



Examiner's Report
Principal Examiner Feedback
Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In AS Russian (6RU0/02)



Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code 6RU02_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

This paper was set in accordance with Specification guidance, and adhered to the format of previous Unit 2 papers. Centres received compact discs or accessed mp3 files containing four passages. The total time allocated to this paper was 2 hours 30 minutes, with candidates having access to the recording for the first 45 minutes only. All questions were compulsory, and the vast majority of candidates attempted all questions. There were many excellent performances. This paper was marked to exactly the same principles as 6RU02 in previous sessions.

The passages came from a variety of authentic sources, and encompassed topics from within the General Topic Areas. The first four passages were spoken, while the remainder were written. Question 1 was a multiple-choice exercise worth four marks, and was based on a report about a Russian golfer. In response to Passage 2, about the educational experience of a young Russian, candidates selected four correct statements from eight. Question 3 was based on an item about a Russian motorcyclist; this was a cloze exercise worth four marks, in which candidates selected from a pool of eight items. Question 4, where eight marks were available, required responses in Russian. This passage was a dialogue between two young Russians about television. From Passage 5, which contained comments about ecological problems in the Moskva River, each of five statements had to be correctly attributed to the person who wrote it, for a total of five marks. Passage 6 was about studying abroad. It required the transfer of meaning into English. Five questions, worth one mark each, were answered in English for a total of five marks. Passage 7 was an article about young people's views on marriage and family. The questions were in Russian, and required short responses in Russian. Ten marks in total were available for this question. Passage 8 provided the stimulus for a written response of 150-165 words on health: whether candidates are much concerned about health, whether or not they agree with the statement that 'only people with money' worry about health, whether it is easy to lead a healthy life in their area, and what, apart from health, is important for young people. Fifteen marks were available for Content and fifteen for Language, making Question 8 worth thirty marks. Seventy marks in total were available for 6RU02.

In Q1, one mark was available for each of four multiple choice parts.

In Q2, four crosses were required to denote the four correct statements. One mark was withheld for each cross offered in excess of four.

In Q3, if the response selected was not completely transcribed correctly, but could clearly not be confused with another word, it still earned the mark.

In Q5, one mark was scored for each statement correctly matched to a topic.

Examiners assessed responses in Q4, Q6, and Q7 in the order that elements were presented by the candidates, and considered no more elements than the number of marks available. In this examination, no part was worth more than two marks. Thus, for instance, in a two mark question, only the first two elements scored. Repeating or re-working the question, or preambles to an acceptable response, did not count as elements in the response.

Q8

Point 1 requires a response which refers to whether the candidate is much concerned about health.

Point 2 invites the candidate to agree or disagree with the statement that 'only people with money' worry about health.

Point 3 requires candidates to discuss whether it is easy to lead a 'healthy way of life' in their area.

Point 4 needs to address the issue of what, **apart from health**, is important in the lives of young people.

For Q8, the following guidance was used for the Content and Response mark:

- CR13-15 requires a direct response to all four bullet points
- CR10-12 requires at least a partial or oblique response to all four bullet points
- CR7-9 is where three bullet points are addressed, directly or partially. CR-9 is the maximum where one bullet point is omitted, but less might be awarded
- CR-6 is the maximum where two bullet points have been omitted, but again, less might be awarded

Summary

Candidates are offered the following advice:

- Where answers require the placing of crosses in boxes, make sure you write only the correct number of crosses
- In Q3, use only the words or figures offered in the box
- In Q4, Q6 and Q7, be aware that full sentences are not required, and that examiners are interested in only the first two elements of a two-mark question
- In Q6, check your English spelling carefully, since errors can often lead to ambiguity
- In Q8, answer all the bullet points evenly, using about 40 words for each
- Avoid including a lengthy introduction which does not relate directly to the bullet points
- Write between 150 and 165 words
- Use a black pen, and ensure that your handwriting is as neat as possible
- Cross out any work that you do not wish to be marked, e.g. planning notes
- Take time to check your work

Question commentaries

Q3

The majority of candidates scored full marks on this question. Very few candidates' misspelled words, but erroneous versions were accepted, so long as they were not ambiguous. Occasionally, candidates offered synonyms, instead of using words from the box. These were not accepted. Where wrong answers were given, they usually fitted grammatically into the sentence, which shows that candidates were not writing answers at random, but had simply misunderstood the spoken text. A number of candidates put велосипед in (iv). The word мотоцикл was also found occasionally as an incorrect response to this part; although factually true, it was not taken from the list, and so could not be credited.

Q4

This question was handled very well by candidates. Part (a) was generally answered successfully, but a few candidates wrote передачи, which did not answer the question. Most candidates answered Part (б) correctly. Part (в) was well done, but some candidates merely wrote игра, which was not a full answer. In part (г), most candidates gave two correct examples, but some did not specify that one could find out about actors in particular. Parts (д) and (е) caused few problems for candidates.

Clip 77342

This candidate achieved six marks. Part (a) was awarded two marks, because the word передачами was regarded as a harmless addition. Part (б) was not a correct answer. Part (г) contained one correct element, for one mark out of two. The second element was incomplete.

Ensure that you give full responses to all questions.

Clip 75876

This candidate achieved seven marks. Most questions were answered with responses which matched the mark scheme. Response (б) was incorrect and may suggest that the candidate misunderstood the question.

Ensure that you read each question carefully before responding.

Q6

Some of the candidates used ambiguous or poor-quality English. Response (a) was generally well done. In point (b) a fair number incorrectly stated that such subjects are better studied in the East. Indeed, examiners also noted references to both the South and the North. In point (c), most responded correctly, but some gave incomplete or misleading answers. Most answered response (d) correctly, but some candidates failed to refer to both reading and speaking in the foreign language. Response (e) proved problematical for a range of candidates since they either did not include an element of comparison in their

answer or in many cases lacked the required knowledge of English to express themselves adequately. Many candidates used 'abroad' as an adjective. Correct use of prepositions also posed a problem, e.g. 'speak *on* a foreign language'.

Clip 77133

This candidate achieved three marks. Three responses corresponded to the mark scheme. Response (b) was not an appropriate answer to the question 'why'. Response (e) was unclear due to poor use of English.

Check that your English in Question 6 is clear and unambiguous.

Clip 77135

This candidate achieved four marks. Four responses corresponded to the mark scheme. Response (b) was not a factually correct statement.

Ensure that your answers match the information that is given in the text.

Q7

Most candidates scored well on this question. Very occasionally, candidates tried so hard to avoid 'lifting' elements from the text that they got into a muddle and did not convey a clear answer. It is acceptable to use words from the text, so long as there is evidence of manipulation; simple copying of passages from the text cannot, of course, be credited. Those questions attracting two marks needed to be answered with slightly more detail.

Examiners accepted a whole range of answers, so long as the essential meaning matched the mark scheme. In Part (a) some candidates omitted the element of comparison. In Part (б), most candidates answered correctly, but a large number simply answered 'for young people/the respondents', without including 'for the majority...'. Part (в) was generally answered successfully, for one mark. Part (г) was well done, except where candidates gave a wrong answer because they only answered 'crisis' or 'family', but did not express the idea of a 'семейный кризис'. In Part (д) only a minority of students managed to come up with an answer that described 'modernisation' as a 'change' to a more modern or newer state, but other viable definitions were credited. In Part (е), very few students mentioned the grandparents in their answer. Most correctly mentioned that Ivan and his wife found it difficult to determine their roles around the house, but failed to make the comparison with the older generation. Part (ж) was generally answered well, for two marks.

Clip 77134

This candidate was awarded seven marks. In Part (б), there was no mention of 'the majority', which was a key element of the answer. In Part (г) the candidate did not specify that it was a crisis in the family; 'crisis' by itself was insufficient. In part (е), the candidate did not make the comparison with the older generation. In the remaining Parts, the words used by the candidate corresponded appropriately to those mentioned in the Mark Scheme, the sense was clear and the answers displayed comprehension of the text, with the candidate manipulating the language of the text or using his or her own words.

Responses in Q7 do not need to be long, but they do need to make sure they include all key elements.

Clip 77340

This candidate was awarded four marks, for correct responses to Parts (a), (b) and (ж). The remaining responses were inappropriate or omitted; it may be that the candidate understood the questions imperfectly.

Ensure you work out what each question means before answering it.

Q8

Most candidates produced a coherent and relevant response to this question, and kept to the word limit of 150-165 words. Many pieces of work were thoughtful, interesting and a pleasure to read. This year, very few candidates chose to ignore the word limit. Those who wrote fewer than 150 words penalised themselves, since they did not develop each bullet point, and there was little evidence of a range of language. Those who went above fell foul of the rule that requires examiners to cease to read after the end of the sense group in which the 165th word falls. This usually resulted in a much reduced mark for content, as in effect, they were being assessed on only three, two or even just one bullet point. The problem was exacerbated for those who elected to write a long and not always relevant introduction to their work. A small number of candidates attempted to write a discursive essay about health, rather than addressing the bullet points.

Some candidates were hindered by the fact that they had not provided themselves with adequate writing equipment. This meant that their work was hard to decipher, and assessment of communication and accuracy was particularly affected.

The most successful candidates wrote four paragraphs of roughly equal length, in which each point had the chance to be developed. The response took the form of an article, but there was no obligation to write a title. Most candidates wrote a clear response for Point 1, stating whether or not they thought much about their own health, and giving details. Some, however, failed to develop this point adequately. Point 2 was generally well answered, with candidates expressing quite passionate views about how both rich and poor are interested in their health, but rich people have more opportunities to take action to improve their health. Point 3 was generally done well; candidates wrote about their local environment or sports facilities, and most related this closely to the bullet point. In a small number of cases, the final point was not covered or developed sufficiently enough due to the word limit. Candidates sometimes gained little or no credit for their final bullet for this reason. A few candidates appeared not to understand the words 'кроме здоровья' in the context of this bullet point, and so wrongly continued to write about the importance of health; others did not specify that they were writing about young people.

The range of performance for language was wide. Most candidates used appropriate and varied vocabulary, while many displayed impressive knowledge of a wide range of more complex structures, including gerunds and participles. Examiners had to balance three key components of the language mark: communication, breadth of language (lexis and structures) and accuracy. Errors were considered to be more significant if they affected the conveyance of meaning. Few pieces of work were faultless; for many, errors occurred in noun, adjective and pronoun declensions, verb conjugations, and the spelling of more

complicated vocabulary. Letter formation was an issue for some; examiners again particularly noticed problems with л, м, т, ш, ю and я. For some candidates, one issue was the overuse of pre-learnt phrases. Punctuation was an issue, with many students just ignoring it. It is important at least to put a full stop to denote the end of a sentence. Some candidates were not confident about the use of personal pronouns and often put them in the wrong case.

Clip 77139

This candidate was awarded 12 for Content and 15 for Language. The article was rather longer than the required 150-165 words, and the examiner stopped marking after that point. This meant that the fourth point was not fully developed, leading to Content mark of 12. The three other points had been fully addressed and developed successfully. Overall, the work was quite successful, with evidence of fluency and relevance. The candidate used an excellent variety of appropriate vocabulary and structures. Some sentences were long and complex. Communication was mostly excellent. There were few, if any, spelling errors.

Keep strictly to the word limit of 150-165 words.

Clip 75865

This candidate achieved marks of 7 for Content and 12 for Language. None of the four bullet points had been fully addressed, and there was some irrelevant material in the second paragraph. The candidate had written only about 100 words. The language used was generally sound. There was good communication, and a good level of accuracy. The structures and vocabulary were generally successful and quite varied.

Make sure you develop all four bullet points equally and fully. Write between 150 and 165 words in total.

Clip 77339

This candidate was awarded 13 marks for Content, and 12 marks for Language. All four bullet points were addressed and developed, and the candidate adhered to the word limit. As for language, the communication was good overall; vocabulary and structures were also good; they included some complex language which had been generally successfully deployed. There was a good level of accuracy.

Ensure that you include a wide variety of complex structures and vocabulary, and check your spellings.

Clip 77133

This is an example of how a candidate can achieve full marks within the word limit of 150-165 words. All four bullet points have been clearly addressed and successfully developed.

The language was sophisticated, varied and accurate, leading to unambiguous communication. This was a well-constructed piece of work, which was a pleasure to read.

Congratulations on an excellent piece of work.

