



External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	French
Level	Intermediate 1

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The level of demand of the examination has been held constant over the years, while the composition of the cohort attempting the examination continues to vary from year to year. At this level, the guidance given to setters concerning the length and type of text for each component is very prescriptive. Consequently, the examination was again appropriate in terms of content, which related clearly to the prescribed themes and topics for this level, and in terms of the level of difficulty, which was appropriate and in line with previous years.

There was this year a small decrease in the number of candidates (by 93), but an increase in new centres (by 27).

The Mean Marks for each element were:

- ◆ Reading = 16.4 (35) – down 0.9
- ◆ Listening = 10.2 (20) – up 1.0
- ◆ Writing = 8.0 (15) – up 0.3
- ◆ Speaking = 24.8 (30) – up 0.7

The mean marks indicate that, with the exception of Speaking, candidates are achieving on or just below half of the available marks for each component of the exam. The mean marks and the distribution of grades do suggest that the majority of this year's cohort were presented at the correct level and had been well prepared for the examination.

However, they also suggest that many candidates (possibly from the new centres) had not been well prepared for the demands of Intermediate 1 (which is benchmarked against Standard Grade General), particularly in coping with the demands of longer reading texts, and might have been more suitably presented for Access 3 or have concentrated solely on the unit awards at Intermediate 1 level. Nevertheless, there were some excellent performances (particularly in Writing) and relatively few very poor performances (these were mainly in Reading and Writing).

Areas in which candidates performed well

Although there was a decrease in the mean mark, the performance of candidates in the two shorter Reading Passages (Community Centre/ Maison pour Tous) was still encouraging, and the more able candidates proceeded to cope well with the longer third text on Maison pour Tous and the longer fourth text (advantages/disadvantages of living in a tourist town). The four texts provided good progression in terms of the level of difficulty and demand, and the majority of candidates related well to the content of the reading texts.

Although overall the performance in Listening was variable, the majority of candidates had been well prepared to cope with predictable items, including numbers, times, weather expressions and high frequency vocabulary (eg leisure interests / clothes and colours / places in town / jobs). There was less incidence of the need to apply the extraneous rule in

the marking of both the Reading and Listening answers, which suggests that candidates are being trained well not to exceed the required amount of information indicated in the question.

Although the mean mark for the Writing task is still low, there were still some excellent performances where candidates had been prepared well and were able to write at some length and with a high level of accuracy to show what can be produced by good candidates within the confines of the task.

Areas which candidates found demanding

In the Reading Paper there was an increase from the previous year in the number of candidates who were unable to attempt or complete the two longer texts — particularly the fourth text on the advantages/disadvantages of living in a tourist town. In general, candidates continue to lose points through failing to provide sufficiently detailed answers. Examples include rendering plural nouns as singular (*boîtes de nuit / bouteilles en plastique*), and giving the noun without the qualifying detail such as adjectives (*gare routière / nombreux étudiants*) or indicators of frequency (*chaque jour sauf ...*).

Only the more able candidates demonstrated the accuracy of comprehension required to answer questions 3 (a)/(b), and the final three questions of the fourth text (Q 4(h)/(i)/(j)), with this text proving too difficult for many candidates: *discuter des événements du voisinage / organiser des sorties*. Some vocabulary seemed surprisingly difficult for candidates (*réunion / banlieue / randonnées / des bandes dessinées / par mauvais temps* and, perhaps less surprisingly, *faire de la recherche / des jeux de société*).

As the mean marks show, the most difficult component for many candidates remains Listening. This was the first year that candidates were allowed to hear each text three times (to bring this component in line with Standard Grade), and it was encouraging that there was an improvement in the mean mark. However, some candidates continue to find the Listening element difficult owing in part to the inability to give sufficient details in their answers, often managing to recognise part of the answer (*les programmes*) but not the precise details (*vendre*).

More surprising was the inability of candidates to perform well in the supported questions (Q4 (b) and 8) and to recognise common vocabulary (*athlétisme / frites / sac à main*) including numbers (*6 ans / 10 minutes / 50 participants*), colours (*jaune et bleu*) and prepositions and places (*à l'entrée du stade*). Many candidates also had difficulty in demonstrating comprehension of the following question in French: *Quel est ton sport favori?*

Many candidates again had considerable difficulty with the Writing element, which produced the greatest range of performances, from very good to very poor. There were still a few candidates for whom the task was clearly beyond their ability and who failed to provide the required number of pieces of information for each of the areas. In preparing candidates for this component, many centres need to give further guidance on what constitutes three sentences; the accuracy required in terms of spelling, genders and use of accents; and how candidates can go beyond a minimal response.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Reading/Listening

In responding to the questions in the reading and listening papers, candidates should be guided by the number of points awarded for each question and **should be discouraged from giving extraneous information** as this is likely to be penalised. Indeed, to avoid candidates falling foul of the extraneous rule, the question itself now usually indicates the amount of information the candidate is required to give by stating in bold eg **'Mention 2 of them'**.

In preparation for the **Reading Paper**, centres should ensure candidates are familiar with the common areas of vocabulary indicated in the prescribed themes and topics for Intermediate 1, and should continue to give candidates sufficient practice in working with longer texts in preparation for texts 3 and 4. Many candidates would benefit from more focused practice of dictionary skills.

Particularly in the **Listening Paper**, centres should ensure that candidates are able to give **accurate** answers through confident knowledge of numbers, common adjectives, weather expressions, prepositions and question words, so that some of the 'easier' points of information are not lost through lack of sufficiently accurate details.

Now that candidates hear each of the Listening texts three times (making it the same as for the internal unit assessment and for Standard Grade), candidates should be encouraged to make use of the third listening to check the accuracy and specific details of their answers.

Writing

Centres need to give further guidance to candidates on what constitutes an adequate amount of information (three sentences) in each section of the Writing task. They also need to encourage candidates to take greater care in how they present this information, particularly in the formation of verb tenses and in the spelling and genders of high frequency vocabulary, eg family, school subjects and leisure activities.

The expanded version of the pegged mark descriptors gives a good indication of what is required of candidates in this task. **These criteria should be shared with candidates.** The exemplification of candidates' performances, which accompanied the new descriptors, also provides centres with examples of good and very good performances in this writing task to show how it is possible to prepare candidates to produce more than a 'minimalist' response under each of the sections.

General

Centres should encourage candidates to ensure that handwriting is legible, and to distinguish clearly between rough notes and what they wish to be considered as final answers.

Centres that are moving from Standard Grade to the National Qualifications Framework, must be aware that Intermediate 1 represents **progression from** Foundation level and is

benchmarked against General level. In particular, this requires candidates to be able to cope with longer reading texts.

The continuing number of poor performances in Writing suggests that some centres may still be having difficulty in presenting candidates at the correct level for their ability. Centres are encouraged to make effective use of the guidance issued by SQA in the form of the materials (marking schemes and Photostat essays) used at the Professional Development Workshop on Intermediate 1 and 2 (December 2005) and the Professional Development Workshop on Writing at NQF Levels 4 and 5 (December 2007).

Further exemplification of the standards has been issued to accompany the new extended pegged mark descriptors. It is hoped that this will also prove useful to centres in improving the performance of their candidates in Writing.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 1

Number of resulted entries in 2010	2274
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2011	2172
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 100				
A	26.7%	26.7%	579	69
B	25.5%	52.1%	553	59
C	22.9%	75.0%	498	49
D	8.0%	83.1%	174	44
No award	16.9%	100.0%	368	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary), and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary). It is, though, very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Head of Service and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.

SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as Arrangements evolve and change.