

Commentaries on candidate evidence

The evidence for the candidates within this pack has achieved the following marks for this course assessment component.

Candidate 1

Portfolio title: Is Meursault condemned to death for events that took place prior to the murder of the Arab?

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because.....

Content

This candidate has not accessed two sources in the modern language, thereby compromising the potential maximum mark. While the title chosen does allow for an evaluative and critical approach, there are some misunderstandings of the focus and therefore many irrelevant or erroneous points (for example the reference to Hemingway and 'iceberg'/journalistic techniques). Throughout the essay, the candidate has difficulty going beyond a merely informative approach, with the introduction being merely a summary of the story.

Although the candidate endeavours to answer the essay title, the conclusion is clumsy and tries to draw inferences which at times seem irrelevant or are misplaced. The allusion to questioning in the courtroom is not developed, and coming so late in the analysis, fails to add to the impression created by this portfolio.

Style

Critical terminology is used at times, but not in a relevant way. There is use of relevant quotations but these do not consistently produce relevant arguments or inferences.

Throughout the portfolio use of English expression and syntax is uneven and at times poor, and the candidate has difficulty maintaining an appropriate register, for example '*viewed as a freak*', '*as I personally see it*', '*I personally theorise that...*'.

Organisation

The work lacks a clear structure (summary, inconsistent level of analysis, conclusion not related to question) so therefore lacks coherence.

Overall, this presents as a portfolio which includes some valid points and interesting ideas but which is let down by a lack of cohesion, poor structure and somewhat clumsy writing..

Candidate 2

Portfolio title: How does Delphine de Vigan portray No as a pitiable character in “No et Moi”?

The candidate was awarded **21 marks** because.....

Content

The title chosen outlines the focus of the analysis and allows the candidate to demonstrate a good understanding of the focus of the study. The candidate is able to develop arguments to show an understanding, and provide an analysis, of the character of No.

Arguments are at times superficial, and can include sweeping statements such as “*the fragility of her frame emphasises her mistreatment*” page 2).

Style

While there is evidence from sources to support conclusions made, the candidate does have some difficulty in drawing appropriate inferences, sometimes elaborating in very simplistic terms (page 2 – “*she hasn’t eaten since yesterday.....No is likely homeless and cannot afford....*”).

The register employed is appropriate, though there are lapses in English expression (for example “*where she frequents*”, “*causes her to act hostile and defensive*” “*contrarily*”, “*mistrustful*”).

Organisation

There is a sense of structure, although mainly chronological, which has an impact on the development of the argument which is generally coherent. Lack of clarity caused by occasional awkward expression does not detract from the overall impression, which is of an essay which presents and evaluates arguments which relate to the title and the focus for analysis.

The conclusion, although sometimes awkward in expression, adequately answers the question asked in the title.

Candidate 3

Portfolio title: To what extent does the reader sympathise with the protagonist Thérèse, in François Mauriac's "Thérèse Desqueyroux"?

The candidate was awarded **30 marks** because.....

Content

The candidate has chosen a title that makes immediately clear the focus of the analysis. A variety of sources support an analytical and critical approach and successfully back up conclusions being made. There is evidence of excellent analysis.

Style

The candidate uses a wide range of specialist vocabulary and critical terminology (for example uses of imagery/first person narrative/reference to tense /word choice/rhetorical question/metaphor).

Organisation

The writing is well-organised and structured, is coherent throughout and remains relevant at all times.

This is an excellent essay with the only false note being that the Mauriac quote (excellent base for the conclusion) is given in English, not in French.

Candidate 4

Portfolio title: How is the importance of religion depicted by religious figures, Catholic priest – Père Jean and Protestant nurse Annette Monod, when humanity is questioned in Louis Malle’s “Au revoir, les enfants” and Rose Bosch’s “La Rafle”?

The candidate was awarded **12 marks** because.....

Content

The essay title is confusing and does not generate an evaluative or discursive approach as a result, particularly given the false premise that the characters whose actions are to be analysed are religious figures.

The candidate has difficulty in going beyond a merely informative approach. There are some attempts to be critical (for example on page 2 - Annette’s recognition that her own religion is not important in the face of the events unfolding, and on page 4 Annette’s calls to rebellion) but there is no discernible thread to any argument. The ideas are quite mundane at times (*‘Père Jean holds his religion in high esteem’* *‘Père Jean’s humanity is incredibly admirable.’* *‘she knows this is a case of humanity and not religion’*)

Style

There are factual inaccuracies regarding the works studied, with ‘Au revoir, les enfants’ being referred to as both an autobiographical novel and a play.

The English expression is inconsistent (*‘when the humanity of a situation is called into question’*, *‘oppositional’*)

There is some evidence from sources but the candidate has difficulty in using critical terminology. The approach is very descriptive, with a number of approximations (animosity between Christians and Jews, Annette’s motivation pages 3 and 4).

Organisation

The essay lacks any sense of structure as it focuses on one film after the other. The writing lacks coherence in places, which detracts from the overall impression (Louis Malle’s career ambitions on page 4)

Candidate 5

Portfolio title: A comparison of 'Au Revoir Les Enfants' and 'Un Sac de Billes'

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because.....

Content

There is no bibliography, which incurred a penalty of 3 marks, equivalent to one pegged mark. The essay title has not been written at the top of the piece but is included in the section to be completed by the candidate on the final page of the flyleaf.

The candidate lays out in the introduction three valid themes on which to focus (compassion from strangers/loss of innocence/fraternal relationship.) The candidate adopts a mostly descriptive, at times simplistic- (*'giving in to fear never helps anyone'*) and informative approach.

The analysis is very superficial, relying mainly on summarising the stories.

Style

Little evidence is presented from sources. At times there are incorrect inferences (*'he is stoically watching his friend and father figure being led...'*) and there are some inaccuracies (*'the boys are tested'*) The English expression is poor in places (*'in both tellings'*; tenses on page 1; *'the priest's life would've been on the line'* - spoken register).

Organisation

There is some sense of structure but the links between themes are awkward and the work lacks coherence.

The lack of structure and coherence have an impact on communication, and the reader is left with the impression of a work in which the candidate has had difficulty presenting arguments and drawing conclusions.