FRENCH LANGUAGE

Paper 8682/01
Speaking

Key messages

For teachers/examiners:

- Keep to the timings prescribed for the examination (see below).
- Prompt candidates to ask questions during/at the end of <u>each</u> conversation section, but keep your own answers <u>brief</u>. A candidate cannot qualify for marks while the Examiner is speaking.
- More than one question per section is required for candidates to qualify for full marks under *Seeking Information*/*Opinions* and Examiners should be prepared to prompt candidates for several questions to enable them to have access to the full range of marks.
- Candidates' questions should relate to the topic under discussion. Please see the Mark Scheme.
- Cover a range of topics (not a single topic) in the General Conversation, some in depth, vary questions and topics from one candidate to another, be prepared to identify and follow the interests and passions of the candidate (not your own), and keep your own contributions to a minimum.
- Create as natural a conversation as possible, interact with the candidate and avoid lists of pre-prepared questions, especially those which elicit one-word or purely factual answers.
- Avoid topics of a highly personal or sensitive nature.
- Ask questions at an appropriate level and avoid IGCSE-type questions except as openers to fuller discussion.
- It is the <u>Examiner's</u> responsibility to introduce the candidate at the beginning of the examination, not the candidate's. There were more centres where this happened this session.
- It is not helpful to use 'Maintenant, présente-toi...' as an opener for the General Conversation, as this tends to restrict discussion to a very narrow range of subjects.
- It is not a requirement of this exam for candidates to give their profile at the beginning.
- If the candidate's Topic Presentation is not related to a francophone country or society, the mark for Content/Presentation must be halved. Many examiners seemed unaware of this.

For candidates:

- Make sure that the presentation is not just factual, <u>but contains ideas and opinions</u> and also allows further discussion in the Topic Conversation.
- Ask questions of the Examiner in both conversation sections and <u>make every effort to ask more than one question</u> on the topic or topics under discussion in order to qualify for the full range of marks under *Seeking Information*/*Opinions*. Make sure your questions are relevant to the topic under discussion.
- Remember that the Topic Presentation must make clear reference to a francophone culture or society: *The presentation must demonstrate the candidate's knowledge of the contemporary society or cultural heritage of a country where the target language is spoken.* This must be more than a passing reference, and candidates who live in a francophone country and who speak about an aspect of their own culture must make it clear beyond doubt to which country they are referring. Many topics were borderline in this respect. If the Topic Presentation is not related to a francophone country or society, the mark for Content/Presentation will be halved.
- Candidates are advised that it is better not to ask the Examiner direct questions during the <u>Topic Presentation</u>, as they disrupt the flow of the Presentation and do not count towards *Seeking Information*/*Opinions* in the conversation sections.
- A number of candidates asked rhetorical questions in the Topic Presentation. Rhetorical questions are not a requirement of the examination, but they may constitute, if desired, an appropriate part of the Presentation. However, candidates should be aware that they do not count towards *Seeking Information/Opinions* in the conversation sections.
- It is not in the spirit of the examination that candidates ask their teacher/examiner for key (or indeed *any*) vocabulary.

General comments

It is important for examiners to remember that this examination is an opportunity for candidates to show what they have learnt and a chance for them to express and develop their own ideas and opinions. Examiners should see their role as providing and facilitating this opportunity.

The way in which an examiner asks a question can make a huge difference to how a candidate is able to respond. Examiners need to be aware that:

1. Very long, complex questions tend to unnerve candidates and rarely facilitate discussion.
2. Closed questions usually elicit short answers, sometimes just yes or no, and should be avoided unless they are intended to open the way for a deeper discussion.
3. Open questions such as *Comment?* or *Pourquoi?* are more likely to allow a candidate the freedom to answer at much greater length and in greater depth.

The examination should be a conversation, which can only be achieved by engaging with and responding to what the candidate says, <u>not by asking a series of entirely unrelated questions with no follow-up</u>. Going through a list of pre-prepared questions rarely results in a natural conversation.

Administration

Recordings

1. Recordings this year were mainly clear, though there are still examples of faulty recording equipment. Examiners must check the equipment before using it and ensure that the microphone favours the candidate without losing the Examiner's own contribution. There were a number of centres where the examiner was completely audible but the candidate distant and hard to hear.
2. Please choose a room which is quiet and where candidates are not distracted by external noise. Every year there are centres where this not the case.
3. Only the examiner and the candidate should be present during the test. If a third person is required to be present, for example a carer, permission must be obtained in advance from Cambridge Assessment.
4. Centres are required to keep a copy of the recording(s) in case a second copy is required by the Moderator or a broader range of marks is requested.
5. Please make sure that the recordings have successfully transferred to the CD or memory stick submitted for moderation. We receive blank or distorted disks every year.
6. Where centres use digital recording software, each candidate's file must be saved individually, as .mp files, and finalised correctly, so that each candidate's examination can be accessed for moderation. Files should be identified using precise candidate details (see the paragraph below) rather than just 'number 1, 2' etc.
7. Please ensure that all recording material (including CD cases) is labelled with details of the centre, syllabus, and candidates, listed with their <u>full</u> names and candidate numbers in the order of recording. Where a centre has candidates at both A and AS level, they should be recorded on separate CDs.
8. Centres are reminded that the sample of recordings they send should represent candidates throughout the range of the entry, from highest to lowest.
9. Please also avoid sticky tape or labels coming into contact with the recording side of CDs, as this makes them unplayable and runs the risk of damaging the equipment on which they are played.
10. Please make sure to submit your moderation samples by the published or you risk your results being significantly delayed.

Paperwork

1. Clerical errors are not uncommon either in the addition of marks or in transferring them to the MS1. These should be checked carefully before submission and all paperwork enclosed with the recordings. For the size of sample needed, please see the details on our website.
2. Centres are reminded that for moderation, in addition to the recordings, they need to send the Working Mark Sheet, a copy of the MS1 (computer mark sheet or equivalent), and any other relevant paperwork.

Application of Mark Scheme

1. There were a number of irregularities observed in the application of the Mark Scheme. Several centres awarded marks out of 10 for *Providing* and/or *Seeking Opinions*, when the maximum is 5; others awarded marks for *Seeking Opinions*, even when the candidate had not asked any questions.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

2. The Mark Scheme makes no provision for awarding half marks. Half marks should <u>not</u> be awarded under any circumstances.

3. Many Examiners do not halve the mark for *Presentation/Content* if the candidate's topic is not demonstrably and unequivocally related to a francophone country, even though the mark scheme specifies this.

4. Where a centre engages two or more examiners to examine the same syllabus, examiners must do an internal moderation. Details about how to do this can be found on our website.

Format of the examination

There are 3 distinct parts to the Speaking Test:

1. Presentation – (3–3.5 minutes).
2. Topic Conversation – (7–8 minutes).
3. General Conversation – (8–9 minutes).

The Speaking Test should last no more than 20 minutes and no less than 18 minutes in total.

In order to be fair to all candidates across the world, these timings should be observed – where examinations are too short, candidates are not given opportunities to show what they can do, and where conversations are over-extended, an element of fatigue creeps in and candidates sometimes struggle to maintain their concentration and level of language.

Examiners must also remember that the longer they spend on their own contributions, the less time candidates have to develop their ideas. Responses to questions asked by candidates should be kept brief.

Presentation (3 to 3.5 minutes)

In this part of the examination, the candidate gives a <u>single</u> presentation on a specific topic of his or her choice, taken from one of the topic areas listed in the syllabus booklet. This is the only prepared part of the examination and the only part for which candidates are able to choose what they want to talk about. There were a number of cases this series where candidates spoke on more than one topic.

The topic list gives candidates a very wide choice – the most popular this year, at both A and AS Levels, were *La Pandémie*, *L'enseignement à distance*, *La Technologie*, *L'égalité des sexes*, *Les Médias Sociaux*, *Le Conflit des Générations*, *Le Sport*, *La Famille*, *Le Tourisme*, *L'environnement* and *La Pollution*. There were a number of the usual favourites, such as drugs, unemployment, marriage and discrimination, a few dealing with culture or politics in a French-speaking country, as well as personal interests such as art or music. Some of the most interesting presentations managed to relate their chosen topic to a whole range of social and political issues. <u>It was noticeable that the link to a francophone country was often borderline.</u>

For the most part, candidates were clearly aware of the need, stated in the syllabus, that the presentation **must** demonstrate the candidate's knowledge of the contemporary society or cultural heritage of a country where the target language is spoken. Where this is not the case, candidates will have their mark for *Content/Presentation* halved (see Speaking Test mark scheme) by the examiner.

Since the topic is chosen beforehand, candidates have usually researched quite widely, and have to select and structure their material to fit into 3 to 3.5 minutes – additional material which cannot be included in the actual presentation because of the time constraint may well prove very useful in the topic conversation section. In general, candidates had no problem speaking for the required time and many were able to give full and interesting presentations.

Candidates would be well advised to steer clear of very factual subjects e.g. *La famille* and *Le Sport*. The mark scheme criteria for the *Content/Presentation* element makes it clear that in order to score well, the presentation should contain not just factual points, but ideas and opinions. Candidates need to think carefully before making their final choice and consider whether it will be possible to develop and expand their chosen topic. Sport and family, though popular choices, are often the least successful for that reason.

Increasingly, candidates spend time giving dictionary definitions of very familiar topics at the expense of expressing their own ideas and opinions.

Candidates only present ONE topic and the Topic Conversation which follows will seek to develop that same topic.

A number of candidates gave Topic Presentations which were far too short. On the other hand, if a candidate goes over time, it is the Examiner's responsibility to draw the Presentation to a close after 3.5 minutes.

Topic Conversation (7 to 8 minutes)

In this section, candidates have the chance to expand on what they have already said and develop ideas and opinions expressed briefly during the presentation. Examiners need to beware of merely asking questions which allow a repetition of the same material already offered – their aim should be to ask more probing questions in order to give candidates opportunities to expand on their original statements and then respond to what the candidate says. There are not necessarily 'right' answers either here or in the General Conversation section and it is in the nature of a genuine conversation that those taking part may not agree with opinions expressed. However, differences of opinion can create lively debate (if handled sensitively and purposefully by the examiner) and can give candidates the opportunity to defend their point of view.

At both A and AS Level, questions should go beyond the sort of questions appropriate at IGCSE Level. Candidates need to be able to show that they are capable of taking part in a mature conversation. In some cases, candidates were not able to offer much development or sustain the level of language used in their presentation, but others were successful in expressing additional ideas and seeking the opinions of the examiner.

In each conversation section there are 5 marks available for questions the candidates ask of the examiner: they should ask <u>more than one question</u> in each conversation section and <u>it is the examiner's responsibility to prompt them to do so</u>. Examiners should make sure that they do not spend too long on their own answers to candidates' questions, thereby depriving candidates of valuable time.

Examiners should note that they must indicate the end of the Topic Conversation and the beginning of the General Conversation.

General Conversation (8 to 9 minutes)

The General Conversation is the most spontaneous section of the examination. Candidates will have prepared their own choice of topic for the Topic Presentation (to be continued in the Topic Conversation), but here they do not know what the examiner will choose to discuss (and it is the examiner who chooses, not the candidate). Clearly the areas of discussion will be those studied during the course, but there seemed to be relatively few varied and in-depth discussions. In a centre with a number of candidates, candidates should not all be asked to talk about the same list of subjects – themes should be varied from candidate to candidate and should on no account return to the original subject of the presentation.

This section is intended to be a conversation between examiner and candidate, so it is not appropriate for the examiner to ask a series of unrelated questions, to which the candidate responds with a prepared answer, after which the examiner moves on to the next question on the list! Examiners should display sensitivity in asking questions about topics of a personal nature i.e. religion and personal relationships and should try to keep their questions general rather than moving inappropriately into personal areas. Examiners should not regard the examination as a platform for imposing their own views on the candidates.

Examiners should aim to discuss a minimum of <u>2 to 3 areas</u> in **depth**, giving candidates opportunities to offer their own opinions and defend them in discussion. Although the section may begin with straightforward questions about family, interests or future plans, which can, in themselves, be developed beyond the purely factual (questions asking 'Why?' or 'How?' are useful here), candidates at both A and AS Level should be prepared for the conversation to move on to current affairs and more abstract topics appropriate to this level of examination.

Candidates should be prompted to ask questions of the examiner in order to give them the opportunity to score marks for this criterion, though examiners should once again be wary of answering at too great a length.

A significant number of examiners only covered one topic in this section.

Assessment

1. The greatest causes of difference were where marks had been awarded for asking questions where none had actually been asked or where Topic Presentations did not relate to a francophone country, in which case the mark for Content/Presentation must be halved.

2. A handful of examiners also found it difficult to establish an acceptable level for *Comprehension/Responsiveness*, *Accuracy* and *Feel for the Language*, while others found it tricky to differentiate between the bands for *Pronunciation/Intonation*.

3. In rare cases, examiners misapplied the mark scheme, most frequently by awarding marks out of 10 for those categories like *Pronunciation/Intonation* and *Seeking Opinions* which carry a maximum of 5 marks.

4. Examiners at centres with a large entry of able candidates should be aware that marks may be bunched and that it may be impossible to differentiate between candidates to a greater degree than the Mark Scheme allows.

5. Where candidates ask questions to elicit clarification or obtain information during the course of conversation, they should clearly be rewarded, but examiners must remember to prompt candidates in both conversation sections – the mark scheme gives the criteria for awarding marks for this element of the examination and these marks should be awarded regardless of whether questions are spontaneous or prompted, provided that they are relevant to the topic under discussion. A significant number of candidates had prepared questions which were not relevant.

6. Centres are reminded that, except in extenuating circumstances, they should engage only one Examiner per syllabus. In cases where the engagement of two or more Examiners on the same syllabus is unavoidable, the Examiners must co-ordinate with each other to establish an agreed standard and submit evidence of internal moderation with the Moderation Sample.

FRENCH LANGUAGE

> **Paper 8682/21**
> **Reading and Writing**

Key messages

- In **Question 1**, the word or words chosen as the answer must be interchangeable in every respect with the word or words given in the question. The inclusion of additional words invalidates the answer.

- In **Question 2**, candidates are required to manipulate the sentence grammatically, not to alter its vocabulary or meaning unnecessarily.

- In **Questions 3** and **4**, candidates should not simply 'lift' (copy/cut and paste) items unaltered from the text. They need to manipulate the text in some way, re-phrasing by using different vocabulary or structures.

- In **Questions 3** and **4**, candidates should **not** begin the answer by writing out the question. Answers beginning with (for example) *Parce que* are quite acceptable.

- In **Question 5**, any material in excess of 150 (total for **parts (a)** and **(b)** combined) is ignored. Candidates should not write a general introduction.

- In **Question 5(b)**, candidates should be encouraged to venture some brief relevant ideas of their own without confining themselves to the material contained in the text.

General comments

The question paper generated a number of good scripts from some able and well-prepared candidates who handled the various tasks with commendable fluency and accuracy, but there were some at the other end of the range of those whose level of linguistic competence and knowledge was simply over-stretched by what was being asked of them.

Stronger candidates usually appeared familiar with the format of the paper and knew how to set about tackling the different types of question. Where candidates scored consistently poorly, it was often because they copied items unaltered from the texts in **Questions 3** and **4**.

Illegibility remains a significant (and growing) problem, partly because of very poor or quirky handwriting and partly because of ambiguous and messy crossings-out and insertions.

There were few signs of undue time pressure, with most candidates managing to attempt all questions, although some answers in **Questions 3** and **4** were unnecessarily lengthy. Most of the questions on this paper could be answered in short sentences containing straightforward grammar and vocabulary, but some candidates tend to over-complicate things by attempting structures which they cannot handle, producing answers that cannot be rewarded. Candidates would also do well to look at the number of marks awarded for each question or part question (indicated either in the body of the question or in square brackets) as an indication of the number of points to be made.

Many candidates still feel the need to incorporate the words of the question as an unnecessary preamble to the answer, which not only wastes time for both candidate and examiner, but also potentially introduces linguistic errors which can detract from the overall impression for the Quality of Language mark – e.g. **3(b)** *Le système pourrait-il être utile dans des situations d'urgence parce que…* ; **3(d)** *Certains professeurs essayaient-ils de gagner du temps en…* ; **3(e)** *Un élève risquerait-il d'être exclu s'il… .* Answers beginning with *parce que*, *en, si,* etc. are quite in order, indeed usually preferable.

In **Questions 3** and **4**, it is encouraging to note that most candidates understand how to 'work' the text to avoid 'lifting', but it still remains a common feature amongst the weaker candidates. It is important to remember that simply 'lifting' items directly from the text, even if they include more or less correct information, does not demonstrate understanding and therefore does not score marks at this level. Candidates must show that they can manipulate the text in some way (even in a minor way) to provide the correct answer. They should try to express the relevant points using different vocabulary or structures. There is an encouraging trend for the stronger candidates to understand how to do this quite simply, avoiding unnecessary over-complication. Even quite small changes (e.g. transforming nouns into verbs or finding a simple synonym) or extensions to the original can show that candidates are able to handle both the ideas and the language – see specific comments on **Questions 3** and **4** below.

The paper ties the questions (and therefore the answers) to specific paragraphs (or occasionally to specific lines) in the texts. Candidates who find themselves writing the same answer for two questions need to pause for thought.

Question 2, on the other hand, is not the time to attempt to find other words for vocabulary items used in the original sentence. This question is a test of grammatical manipulation, not of an ability to find alternative vocabulary for its own sake. Candidates should therefore aim to make the minimum changes necessary, whilst retaining as many elements of the original as possible. They need to be aware, however, that alterations made to one part of the sentence are likely to have grammatical implications elsewhere, particularly in matters of agreement. **Candidates should not attempt to cut corners by omitting the prompt at the start of their answers.**

In **Question 1**, many candidates are aware of need for the words given as the answer to be interchangeable in every respect with the word or words given in the question – i.e. the word or words to be inserted must fit precisely into the 'footprint' of the word or words which they are replacing.

In **Question 5**, candidates should realise the importance of the word limits clearly set out in the rubric: a total of 140 words for both sections, 90–100 words for the summary of specific points made in the original texts and 40–50 words for the response. **Material beyond 150 words overall is ignored and scores no marks. This means that those candidates who use up the entire allocation of words on the Summary automatically receive none of the 5 marks available for their Personal Response**. Although there has been a marked improvement in this respect in recent series, some candidates still write answers in excess of the word limit, sometimes by a large margin, meaning that many answers to the **Personal Response** cannot be awarded any marks since the overall word limit has been exceeded before it starts.

These limits are such that **candidates cannot afford the luxury of an introductory preamble**, however polished. It appears that some candidates are still unnecessarily afraid of being penalised for not introducing the subject. In some cases, this resulted in candidates simply using up virtually a third of the number of words allowed, literally pointlessly, before they started. The word limit is already quite tight to achieve ten points and, from the outset, candidates need to make the point as succinctly as possible and move on to the other nine. It is a summary/*résumé* of specific points from the texts that is required in the first part of **Question 5**, not a general essay or a vehicle for personal opinions.

Some candidates made the same point several times or went into unnecessary detail.

It is strongly recommended that candidates count carefully the number of words that they have used as they go through the exercise and record them accurately at the end of each of the two parts, if only in order to highlight to themselves the need to remain within the limits. For the purpose of counting words in this context, a word is taken to be any unit that is not joined to another in any way: therefore *il y a* is three words, as is *qu'est-ce que c'est?*

The most successful candidates often showed clear evidence of planning and editing their material with the word limit in mind, but other scripts were littered with crossings-out, which did little to improve standards of presentation and legibility.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Answers sometimes appeared to be chosen largely at random, bearing no grammatical or semantic relationship to the given word in the question. Candidates might be well advised to narrow down the choice by identifying the part of speech involved.

For example, in **Item (a)** the prompt *connectés* is a masculine plural past participle, of which the only other example in the prescribed first two paragraphs is *reliés*, which could well have pointed the candidate in a sensible direction even if (s)he was unfamiliar with the meaning of the words.

Item (b) proved difficult for those who seemed to think that *la rentrée* must have something to do with entrances, so *portes* (or *port*) was sometimes offered, whilst **Item (c)** *exigé* was sometimes thought to have something to do with exiting (hence *sortira*);

Item (d) (*désormais*) was perhaps identified successfully for *dès maintenant* by only a minority of candidates, but **Item (e)** was the most successfully handled, with most candidates recognising the synonyms *classe/cours*.

Question 2

There were a number of very good answers to this question, but the task proved quite demanding for candidates with an inadequate command of grammatical structures, or who failed to observe the basic rules of agreement.

Some candidates appeared to see this as an exercise in simply re-arranging the order of the words of the original, with no regard for sense.

In **Item 2(a)**, some understood the requirement for a transformation into the active, but fewer saw the need to make *pourront* plural, sometimes omitting it altogether or else leaving *contrôlé* unaltered.

In **Item 2(b)**, those who produced an attempt at the passive often forgot to make *déclenchée* agree. Some others misunderstood *oubli* as a verb and added an *e* to that instead.

In **Item 2(c)**, those who recognised the need for a subjunctive could not always find the correct form (*sachent*).

In **Item 2(d)**, a number of candidates did not conjugate *prévenir* correctly in the future tense.

Item 2(e) saw some candidates attempting the transfer to reported speech but running into difficulty with conjugating *se plaindre*.

Question 3

There was a tendency among some candidates simply to seize on a word in the question and to write out the sentence from the text which contained it or something similar, in the hope of including the answer somewhere along the way. Questions are usually specifically designed to prevent this.

Item 3(a) offered candidates the opportunity to get off to a good start with *introduire/utiliser des badges (électroniques)* or similar and then to find an appropriate verb to replace the noun *détection*, as suggested by the question: *détecter/contrôler/enregistrer/vérifier,* etc.

Item 3(b) saw some confusion between *le port* and *les portes*, and not all mentioned the need for the badges to be carried/worn at all times. But the automatic recording of entries/exits was well understood by most, and a good number found simple ways *of* expressing the idea that *les lecteurs peuvent trouver l'élève en cas d'urgence/danger* without resorting to *la location/l'emplacement/l'emergence,* etc.

Item 3(c) was often successfully answered by candidates who understood the question *A quoi servira…?*, and wrote *Leur dire que leur enfant n'est pas (arrivé) à l'école/en classe* or similar. Some then went too far by suggesting that an actual (rather than possible) accident could be detected/notified via the system.

In **Item 3(d)**, candidates successfully pointed to the teaching time saved in not needing to take the register and in discouraging unauthorised absences, although the use of *attendance* and *assurance* sometimes confused the issue – as did the occasional suggestion that it was useful as a means of detecting teachers' absences. The final element was often omitted or not answered in the past tense as required by the question.

Item 3(e) often generated both marks for candidates who found straightforward ways of expressing the consequences whilst avoiding 'lifting' from the text (e.g. *Il devra payer 15 euros. S'il porte le badge d'un autre élève.)*

Item 3(f) was answered well by those candidates who avoided lifting the nouns *achat, passage* and *déplacements* and replaced them (for example) with three simple verbs such as *acheter, passer* and *se déplacer,* as suggested by the use of the verb *faire* in the question.

Question 4

Item 4(a): successful candidates here recognised the need to find another way of expressing *grincer les dents,* and did so with alternatives as simple as *Ils ne sont pas contents.* They then went on to say *La plupart des professeurs sont pour/positifs* and *Certains parents l'applaudissent/disent bravo*, making this one of the best answered questions.

In **Item 4(b)**, candidates generally appeared to understand the idea of a petition but some were unable to provide a suitable verb, attempting unsuccessfully to press the ubiquitous *mettre* into service with *Ils ont mis une pétition*. *Le retrait* was often misunderstood (or lifted) for the second element here.

In **Item 4(c)**, stronger candidates found ways of expressing the criticism levelled against the school: *On n'a pas consulté les parents/demander leur avis* and *On n'a pas expliqué pourquoi/les raisons,* both answers needing a past tense if a finite verb was used. The further criticism of the school for announcing the measure under the cover of the summer holidays eluded many for the third mark.

In **Item 4(d)**, candidates generally understood the question, with good numbers recognising the ease of using the -er verbs *surveiller/espionner* and *pirater/voler* to avoid lifting the nouns of the text.

In **Item 4(e)**, a significant proportion successfully expressed the students' rejection of the *directrice*'s assurances – *ils n'y croient pas/ne sont pas convaincus* – and their belief that her intention was to spy on them, although the use of *mettre* on its own – *elle veut mettre un traceur* – was again unrewardable here.

In **Item 4(f)**, successful candidates correctly identified Maria's view that the school was invading students' right to privacy, but some got confused and thought that it was the students who did not have confidence in the school or indeed in themselves. More able candidates often finished on a good note with answers such as *la rentrée sera turbulente/problématique/agitée* or *l'auteur prévoit des tensions/problèmes/disputes à la rentrée.*

Question 5

This question asked candidates to summarise the justifications and assurances offered by the *directrice* and the dissatisfaction expressed by some parents and students.

Being concise is part of the task. See **General comments** at the start of this report for the need for candidates to embark directly on identifying and giving point-scoring information without a general introduction.

The mark scheme identified 14 rewardable points, of which most candidates managed a reasonable number. Some candidates simply copied out verbatim chunks of the text, hoping to chance upon some rewardable material. A number of others produced general essays without including the required rewardable elements.

The most commonly identified points in favour of the new system included the ability to check attendance, reduce absenteeism, save potential teaching time by not having to take the register, and being able to locate students in an emergency or notify parents of the possibility of a problem on the way to school. *La location des élèves* quite often confused issues, whilst the possibility of using the badge to pay for school services was less commonly identified

Sources of discontent included the lack of consultation and explanation, the announcing of the scheme during the holidays and a strong suspicion that the real motivation was to spy on students, thereby demonstrating a lack of trust and respect for their private lives.

There is no specific penalty for 'lifting' in this exercise as far as <u>content</u> is concerned, but excessive reliance on the language contained in the text is liable to be penalised in the quality of language mark.

The **Personal Response** was designed to broaden the debate away from electronic badges in schools to the use of technological surveillance in society in general. Candidates who restricted themselves to the school context therefore scored poorly, but those who answered the question were generally in favour of surveillance on the grounds that it identifies the guilty and protects the innocent, although there were some thoughtful comments about the potential for misuse and the invasion of privacy.

Quality of Language

The quality of language varied from good to very poor. The very strongest candidates wrote fluently and accurately, demonstrating a broad and flexible range of vocabulary and a commendable control of structure. The weakest struggled with the rudiments of the language, finding it difficult to express their ideas in a comprehensible form.

Agreements of adjectives with their nouns and verbs with their subjects (and even the process of making nouns plural) – the nuts and bolts of the language – appeared largely random in many scripts. Some candidates seemed to be unaware of the need to make any agreements whatsoever. It is tempting to put much of this down to a lack of checking, alongside a very high incidence of miscopying of words given in the text or questions. Given that there are rarely signs of undue time pressure, one can only urge candidates to be much more systematic and rigorous over checking what they have written. However, the problem may in some cases be much deeper than this. It is hard to attribute to pure carelessness: *ont cour le risque; ont nes pas d'accord ; les élèves ne croix pas du tous ; l'école nous mais dans un embara ; ils on faient sa.*

There appears to be a tendency even amongst those who do appreciate the need for agreements to confuse how to make nouns and adjectives plural with how to make verbs plural: for example the plural of *l'élève* becoming *les élèvent,* and the plural of *il entre* becoming *ils entres*.

Incorrect verb forms were prevalent, even with some very common verbs in the present indicative e.g. *faire (ils faient), avoir (ils avent), dire (elle di).*

The use of the infinitive (*-er*) ending – or indeed anything else that sounded vaguely similar – seemed interchangeable with the past participle (*-é*) in some scripts.

The approach to spelling was in some cases phonetic or idiosyncratic, e.g. *tros, on/ont, son/sont, ces/ses/c'est, ce/se, mes/mais, sa/ça, et/est, voix/voit/voie, sel/celle* often seemed to be selected at random.

Time spent in studying vocabulary in lexical groups might be time well spent.

Personal pronouns and adjectives in general would repay further study, as would the constructions following some common verbs; *aider, demander, permettre, obliger,* etc.

The above section inevitably focuses on linguistic weaknesses which prevented candidates from satisfactorily expressing answers which one suspected they may actually have known. But candidates were nevertheless often able to transmit the required information and opinions using French which, although sometimes flawed, communicated effectively.

FRENCH LANGUAGE

Key messages

- In **Question 1**, the word or words chosen as the answer must be interchangeable in every respect with the word or words given in the question. The inclusion of additional words invalidates the answer.

- In **Question 2**, candidates are required to manipulate the sentence grammatically, not to alter its vocabulary or meaning unnecessarily.

- In **Questions 3** and **4**, candidates should not simply 'lift' (copy/cut and paste) items unaltered from the text. They need to manipulate the text in some way, re-phrasing by using different vocabulary or structures.

- In **Questions 3** and **4**, candidates should **not** begin the answer by writing out the question. Answers beginning with (for example) *Parce que* are quite acceptable.

- In **Question 5**, any material in excess of 150 (total for **parts (a)** and **(b)** combined) is ignored. Candidates should not write a general introduction.

- In **Question 5(b)**, candidates should be encouraged to venture some brief relevant ideas of their own without confining themselves to the material contained in the text.

General comments

Overall, the texts were felt to be of an appropriate level and approachable by the overwhelming majority. The subject matter appeared to be of interest and relevance to the candidates who were generally able to engage with the texts.

There were some very good scripts from able and well-prepared candidates who handled all the tasks with commendable fluency and accuracy, whilst there were some at the other end of the range whose level of linguistic competence was severely challenged by what was being asked of them.

Illegibility remains a significant problem, partly because of very poor handwriting (notably the letters *r* and *s* appearing identical on the end of words) and partly because of ambiguous and messy crossings-out and minute insertions.

Most candidates appeared familiar with the format of the paper and knew how to set about tackling the different types of question. Where candidates scored consistently poorly, it was often because they copied items unaltered from the texts in **Questions 3** and **4**.

There were few signs of undue time pressure, with most candidates managing to attempt all questions, although quite a lot of answers in **Questions 3** and **4** were unnecessarily lengthy. Most of the questions on this paper could be answered in short sentences containing straightforward grammar and vocabulary, but some candidates over-complicate things by attempting structures which they cannot handle, producing answers that cannot be rewarded. Candidates would also do well to look at the number of marks awarded for each question or part question (indicated either in the body of the question or in square brackets) as an indication of the number of points to be made.

Many candidates still feel the need to incorporate the words of the question as an unnecessary preamble to the answer, which not only wastes time for both candidate and marker, but also potentially introduces linguistic errors which can detract from the overall impression for the Quality of Language mark – e.g. (**3(b)**)

Le sport protège-t-il le corps parce que… ; (**3(c)**) *Certaines personnes nuisent-elles à leur propre santé en…* ; (**4(b)**) *Les jeunes sont-ils particulièrement vulnérables à l'activité physique trop intense parce que…* . Answers beginning with *parce que, en* etc. are quite in order and generally preferable.

In **Questions 3** and **4**, it is encouraging to note that copying wholesale from the text has diminished in recent sessions, with more candidates understanding how to 'work' the text to avoid 'lifting', but it remains a common feature for some candidates. It is important to remember that simply 'lifting' items directly from the text, even if they include more or less correct information, does not demonstrate understanding and therefore does not score marks at this level. Candidates must show that they can manipulate the text in some way (even in a minor way) to provide the correct answer. They should try to express the relevant points using different vocabulary or structures. Even quite small changes (e.g. transforming nouns into verbs or finding a simple synonym) or extensions to the original can show that candidates are able to handle both the ideas and the language – see specific comments on **Questions 3** and **4** below.

The paper ties the questions (and therefore the answers) to specific paragraphs (or occasionally to specific lines) in the texts. Candidates who find themselves writing the same answer for two questions need to pause for thought.

Question 2, on the other hand, is not the time to attempt to find other words for straightforward vocabulary items used in the original sentence. This question is a test of grammatical manipulation, not of an ability to find alternative vocabulary for its own sake. Candidates should therefore aim to make the minimum changes necessary, whilst retaining as many elements of the original as possible. They need to be aware, however, that alterations made to one part of the sentence are likely to have grammatical implications elsewhere, particularly in matters of agreement. **Candidates should not attempt to cut corners by omitting the prompt at the start of their answers.**

In **Question 1**, candidates nowadays appear more aware of need for the words given as the answer to be interchangeable in every respect with the word or words given in the question – i.e. the word or words to be inserted must fit precisely into the 'footprint' of the word or words which they are replacing.

In **Question 5**, candidates should realise the importance of the word limits clearly set out in the rubric: a total of 140 words for both sections, 90–100 words for the summary of specific points made in the original texts and 40–50 words for the response. **Material beyond 150 words overall is ignored and scores no marks. This means that those candidates who use up the entire allocation of words on the Summary automatically receive none of the 5 marks available for their Personal Response**. Although there has been a marked improvement in this respect in recent sessions, some candidates still write answers in excess of the word limit, sometimes by a large margin, meaning that many good answers to the **Personal Response** cannot be awarded any marks since the overall word limit has been exceeded before it starts.

These limits are such that **candidates cannot afford the luxury of an introductory preamble**, however polished. It appears that some candidates are still unnecessarily afraid of being penalised for not introducing the topic (perhaps because of different practices in other subjects). To give just one example among many, the candidate who started *Tout d'abord, qu'est-ce que c'est que le sport ? Le sport est un moyen de pratiquer des exercises physiques pour pouvoir être en bonne santé, mais le sport contient des bienfaits et des inconvénients. D'abord les bienfaits : le sport est tellement apprécié qu'il est pratiqué partout dans le monde…* simply wasted a third of the available words, literally pointlessly. The word limit is already quite tight to achieve ten points and, from the outset, candidates need to make a relevant point as succinctly as possible and move on to the other nine. It is a summary/*résumé* of specific points from the texts that is required in the first part of **Question 5**, not a general essay or a vehicle for personal opinions.

Other candidates made the same point several times or went into unnecessary detail.

It is strongly recommended that candidates count carefully the number of words that they have used as they go through the exercise and record them accurately at the end of each of the two parts, if only in order to highlight to themselves the need to remain within the limits. For the purpose of counting words in this context, a word is taken to be any unit that is not joined to another in any way: therefore *il y a* is three words, as is *qu'est-ce que c'est?*

The most successful candidates often showed clear evidence of planning and editing their material with the word limit in mind, but other scripts were littered with crossings-out, which often interfered with legibility.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This was a reasonably straightforward first exercise, but answers from some candidates sometimes appeared to be chosen largely at random and bore no grammatical or semantic relationship to the given word in the question. Candidates would be well advised to narrow the choice down by identifying the part of speech involved.

- **Item (a)** was generally well recognised, although the occasional addition of *la journée* invalidated on the 'footprint' principle. (See above, in the **General comments** relating to Question 1.)
- In **Item (b),** d*étendu* was correctly offered as a synonym for *décontracté* by most.
- **Item (c)** produced a large number of correct identifications of *comprimés*, but some went for *médicaments* which is outside the prescribed final two paragraphs. Others inserted an unnecessary *les*.
- **Item (d)** was generally successfully identified, with the occasional incorrect addition of *les*.
- **Item (e)** was well done, with the occasional omission of *tout*.

Question 2

There were some good answers to this question, but the task proved very demanding for candidates with an inadequate command of grammatical structures, or who failed to observe the basic rules of agreement.

In **Item 2(a)**, the transfer to the passive proved problematic for those who did not see any need to make *recommandée* agree or changed the tense.

In **Item 2(b)**, candidates often omitted the *ne,* inserted a *pas,* or unnecessarily altered the tense of the verb.

Item 2(c) saw many candidates identifying the need for a subjunctive following *Il vaut mieux que*, but sometimes slipping up over forming it correctly.

In **Item 2(d)**, some saw the need to change *on peut* to *les sports peuvent* but then forgot to complete the task and left *pratiquer* or *pratiqué* in the singular.

In **Item 2(e)**, the opposite happened with *les sports sont capables* being incorrectly left in the plural, often compounded by the addition of *ne…pas.*

Question 3

In **Item 3(a)**, candidates who were alert to the idea of avoiding 'lifting' by replacing the nouns *inclusion, durée* and *échauffement* by their corresponding verbs got off to a good start here, even if not all understood *hebdomadaires* and others thought that three different types of activity/sport were necessary.

In **Item 3(b)**, successful candidates often opted for simplicity with *Il réduit/diminue le rythme cardiaque/l'hypertension* or *le coeur bat moins vite*, avoiding *diminuter/dimunier/ disminuer/ir* and similar. However, fewer offered the straightforward *manger/se nourrir/alimenter* in response to the third part of the question.

In **Item 3(c**), some missed the point about spending too long sitting in over-heated rooms (not *chambres, endroits* or *places)* but usually mentioned excessive food consumption/over-eating and lack of exercise/physical activity/movement.

Item 3(d) was the most successfully handled question here, with candidates generally opting for the verbs *éliminer* and *consommer* (rather than the occasional *éliminater* and *consumer*).

In **Item 3(e)**, not all candidates noticed that there were four separate points to be made here, but many sensibly answered using straightforward verbs: *respecter/suivre, accepter, établir /développer, coopérer/travailler ensemble/en groupe.* Some who used *accepter* nevertheless invalidated their answer by including the *de* from *acceptation de la défaite* (so writing *accepter de la défaite,* which did not demonstrate full comprehension.)

Question 4

In **Item 4(a)**, most candidates pointed to the need to avoid training *trop intensivement/excessivement/sans limite*, but many were reluctant to attempt alternative ways of expressing *douleurs (on a mal/cela fait mal)* or *blessures (on peut se blesser/se faire mal)*.

In **Item 4(b)**, some did not seem to understand (or mention) *les os*, but most successfully identified the desire to improve performance and reduce recovery time.

In **Item 4(c)**, the first mark required the idea of resuming physical activity too suddenly at the outset, rather than just pushing oneself too hard in general. Some who sensibly offered *reprendre* invalidated their answer by incorporating the *de* from *la reprise d'une activité* into *reprendre d'une activité.* Some candidates wanted to offer advice on how to run a marathon, but there were plenty who understood the idea of being able to chat and run at the same time.

In **Item 4(d)**, the first mark involved the idea of <u>thinking</u> constantly about training (*ils pensent tout le temps à…*) rather than simply *ils s'entraînent tous les jours/trop souvent,* but was generally handled well enough. Many found ways to express the idea of reduced performance *(ils travaillent moins bien/font moins bien au travail*) but attempts to create verbs to replace *rupture* and *interruption* for the final two marks often came to grief.

In **Item 4(e)**, some wanted to express *réaliser* as *comprendre* or offered *réaliser qu'ils ont du potentiel*. Many candidates found neat ways of handling the idea that winning medals is not all that matters without lifting *il n'y a que*, whilst most successfully pointed to the unacceptability of *se doper*.

Question 5

Question 5(a) asked candidates to summarise the benefits and dangers of sport and exercise in general, both physical and psychological.

Being concise is part of the task. See **General comments** at the start of this report for the need for candidates to embark directly on identifying and giving point-scoring information without a general introduction.

The mark scheme identified 14 rewardable points, of which most candidates managed a significant number by knowing how to select material carefully and economically. The most efficient reached the maximum of 10, whilst some simply copied out verbatim chunks of the text, hoping to chance upon some rewardable material.

There is no specific penalty for 'lifting' in this exercise as far as <u>content</u> is concerned, but excessive reliance on the language contained in the text is liable to be penalised in the Quality of Language mark. Those who simply resort to presenting a list in the form of bullet points using nouns without introductory verbs are also unlikely to score high on the language mark.

The rubric of the **Personal Response** (**5(b)**) specifically ruled out mention of exercise and sport, and asked for <u>other</u> ways of preserving physical and mental health. Most of those who respected the question which they were asked produced sensible suggestions: a healthy diet, yoga*,* the importance of friends and family, work-life balance, hobbies, music, etc. Interestingly, there was virtually no mention of avoiding tobacco, alcohol or drugs in general, or spending too long in front of screens.

Quality of Language

The strongest candidates wrote fluently and accurately, demonstrating a broad and flexible range of vocabulary and a robust control of structure. Some struggled with the rudiments of the language, finding it difficult to express their ideas in a comprehensible form.

Agreements of adjectives with their nouns and verbs with their subjects (and even the process of making nouns plural) – the nuts and bolts of the language – appeared largely random in a number of scripts. Some candidates seemed to be unaware of the need to make any agreements whatsoever. Incorrect verb forms proliferated, with some unable to conjugate even very common verbs such as *faire, pouvoir, avoir* and *courir* in the present indicative, and *-ir* and *-re* verbs in general.

The use of the infinitive (-*er*) ending – or indeed anything else that sounded vaguely similar – seemed interchangeable with the past participle (-*é*) in some scripts.

The approach to spelling was in some cases at best phonetic, even with very common words, e.g. *prandre, sant* for *sans, soi/sois/soit, peu/peut/peur, mes/mais, on/ont, son/sont, ces/ses/c'est, sa/ça,* all of which often seemed to be selected at random.

Time spent in studying vocabulary in lexical groups might be time well spent, whilst emphatic pronouns, and indeed pronouns in general, would certainly repay further study, as would constructions following certain common verbs: *permettre, aider; demander, obliger,* etc.

The above section inevitably focuses on linguistic weaknesses, but the majority of candidates were able to transmit the required information and opinions using French which although often flawed was nevertheless generally comprehensible to a sympathetic reader. The top candidates displayed an ability to write French which was both virtually free from error and commendably idiomatic and convincing.

FRENCH LANGUAGE

Paper 8682/23
Reading and Writing

© 2021

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

Cambridge Assessment International Education

https://xtremepape.rs/

FRENCH LANGUAGE

Paper 8682/31
Essay

Key messages

In order to be successful on this paper, candidates need to read the questions carefully and take sufficient time to plan their essays before starting to write. They then need to create logical, well-illustrated answers on the actual question set. Candidates should use the introduction to show their understanding of the essay title with all its elements and the conclusion to show their considered final judgement of the issues they have discussed. Paragraphing, with use of appropriate linking words or phrases, is also important to show both clarity of thought and logical progression through an argument. In order to attain high marks for language, candidates should write accurately and idiomatically in language which demonstrates complexity both in structure and vocabulary.

General comments

Many essays were extremely short and the majority only just reached the minimum suggested word count. Some candidates wrote an answer based on the overall topic heading, paying no heed to the question set, whilst others were merely trying to create sentences using the words in the five questions on the paper. A number of essays were limited to generalisations with few examples and were poorly structured and punctuated. There was considerable interference from both English and Spanish in many answers which impeded the communication of ideas. Many essays demonstrated poor command and control of language with a significant number of serious grammatical errors. Some candidates did manage to write with a fair level of accuracy and were thus able to communicate their ideas.

Among a number of common errors, the following were seen:

- Misspellings of common words: *emploie, immagration, beacoup, gouverment, environment, réussire, le travaille*.
- Incorrect gender of common words: e.g. *une grande problème, une choix importante.*
- Incorrect use of negatives (*c'est ne pas, ne bon pas, c'est n'est*).
- Incorrect word order noun/adjective.
- Use of *comment* for *comme, pour* for *par.*
- Use of *faire* for *rendre:*
- Use of *parce que/car/grâce à* instead of *à cause de.*
- Incorrect use of preposition after common verbs e.g. *commencer de, encourager de, hésiter de.*
- Overuse of *chose/choses; personnes/gens; beaucoup.*
- Confusion between: *ces/ses/c'est; ça/sa; son/sont; ce/ceux; mais/mes/met; mois/moi.*
- Redundant use of *y* and *en.*

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Les consommateurs de nos jours ont trop de choix dans les supermarchés. Êtes-vous d'accord?

Few candidates attempted this question. Essays were often limited to lists of types of food available in supermarkets. Some candidates believed that supermarkets offered too much processed food to consumers, leading to an increase in obesity and diabetes rates. Others thought that supermarkets offered a good range of healthy food options and foods suitable for those with allergies or who followed special diets. Overall, a wide choice for consumers was seen to be positive as long as customers were able to make wise decisions when shopping and not be encouraged into buying the wrong things.

Question 2

Le veganisme: l'avenir de l'humanité? Discutez.

Candidates attempting this question often just talked about the benefits of a vegan diet for the individual without considering the benefits to humanity. They recognised that following a vegan diet can be expensive but that for many people it is a healthy option and avoids the need to kill or make use of animals. Some candidates stated that a vegan diet did not contain sufficient nutrients for a healthy life because it lacks proteins, vitamins and minerals and that it takes time and effort to create meals that are varied and healthy. Overall, candidates did believe that veganism was of benefit to the environment since it would mean that less meat would be produced, meaning less pollution, and overfishing would cease. In this way, it could be of great help for the future of humanity.

Question 3

Pour avoir une vie totalement réussie, on doit avoir un emploi satisfaisant et agréable. Êtes-vous d'accord?

This was a popular question but many candidates failed to engage fully with the thrust of the question. Many focused on the what work means for the individual materially such as the ability to buy food and clothes, afford a home and have holidays. They felt that a job did not have to be particularly interesting for these needs to be met. Some pointed out that there were other ways to become fulfilled in life such as having family and friends, being a good citizen, helping others. Candidates often saw that work was more about respect or status in society rather than one's own job satisfaction but it was still important for one's mental health to be fulfilled at work.

Question 4

L'immigration: impact positif ou négatif sur le pays d'accueil.

Many candidates chose this question. They sometimes wrote about immigration in general terms rather than explaining its impact on host countries. The best answers described the economic benefits since immigrants work and therefore invigorate local economies by buying goods and services and paying housing costs and local taxes. As well as this, they bring different cultures and traditions that enrich and diversify those of the host country. Some negative impacts were recognised; local people might feel that they were being outcompeted for jobs, rates of crime might rise and there might be animosity between locals and the immigrant population. In general, most candidates felt that immigration was a positive thing and that people should have the right to move from one country to another to escape war and poverty and to seek a better life for their families.

Question 5

«Nous sommes tous égoistes face à la crise écologique.» Qu'en pensez-vous?

This question elicited some good responses, with examples of how people could make a contribution to the fight against the environmental crisis facing the planet. Candidates mentioned ways in which individuals can play their part such as reducing their use of plastic, driving less or only driving electric cars, changing to a meat-free diet. They also felt that businesses should consider the environment before profit and reduce the amount of pollution they cause and that governments should come together to recognise the current dangers and put in place global policies to alleviate the damage caused by economic growth and worldwide apathy. Candidates answering this question generally had some good ideas and were able to communicate them effectively.

FRENCH LANGUAGE

Paper 8682/32
Essay

Key messages

In order to be successful on this paper, candidates need to read the questions carefully and take sufficient time to plan their essays before starting to write. They then need to create logical, well-illustrated answers on the actual question set. Candidates should use the introduction to show their understanding of the essay title with all its elements and the conclusion to show their considered final judgement of the issues they have discussed. Paragraphing, with use of appropriate linking words or phrases, is also important to show both clarity of thought and logical progression through an argument. In order to attain high marks for language, candidates should write accurately and idiomatically in language which demonstrates complexity both in structure and vocabulary.

General comments

There was a considerable range of ability shown: at the upper end, essays were stylistically sophisticated and demonstrated an impressive control of language and argument, whereas weaker essays revealed that candidates had taken too little time in planning and had often not fully understood the question they had chosen. This sometimes became clear in the introduction when they asked a different question at the end of their introductory paragraph than the one set. This set them off on completely the wrong path throughout. Words from the titles were routinely misspelled or attributed the wrong gender and there was little attempt to use synonyms to alleviate repetition. Introductions often took the form of a long quotation or a definition of one or two of the terms in the question e.g. *un repas* or *la famille,* when they should really show a candidate's understanding of the question and its parameters. In some cases, the language was poor with many basic errors, particularly agreements, overuse of the infinitive, and incorrect articles. Spelling was often poor, with words spelt many different ways within the course of an essay. Handwriting was also a problem in many cases and that, combined with a lack of punctuation made following the logic of an argument at times quite difficult.

Among a number of common errors, the following were seen:

Phonetic and/or misspellings – *c'est rent (seront)*, *peu* for *peut*, *déçu* for *dessous*, *si* for *ci*, *et* for *est*, *tôt* for *taux*

Misspellings of common words – *beacoup, gouvernment, environment, réussire, le travaille*

Personnes/*gens* used interchangeably leading to incorrect subsequent use of *ils*/*elles*

Overuse of *plusieurs*

Use of made-up words such as *démodation* and *discutation*

Incorrect use of negatives (*c'est ne pas, ne bon pas, c'est n'est*)

Incorrect word order noun/adjective

Use of *comment for comme, pour* for *par*

Use of *faire* for *rendre:*

Use of *parce que/car/grâce à* instead of *à cause de.*

Incorrect use of preposition after common verbs e.g. *commencer de, encourager de, hésiter de*

Confusion between: *ces/ses/c'est; ça/sa; son/sont; ce/ceux; mais/mes/met; mois/moi*

Redundant use of *y* and *en*

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

La fin de l'argent liquide: rêve ou réalité?

Many essays on this topic dealt with the impact the pandemic had on the use of cash and made the point that the current crisis was making the disappearance of cash seem more like a reality, perhaps in the not too distant future. Many candidates spoke about the use of cryptocurrencies which had advantages as they could be used online and instead of money in some locations. They could also see the disadvantages of this type of currency as it it is prone to fluctuations in value and is hard to trace and thus of considerable benefit for those involved in corrupt practices. Other candidates could see that cash still has a value for small purchases such as buying fruit in the market or buying a magazine or a cup of coffee. In general, candidates were of the opinion that carrying large amounts of cash was a thing of the past and that soon we would all buy goods using our phones.

Question 2

Le repas en famille: rituel démodé? Qu'est-ce que vous en pensez?

This was a popular question and most candidates had a view about the necessity of family meals. Most were of the opinion that nowadays family members are too busy to eat together and they blamed long hours for working parents and children at school as well as the dependence on technology. They blamed young people particularly for using their phones and devices all day and spending too much time playing video games in their rooms. This prevented families from coming together at meal times. Some candidates could see the real benefits of eating together as a family, at least once a week, when all members would have the chance to talk about their lives, their problems and their relationships. Candidates generally had something relevant to offer on the topic though many essays were rather unsophisticated, personal and repetitive.

Question 3

«Il faut bien gérer les avancées technologiques pour protéger les emplois.» Que pensez-vous de cette affirmation?

Many candidates focused their essays more on the technological advances than on the relationship between those advances and the world of work. Most accepted that there would inevitably be a rise in unemployment as robots started to take over from workers in factories and distribution centres. The best answers made the point that jobs would not necessarily be lost but would change. Some provided a historical perspective, explaining that the industrial revolution had also changed the nature of work. It was felt that there would now be more jobs in the technology sector and that there would always be a need for people to write programmes and to operate the computers controlling the robots. Candidates were clear that governments should be aware of the threat to jobs and to try and create a balance between progress and the needs of the workforce.

Question 4

Les progrès économiques et sociaux n'apportent pas toujours des bénéfices réels aux gens défavorisés. Discutez.

Few candidates attempted this question. Those who did wrote thoughtful and considered answers. They pointed out that as countries become more wealthy and have thriving economies, there are many more jobs of all types available. They also felt that as people become more wealthy they tend to be more charitable to those less fortunate, having disposable income to give to charities working with those without jobs or homes. It was still considered, however, that those from deprived backgrounds were likely to struggle, since in rich countries, the rich often become richer and the poor become poorer and are unable to share in the economic progress. Taxing of the wealthy was often mentioned as a way of providing for social care and candidates pointed out that governments, bioth local and national, should do more to make society more equal

Question 5

«Les gens ne savent pas s'adapter aux changements environnementaux.» Êtes-vous d'accord?

Many candidates wrote a general essay on environmental changes without making much reference to whether people knew how to adapt to them. The best answers pointed out that the issue was a lack of education and that governments could do more in this area by promoting more environmentally friendly behaviours and then enforcing them using laws. Other responses stated that people were aware of what they should do to help the environment but were reluctant to change their lifestyles either through apathy or because it was an issue for future generations and not them. Some candidates interpreted the question as being one's own personal environment and, as an example, they talked about immigrants moving to a new country and finding it hard to adapt to the new climate, language and society norms. Most candidates answering this question had points to make and were able to communicate their ideas effectively.

FRENCH LANGUAGE

Paper 8682/33
Essay

© 2021

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

© 2021