



Cambridge International AS Level

FRENCH LANGUAGE

8682/23

Paper 2 Reading and Writing

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Section 1

Question	Answer	Marks
Question 1		
1(a)	prévoient	1
1(b)	restreintes	1
1(c)	croissante	1
1(d)	autant	1
1(e)	atout	1

Question	Answer	Marks
Question 2		
Responses which do not fit directly into the 'footprint' left by the original word are not allowed – i.e. no additions, no deletions.		
2(a)	<u>Plus de 2 000 espèces différentes</u> sont mangées.	1
2(b)	<u>Il est difficile</u> d'imaginer la solution.	1
2(c)	<u>La planète</u> peut être nourrie par les insectes.	1
2(d)	<u>Il faut qu'on</u> sache que 2 milliards en consomment.	1
2(e)	<u>Une augmentation</u> est prévue par les experts.	1

Question	Answer	Marks
Question 3		
Candidates must not copy word for word from the text.		
3(a)	Comment l'élevage des insectes comestibles pourrait-il être bénéfique, selon le <u>deuxième</u> paragraphe ?	2
	✓(a) Il(s) utilise(nt)/consomme(nt)/nécessite(nt) moins de <u>ressources</u> (que les vaches) (pour produire les protéines et vitamines).	1
	✓(b) Ils ont un niveau/une teneur plus bas(se) de graisse/cholestérol. Ils sont plus faibles en/contiennent/ont moins de ...	1

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Que font les insectes qui rend leur élevage bénéfique du point de vue <u>écologique</u> ? Nommez quatre choses. (<i>troisième paragraphe</i>)	4
	✓(a) Ils produisent/émettent moins/peu de gaz à effet de serre (que ...).	1
	✓(b) Ils utilisent/consomment/nécessitent peu/pas beaucoup/moins d' <u>eau</u> .	1
	✓(c) Ils génèrent peu/pas beaucoup/moins de déchets.	1
	✓(d) Ils éliminent/utilisent/mangent/se nourrissent de nos (propres) déchets (organiques).	1
3(c)	Que font les insectes qui rend leur élevage bénéfique du point de vue <u>économique</u> ? Nommez trois choses. (<i>quatrième paragraphe</i>)	3
	✓(a) Ils se reproduisent (plus) rapidement/vite.	1
	✓(b) Ils arrivent à/atteignent la maturité/l'âge adulte (plus) vite/jeunes.	1
	✓(c) Ils occupent/prennent peu/moins de place.	1
3(d)	Comment les Européens démontrent-ils leur nouvel intérêt pour la consommation d'insectes ? (<i>cinquième paragraphe</i>)	2
	✓(a) (De plus en) plus de bars proposent des insectes.	1
	✓(b) On en/les vend/peut en/les acheter dans les magasins diététiques.	1

Question	Answer	Marks
3(e)	Quelles idées préconçues faut-il éviter pour expliquer la popularité de la consommation des insectes (<i>deux points</i>) ? Quelle est la réalité, selon la FAO (<i>un point</i>) ? Quel est le sens de la dernière petite phrase (<i>un point</i>) ? (<i>dernier paragraphe</i>)	4
	✓(a) (C'est parce qu') ils ne coûtent pas cher.	1
	✓(b) Penser qu'on ne les mange que parce qu'il n'y a pas/on manque d'autre nourriture (disponible)/rien d'autre à manger.	1
	✓(c) Les gens aiment les manger/apprécient leur goût.	1
	✓(d) Mangez-en beaucoup/souvent/servez-vous avec enthousiasme/à consommer/dégustez sans modération/bon appétit !	1

Quality of Language – Accuracy

5	Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4	Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3	Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2	Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1	Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.

Additional marking guidance for Quality of Language

The five marks available for Quality of Language are awarded **globally** for the whole performance on each set of answers.

A concise answer, containing all mark-bearing components for Content is scored on the full range of marks for language, i.e. length does not determine the Quality of Language mark.

Answers scoring 0 for Content cannot contribute to the overall Quality of Language mark.

Identify the answer(s) scoring 0 for Content in the whole set of answers. Then add together the number of Content marks available for each of these questions and reduce the Quality of Language mark according to the following table:

Total Content marks available on questions where a candidate scores 0	Reduce Quality of Language mark by:
2–3	1
4–5	2
6–7	3
8–14	4
15	5

Note: A minimum of one mark for Quality of Language should be awarded if there are any Content marks at all (i.e. 0 Quality of Language marks only if 0 Content marks).

Section 2

Question	Answer	Marks
<p>Question 4</p> <p>Candidates must not copy word for word from the text.</p>		
4(a)	<p>En ce qui concerne la consommation d'insectes, quelle est la situation actuelle en France (<i>un point</i>) et dans certaines autres régions de la planète (<i>un point</i>) ? Pourquoi les touristes sont-ils parfois des exceptions à la norme (<i>un point</i>) ? (<i>premier paragraphe</i>)</p> <p>✓(a) Dans certaines régions (de la planète) on en consomme beaucoup/souvent/habituellement.</p> <p>✓(b) En France, on en consomme très peu. / Ils ne sont pas du tout populaires.</p> <p>✓(c) Ils les ont découverts/apprécies pendant un voyage.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>
4(b)	<p>Pourquoi l'auteur appelle-t-il l'ANSES « ce gardien de nos assiettes » (<i>un point</i>) ? Qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire avant que l'Agence autorise la mise en vente des insectes comestibles (<i>un point</i>) ? Pourquoi critique-t-elle certains opérateurs (<i>un point</i>) ? (<i>deuxième paragraphe</i>)</p> <p>✓(a) Elle assure la <u>sécurité</u> de ce que nous <u>mangeons/notre nourriture</u>.</p> <p>✓(b) Des recherches/études (scientifiques) sur les <u>dangers/allergies/substances toxiques</u>. Acquérir plus de connaissances des <u>risques etc.</u> Evaluer/connaître/comprendre/déterminer les <u>risques etc.</u></p> <p>✓(c) Ils ne se soucient/préoccupent pas de/s'intéressent pas/sont indifférents à la santé (des consommateurs).</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
4(c)	<p>En quoi l'attitude de l'ANSES pourrait-elle être excessivement prudente, selon l'auteur (<i>un point</i>) ? Quelles précautions suggère-t-il tout de même (<i>deux points</i>) ? Pourquoi (<i>un point</i>) ? (<i>troisième paragraphe</i>)</p> <p>✓(a) 2 milliards de personnes en consomment déjà. Ils ne posent pas plus de risques que d'autres aliments.</p> <p>✓(b) S'assurer de/comprendre/connaître (parfaitement) s'ils sont mangeables/si on peut les manger (en toute sécurité).</p> <p>✓(c) Ne pas chercher les insectes en forêt.</p> <p>✓(d) Vous risquez de tomber malade/vous empoisonner/intoxiquer/finir à l'hôpital.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>
4(d)	<p>Comment pourrait-on augmenter les ventes des insectes comestibles ? Pour quelle autre raison les Français n'en mangent-ils pas en général, selon M. Villars ? Comment la situation évolue-t-elle à présent ? (<i>quatrième paragraphe</i>)</p> <p>✓(a) Réviser/réduire/revoir le prix.</p> <p>✓(b) Pour des raisons psychologiques. Ils trouvent l'idée dégoûtante/répugnante. L'idée les dégoûte.</p> <p>✓(c) La réticence/répugnance diminue. Les gens deviennent moins réticents/plus curieux. De plus en plus de consommateurs sont prêts à les essayer.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
4(e)	Pourquoi M. Villars mentionne-t-il les huîtres, les cuisses de grenouille et les escargots ? Quelle possibilité envisage-t-il pour l'avenir ? (<i>dernier paragraphe</i>)	2
	✓(a) Les Français mangent des/ces produits qui dégoûtent/sont trouvés/considérés dégoûtants par d'autres cultures.	1
	✓(b) (Qu')on trouvera/vendra/pourra obtenir/ manger/acheter les insectes partout/dans beaucoup de restaurants.	1

Quality of Language – Accuracy

5	Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4	Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3	Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2	Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1	Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.

Additional marking guidance for Quality of Language

The five marks available for Quality of Language are awarded **globally** for the whole performance on each set of answers.

A concise answer, containing all mark-bearing components for Content is scored on the full range of marks for language, i.e. length does not determine the Quality of Language mark.

Answers scoring 0 for Content cannot contribute to the overall Quality of Language mark.

Identify the answer(s) scoring 0 for Content in the whole set of answers. Then add together the number of Content marks available for each of these questions and reduce the Quality of Language mark according to the following table:

Total Content marks available on questions where a candidate scores 0	Reduce Quality of Language mark by:
2–3	1
4–5	2
6–7	3
8–14	4
15	5

Note: A minimum of one mark for Quality of Language should be awarded if there are any Content marks at all (i.e. 0 Quality of Language marks only if 0 Content marks).

Question	Answer	Marks
Question 5		
Question 5(a) (Summary)		
The summary could include the points below up to a <u>maximum of 10</u> .		
5(a)	<p>Résumez les avantages de la consommation d'insectes comme sources de nourriture et les raisons pour lesquelles on en mange si peu en France, tels qu'ils sont présentés dans les deux textes.</p> <p>Avantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓a Consomment moins/peu de ressources/eau ✓b Riches en/produisent protéines ✓c Pauvres en graisse/cholestérol/bons pour la santé ✓d Moins/peu de gaz à effet de serre ✓e Produisent moins de déchets/consomment les déchets/peuvent être cultivés en utilisant les déchets ✓f Reproduction/maturation rapides ✓g Occupent peu de place ✓h Goût <p>Pourquoi si peu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓i L'ANSES appelle à la prudence ✓j Insuffisance de connaissances (scientifiques)/recherches/évaluation ✓k Risque d'allergies/substances toxiques/intoxication ✓l Opérateurs peu soucieux de la santé ✓m Prix ✓n Répugnance/dégoût/barrière psychologique 	10

Question	Answer	Marks						
<p>Question 5(b)</p> <p>Content marks – Response to the Text</p> <p>Mark like a mini-essay according to the variety and interest of the opinions and views expressed, the response to the original text stimulus and the ability to express a personal point of view.</p>								
5(b)	<p>Personal response</p> <p>Sans parler d’insectes, quelles autres options auriez-vous à proposer pour permettre de nourrir toutes les nouvelles bouches dans les années à venir ?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 645 1318 1335"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 645 1318 790"> <p>5 Very good Varied and interesting ideas, showing an element of flair and imagination, a capacity to express a personal point of view.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1321 645 1318 1335" rowspan="5" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 795 1318 925"> <p>4 Good Not the flair and imagination of the best candidates, but work still shows an ability to express a range of ideas, maintain interest and respond to the issues raised.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 929 1318 1059"> <p>3 Sound A fair level of interest and ideas. May concentrate on a single issue, but there is still a response to ideas in the text.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1064 1318 1193"> <p>2 Below average Limited range of ideas; rather humdrum. May disregard the element of response to the text, and write a largely unrelated free-composition.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1198 1318 1328"> <p>0–1 Poor Few ideas to offer on the theme. Banal and pedestrian. No element of personal response to the text. Repeated error.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>5 Very good Varied and interesting ideas, showing an element of flair and imagination, a capacity to express a personal point of view.</p>	5	<p>4 Good Not the flair and imagination of the best candidates, but work still shows an ability to express a range of ideas, maintain interest and respond to the issues raised.</p>	<p>3 Sound A fair level of interest and ideas. May concentrate on a single issue, but there is still a response to ideas in the text.</p>	<p>2 Below average Limited range of ideas; rather humdrum. May disregard the element of response to the text, and write a largely unrelated free-composition.</p>	<p>0–1 Poor Few ideas to offer on the theme. Banal and pedestrian. No element of personal response to the text. Repeated error.</p>	
<p>5 Very good Varied and interesting ideas, showing an element of flair and imagination, a capacity to express a personal point of view.</p>	5							
<p>4 Good Not the flair and imagination of the best candidates, but work still shows an ability to express a range of ideas, maintain interest and respond to the issues raised.</p>								
<p>3 Sound A fair level of interest and ideas. May concentrate on a single issue, but there is still a response to ideas in the text.</p>								
<p>2 Below average Limited range of ideas; rather humdrum. May disregard the element of response to the text, and write a largely unrelated free-composition.</p>								
<p>0–1 Poor Few ideas to offer on the theme. Banal and pedestrian. No element of personal response to the text. Repeated error.</p>								

Quality of Language – Accuracy

5	Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4	Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3	Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2	Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1	Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.