



Pearson

**International Advanced Level
Modern Foreign Languages
(French, German & Spanish)
Oral Training Guide**

Contents	Page
Introduction	3
Part 1 – Generic overview of oral assessment	4
Preparing students for oral tests	7
Assessment Criteria – Unit 1	14
Assessment Criterial – Unit 3	16
Part 2 – Language specific commentaries on exemplar tests	18
French IAS Unit 1 exemplar test commentary	18
German IAS Unit 1 exemplar test commentary	21
Spanish IAS Unit 1 exemplar test commentary	23
French IAL Unit 3 exemplar test commentary	25
German IAL Unit 3 exemplar test commentary	28
Spanish IAL Unit 3 exemplar test commentary	31

Introduction

This guide is to advise teachers on how best to prepare students for examination in International Advanced Subsidiary (IAS) and International Advanced Level (IAL) Modern Foreign Languages Units 1 and 3, and how to conduct the oral exam. This guide is not prescriptive.

Part 1 of the guide outlines a generic overview for oral assessment whilst Part 2 gives more detailed subject specific commentaries on exemplar oral assessment.

Essential preparation

Teachers should familiarise themselves with the details of the IAS and IAL oral examinations (Units 1 and 3) including the unit description, assessment requirements and assessment criteria in each specification.

Teachers should also refer to the Oral Training Guide section in the MFL *Getting Started* guide on the website [here](#).

Related documents can be downloaded from the Pearson Edexcel website [here](#).

It is essential that teachers are aware of the requirements of each unit, any incorrectly conducted tests can adversely affect candidates' marks.

Part 1: Generic overview of oral assessment

IAS Unit 1: Spoken Expression and Response

This unit rewards students for their ability to converse in French, German or Spanish on a general topic area (GTA) they have chosen in advance. Students will need to demonstrate they can engage in a discussion in the respective target language that relates to a chosen GTA and allied subtopics. They will be expected to give relevant and appropriate information, convey opinions, interact and respond to a range of questions.

Choice of IAS Unit 1 General Topic Area

Before the test, students must choose **two** of the following four GTAs:

- Youth matters
- Lifestyle, health and fitness
- Environment and travel
- Education and employment.

Students are free to choose any two of these four general topic areas, depending on their preference and interests. A definitive list of the subtopics linked to each of these general topic areas is provided below:

Youth matters

Family relationships and friendships
Peer pressure and role models
Music and fashion
Technology and communication

Lifestyle, health and fitness

Food and diet
Sport and exercise
Health issues
Urban and rural life

Environment and travel

Tourism, travel and transport
Natural disasters and weather
Climate change and its impact
Energy, pollution and recycling

Education and employment

Education systems and types of schooling
Pupil/ student life
Volunteering and internships
Jobs and unemployment

It is anticipated that students from the same centre will choose to prepare different general topic areas, in order to reflect the range of their individual interests. Some overlap of topic choice is, however, expected.

Students will inform the Teacher-Examiner no more than three weeks before the assessment which two general topic areas they have chosen. They will then be examined on **one** of their two chosen GTAs. They will learn which GTA they have been allocated only when they arrive for their preparation time. Teacher-Examiners

must refer to the *Sequence of Oral Tests* (in the Teacher-Examiner booklet) to determine which GTA the candidate will be allocated.

Unit 1 tests will be set on each of the four topic areas.

The tests will be in the form of a short stimulus text in the target language. The stimulus cards are issued on a random allocation basis according to the *Sequence of Oral Tests*. Teacher-Examiners may not choose the order of the cards themselves.

15 minutes before the test, students will be given, at random, one stimulus card on one of the topic areas they have prepared.

This sequence must be applied to all candidates except where a particular instruction might cause distress (for example reference to relative who is ill or similar situation); in this case, the next suitable stimulus must be used.

The sequence must be continued after breaks in examining in any one day, for example after lunch.

Supervised preparation time

Students will have 15 minutes' supervised preparation time immediately prior to their speaking test to prepare the stimulus allocated to them. During this time, they should study the text with a view to answering questions about it and to discussing the subject of the text in more detail. Students may not have access a dictionary or any other resources during the preparation time. They may make notes (up to one side of A4 paper if they wish) but must not write on the stimulus provided.

It is important students know that, in the first part of the test (Section A), they will be asked to offer opinions about the subject of the text and the related subtopic, and to discuss it in some detail, in addition to demonstrating comprehension of the text. In the second part of the test (Section B) students will need to talk about other aspects of the general topic area they have chosen.

Students must take both the stimulus and any notes into the examination and may refer to both at any point during the test. Both the stimulus and the notes must be handed to the Teacher-Examiner at the end of the test, and must be retained by the centre until after the publication of final results for the examinations session.

The Unit 1 test comprises two sections:

Section A

The Teacher-Examiner will begin the test by asking the four questions set by Pearson Edexcel and printed in the Teacher-Examiner's material.

The first two questions ask students to demonstrate factual understanding of the stimulus text.

Question 1 relates only to the content of the first paragraph of the text on the stimulus card. In order to provide a full and detailed answer to this question, candidates are expected to mention three points in their response. Candidates will not be able to lift their answers verbatim from the text but will need to manipulate the language to some extent.

Question 2 will refer to the remainder of the text.

Questions 3 and 4 will relate to the theme of the stimulus text but will invite students to express their opinions on or give their reactions to the subject matter of the stimulus text and allow them to demonstrate an understanding of the wider implications of the text.

In the interests of comparability and for the purposes of fair assessment across all centres, the Teacher-Examiner must not rephrase these questions or ask any supplementary questions. Should the Teacher-Examiner rephrase or expand on these questions, this will affect the students' marks for *Understanding (Stimulus specific)*.

However, although the questions provided by Pearson Edexcel for French and German will use the formal 'you' to address the candidate, the Teacher-Examiner may use the informal 'you' if more appropriate. The Teacher-Examiner may then undertake any necessary consequential changes to the linked verbs and adjectives etc. No other changes may be made.

Section B

In this section, the Teacher-Examiner must initiate a discussion about the general topic area chosen. The specific topic of the stimulus may be used as a starting point for this discussion, but the Teacher-Examiner must move away from this topic to more general discussion of the topic area and its linked subtopics. Failure to move away to different subtopics will have an impact on final marks.

There is no requirement to cover all the subtopics in the allocated GTA. However, the Teacher-Examiner should ensure that the candidate is given the opportunity to engage in a discussion on at least two of these subtopics and the discussion time should be divided evenly between the subtopics. The actual number of subtopics covered will depend on the student's response and the student may have more opportunity to demonstrate the extent of his or her knowledge and linguistic ability through a thorough discussion on two subtopics as opposed to a superficial discussion of several subtopics.

The general principle of the discussion should always be to start by asking straightforward, accessible questions and then to move on to questions which can progressively take students towards their 'linguistic ceiling'. Open questions should be used where possible in order to elicit a full response from the candidate. The Teacher-Examiner should encourage the student to expand his or her answers and to give reasons for his or her opinions.

Timing

The test time is 8–10 minutes. The time starts from when the Teacher-Examiner begins asking the first question in Section A. These 8-10 minutes should be divided equally between Sections A and B. However, if students complete the answers to the four questions in Section A in less than four minutes, the Teacher-Examiner must ensure the discussion in Section B is extended, in order that **the total test time is at least eight minutes**.

Tests which are too short cannot be deemed to demonstrate the full requirements of the assessment criteria. Excess candidate material (i.e. longer than ten minutes) will not be assessed.

Preparing students for IAS U1 oral tests

For IAS Unit 1, students must choose **two** of these general topic areas:

- Youth matters
- Lifestyle, health and fitness
- Environment and travel
- Education and employment

These areas are the four IAS general topic areas which will have been studied in class, but in preparation for the Unit 1 test, students should be encouraged to undertake additional, independent research since in the test they must express ideas and opinions which are supported by evidence from their research. They should take the opportunity in their preparation to investigate their two chosen general topic areas in greater depth to allow them to give responses which go beyond simplistic points based on general knowledge and which offer a range of ideas .

In preparation for this test, teachers can build on their students' natural curiosity, creativity and individual interests.

Possible activities might include the following:

- Students work in small groups to identify which of the general topic areas interests them most, and aspects of that area which they might explore.
- Individual students research a particular aspect of the general topic area they have chosen and present it to the rest of the group. Students might prepare a PowerPoint presentation, a worksheet or vocabulary list for their classmates, or an activity for their classmates to do.
- Students interview each other and/or their teacher to canvass opinion and ideas about a particular topic.
- Students write mind maps to identify links between aspects of the topic and to expand and order their ideas.
- Students consider questions for each other about the general topic area they have chosen, and practise answering these questions in as much detail as possible.
- Students time themselves (or each other) talking about a particular subtopic of the general topic area they have chosen, trying to increase each time the amount of time they can talk without needing to be prompted (from 10 seconds, to 15, to 20, etc.).

When researching the general topic areas they have chosen, students may use internet-derived sources, but should also be encouraged to refer to books, newspapers, magazines, television and radio programmes.

Teachers should share the assessment criteria for this unit with their students, so that they are fully aware of the assessment demands and can bear these in mind when preparing for the test.

Students must be aware that Teacher-Examiners are not allowed to rephrase or expand on the initial **four** questions on the stimulus text in Section A, and that students should answer these questions as fully as possible.

There is no requirement in the IAS Unit 1 oral test for students to demonstrate knowledge of countries and contexts in which the relevant target language is spoken, though of course they are free to do so.

Although this unit relates to chosen general topic areas, it is essentially designed to assess manipulation and understanding of the spoken language. The general topic areas should be considered as different contexts in which students can develop, use and understand spoken French, German or Spanish.

The 15 minutes preparation time

Before the Unit 1 test, students will have 15 minutes to study a stimulus text linked to the general topic area they have chosen.

Students must not write on this stimulus, but may make notes on a separate piece of paper. Both the stimulus card and any notes must be taken into the exam room, and students can refer to these at any point during the test. However, students must not refer to dictionaries or any other resources during the preparation time.

Teachers may wish to advise their students of the following to ensure that they make good use of their time:

- Begin by reading the entire text through (possibly two or three times).
- Do not waste time writing out complete sentences; you will not be allowed to read out long prepared statements in any case (remember that marks are awarded for spontaneity in this unit).
- Consider the types of questions which might be asked about the text, and your answers to these questions.
- Identify any vocabulary you already know that might be useful when answering questions on this topic.

IA2 Unit 3: Understanding and Spoken Response

In this test, students will be rewarded for demonstrating the ability to understand spoken French, German and Spanish and to use the target language to explain, to clarify, to justify a point of view, to express opinions and to defend an argument. They will have to demonstrate knowledge of the issue they have chosen to debate and will need to show evidence of wide-ranging reading and research into this issue.

This unit test comprises two sections:

Section A

This is a debate on an issue chosen by the student in advance of the test. Students will introduce the issue they have chosen for up to one minute, after which the Teacher-Examiner will facilitate debate on this issue for up to a further four minutes.

Section B

The Teacher-Examiner must introduce at least **two further issues** for discussion. Students must not know in advance of the test which further issues the Teacher-Examiner will choose for discussion: these must be unpredictable elements of the test.

Teacher-Examiners must ensure that the unpredictable issues in this unit are linked to the general topic areas described in the specification. All students at IA2 will be expected to have covered the seven general topic areas to some degree, and students who are able to demonstrate good knowledge of any of these areas should be rewarded accordingly. Teacher-Examiners should not require the candidate to produce any very detailed or specialised knowledge in the follow-on unpredictable discussions.

It is in the students' interest for Teacher-Examiners to cover a range of issues for discussion in order that students can demonstrate both the breadth and depth of their knowledge and linguistic competence.

As students will be rewarded for the ability to analyse issues critically, it is important that the Teacher-Examiner's questions are sufficiently challenging to allow the candidate to access the full range of marks for *Critical Analysis*. If the Teacher-Examiner's questions are not sufficiently complex and challenging, students' opportunities to score high marks in this area of assessment will be constrained.

Timing

The IA2 Unit 3 test should last between 11 and 13 minutes.

Section A (debate on the chosen issue)

This section should last for up to 5 minutes in total. Students should introduce their chosen issue and outline their stance on it for about one minute before the debate begins. The Teacher-Examiner should interrupt students if this introduction exceeds about one minute. This introduction is followed by up to 4 minutes' debate on the chosen issue.

Section B (discussion of further issues)

The remainder of the test time (i.e. 6 to 8 minutes) is for discussion of at least two further issues chosen by the Teacher-Examiner. Students will not know in advance of

the test which issues the Teacher-Examiner will introduce for discussion. The time does not have to be divided precisely between these further issues, but care should be taken to ensure that students have the opportunity to discuss at least two further issues in detail. Excess material will not be assessed.

Choice of IA2 Unit 3 issue

Students should choose an issue which they are prepared to research in depth and which is suitable for debate. They must adopt a definite stance on the issue and maintain this during their assessment.

Students have a completely free choice of the issue they wish to debate; it does not have to relate to any of the IAL general topic areas. However, the chosen issue must not be based on the topic, literary work or film studied for Unit 4 but it may focus on a wider exploration of the author or film-maker of those works studied. There is no requirement for students to demonstrate knowledge of the countries and contexts in which the target language is spoken, though of course they are free to do so.

When making their choice, students are advised to choose an issue on which they have a strong opinion. They must be sure the issue can provide them with sufficient material for a one-minute presentation followed by four minutes of debate (they should have four or five different arguments in support of their point of view) and can include facts and figures to support their argument.

Students must indicate in French, German or Spanish (as relevant) their stance on the issue they have chosen, so they would be well advised to consider carefully the way in which the issue for discussion is phrased. It is often helpful to use a statement beginning with *I think (that)...., I believe (that)* or *In my opinion....* in order that the stance taken is clear.

Examples of suitable issues, making the stance clear, are *I believe tuition fees are unfair* or *In my opinion we should donate more money to developing countries*. These statements should be written in the target language and are given here only as an indication of how the stance should be stated on the OR3 (Oral Chosen Issue form).

- Students must complete an OR3 in advance of the test, on which they must write a brief statement about the chosen issue.
- One copy of this form must be given to the Teacher-Examiner before the test.
- Students must take a copy of this form into the examination and may refer to this at any point during the test.
- One copy of the OR3 form must be uploaded, with the recording, for the examiner.

Preparing students for IAL U3 oral tests

For IA2 Unit 3, students choose an issue they wish to debate and must take a stance on this issue. They do not have to choose an issue related to the countries and cultures whose language they are studying, but they may do so if they wish. The issue does not have to relate to one of the general topic areas in the Pearson Edexcel specification.

Much of the preparation for this unit will be similar to that for Unit 1. In addition, the following can be considered:

- If two candidates chose the same issue within a teaching group, encourage them to take opposing views so that they can practise with each other.
- Allow candidates to present their chosen issue to the class, showing both points of view, to ensure that they have correctly pre-empted any typical challenges on the issue.
- If the teacher practises with the candidate, change the wording and order of the challenges, to check for a real understanding of what is being said. Try to challenge what the candidate has actually said, rather than working through a list of pre-decided questions.
- To maintain spontaneity, and prevent the issue of over rehearsing the debate, train students to challenge each other, and debate with each other.
- Teachers should share the assessment grids for this unit with the students, and make sure that students are aware of the need to defend the stance that they have adopted on their chosen initial issue.

Examining technique

General

Teacher-Examiners conducting the tests need to put the students at ease, to be friendly and approachable and to ensure that the questions asked encourage students to achieve the highest standard of which they are capable.

They must balance this with the responsibility to conduct the test to comply with the conditions of the Pearson Edexcel specification. Students will also expect that the test will be conducted with due seriousness and formality.

The examination room must be prepared and ready in advance, providing sufficient space (including table space on which students may put the IAS Unit 1 allocated stimulus and any notes, or the IA2 Unit 3 oral form) for both the Teacher-Examiner and each student to feel comfortable.

It is the Teacher-Examiner's role to keep the discussion going, to encourage the students and to ensure that the test is correctly conducted, but Teacher-Examiner contribution should be kept to a minimum.

The Teacher-Examiner should ask a range of open questions which will push the students to reach their linguistic 'ceiling'. These questions should elicit from the candidate a range of functions, for example narrate, explain, clarify, hypothesise, justify, speculate, describe. The conversation/discussion should flow naturally. The Teacher-Examiner must not allow the candidate to recite large amounts of pre-learned material

The Teacher-Examiner must not correct students' language, nor express disapproval.

The test should conclude on a positive note and students should leave the exam room feeling that they have given the best performance they possibly could.

The Teacher-Examiner must keep to the time allocated to the test.

Unit 1

With the exception of the four prescribed questions on the Unit 1 stimulus, which must not be rephrased, the Teacher-Examiner should encourage students to expand on answers and to provide detail and clarification.

Personal questions and general conversation should be avoided. Personal questions do not allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the general topic area and general conversation is not part of this test.

Unit 3

In the Unit 3 test, the Teacher-Examiner should challenge the students' point of view, allowing students to defend their opinion and to demonstrate the ability to debate. The Teacher-Examiner must also ensure that the questions are sufficiently complex and challenging to allow students to access the full range of marks available for *Critical Analysis*.

General conversation should be avoided, as it is not appropriate in this test. Students should continue to demonstrate their ability to debate and discuss issues throughout the test and the Teacher-Examiner should give them every opportunity to do so. In-depth, specialist and/or factual knowledge is not expected in this test.

Examining technique checklist (Units 1 and 3)

The following information will be helpful for teacher examiners in preparing to administer the oral tests.

- The examiner's opening should put the candidate at ease.
- The examiner should remain friendly and encouraging throughout.
- There should be a predominance of open questions and encouragement.
- The conversation/discussion should flow naturally.
- The examiner should elicit from the candidate a range of functions e.g. narrate, explain, clarify, hypothesise, justify, speculate, describe.
- The examiner should take the candidate beyond learned or prepared material.
- The examiner should interrupt any pre-rehearsed sections.
- The interventions should be sufficiently demanding.
- The examiner should take the candidate to his/her linguistic ceiling.
- The examiner should keep input to a minimum.
- The examiner should refrain from proffering anecdotes, opinions, advice or information.
- The closing should be upbeat but not effusive.
- The examiner should keep to time.
- In Unit 3, the examiner should oblige the candidate to maintain his/her stance on the chosen issue.
- In Unit 3, the examiner should cover at least two further genuinely unpredictable areas.

Assessment criteria

Students will be rewarded for their performances according to the following assessment criteria, which will be applied on a 'best fit' basis.

Unit 1

Mark	Quality of language (Accuracy): A03
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated examples of correct language. • Poor pronunciation and intonation.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many basic errors, often impeding communication. • Pronunciation and intonation, not always comprehensible.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy variable, basic errors sometimes impede communication. • Pronunciation and intonation comprehensible.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally accurate but some errors in more complex language, communication rarely impeded. • Pronunciation and intonation generally good.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly accurate but not necessarily error-free. • Pronunciation and intonation authentic.
Mark	Quality of language (Range of lexis): A03
0	No rewardable material.
1	Very basic lexis; minimal command of structure.
2	Lexis restricted; operates generally in simple sentences.
3	Adequate range of lexis; limited range of structures.
4	Good range of lexis with some examples of more complex structures.
5	Wide range of lexis and good variety of structures with only occasional limitation.
Mark	Spontaneity and development: A01
0	No rewardable material.
1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal spontaneity. • Cannot develop responses. • Often fails to respond or needs regular prompting. • Very reliant on examiner's language.
5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some examples of spontaneity. • Limited development of responses. • Some hesitation in more complex areas. • Difficulty with some questions.
9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many examples of spontaneity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some development of responses. • Responds usually without undue hesitation. • Deals adequately in most situations.
13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High incidence of spontaneous, fluent discourse. • Detailed development of responses. • Able to respond readily to all questions. • Develops and sustains discourse well.
Mark	Understanding (stimulus specific): AO2
0	No rewardable material.
1	Limited answers to prescribed questions, demonstrating poor understanding of stimulus text.
2	Satisfactory answers to prescribed questions, demonstrating adequate understanding of stimulus text.
3	Detailed answers to prescribed questions, demonstrating good understanding of stimulus text and its wider implications.
4	Full and detailed answers to prescribed questions, demonstrating excellent understanding of stimulus text and its wider implications.
Mark	Knowledge and understanding (General topic area): AO1
0	No rewardable material.
1–2	Hardly any relevant ideas and opinions, demonstrating poor understanding of general topic area.
3–4	Few relevant ideas and opinions, demonstrating limited knowledge and understanding of general topic area.
5–6	Some relevant ideas and opinions, demonstrating satisfactory knowledge and understanding of general topic area.
7–8	Many relevant ideas and opinions, demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of general topic area.
9–10	Wealth of relevant ideas and opinions, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding of general topic area.

Unit 3

Mark Spontaneity and development: AO1	
0	No rewardable material.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal spontaneity. • Cannot develop responses. • Often fails to respond or needs regular prompting. • Very reliant on examiner’s language.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some examples of spontaneity. • Limited development of responses. • Some hesitation in more complex areas. • Difficulty with some questions.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many examples of spontaneity. • Some development of responses. • Responds usually without undue hesitation. • Deals adequately in most situations.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High incidence of spontaneous, fluent discourse. • Detailed development of responses. • Able to respond readily to all questions. • Develops and sustains discourse well.
Mark Quality of language (Accuracy): AO3	
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated examples of correct language. • Poor pronunciation and intonation.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many basic errors, often impeding communication. • Pronunciation and intonation, not always comprehensible.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy variable, basic errors sometimes impede communication. • Pronunciation and intonation comprehensible.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally accurate but some errors in more complex language, communication rarely impeded. • Pronunciation and intonation generally good.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly accurate but not necessarily error-free. • Pronunciation and intonation authentic.
Mark Quality of language (Range of lexis): AO3	
0	No rewardable material.
1	Very basic lexis; minimal command of structure.
2	Lexis restricted; operates generally in simple sentences.

3	Adequate range of lexis; limited range of structures.
4	Good range of lexis with some examples of more complex structures.
5	Wide range of lexis and good variety of structures with only occasional limitation.
Mark	Reading and research (Debate only): A02
0	No rewardable material.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scant evidence of any reading and research into the chosen issues and other topics discussed. • Very superficial.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little evidence of reading and research into the chosen issue and other topics discussed. • Obvious gaps and very little detail.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate evidence of reading and research into the chosen issue and other topics discussed, but overall lacks breadth and detail. • Somewhat inconsistent.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to very good evidence of wide reading and research into the chosen issue and other topics discussed with occasional gaps. • Some pertinent detail at times.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent evidence of in-depth and very wide reading and research into the chosen issue and other topics discussed. • Excellent detail.
Mark	Critical analysis: A04
0	No rewardable material
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only superficial engagement with key issues. • Limited links between ideas, leading to limited coherence throughout.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial explanations of key issues. • Occasional links between ideas and some attempts to justify these.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full explanation of key issues. • Some justified links between ideas, and coherent arguments are sometimes present.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A critical analysis of key issues, albeit inconsistent. • Justified links between ideas, with coherent arguments mostly present that show a developing individual response.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full evaluation of key issues. • Consistently justified links between ideas, often well substantiated with insightful observations that form a well-rounded individual response.

Part 2 – Commentaries on language specific exemplar oral assessments

IAS Unit 1

French

IAS French commentary

Total mark awarded 26/40

Lifestyle, Health and Fitness [Stimulus 1A 2016]

Section A

The test is conducted according to the demands of the specification. In this section of the test, the Teacher-Examiner asks the four questions as they are written on the Teacher-Examiner version of the stimulus card (rephrasing of these set questions is not allowed). The Teacher-Examiner indicates the set questions by saying *première question* etc. He does not introduce the second question, but by saying *troisième question, dernière question* he marks the progression through this section of the test clearly to the candidate. Though rephrasing the questions is not allowed, it is permissible to introduce the questions in this way and indeed is good practice to do so.

Section B

In this section the Teacher-Examiner asks questions which move away from the topic of the stimulus card but which all relate to the sub-topics of the candidate's chosen GTA (Lifestyle, Health and Fitness, for which the subtopics are Food and Diet, Sport and Exercise (the subtopic of the stimulus card), Health Issues and Urban and Rural Life). The Teacher-Examiner indicates clearly the move from Section A to Section B. He then asks one question picking up on something the candidate has already mentioned about sport, before moving on to ask questions about whether sport should be compulsory at school, why sport is important for health, whether young people nowadays experience stress, how stress might be avoided, which is the biggest health problem at this time, smoking and young people, smoking and the government, obesity, diet and sugar.

The way in which this Teacher-Examiner conducts this test is an example of good practice. Throughout the test, his tone is friendly and encouraging. He prompts the candidate to develop her answers but does not speak too much; in the test as a whole we hear the candidate speak much more than the Teacher-Examiner. The questions he asks in Section B invite the candidate to express a point of view. The Teacher-Examiner picks up on what the candidate says and develops that line of questioning, e.g. when the candidate says that smoking is the biggest health problem, he asks two follow-up questions which prompt her to express further information about this topic.

The timing of the test begins as the Teacher-Examiner begins asking the first question. Section A (the candidate's response to the four set questions on the Teacher-Examiner version of the stimulus card) lasts 2 minutes 37 seconds and the total test time is 10 minutes 20 seconds, very slightly longer than the 8-10 minutes required by the specification. Where tests are longer than 10 minutes, if the teacher is speaking at 10 minutes, then marking stops immediately. If the candidate is

speaking at the 10-minute mark, then the examiner marks to the end of the candidate's sentence.

Assessment commentary

Quality of Language (Accuracy)

Mark awarded – 3/5

Although there are fairly frequent errors of accuracy in this test, comprehension is only sometimes delayed or impeded. The candidate's pronunciation is generally comprehensible. The candidate struggles with correct verb conjugations on many occasions; at this level the best candidates would be expected to know the conjugations of common verbs, regular and irregular. Similarly, this candidate makes other errors of language which an IAS candidate might be expected to avoid (e.g. *de les nouveaux gyms*, the gender of *chose*, *on doit mange*). As the accuracy of the test is variable and basic errors sometimes impede communication (e.g. *tous les personnes peut utilise les*), a mark of 3 is awarded.

Quality of Language (Range)

Mark awarded – 3/5

The candidate is confident in constructions such as the sequence of tenses after *si*, the superlative, and she correctly uses the subjunctive and *qui*. She demonstrates a range of lexis which is adequate, with some topic-specific vocabulary. She is able to use phrases which express her opinion (e.g. *ça dépend, je pense que*) but, for Section B in particular, the candidate's range of language and structures tends to be a little repetitive. The mark awarded is 3.

Spontaneity and Development

Mark awarded – 10/16

Apart from one instance in Section A, the candidate is quick to respond to all the examiner's questions. She is able to respond to all the questions and often works hard to develop her answers, not waiting for a question but usually attempting to give examples and express ideas that will develop the conversation. However, her answers cannot always be said to be well-developed; she has to be prompted to develop her idea about drinking being used by some to combat stress, for example. Her performance is spontaneous. There is natural hesitation in Section A. In Section B there is more hesitation and there are some instances of repetition. In all, this candidate can be said to deal adequately with most situations; she responds well but her answers are not always full. A mark of 10 is awarded.

Understanding (Stimulus specific)

Mark awarded – 3/4

This mark is awarded purely for the candidate's response to the four questions set by Pearson Edexcel on the text.

Please note that for the IAL specification, question 1 relates only to the content of the first paragraph of the text on the stimulus card. There will be three items of information in the first paragraph which can be used to answer question 1, and candidates are expected to mention three points in their response to this question.

The candidate gives good answers to questions 1 and 2. The Teacher-Examiner needs to repeat question 3; this does not affect the candidate's mark, and, after the question is repeated, the candidate gives a good, if not extremely detailed, answer. (It is worth mentioning here that one repetition of a question does not affect a candidate's mark, but, where a candidate needs a question to be repeated on several occasions, the mark for "spontaneity and development" may be affected.) The candidate gives an answer to question 4 which, while mostly convincing, is not very detailed. A mark of 3 out of the 4 marks available is awarded.

Knowledge and Understanding (General Topic Area) Mark awarded – 7/10

This mark is awarded purely for the knowledge and understanding of the GTA demonstrated in Section B of the test.

The candidate has something to say about all of the subtopics introduced in Section B of the test. Her ideas lack detail on occasion but she volunteers opinion about the dangers of drinking alcohol and obesity, for example. She has clearly thought about issues surrounding this topic, volunteering, for example, that it is important to eat a balanced diet in order to be healthy, and ideas as to why sport is good for people. Her knowledge and understanding of the GTA can be said to be good, and a mark of 7 is awarded.

IAS German commentary

Total mark awarded 31/40

Environment and travel [World around us Stimulus 2B 2015]

Section A

The candidate answers the first question correctly. He finds the relevant information from the text and gives an answer with an example. He does not rely heavily on the language from the text, rather than his own words and there are some inaccuracies with verb agreements. The second question is also answered correctly, but with language from the text and no addition of the candidate's own words. Question 3 has been reworded to use the *du* form of address, which is the only permissible change. The answer is appropriate, and shows some knowledge of topic specific vocabulary. The implications, whilst relevant, are both related to the verb *kosten*. In the final question, the ideas are pertinent, but the details are vague. The idea of *wie* in the question is dealt with quite superficially. There are accuracy issues with the noun *Anstieg / Steigerung*. This section lasts 2 minutes 10 seconds.

Section B

The discussion begins with a more general discussion of the subtopic of the stimulus card. Ideas of what can be recycled are explored, for which the candidate offers *Papier, Metall, Pappe, Kunststoffe*, how much is recycled, *45% in Deutschland, 38% in England* and why some countries are better than others. This is evidence of knowledge of the topic area. Pronunciation is very good, despite a lapse on *Sammelstelle*. There is an accuracy issue with comparative adjectives and the construction of the *wiederverwertet* phrase used, but communication is clear. After a short time exploring the recycling subtopic, the discussion moves on to transport. The Teacher-Examiner must move away from the subtopic of the stimulus card to allow the candidate to show further knowledge and understanding of the GTA. The candidate shows good knowledge of car usage, and reasons why there are differences between countries showing further evidence of knowledge and understanding. The discussion develops well, the candidate and examiner interact naturally and the candidate can exploit his detailed research to respond readily to the questions posed. Pronunciation and intonation remain consistently good, but there are some difficulties with plurals of nouns (*Bus/Zug*) and irregular verbs (*fahren*). The understanding of why public transport is better for the environment is good and the comparisons between the forms of transport make some detailed points. Relative pronouns are attempted, but accuracy in this construction is an issue. The consequences of CO₂ production are explored. The candidate has relevant ideas, and can offer a range of thoughts, although he is uncertain about some of the terms. Extreme weather shows good range of knowledge.

Assessment commentary

Quality of language (Accuracy)

Mark awarded – 4/5

This performance is a good example of how the "best fit" principal of marking is applied. Pronunciation and intonation are authentic – a feature of the highest mark band. Accuracy is variable however, and there are a number of basic errors. On balance, a mark of 4 is given.

Quality of language (Range of Lexis)**Mark awarded – 3/5**

There is a good range of lexis, appropriate to the topic. On the other hand there is use of phrases, like *ein bisschen nicht so gut*, which demonstrate the range of lexis is not consistent. Modal verbs are used, impersonal constructions, *weil, dass, wenn*, relative pronouns are all attempted. However, the attempts are isolated. The range of tenses is not wide, nor is the range of subordinate conjunctions. Furthermore the impressive lexis are often presented in list form.

Spontaneity and Development**Mark awarded – 13/16**

The response is spontaneous, and a natural discussion develops. The candidate speaks fluently, without undue hesitation. He can self-correct, which demonstrates that he is formulating his ideas in response to what is being asked. He develops his ideas well, and explores a range of possibilities in response to answers. There is some inconsistency in the quality of his development, however, which means that elements of the 9-12 and the 13-16 bands are considered. For this reason, the mark is placed at the lower end of the 13-16 band.

Understanding (Stimulus Specific)**Mark awarded – 2/4**

It is clear that the candidate understands the text and the questions. All of his answers are appropriate and correct. However, he relies heavily on the wording of the text rather than his own words. The implications considered are pertinent but could have shown more variety.

Knowledge and Understanding**Mark awarded – 9/10**

This candidate provides a wealth of evidence to suggest that he has prepared his topic area well. He is aware of recycling statistics, car usage, the car industry, public transport, the impact of different forms of transport, forms of extreme weather, and consequences of carbon emissions. He is able to use these to make comparisons, form opinions, and explain links – for example, the fate of the Nepalese Sherpa. The top mark band applies to this candidate.

Spanish

IAS Spanish commentary

Total mark awarded 27/40

Youth matters [Youth culture and concern Stimulus 1A 2014]

Section A

The exam begins with a friendly greeting. Then the examiner reads clearly the four prescribed questions on the stimulus card and gives the candidate ample time to respond. This part of the exam lasts 4 minutes.

Section B

The examiner now indicates that the examination is moving to the second part of the test and smoothly leads the conversation away from the issues presented in the stimulus but keeps closely to the GTA of Youth Matters. She develops the discussion by asking the difference between young people now and young people in the past. The candidate mentions technology in his answer and this leads to the disadvantages of the Internet followed by a discussion on mobile phones and the importance of technology to young people nowadays. The discussion finishes with the cost and expense of mobile phones for parents. In this part of the exam the examiner asks probing questions which allow the candidate to use different structures and lexis.

Throughout the exam, the examiner listens to the detail of what the candidate is saying and follows his lead. All areas introduced for development are well linked and follow a natural course in ensuing discussion. The examiner encourages and reassures the candidate with positive comments such as: *Sí, entiendo*.

The exam lasts 10 minutes and 20 seconds.

Assessment commentary

Quality of Language (Accuracy)

Mark awarded – 3/5

Sometimes the candidate is able to communicate clearly and accurately but at other times his linguistic ability lets him down. Often, he starts well and then he is not able to carry it through to the end of his explanation. There are errors in basic language (negatives, agreements and gender of common words). Pronunciation and intonation is inconsistent but generally it is comprehensible with some lapses.

Quality of Language (Range of lexis)

Mark awarded – 4/5

This candidate's range of vocabulary and structures is better than his accuracy. There is a good variety of structures: imperfect, perfect, conditionals. He has a good range of lexis for this General Topic Area.

Spontaneity and development

Mark awarded – 10/16

The examiner and candidate are listening and responding to each other. The conversation is spontaneous. The candidate understands all the questions he is asked and responds usually correctly to all. This allows us to place him in the 9 to 12 criterion box initially before considering other factors.

However, he is fairly hesitant throughout and is not always able to communicate clearly what we know he wants to say and for this reason he is leaning towards the box below. His hesitation affects his ability to develop his responses but at times there is some good development.

Understanding (Stimulus specific)

Mark awarded – 3/4

Question 1: The candidate gives a full answer to this question. He mentions three clear points:

- *las bandas juveniles son un fenómeno emergente*
- *los miembros tienen las familias desestructuradas y fracaso escolar*
- *ellos encuentran la seguridad de los amigos de las bandas”*

Question 2: Not all the points the candidate makes are correct or relevant to the article/question. However, the candidate can have some credit because he mentions two clear points.

- *son violento*
- *consumen alcohol y las drogas*

Question 3: This answer is correct but the explanation that the candidate gives is confusing and therefore cannot be entirely credited. The language in this response interferes with the communication of the point the candidate is trying to make.

Question 4: The candidate gives a full answer to this question. The candidate communicates clearly the idea that Internet and friendships found there can be a problem as they are not real.

Knowledge and understanding (General Topic Area) Mark awarded – 7/10

This candidate has clearly thought about and prepared this General Topic Area and has many relevant ideas and opinions on whatever he is asked. He demonstrates a good understanding and there is some depth to his answers as he gives examples, explanations and justifications. This allows us to place him in the 7-8 band.

IAL Unit 3

French

IA2 French commentary

Total Mark awarded – 34/40

Issue and stance Pour l'homoparentalité

General comments

The timing of the test begins as the candidate begins presenting his or her chosen issue. To begin Section A (debate on the chosen issue), the candidate introduces her chosen issue for up to one minute (here the introduction lasts 53 seconds) and the whole of Section A should last approximately five minutes (here it is 5 mins 35 seconds). Section B (discussion of two further issues) should last 6-8 minutes (here it is 7 minutes 33 seconds), making a total test time of 11-13 minutes (here 13 minutes 8 seconds). Where tests are longer than 13 minutes, if the teacher is speaking at 13 minutes, then marking stops immediately. If the candidate is speaking at the 13-minute mark, then the examiner marks to the end of the candidate's sentence.

Section A

The candidate's introduction is well-planned and clear, presenting both the issue and her stance on the issue, and she backs up what she says with relevant information and facts.

After the candidate has introduced her chosen issue and her stance on this issue, the examiner challenges the candidate in the following ways:

Pour moi, c'est une idée un peu bizarre; on ne peut pas avoir deux mères ou deux pères. Ce n'est pas naturel.

The candidate's response is robust and she supports her opinion convincingly. Though she misses the correct preposition after *permettre*, she uses the conditional tense and infinitives accurately.

Je trouve qu'un couple consiste d'un homme et d'une femme. Des parents de sexes différents apportent des choses différentes à leur enfant.

The candidate's response to this question is very full. She expresses herself clearly and develops her argument convincingly, using the example of school in addition to the family.

Je pense qu'un enfant qui a deux pères ou deux mères va souffrir à l'école. Cet enfant est déjà peut-être un peu vulnérable, et on va certainement se moquer de lui.

In response to this opinion the candidate uses a range of relevant vocabulary (e.g. *isolé, intimidé*). Her opinion is mature and considered. The level of language she uses, with three correct examples of the subjunctive, is impressive.

Un enfant a besoin d'être dans un couple stable. Les couples homosexuels ont la réputation d'être moins stables que les couples hétérosexuels.

Again, the candidate offers a robust and mature response to this opinion, and one which is entirely convincing. She develops her answer fully.

Section B Discussion of unpredictable areas

The requirement for Section B is that at least two further issues for discussion are introduced by the Teacher-Examiner. To quote from the specification, "the Teacher-Examiner should cover a range of issues for discussion so that students can demonstrate both the breadth and depth of their knowledge and linguistic competence", and "students will be rewarded for the ability to respond to the spoken language, so it is important that the Teacher-Examiner's questions are sufficiently challenging to allow the candidate to access the full range of marks". The conduct of this test meets both criteria and throughout the examination the Teacher-Examiner challenges the candidate's point of view. At the end of Section B, the Teacher-Examiner indicates to the candidate that the test is coming to an end (*et pour finir...*); another example of good practice.

The Teacher-Examiner introduces in Section B issues which allow a level of debate suitable at this level i.e. the level of tolerance in society (in response to which the candidate introduces discussion of racism), discrimination, women's rights and equality between the sexes, the rôle of mothers, the different attitudes of female and male students, stereotypes and single-sex versus mixed education.

Assessment commentary

Spontaneity and Development

Mark awarded – 18/20

Throughout the test, with, as would be expected, the exception of the prepared introduction of her chosen issue, the candidate's performance is natural. In section A, she speaks at a good pace and with natural hesitation. In section B, her delivery is slightly slower and more hesitant. There is never any doubt that she has understood all the examiner's questions, and she is able to respond readily to all the questions he poses. This candidate works particularly hard to sustain and to develop the conversation, offering examples, further detail and ideas. In Section A, she is particularly successful in doing this; she responds to, picks up on and develops every point the teacher makes. In Section B, her answers and arguments are not always extremely detailed, but she clearly meets the criteria for awarding a mark in the top box for this section and a mark of 18 is awarded.

Quality of Language (Accuracy)

Mark awarded – 3/5

When awarding the mark for Accuracy, it is important to consider not merely the number of mistakes that are made, but the accuracy of the candidate's performance as a whole. In this test, there are many examples of correct language, but also many examples of mistakes that might not be expected of a candidate of this level (e.g. the gender of *différence*, confusion of *ils* and *elles*, use of *de les* rather than *des*). Communication is sometimes delayed but rarely impeded, and the candidate's pronunciation and intonation are generally good. The examiner deliberated between a mark of 3 and 4 for this section. However, given the frequency of basic errors in the test as a whole, a mark of 3 is awarded.

Quality of Language - Range

Mark awarded – 4/5

In discussing her chosen issue, the candidate uses a good deal of topic-specific vocabulary and gives the impression is that she is not often restricted in what she says by the range of lexis available to her. In Section B of the test, discussion of unpredictable issues, the range of lexis and structures she uses is more pedestrian, as might be expected. Throughout the test, she uses a variety of phrases to express

her point of view (e.g. *je trouve surprenant que, je crois que, selon moi*), to counter the arguments put to her by the examiner (e.g. *je ne partage pas votre opinion*) and to develop the discussion (e.g. *parce que, en fait, par exemple*). The candidate is able to use a range of structures accurately (e.g. there are several examples of the correct use of the subjunctive mood, of the comparative and of complex structures such as *en ce qui concerne la façon d'y arriver, la raison pour laquelle*). Looking at the test as a whole, the candidate is judged to have used a good range of lexis with some examples of more complex structures and so a mark of 4 is awarded.

Reading and Research (Debate only)

Mark awarded – 5/5

The candidate has clearly researched the topic thoroughly and, throughout the debate section, supports her argument with relevant and convincing facts and details. She is in control of the material she has researched and uses it well to support the points she makes. Her reading and research is detailed (e.g. the dates when it became legal for same-sex couples to adopt a child in England and in France, the number of countries in which it is legal for same-sex couples to adopt) and wide-ranging (e.g. reference to lack of research to support the idea that same-sex adoption has a negative effect on the child, or that a single-parent family is more likely to be poor than one with two parents). She has clearly considered the arguments surrounding the issue (e.g. she convincingly counters the argument that same-sex couples are less stable by pointing out that if a same-sex couple has a child, it is a conscious decision on their part) and is able to defend her point of view consistently throughout this section. A mark of 5 is awarded.

Critical analysis

Mark awarded – 4/5

The candidate responds to all the issues presented by the examiner. She is able to link ideas and her arguments are always coherent, if not always extremely well-developed. However, though she is never without a response, she deals with some issues in more depth than others and does not develop her argument about all the issues in Section B to the extent that might be expected of the very best candidates at this level. A mark of 4 out of the possible 5 is awarded.

IA2 German commentary

Total Mark awarded 40/40

Issue and stance: Gegen das existierende System für Organspenden in England und anderen europäischen Ländern.

Section A

The presentation of the issue lasts 44 seconds, which is within the regulations. The purpose of presentation is not only an opportunity to outline the issue, but also a chance for the candidate to overcome initial nerves. The candidate speaks very quickly, and the opening is clearly pre-learned, but this is acceptable. The opening provides excellent evidence of research, for example, the laws in Wales. Many implications of the issue are also presented, such as illegal organ donation and patients waiting for transplants.

The examiner challenges the candidate's stance in the following ways:

Jeder muss Organspender sein?

A considered response – people are forced to think about donation, rather than to be donors sentence does not make sense. Accurate use of passive and use of infinitive with *zu*.

Man muss eine Bestätigung haben, dass man kein Organspender werden möchte?

Use of conditional and good subordinate clause word order. However, the candidate seems less sure of her answer here, perhaps she has misunderstood *Bestätigung*.

Also es wird nicht automatisch....

Candidates should be encouraged to use phrases like *Nein, überhaupt nicht!* to emphasise and maintain their stances.

Manche Personen möchten aus religiösen Gründen keine Operationen haben, sollten wir das nicht respektieren?

The level of challenge is good, IA2 candidates should be encouraged to explore moral, political and religious arguments. The response shows further, in-depth research. This is evidenced by the topic specific lexis, and the knowledge of Germany and Spain. The lexis, for example, *eine starke Abneigung* is impressive.

Aber finden Sie das denn moralisch in Ordnung, dass....

A further, high level challenge. Accurate language in response with very complex structures. It becomes evident as the debate continues that the candidate is secure in complex word order, complex structure and the case system. There is an error with the verb *gegeben*, however.

Sollte jemand sterben, damit....sie weiter rauchen können?

The examiner presses the issue further, which allows the debate to take on a more natural form and allows the candidate to justify her stance further.

Viele Leute würden sich dann darauf verlassen...

The candidate is able to accept that the issue is not simply for or against, there are limitations, but can quickly come back to her own standpoint and counter this argument. There is an error with the dative case after *aus*.

Wer Missbrauch betreibt, der kann kein Organ gespendet bekommen?

Again, the candidate accepts that this is an argument, but quickly comes back to the point. Effective argument, that the important issue is how we increase the organs which we have for transplant. There then follow many ways in which the candidate would like to make her ideas into successful practice.

The examiner ends the debate on a positive note. Section A lasts 4 minutes 58 seconds.

Section B Discussion of unpredictable areas:

Gentechnologie und Klonen

The candidate expresses her own opinion, with examples of *Stammzellen* and *Alzheimers*. She can then also show an awareness of other opinions, *katholische Kirche*. Topic specific lexis is evident and she also self-corrects which shows an excellent awareness of the language. The language remains highly accurate, even in complex *wenn* clauses, although there is a gender error *der Schaf*, and a lexical error *Krankungen*. The candidate sustains the discourse well, by taking the initiative to talk about tomatoes.

Kernkraft / Energie / Klimawandel

The candidate seeks clarification of the topic, which is to be expected on occasions in a spontaneous, unpredictable discussion. Once again, word order is secure and the language is almost entirely accurate. The candidate develops the discourse with some very detailed examples. This is not a requirement of section B, but is one way to develop and sustain the line of argument.

Jugendarbeitslosigkeit

The candidate has a wealth of ideas about the topic, which she uses to build her opinions. There is a lapse of pronunciation on *Teufelskreis*. Once again, specialist knowledge is not a requirement in this section of the examination. However, this candidate is clearly very aware of the topics covered in the course and therefore can confidently express, exemplify and explain her views as a result.

Total time: 11 minutes 48 seconds

Assessment commentary

Spontaneity and development

Mark awarded - 20/20

There is a high incidence of spontaneous, fluent discourse. The discussion flows naturally, with both participants listening and reacting to each other's ideas. The development of the responses is detailed, with specific examples in the debate, and an ability to consider different points of view. The candidate responds readily to all questions, and takes the initiative to sustain the discussion.

All the criteria for the top mark band are fulfilled. There are no elements of the mark band below which are applicable, so a mark of 18 or higher is considered. In this instance, one must consider whether one can reasonably expect any more from an IA2 candidate. If, as in this case, one cannot, full marks are awarded.

Quality of Language (accuracy)

Mark awarded - 5/5

The pronunciation and intonation are both authentic and the language is highly accurate, though not entirely error free. This performance fulfils the requirements of the top band for accuracy.

Quality of Language (range of lexis)

Mark awarded - 5/5

There is a wide range of lexis, and the candidate is equipped with topics or is it topic specific since in the debate there is only one topic? The range of structures is also comprehensive. One limitation could be the repetitive use of the word *Leute*, but there is adequate compensation for this.

Reading and Research (debate only)

Mark awarded - 5/5

There is excellent evidence of reading and research. Legal knowledge, specialist terms, knowledge of surveys in Germany, and laws in Spain and Wales. There is also evidence of research into how the candidate's proposed system could be implemented.

Critical analysis

Mark awarded 5/5

The level of critical analysis was consistently high throughout, therefore the descriptor in the mark band of 4 is not applicable. The quality of analysis was shown by the general awareness, evaluation and expression of her own feelings, as well as the opinions of others, across a range of issues.

Spanish

IA2 Spanish commentary

Total Mark awarded – 33/40

Issue and stance: En contra de los altos sueldos que ganan los futbolistas

The examiner starts with a friendly greeting and invites the candidate to begin his presentation.

Section A

The candidate outlines his chosen issue for one minute, adopting a definite stance against the high salaries footballers earn. The examiner then adopts the opposite view to the candidate and provides strong and meaningful challenges to allow the candidate to defend his views and to use the language of debate and argument.

Section B

After 5 minutes and 20 seconds the examiner indicates that the examination is moving to the second part of the test and moves away smoothly from the initial issue. She then directs the discussion to different topics beginning with the current corruption cases in Spain followed by a comparison of English and Spanish law and finally moves to the topic of immigration. In this part of the exam the examiner asks probing questions which allow the candidate to produce the necessary detail and depth in his responses.

Throughout the test, the examiner responds to what the candidate is saying and directs a natural discussion that enables the candidate to debate and discuss knowledgeably from the material he has prepared. The examiner encourages and reassures the candidate with positive comments such as: *Exacto. Sí, sí, muy bien.*

The conversation flows naturally and the test ends on a positive note with the examiner thanking the candidate.

The test lasts for 13 minutes.

Assessment commentary

Spontaneity and development

Mark awarded – 16/20

Throughout the exam, the candidate demonstrates his ability to engage in a natural and meaningful discussion. He responds readily, develops his responses and expresses his views on all the issues raised. This allows us to place him in the middle of the 16 to 20 criteria box.

Quality of Language (Accuracy)

Mark awarded – 3/5

The candidate is able to communicate what he wants to say but his accuracy is variable and he makes many basic errors (formation of verbs, errors of gender, number, agreement) which at times could impede communication. Pronunciation and intonation is inconsistent but generally it is ok with some lapses.

Quality of Language (Range of lexis) Mark awarded – 5/5

This candidate's range of structures is very good, he uses conditionals, imperfections, subjunctives, imperfect subjunctive. He has an impressive range of lexis.

Reading and research (debate only)**Mark awarded – 5/5**

This candidate is very well informed and has opinions and examples to illustrate all his points of view. He has done excellent in-depth research into his chosen issue and he also has very good command of lexis relevant to his area of debate.

Critical analysis**Mark awarded – 4/5**

This candidate can express his opinions clearly and most of the time analyse and justify his points of view with examples. He has sufficient evidence and knowledge to support his arguments and at times he produces detail and depth in his responses.