

# CONTENTS

---

<b>ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Papers 0510/01 (Core) and 0510/02 (Extended) Reading and Writing.....	2
Papers 0510/03 (Core) and 0510/04 (Extended) Listening.....	6
Paper 0510/05 Oral .....	9
Paper 0510/06 Oral (Coursework) .....	12

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

---

Papers 0510/01 (Core) and 0510/02 (Extended)

Reading and Writing

## General comments

This session provided an interesting variety of responses covering the whole range of marks and with some outstanding papers at the upper end. This demonstrates that teachers and candidates are even better prepared for the examination than before and candidates appeared to engage well with most of the questions at both the Core and Extended levels.

Candidates seem to have been entered at the correct level although there were one or two cases where Core candidates could have attempted the Extended paper and vice versa.

Good use was made of the time and if candidates did omit exercises these were usually in **Part 3** for Extended candidates and in the summary writing for Core. There is also an issue about the word count in these sections of the examination; some candidates ignored these requirements this session which affected their marks.

There were some instances where candidates did not fully address the rubric especially in the summary writing and in **Part 3 Exercise 2** which inevitably had an impact on their overall score.

Punctuation and paragraphing are showing improvement but more work needs to be done so that candidates have a clearer idea of what is required in these areas of English writing. In some cases, even linguistically strong candidates appeared unaware of the importance of paragraphing in their responses to exercises in **Part 3**.

Reading comprehension in the first part of the examination was good and in most cases candidates scored quite well in **Parts 1** and **2** at both tiers.

Handwriting continues to cause a problem in some cases and from some Centres. Examination instructions clearly suggest that candidates should write in pen, not pencil or red pen and that they should not use the margins which are clearly labelled *for Examiner use only*. A few papers are directly addressing pleading comments to the Examiner which do not have any effect.

Those who have been well prepared are aware that there are blank pages for candidates to extend their writing if needs be and where candidates have done so, they have clearly indicated where to find the continuation. This is appreciated by Examiners.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Part 1**

#### **Exercise 1: Durrell Wildlife Zoo**

This exercise was generally well answered in both Core and Extended and candidates experienced little difficulty handling it.

- (a) This was usually correct although some candidates omitted the word 'extinct' or 'animals'. Incorrect answers included 'breathing heart'.
- (b) A common correct answer was 'discount in shop' with occasionally 'newsletter' as an alternative.
- (c) The full range of possible answers was given; 'workshops' and 'Saturday morning club' were most common.
- (d) This was usually correctly answered with ideas given directly from the text or paraphrased so that the meaning was understood.
- (e) This was usually correct although some answers gave '14.30' or 'relatives and friends' and 'feeding times'.
- (f) This was usually correct although incorrectly lifted answers mentioned 'red arrows' without the idea of them being followed.

**Exercise 2: Paper 2 (Extended) *Sir Magdi Yacoub***

An exercise which gave some scope for the Extended candidates.

- (a) Correctly answered in most cases with candidates giving both answers of 'transforming' and 'saving lives', but 'he transplanted more hearts than anyone else' was a common error.
- (b) Many correct answers including both ideas even when lifted from the text, as in 'he is aware of the role of good nutrition and regular exercise'.
- (c) This caused some difficulties as many candidates did not mention the 'donor'. There were incorrect lifts of 'there are no regular hours for a heart surgeon' or 'surgery must take place when it needs to be carried out', the latter answer having little meaning or relevance to the question.
- (d) This was also a challenging question for some. In some cases only half the answer was given, 'visiting the Amazon' or the incorrect 'gardening' or 'growing orchids'.
- (e) A range of correct answers was given but the most common wrong answer was 'children brought for surgery'.

**Exercise 2: Paper 1 (Core) *Chinese Space Flight***

Quite an accessible exercise, although testing for some.

- (a) A good number of correct responses including 'taikong' and 'space'.
- (b) 'Feel good' and 'radioed' were given as correct answers but there was also mention of 'Gobi Desert' which was incorrect and possibly due to misunderstanding of the rubric.
- (c) Even if the entire sentence was lifted, marks were awarded as long as the 'medicinal herbs' were mentioned. Often only 'chicken and rice' or 'traditional Chinese food' were given as responses to this question.
- (d) Often correctly answered.
- (e) Mostly correctly answered. The most common wrong answer was 'a step forward for mankind'.

**Exercise 3: *Codes***

In general, less able candidates found this exercise testing.

- (a) Although many Extended candidates found this a relatively easy question, less able candidates struggled and often left out the crucial idea of 'security'. Some lifted the incorrect idea from the text, 'indicator of history of civilisation'.
- (b) Many options from the mark scheme were given for this question.
- (c) (01) In both Core and Extended papers candidates often made the mistake of giving '\$20 000' instead of '\$20 million'. A few candidates missed out the dollar sign too.
- (d) (02) This posed some difficulties for candidates as quite a few missed out 'Stone' and many gave the wrong response of 'hieroglyphics'.
- (e) (01) Although this was often correctly answered the unwary gave the answer to the wrong code giving 'four parts'.
- (f) (02) This was usually well answered at both tiers and only a few candidates failed to give both identities of the code breakers. Rarely, the same person was given twice.

**Part 2****Exercise 1: Source of Mekong**

A good exercise which rewarded the more accurate candidates.

- (a) The most usual answers were 'Tibet' and 'China' but quite a few candidates failed to use the map to answer this question and gave 'South America' or even 'The Maldives' as a response. Some mentioned Everest which was too general and others misread the map entirely giving 'Bhutan' or more usually 'Nepal' as an answer.
- (b) This was usually well answered and many candidates paraphrased or lifted from the text to give a correct response.
- (c) Most candidates gave the correct answer but it was poorly expressed grammatically as 'he was marvelled' and some answers gave 'Mother Goddess' without further explanation.
- (d) This was a demanding question which only able candidates tackled with accuracy. Many gave 'Qinghai Province' or '5 km north' without reference to the stream.
- (e) About half the candidates gave a correct response but many others gave 'water poured off glacier' or 'freezing glacier water'.
- (f) Quite a well answered question but some candidates gave the response about 'giving talks later on' or 'being a guest lecturer'.
- (g) (02) Nearly all candidates were able to identify all four content points.

**Exercise 2: Summary**

This proved a testing exercise for many this session and a disturbing number of candidates made little attempt to write what was requested. Many concentrated on the generalised use of computers for both boys and girls and others gave the answer of *what* this gives to boys rather than as the question required, *how* computers can aid boys in the learning process. This misreading of the rubric occurred both in the Core and Extended papers. In addition there was very little notice taken of the word length requirement with the result that many candidates forfeited content points because they gave a long, involved pre-ambule to the summary, including ideas about educational standards and 're-engaging underachieving boys'.

Nonetheless, there were good, succinct and successful answers from some candidates.

**Exercise 3: Paper 2 (Extended) Tree Top Raft**

Like the summary exercise this was challenging for many candidates, who did well in the first sections of the exercise but struggled with the latter parts.

*Design:* Most candidates identified 'spider web' or 'six ribs'. These were the most popular points although a few candidates wrote 'like a spider' which was an incorrect response.

*Size/capacity:* The two content points given on the mark scheme were usually correctly identified in either order.

*Means of access:* This was a more difficult question to answer for many and the most common mistakes were 'climb up to raft before dark' and '30 minutes per person to get in'. 'Harness' was more often recognised than 'special entrances' and sometimes both answers were given on the same line. Only one mark can be awarded in these circumstances.

*Raft moving requirements:* 'Hunting horn' was generally correct but the idea of the airship was harder for candidates to find. Some put just 'by air' which was too vague and others gave, 'everyone wears safety line'.

### **Exercise 3: Paper 1 (Core) Form Filling**

Very few candidates are now using their own details to complete the form. Many Centres have obviously practised this type of exercise well before the examination as improvements have been observed overall. Although this is usually a straightforward transformation exercise, some candidates seem to find difficulties in following the instructions on the form itself.

A pleasing number of candidates read and followed the instruction to fill in the first section in capital letters although some began in capitals then drifted into upper and lower case.

The name was usually correct but the date of birth included 16<sup>th</sup> May or the year was missing. Unnecessary prepositions appeared too.

The address is still causing problems for some as many candidates are simply writing 'Berlin', which is not acceptable. Some wrote that it was a mile away from the Sports Centre.

The e-mail address and telephone number were usually correct.

*Sporting Experience* was usually correct in spite of the fact that some included information about the achievements and prizes in this section. Quite a few candidates wrote, incorrectly, in the third person singular, 'he plays...'.

*Achievements and prizes* was generally correct.

The *Future Plans* section was also usually correctly answered although a few wrote 'any hours'.

*Months for work* was sometimes too vague for a mark to be awarded. The answer required 'July' and 'August' as a response and many wrote 'all summer'.

Very few candidates were able to give the position of 'Head' teacher and quite a few spelled the name wrongly.

### **Part 3**

In this section of the paper most candidates had something to say although at times all prompts were not addressed or they were cursorily dealt with. Work still needs to be done in encouraging candidates to develop argumentative skills and promote ideas.

In some Centres the exercises were interesting and clear to read even if paragraphing was inconsistent and punctuation sometimes very weak.

Less able candidates either failed to complete the exercise or only slightly expanded on the prompts. Many candidates did not apply the minimum word length.

### **Exercise 1**

All candidates were able to attempt something in this exercise even if their reading experience had been limited. Some chose course books on English, Physics, Biology and Computing or Self Help books for teenagers whilst others wrote very convincingly about best sellers including Harry Potter and the Da Vinci Code. Others discussed the Brontes, Dickens and Shakespeare.

The rubric prompts were addressed although many forgot to recommend the book to others. Nonetheless, there was scope for better candidates to write with some interest and evidence of good and accurate use of idioms and relevant vocabulary including, 'twists and turns of the plot', 'took me to a whole new world', 'a page turner', 'gripping', 'couldn't put it down'. Such enthusiasm was generated by some candidates that it was an inspiration to Examiners to actually read or re-read the book which had been recommended.

On the other hand, a number of candidates failed to write in the correct register. When some candidates tried to explain the plot there were serious failings in the use of grammar. These weaker candidates also gave minimum information and limited elaboration of their points.

**Exercise 2**

Candidates gave the impression of being more confident in this task covering the rubric prompts even if in some cases the visit had already taken place. This occasionally gave rise to a mixture of tenses which revealed a lack of knowledge of irregular verbs, for example, 'teached'.

There were some misunderstandings where candidates wrote applying to be volunteers or the prompts were used to invite people to the school. Sometimes the visitors were famous people from the media or the local area. Tone and register were usually appropriate.

**Exercise 3: Paper 02 (Extended)**

Generally quite well answered, though all but a few contented themselves with a non-committal review of the arguments for and against in the prompts. For some, the other side of the argument was implied but not explicit. Better candidates gave a reasoned argument following a common format, discussing first one side then the other side and finally what they thought. Quite a few of these candidates did use their own ideas and were not so reliant on the prompts. Again some candidates had an excellent knowledge of relevant idioms such as 'an idle mind is the devil's workshop' and 'time and tide wait for no man'.

Less able candidates relied heavily on lifting from the prompts, having little to say for themselves. These responses were often quite short.

<b>Papers 0510/03 (Core) and 0510/04 (Extended)</b>
---

<b>Listening</b>
------------------

**General comments**

Centres had prepared candidates well for the Listening components. The whole range of marks from 0-36 was seen by most Examiners and very few questions were omitted by candidates. It was evident that candidates coped well with the format and timing of the papers, often using the blank pages for rough working and note-taking whilst working out answers. It is always good to be able to see these processes so clearly. The good spread of marks shows that differentiation was efficiently achieved throughout the entries and that candidates responded well at all levels to accessible questions, where there was obvious engagement with subject matter, task and taped text.

Candidates did perform very well in response to both papers this session. Examiners commented on the strength of the cohorts entered; Centres are to be congratulated for their good guidance and preparation. Again Examiners did not take spelling into account in accordance with the *listening for understanding* ethos of the components. As usual, though, marks were not awarded when candidates substituted another word which changed the sense of the answer and negated it, for example, 'skin rushes' instead of 'skin rashes'. In general, good answers by candidates were usually concise, utilising key words from the original rather than writing a string of phrases and hoping that the answer is embedded within.

**Comments on specific questions****Part 1**

This is the short question and answer section, comprising six short scenarios requiring focus and concise answers. 7 marks were available for Paper 3 and 8 marks for Paper 4.

**Questions 1-6***Paper 3***Question 1**

This very accessible first question was efficiently answered by most candidates showing obvious understanding of subject and question demand. The answer required was 'outside'.

**Question 2**

Alisha did not have a library card. This was within the experience of most candidates and most fared well here.

**Question 3**

This was again well answered by most candidates; the new timetable idea or the fact that the 7.07 train now leaves at 7.00. Just a few candidates reiterated the question and wrote 'he missed it', failing to score.

**Question 4**

Nico's watch had stopped and most candidates understood this although some wrote a detailed transcription of the tape and failed to score by producing a variety of possible answers, without identifying succinctly the actual answer.

**Question 5**

Two items were necessary here. Many candidates reiterated the question and wrote 'passport', failing to score. The candidates needed to mention a birth certificate and some proof of Mariam's address in order to achieve the mark.

**Question 6**

Many candidates wrote 'a different building' or 'a tourist building' or 'turn right', none of which were credited. The answer was tallest building/music block/second floor. One mark was awarded for one correct answer and two marks for any two correct answers.

*Paper 4*

**Questions 1-6**

For **Questions 1-3** see **Questions 4-6** for *Paper 3*.

**Question 4**

This needed the answer 'Post office' but some candidates answered *when* instead of *where* and provided a time. It is often evident that more work on *where/when/why/how/who* questions would raise candidate scores and ensure efficient answering of the question.

**Question 5**

This carried two marks; the first was awarded for the idea of bad weather conditions and the second for having to pay nothing for the drink. If the candidate wrote 'it was free' that was credited too. Some candidates wrote amounts of money which they thought should be paid for the drink and failed to score the second mark.

**Question 6**

This required the idea of the power cut. Many wrote about the café only serving cold food and thought it did not serve hot food at all.

**Part 2**

This part of each paper comprised two form-completion exercises.

**Question 7**

This form-filling exercise was in response to an interview about a sponsored walk on the Great Wall of China. There were 5 marks available for Paper 3 and 7 marks available for Paper 4.

The location of the project was the Great Wall of China; many candidates wrote the 'Great walk' of China and failed to score. Some candidates did not understand 'location' and wrote unrelated items in the space provided.

The aim was to help research into disease. If it was obvious that a candidate understood disease here, all manner of variant spellings were accepted by Examiners. The length of the wall was 5 000 km and most candidates were correct. The Wall was built over 2 000 years ago and there were 56 fundraisers or other fundraisers as participants. The website address [www.walkforlife.net](http://www.walkforlife.net) was universally well done by candidates; much of the answer was in the title of the exercise. Still some candidates wrote 'Work for life' and failed to score. There did seem to be unfamiliarity with e-mail addresses in some Centres.

**Question 8**

This form-filling exercise was in response to an interview with the winner of a telephone text messaging poetry competition and was generally well received by candidates. 7 marks were available on Paper 3 and 9 marks for Paper 4.

The competition began 'last year' and the definition; 'shortened' or 'abbreviated' language was well answered by all candidates. The advantages; 'speed' and 'cheapness' were not so well done. Many candidates wrote the same idea twice; 'quick to do' and 'speed', for example, and failed to score. The length was '160 characters'; 'words' was not allowed but if the candidate explained characters that was credited. 7 500 was the number of previous entries; very well done, a result of good number work by Centres. The judges were the 'text poets' or 'entrants' and the winning poems were displayed on 'buses', again well done by most candidates. How to enter caused some difficulties and was a good differentiator; the idea of texting the entry to 88801111 was needed but often the number had too few 8s or 1s or included a 2 instead of a zero. The website for Paper 4: [www.textpoetry.com](http://www.textpoetry.com) was well attempted.

Generally candidates performed quite well here and seemed to engage with the subject matter and task effectively.

**Part 3**

This part was the most challenging section of each paper and comprised two exercises.

Paper 3 continued with the two true/false exercises for **Part Three**. These remain a good method of testing comprehension. There was much evidence of candidate working and re-working here on second hearing of the taped text. Generally candidates scored quite well, showing a good level of aural comprehension and engagement with the subject matter of each exercise.

**Question 9** was about the invention of ice cream and carried 5 marks for Paper 3 and 6 marks for Paper 4, **(a)** **(b)** and **(j)** were among the common errors here for Paper 3 responses. Paper 4 **(a)** needed the idea of the ice house to keep the drinks cool. Some answered *what* but not *why* as the question demanded and failed to achieve the mark. **(b)** the ingredients for ice cream were milk and egg, not 'grape juice' or even 'great juice' as many wrote.

In **(c)** the ideas of hot and cold climates were needed. **(d)** concerned the invention of the refrigerator and **(e)** the idea of ice cream's nutritious ingredients; its vitamins and fat content.

**Question 10** for Paper 3 was in response to a talk about spa waters in Hungary. Candidates answered quite well here but **(g)**, **(h)**, **(i)** and **(j)** were among the common errors.



**Question 10** for Paper 4 concerned the development of penicillin and differentiated well. **(a)** asked for Fleming's life before the study of medicine; many wrote 'studied medicine' and did not score. The answer needed two of: born 1881/inScotland/sheepfarming family/did not follow family tradition/excelled in sciences at school.

Many wrote 'ship' or 'cheap' for 'sheep' which altered the sense and negated the answer.

In **(b)** when Fleming used a diluted solution, the bacteria did not grow. Many were able to understand this and provide a correct answer.

**(c)** required the idea that the scientists must carry out tests to purify the penicillin or develop an injectable form and many candidates understood this concept.

The bad effects for **(d)** were: allergy/swelling/shock/rashes, many wrote 'rushes' and did not score. Often candidates did not understand the question **(e)** which needed the answer 'resistant'; many wrote about the rashes and swellings here instead.

**(f)** required the answer 'important' as penicillin remains an important antibiotic; answers involving figures of usage failed to describe its status.

### **Overall**

A good general response by candidates to two quite challenging papers which encompassed a range of situations, subjects and vocabulary. More work on where/when words would help to achieve better scores as would reminders to candidates that the answer is never the question rewritten. Candidates should always check the rubric of the question to ensure that the correct amount of detail is given in the answer and to make sure that the whole question has been answered. As always, use of past timed papers in conjunction with a published mark scheme is to be recommended, in order to ensure that candidates are fully aware of the format, range of subject matter and type of questions posed by the papers.

**Paper 0510/05**

**Oral**

### ***Part A – Welcome and brief explanation***

Examiners are asked to give a brief explanation of the format of the test; of what the candidates can expect to happen in the next 10 minutes or so. For example, it is important that candidates are aware that **Part B** is *not* assessed. How this is done is perhaps best left to the discretion of Examiners at Centres. If the Examiner is the candidates' regular class teacher, it may suffice to simply confirm that the candidates 'know what will happen'. However, at Centres where the Examiner is meeting candidates for the first time, Moderators expect to hear a *full* explanation of the test format.

### ***Part B – The Warm Up***

Examiners are reminded that the warm up serves two purposes: to place the candidate at ease and to perhaps indicate which Topic Card might be the most productive for discussion. At Centres where the candidates are known to the Teacher/Examiner, it is of course likely that a short warm up is all that is needed. However, at Centres where candidates are meeting Examiners for the first time, the Examiner's skill and sensitivity in conducting an appropriate warm up is probably more apparent.

Warm ups should not be too long or too short; Centres **should adhere to the 2-3 minutes** suggested in the *Teacher's/Examiner's Notes*. The warm ups should not be too formal or formulaic – *the focus should be on the candidate* and an effort should be made to make that person feel as comfortable as possible, given that he or she is about to take an examination. Examiners should not include the topic of examinations (or talk about nerves) in the warm ups, nor is it likely that a candidate will be placed at ease by talking *entirely* about his or her school.

**Part C – Handing out the Topic Card and preparation time**

Moderators would prefer that tapes are paused at this stage, while the candidate considers the contents of the card. This must be less stressful for candidates than leaving the tape running. Also, it is not necessary to read out word-for-word what is printed on the card – a summary of the topic is fine.

Candidates are allowed to ask questions during this stage, but this *need not* be recorded.

Examiners are reminded that the selection of Topic Cards should *not* be random. It is not actually fair to candidates to choose cards in this manner (e.g. A, B, C, D, E – then a repeated pattern). Topics should be selected to try to match each candidate's interest and ability (from evidence in the warm up perhaps). Moderators are listening to see how, and how well this is done by Examiners.

There is no need to use all of the cards, and certainly no need to distribute topics/cards evenly. However, please do attempt to use a good range of topics.

**Part D – The Conversation**

The aim of the Cards is to generate *focused discussion*, and many Examiners and candidates are achieving this in a variety of ways. The very best discussions are those during which Examiners create a relaxed atmosphere, allowing candidates to speak easily and at a good length. Such Examiners are confident, in control (without dominating of course), possess an understanding tone of voice, are friendly but in a professional manner, and respond to most of what candidates say.

Some Examiners are reminded, however, that it is their responsibility to do as much as possible to ensure that candidates do not offer speeches, or do not try to sustain monologues. In these cases, the Examiner should intervene quickly and begin a conversation. If a candidate is talking continuously for more than 30 seconds, this is not likely to result in a proper conversation/discussion.

Moderators would like to hear discussion/conversation *from the outset* – there is no need for an introductory or extended speech by the candidate about the topic.

For a conversation to occur, there needs to be input from both parties. It is *not acceptable* to regard the test as an interview, proposing a series of questions in a formal manner. It is acceptable for Examiners to add to the conversation with views and/or ideas, which may lead to prompts for further discussion. Examiners should aim to establish a 'semi-formal' environment.

**The Topic Cards**

Moderators report that Cards C and D presented difficulties for some candidates. The topic of buildings was probably a difficult one, perhaps narrow, and as such required a degree of interest and/or prior knowledge from candidates. A Career in the Police Force (Card D) was either handled very well (possibly by those candidates with first-hand experience) or poorly. In the latter examples, candidates failed to engage in sufficient detail.

Cards A, B and E provided plenty of room for discussion. The topic of toys did seem to have a gender bias; space exploration opened up a number of avenues of related issues; and candidates who were 'stuck on a desert island' were able to talk about what was (and was not) important to them.

Many Examiners realise that these topics are starting points, and go some way in developing broader discussion – this is fine. The prompts are not intended to be prescriptive; indeed, there is no requirement to use them all. Examiners are expected to attempt to work with the candidate in developing a topic. Some of the prompts invite an element of critical analysis; others allow anecdotal/personal response.

Examiners are encouraged to differentiate in terms of the content and the difficulty of the topics. It is good examining to 'thin out' a topic for a weaker candidate. Equally so, Examiners will need to ask more challenging questions of more able candidates – perhaps introducing more abstract strands of discussion. The assessment criteria are designed to accommodate such differentiation.

### **Assessment Criteria**

Structure and vocabulary are being applied with a good deal of confidence and accuracy. Fluency, however, is being over-rewarded in two main areas: 1) the ability to maintain and sustain conversation/dialogue, and 2) accurate and clear pronunciation and intonation. For the latter, Examiners are reminded that pronunciation and intonation is probably not an issue or concern for those candidates in Band 2 or Band 1. However, this aspect does become more relevant and noticeable in Band 3, and of course, in lower Bands.

Moderators are sympathetic here: a candidate with excellent conversational skill but 'heavy' intonation and obtrusive pronunciation is as difficult to assess as one who pronounces clearly with natural intonation, but who is unable to generate, develop or sustain conversation. Examiners need to strike a balance between these key descriptors in the fluency criterion.

On the whole, Moderators detected very slight leniency. Adjustments were made to reflect this, particularly in lowering Band 1 marks into Band 2.

### **Administrative procedures**

Many Centres are clearly aware of the tasks and duties that need to be carried out by the External Moderators. However, there are several procedural matters, which if done more efficiently, would make external moderation swifter and easier:

- Moderators are still having to complete an unacceptable number of Amendment Forms. Mistakes in adding up and/or transcription will have been drawn to a Centre's attention on the Report – would these Centres please *nominate a person other than the Examiner* (e.g. a colleague in the English department) to check the totals which are being arrived at. It really is unacceptable to award a mark to a candidate after an Examination, and then record a *different* mark on the official documentation.
- Some Centres are still failing to include *both* of the required forms. The Moderator's copy of the Mark Sheet (MS1) is important to confirm accurate transcription of the marks. The Summary Form is equally important, as this indicates the breakdown of the marks into the three criteria for all of the candidates.
- Regarding sampling. Ideally, Moderators prefer to receive the minimum number of recordings (10 for most Centres, or 15 or 20 for large Centres) *on one or two cassettes*. However, it is appreciated that cases will occur where a considerable amount of work is involved in transferring recordings to another tape(s). In these cases, Centres will need to make a decision as to whether the size of entry necessitates transference. Moderators are happy to receive a few extra recordings if this makes it much easier for the Centre.
- It seems that a number of Centres are not recording all of their candidates. These Centres are reminded that *all candidates* must be recorded – the sample is then drawn from these. It is clearly unfair to those candidates who are to be recorded if others are not, particularly as candidates become aware of this disparity.

### **Advice to large Centres**

The use of more than one Examiner should be seen *only* at large Centres i.e. those with a large number of candidates. For the purposes of this examination, a working definition of a 'large Centre' is one with *more than 30 candidates*. It is assumed, therefore, that a single Examiner should be in a position to conduct up to 30 oral tests – many Examiners have shown that they are able to cope with significantly more than this number.

Where more than one Examiner is required, a Centre should ideally offer an internal training session or workshop to ensure that the Oral Tests are conducted in a similar manner.

It is also important that steps are taken to ensure that *the assessment criteria have been applied consistently* – achieved by some type of internal moderation. It is very difficult for External Moderators to confirm competent examining when Examiners at the same Centre are interpreting and applying the criteria differently.

It is requested, therefore, that Centres who need to use more than one Examiner, *appoint a single Examiner to be responsible for overseeing the Oral Test examination session*. Duties should include: planning the tests; drawing up a suitable testing timetable; ensuring that each Examiner has a good number of candidates to examine (at least 30); monitoring the examining team to maintain consistency throughout the session; and organising and collating the documentation which is sent in to CIE.

In short, CIE needs to see that a single person has assumed responsibility for the Centre's submission.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Paper 0510/06</b> <b>Oral (Coursework)</b></p>
--

**General comments**

In the ideal portfolio of coursework a candidate would complete three *different* tasks. It would be very pleasing to see that candidates have been involved in group discussions and pair-work, in addition to making individual presentations. Evidence of this should be presented on the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

There was more evidence in this session that some Centres are not only doing the above, but they are successfully integrating the activities into normal teaching/schemes of work. This was particularly so where work on literary texts was seen.

At such Centres, where a good range of activities were completed, using a variety of formats, candidates appeared to enjoy themselves and perform well.

However, at a few Centres, candidates completed three quite similar activities. It is not acceptable, for example, to ask candidates to deliver three talks, even if they focus on three different topics. The result of this approach is inevitably *limited and disappointing coursework*.

The External Moderator urges these Centres to think again about why they opt for the Coursework component. The aim of coursework is surely to broaden a candidate's learning experience, not to limit it, and to give a candidate more scope for conveying his or her oral skills than in a single, more formal test.

Where coursework begins to resemble an Oral Test, it should probably not be conducted.

If there is any confusion as to what is appropriate coursework, it is recommended that candidates are entered for the Oral Test (0510/05).

**Assessment**

Assessment was sound in almost all cases. The exception (where leniency was observed) was the result of the limited and inappropriate approach to coursework described above.

**Advice to Centres**

This remains very similar.

A Moderator is seeking to fulfil two main duties when listening again to a Centre's coursework: initially to confirm the Centre's interpretation and application of the assessment criteria, but also to confirm that a variety of appropriate tasks have been completed.

For the moderation process to be completed efficiently, *it is still requested* that Centres submit *only* a recording of candidates *engaged in a discussion or a conversation*. This might be with a Teacher/Examiner or it might be with another candidate.

There is no need to send in examples of group work, and/or recordings of candidates' presentations or speeches. Indeed, Centres are reminded that *there is no need* to record activities which will not feature in the sample sent in. It would be far too cumbersome to have to record all coursework activities, and it would negate the aim of assessing candidates in a more relaxed and possibly creative/expressive atmosphere.