

FIRST LANGUAGE PORTUGUESE

Paper 0504/02

Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

Although most candidates coped with this paper, a few did not seem to be fully prepared for this examination. There were problems similar to those encountered in previous years.

Presentation of work

Some Centres with large numbers of candidates did not ensure scripts were sent in the order shown on the Attendance Registers. Some candidates did not ensure their answer sheets were in numerical order. Many candidates did not ensure their handwriting was immediately legible. A few did not mark 'Rough work'. The practice is to put a line through work that is not to be assessed. Some made excessive use of correcting fluid and did not ensure their work was clear and readable. Some crossed out many parts of their answers, marked those parts with asterisks and rewrote elsewhere. Some candidates found it necessary to write in the margins. These are to be left blank.

Number of words

Although the instructions are: *Não escreva mais de 300 palavras*, once again, some candidates wrote well in excess of this number. Candidates must adhere to instructions. Marks are only given for the first 300 words of the answer.

Quality of language

As in previous years, many candidates seemed unsure of many aspects of Grammar – punctuation, spelling, the use of accents and of the hyphen, verbs and tenses, agreement, gender of nouns, object and reflexive pronouns, etc. The verb *tar* appeared frequently.

Very often candidates were unable to write correctly words that they borrowed from the question paper.

Comments on specific questions

Part 1

Question 1

There were some good answers to this question, but often candidates did not demonstrate that they had taken into consideration what they had read in both texts. Many quoted extensively from the text(s). Many candidates failed to mention most of the points and concentrated on describing what childhood used to be like, giving irrelevant details about their own or their friends' needs and lives, or advice to parents.

Question 2

Many candidates wrote interesting dialogues between one of the children and a parent. Usually the parent recognised his/her mistake, as when Felipe explains that he wants to *sair do balé porque todos meus amigos caçoam-me* and succeeds in convincing his father that he will be happier *ver o Vasco dar dez a zero ao Corinthians*, or in the following final exchange:

Pai: Você quer crescer e não saber falar três línguas?

Felipe: Estou à beira de um colapso nervoso.

Pai: Filho, desculpe-me, foi meu erro em pensar que você poderia fazer tantas coisas, mil perdões.

Sometimes the child's plea was quite heart-rending, as Carolina's:

E minha felicidade? Será que tem um horário na minha agenda atarefada para isso? Pai, eu quero ser criança. Eu quero ser igual àquelas crianças que brincam na rua. Eu quero poder ir nas festas dos meus amigos e me entupir de comer pipoca! Será que você me pode entender?

Parents were not always understanding, for example Carolina's mother:

Mas é tudo tão bom para você. Se você quiser podemos fazer seu almoço e no carro se pode comer e se trocar.

Or Vanessa's:

Agora eu não quero mais ouvir você falando que não quer fazer aula de canto! E é bom você comportar –se durante a aula.

However, many did not adhere to the rubric and wrote interesting but long and irrelevant descriptions of the scenario instead of concentrating on the dialogue. At times there were long exchanges of irrelevant greetings.

Part 2

Question 3

Again, there were many interesting and well-developed answers. However, candidates did not always answer the three bullet points as fully as expected. Sometimes there were long and irrelevant introductions with their views on the recent fire. Some candidates wrote letters with irrelevant introductions and endings. Very few candidates were unable to cope with the topic.

Paper 0504/03

Continuous Writing

General comments

The overall mark for this paper is 40. There was a selection of 9 titles provided, calling for an imaginative, narrative or argumentative response. The candidates' language performance was of a very good level, with a good percentage getting a mark of 30 or more. However, there were some common spelling mistakes such as: *viajem* instead of *viagem*; *tarem* instead of *estarem*; *proffissão* instead of *profissão*; *trafficante* instead of *traficante* and *convenser* instead of *convencer*.

Some candidates failed to indicate the number of the question they were answering in their script. Others altered the title of the essay they attempted, which therefore differed from the one set on the question paper itself. It is important that they stick to the original wording of the questions, because in some cases shortening the title passes over important nuances of the matter to be discussed.

Some candidates did not read the instructions carefully and attempted to do more than one composition. A number of others who attempted to write just the one composition exceeded the maximum word limit by a considerable margin.

More attention should be paid to the organisation of paragraphs and handwriting.

There was a good standard of vocabulary, syntax and grammar.

Frequent anglicisms used by candidates: *pretendido*; *twistar*; *infancidade*; *bizarro*.

In some cases thoughts, feelings and opinions were expressed in a very informative and convincing fashion. This made the marking an enjoyable and interesting experience. There was clear evidence that many candidates had been very well prepared by the Centres for the syllabus and the paper.