ITALIAN

> **Paper 0535/01**
> **Listening**

Key messages

- It is not necessary for candidates to write full sentences in answer to the questions.
- Some candidates need to be more aware of the number of boxes ticked in **Question 16**. A few candidates ticked only four boxes instead of the six required.
- Some candidates seemed not to be aware that the task for **Questions 17–21** requires only the word(s) in bold to be replaced.

General comments

Many candidates performed very well in this year's examination. Virtually all candidates could answer correctly most of the questions in **Part 1**. **Part 2** was also well answered by the majority. A wider range of performance was seen in **Part 3**.

A number of candidates wrote unnecessarily long or elaborate answers. There is no additional credit available for quality of language: answers are marked for communication only. It is advisable for candidates to answer questions straight to the point. Including redundant information introduces a risk of invalidating an otherwise correct answer, for example by distorting the meaning, or highlighting a lack of comprehension.

Candidates should be encouraged to read the questions carefully and take account of all details, noting, for example, the presence of the word *sorprendente* in **Question 32**.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1–8

Candidates of all abilities were able to recognise most of the 8 items from a short conversation and to choose the correct option for each item. The few incorrect answers given were mainly for **Question 5**, where *'bevanda calda'* was sometimes taken to mean cold drink. **Question 2** was also occasionally answered incorrectly by candidates.

Exercise 2 Questions 9–15

This exercise was based on a message to a coach party. In general, candidates recognised most of the vocabulary and performed very well.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Question 16

This exercise was based on statements by four young people talking about their preference for listening to music. Candidates were expected to select six correct statements out of twelve. Most candidates were able to identify at least four correct statements. Wrong answers seemed to be at random.

Exercise 2 Questions 17–25

This exercise was based on interviews with two young people talking about their preferred means of transport.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

The first interview (**Questions 17–21**) was with Milena, whose family prefer motoring holidays, as the mother does not like flying. Candidates were asked to correct an incorrect detail in each of the answers provided. The incorrect detail was clearly indicated in bold. There were some instances of candidates including additional material, which in a few cases demonstrated a lack of comprehension and invalidated what would otherwise have been a correct answer. A number of candidates were unable to render the word "*periferia*" in a way that conveyed meaning. *"Fretta"* was not always understood and was often misspelt.

The second interview (**Questions 22–25**) was with Gianluca, who prefers flying. Most candidates managed to give an acceptable answer to **Question 22**, although there were considerable problems spelling "*ora*", which was often written with an h in front. Answers to the remaining questions showed that a large proportion of candidates either did not understand the text or found it difficult to word their answers. **Question 25** was often answered with redundant material, which sometimes made the answer wrong.

Section 3

Exercise 1 Questions 26–31

This exercise was based on the conversation between Angelo, who had been working as a volunteer on a summer camp, and a friend. The format of the questions was multiple choice, with four written options. Because of the increasing level of difficulty, candidates at the lower end of the ability range found themselves out of their depth and provided random answers. Among those who were comfortable with the level, some thought that Angelo *"è rimasto al festival"* instead of *"è andato a pescare"*.

Exercise 2 Questions 33–42

This final exercise was based on an interview with a young tennis player. This was the most challenging set of questions of the paper as candidates were expected to write their own answers in Italian and the text was more complex than in the preceding exercises. Most candidates attempted to answer the questions.

Question 32 was often answered wrongly because candidates did not focus on the word *"sorprendente"*, and wrote that Maria considers herself Italian because she was born in Italy and so were her brothers. Only a handful of candidates were able to give the correct spellings for *"Brasile"* or *"brasiliani".* Spellings which used a z instead of an s were tolerated.

A number of candidates were unable to score for **Question 35**, either as a result of lack of comprehension, or because they found it difficult to word their answers clearly enough to communicate.

The correct answers for **Question 36** were either "*padre"* or "*papa".* Those who wrote "*pappa"* did not score, having given an incorrect answer. Very few candidates provided the right possessive adjective, but this was tolerated.

For **Question 37** there were two acceptable answers. Most candidates understood the targeted information but some found it difficult to word their answers. The greatest difficulty seemed to be finding the right pronoun ("*non li/gli importa, li/gli fa piacere"* were accepted but the reflexive was rejected).

ITALIAN

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 0535/02
Reading

</div>

Key messages

It is advisable for candidates to:

* make sure they have answered every part of every question;
* keep their answers brief and focused, particularly in Section 3 – where only a single line space is provided, a short answer is expected;
* allow time to check their answers for accuracy.

General comments

Candidates mostly seemed very well-prepared and appeared to approach the questions with confidence.

In general, performance was strong. Almost all candidates attempted all questions in the paper.

In accordance with the marking criteria, linguistically inaccurate answers received full credit as long as they demonstrated genuine comprehension and an unambiguous, clear message.

Comments on specific questions

Prima parte

Esercizio 1 Domande 1–5

Most candidates scored well in this section, demonstrating familiarity with the items of vocabulary tested. **Question 3**, *pomodori*, was incorrectly answered by a small number of candidates, although most candidates gave the correct response. **Question 4**, *aspettami al semaforo*, proved to be the question in this exercise that was most challenging for candidates, who, where their answer was incorrect, in large part opted for *D* (a roundabout).

Esercizio 2 Domande 6–10

Most questions in this exercise were answered successfully by candidates. **Question 9** (*Daniela guarda una partita*) challenged some candidates who tended to opt for the picture of a woman driving a car (possibly due to the similarity of *guarda* and *guida*).

Esercizio 3 Domande 11–15

Nearly all candidates performed well in this exercise, locating the correct answers from the multiple choice options. Where marks were dropped, this was often in **Question 12** (*L'edificio si trova...*), and sometimes also **Question 11** (*Ogni mattina Paola va...*).

Seconda parte

Esercizio 1 Domande 16–20

In this exercise, candidates were asked to read an advert for a zoo, in which details are given about the location, access, entry price and facilities. Five statements with gaps that are based on the text then follow and candidates are asked to choose the correct word from the ten options provided. For every statement

there are two words that could fit grammatically in each gap, so candidates have to understand the actual content of the text and then transfer their understanding to the gap-fill statements by choosing the word that gives the correct meaning.

Many candidates performed well in this exercise in which the ability to locate the correct meaning in the text and transfer this to the statements was being tested. *Stancante* (instead of the correct answer, *piacevole*) was occasionally given in **Question 16**. More often, mistakes were made in **Question 17**, with *città* in place of *periferia*. A few candidates gave an incorrect response for **Question 19**, *dieci*, instead of *quindici*. **Question 20** was, on the whole, answered consistently well.

Esercizio 2 Domande 21–29

Esercizio 2 was based on an email from Stefano to his friend, Davide, in which he discusses how he stays healthy and fit. This was followed by questions that tested the candidates' comprehension of the email/text.

Generally, all questions in this exercise were well-attempted, with most candidates demonstrating understanding of the majority of details of Stefano's healthy lifestyle. **Question 21** (*Cosa vuole sapere Davide nella sua ultima e-mail?*), prompted a few candidates to give responses using irrelevant material from the first paragraph of the email (for example, *È sempre bello ricevere le tue notizie!*). Some candidates performed less well on **Question 22(ii)** because, although they had identified the two correct answers, they gave them both in **Question 22(i)**, then introduced incorrect additional material for **part (ii)** (usually along the lines of *mi posso anche divertire*).

The question that proved most challenging to candidates in this exercise was **Question 23** (*Cosa mangia Stefano alla fine del pranzo?*). Candidates gave several incorrect responses, often either *tante verdure, spesso con del pesce o del pollo*, or sometimes *la cena con della frutta fresca*. Where candidates had written *finisce sempre **il pranzo e la cena** con della frutta fresca*, credit was given, however a response of merely *la cena con della frutta fresca* was not rewarded as it was not evident that the candidate had demonstrated sufficient understanding.

Question 25 (*Quale sport Stefano preferisce fare di mattina?*) was answered almost entirely correctly, with **Questions 26**, **27** and **28** also answered well. Where the mark was not scored in **Question 29**, it was often due to the incorrect response of *mi posso alzare presto*.

Terza parte

In Section 3, candidates are asked to demonstrate a more precise understanding of Italian, and as such, responses should be focused. Additional material copied from the text may obscure understanding and consequently invalidate an otherwise correct answer.

Esercizio 1 Domande 30–34

In **Questions 30** to **34**, candidates were asked to read an interview and indicate whether each of the statements that followed were true or false and, where false, correct the statement according to the text.

A good number of candidates correctly chose the 3 false and the 2 true statements. Where candidates chose the incorrect true/false statements and therefore ticked the wrong box, it was often in **Questions 31** and **32**.

Whereas **Question 31** was usually successfully corrected to *quando era una bambina Chiara desiderava diventare una professoressa*, **Question 32** proved less straightforward for some. A significant number of candidates did not score here because they merely made the statement negative (*Chiara **non** sa tutto dei problemi personali dei suoi alunni*). Candidates should be reminded that marks will not be awarded for this. A good number of candidates also gave an answer that reflected a lack of understanding of the statement, reading *problemi* as communicating something about Chiara not getting on well with her students. Where candidates introduced the irrelevant statement, *va d'accordo con tutti gli studenti*, to an otherwise correct response for **Question 32**, the mark was invalidated.

Esercizio 2 Domande 35-40

In Exercise 2, candidates were asked to read a text, and then respond in Italian to the questions that followed, all based on Luigi, an Italian biologist who has realized his dream by opening a summer camp in the mountains for young people.

Most candidates were able to give a correct answer to **Question 35**, although several gave incorrect responses indicating that Luigi's dream was to **go** to a summer camp. **Question 36** (*Perché da piccolo Luigi andava ai campi estivi?*) was answered incorrectly by some candidates who merely said something along the lines of *mi mandavano in vacanza ai campi estivi*, without any further detail as to the reasons that his parents chose to do this.

Questions 37(i) and **(ii)** were answered almost universally well. **Question 38** although answered successfully by most, was sometimes answered incorrectly due to candidates giving one of the following responses: *giovani* /*80 ragazzi*.

Question 39 proved to be the most challenging question of the paper. A variety of incorrect responses were given, although the most common problem was candidates only giving a partial response by not including *educative* and *divertenti* when describing the main advantage of spending so much time outdoors.

The final question of the paper, **Question 40**, was answered well by most candidates.

ITALIAN

Paper 0535/03
Speaking

Key messages

- Examiners should read the Teacher's Notes booklet prior to conducting the examination to be familiar with the format of the test and the requirements of the mark scheme.
- It is important that the role-play cues, as written in the Teacher's Notes booklet, are followed carefully.
- Examiners should consistently ask questions to elicit the past, present and future tenses in both conversation sections.
- It is not necessary for a candidate to be of native speaker level to achieve full marks.

General comments

Overall, Examiners conducted the examinations well. However, there were some instances of Examiners improvising the scenarios and modifying the cues. It is important that tasks are not missed out and that the cues provided are not changed.

In the conversation tests, the majority of Examiners gave candidates the opportunity to respond to a range of questions and the conversations developed in a natural way. To allow candidates to achieve a mark of above 6 on scale (b), linguistic content, Examiners must ask questions that elicit past and future tenses in both conversation sections.

Clerical checks

The addition of marks and the transfer to the MS1 mark sheet/computer printout were done well and there were only isolated errors. The working mark sheet must be completed fully with all the required information.

Cover sheet for moderation sample

The cover sheet for the moderation sample, which can be found at the back of the teachers' notes booklet, provides a checklist to ensure that all required examination materials and documentation are correctly completed and submitted. Whilst the majority of Centres included it, a few Centres did not and are reminded of its importance.

Sample size

Centres submitted a correct sample and Centres with more than one Examiner included recordings from each.

Recording quality and presentation of samples

The recording quality was generally good and both the Examiner and the candidate were clear and audible. In a few cases the position of the microphone was positioned too closely to the Examiner or the level of background noise was distracting. It is helpful to conduct a test to check recording quality.

Internal moderation in Centre

In general, Centres with permission to use more than one Examiner due to having a large number of candidates had put measures in place to ensure consistency across the Centre and provided a sample that included examinations conducted by each Examiner.

Duration of tests/missing elements

Most Centres carefully followed the timings stipulated. Centres are reminded that each conversation section should last 5 minutes.

Application of the mark scheme

The majority of Examiners applied the mark scheme consistently and fairly, and in most cases, no adjustment was required. Where an adjustment was required, the most frequent reasons were as follows:

- Marks were awarded for role play tasks that were omitted or only partially completed
- Candidates were marked too severely
- Candidates were not given the opportunity to use both past and future tenses in both conversation sections.

In the role-play tasks if a verb is used it must be correctly conjugated to merit 3 marks. In a two-part task, if only one part is completed a maximum mark of 1 can be awarded.

Comments on specific questions

A Role plays

Most candidates seemed to have a good understanding of the requirements and used the cues well to complete the tasks. The A role-play is designed to be easier than the B role-play and Examiners made candidates feel at ease. In some instances Examiners changed or omitted tasks, which is to be avoided.

B role plays

The B role-plays include both unexpected questions and the requirement to use a different tense. Most Centres followed the cues carefully and gave the candidates the opportunity to gain marks for each task.

Topic presentation and discussion

Candidates spoke on a range of different topics including their town, travel and pastimes. Teachers should advise candidates to talk about one topic rather than have a general discussion about themselves.

The conversation that follows the presentation should be spontaneous and develop naturally as the candidate responds. Candidates should not be tested on general knowledge relating to their topic so Examiners should avoid questions asking for historical and cultural information outside the candidate's experience. It is essential that Examiners ask questions to elicit both past and future use.

The topic presentation and discussion combined should last approximately five minutes. If the section is too short, candidates may not be able to demonstrate the full range of language to maximise their mark. If the section is too long, the candidate may be overstretched.

It is important that the Examiner marks the transition to the general conversation with a phrase such as 'ora passiamo alla conversazione generale'. This supports the candidate and ensures a clear division for the purposes of moderation of the Centre's marking.

General conversation

The general conversation gives the candidate the opportunity to answer questions on 2 or 3 additional topics. In general, a good range of topics was covered and questions were appropriately focused on the candidate's experience. Centres are reminded of the need for a candidate to use both past and future tenses to access a mark of 6 or above on scale (b), linguistic content. Examiners should ensure that they ask a number of questions to elicit each tense.

This section of the exam should last for approximately 5 minutes as stipulated in the Teacher's Notes booklet. Examinations that are too short may not give the candidate an opportunity to use the range of language required to score highly.

In the strongest performances, candidates used a range of tenses and grammatical structures and varied their vocabulary. They routinely gave opinions with justifications and developed their responses confidently.

ITALIAN

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 0535/04
Writing

</div>

Key messages

- Candidates should read the questions carefully.
- On **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should address each bullet point clearly and explicitly.
- Candidates should be discouraged from introducing extraneous or irrelevant material into their answers.
- Candidates should check their work carefully.
- Candidates should take care to ensure their handwriting is legible.

General comments

In general, candidates performed very well on this paper.

Among weaker performances this year, *e* and *è* were often mixed up. The same happened with *ho* (I have) and *ha* (he/she has) that became *o* (or) and *a* (to). There was also confusion between the use and meaning of *bene*, as a (wrong) substitute for *buono*, or problems distinguishing between *molto* (adverb) and *molto/molti* (adjective).

The correct conjugation of *piacere* in all tenses was problematic for many candidates.

It is worth reminding candidates that they will only be assessed for OLF for relevant material, so it is not advisable to write at length beyond the last bullet point of a task.

In some performances, candidates used a very narrow range of repeated vocabulary and structures. It should be noted that <u>variety</u> of language – both verbs and other grammatical structures – is rewarded on **Question 3**.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

List of things the candidate might buy in a supermarket

The majority of candidates were able to list five words which were recognisable as things that might be seen in a supermarket; a certain amount of leeway was granted here in terms of accuracy of spelling and gender (e.g. accepting *fungi, spagetti, pomidori*) and 'sound alike' words (e.g. cafe for *caffè,* aqua for *acqua*). There was a generous range of nouns available for marks in this exercise. However, some candidates provided words in languages other than Italian (particularly Spanish and English) for which they could not receive credit. A very few candidates only gave 3 or 4 items and therefore could not earn full marks.

Question 2

Description of candidate's holiday

There were many detailed answers here which gained full marks for communication. However, many candidates seemed to struggle with bullet point 1 (those who struggled with this bullet point erroneously interpreted the question as "*dove*" instead of "*quando*" and did not give any information about when they went on holiday). Almost all candidates successfully tackled bullet points 2, 3 and 4. There were often problems with the use of constructions that take an infinitive verb, e.g. *amo ballare, preferisco vedere, vorrei andare*.

Centres should encourage candidates to read the bullet points very carefully, to answer each one directly and to expand their answer with relevant information in clauses containing verbs.

Question 3

(a)   An evening at the cinema

This was quite a popular choice for candidates in this section of the paper. Most candidates followed the bullet points closely. In responses to the first bullet point, most candidates named a film that they had been to see. Some candidates tried to extend their answer by adding the genre, often unsuccessfully (e.g. by introducing misspellings: film 'di comedia', instead of *commedia* or *film comico*; 'film accion' or 'film action' instead of *film d'azione* o *d'avventura*; 'film di romance' instead of *film romantico*). It was sufficient to give the title of the film they had seen. Some candidates were able to use vocabulary relating to the world of film and cinema, such as *schermo, trama, attori, effetti speciali*. A few candidates gave detailed accounts of plots and wrote about why particular genres appealed or otherwise.

For bullet point 2, many candidates offered answers about eating out. Occasionally this digressed into a description of what everybody ate (*ho mangiato, il mio amico ha mangiato, abbiamo bevuto …*).

For bullet point 5, a few candidates failed to make clear reference to the future or use the future tense.

(b)   Your School

This was the most frequently chosen option in this section of the paper. Some candidates tried to include a wide and complex range of vocabulary about school. Most candidates were able to gain one or two ticks for bullet points 1 and 2 although many candidates could not spell *materia* or *professori*, which were words given to them in the question. Another problem frequently seen in responses to bullet point 2 was that when giving an opinion about teachers, some candidates translated the English adjective "strict" with the words 'stricto' or 'stretto', instead of the correct word *severo*. On the other hand, some candidates used more sophisticated vocabulary for this bullet point (e.g. *il mio professore pianifica le sue lezioni*)

Bullet point 3 was often not interpreted as intended. Whilst some candidates produced excellent answers describing outings with their School to museums and galleries or even trips to Italy, many candidates wrote about everyday activities such as playing sport at School, rather than doing something with the School. Similarly, for bullet point four, some seemed to overlook the word *interessante* in the bullet point and just described any lesson.

A number of candidates extended their response by 100 words or more, going on to write about other irrelevant topics. This is to be avoided.

(c)   A surprise at the shopping centre

This was the least frequently chosen question in this section, but the majority of those who chose it seemed to have a good grasp of the language and so were able to write interesting, detailed and quite original responses to this more open-ended narrative task. Some candidates were able to produce fluent and vivid accounts of an extraordinary event at a shopping centre, while others had a rather individual notion of what constituted an extraordinary event, with examples ranging from a lion on the loose to a sale at a clothes shop, being witness of a robbery, meeting a famous pop star or football player to leaving a bag of oranges on the counter in a shop. Some candidates appeared to conflate bullet points 1 and 2 and were not able to gain all possible communication marks. There were occasional instances of completely irrelevant essays which could not be awarded marks.