

Comments on candidate performance**General comments**

Number of entries in 2012: 30

- Performance in Paper 1 declined this year, with the average mark being 31
- Performance in Paper 2, however, showed a marked improvement; average mark was 51.1
- The discursive essay was well done, with the full range of titles being tackled
- In the Folio the average mark was 17.7 with all candidates opting for the Extended Reading/Viewing
- In Speaking, the average mark was 41.7 and there were a number of good performances

Candidate performance in Reading and advice to centres

- Results were good in the comprehension questions and there were some excellent translations
- The main areas of difficulty proved to be the inferential and translation questions in In the inferential question many candidates seem to have had difficulty in tackling both sides of the two-part question equally; the first part was quite well done but the second part was less well done
- The translation also proved to be somewhat tricky, with a number of candidates scoring poor marks due to poor command of English and improper dictionary use
- It is recommended that Paper 1 be done in the exact order in which it is presented. Many candidates do the translation and/or inferential question(s) before the comprehension questions; this is to be discouraged as working through the comprehension questions enables candidates to build up a detailed idea of the content, style and message of the passage
- Candidates should be encouraged to make sure that they read all the questions carefully and answer them precisely, avoiding translating chunks of language. Candidates should not include information from the translation section in these answers.
- Candidates should set aside enough time to do the inferential and translation questions In the translation, candidates should also check carefully for accuracy and possible omissions, especially of single words as these can often incur a one or two point penalty.
- More detailed and frequent grammar input and practice is recommended for the discursive essay Many basic errors could be avoided by careful checking of verb tenses and endings, adjectival agreements, genders, spellings and accents.

Candidate performance in Listening and advice to centres

- The range of discursive essays was well received by candidates, who attempted all titles. A number of essays were of a very high standard with reasoned and thoughtful discussions of the topics.
- In discursive essay, there were lots of weaknesses in grammar and poor proof-reading
- In the Folio, essays on background topics were generally weaker than those on literary texts, with little or no attempt at critical evaluation or analysis.

Candidate performance in Writing and advice to centres

- Performance in the Folio was comparable to previous years
- The choice of background topic essay titles in the Folio should be carefully considered by both teachers and candidates to avoid titles that are too vague, over-ambitious and incapable of being properly addressed within the prescribed word-length.
- More detailed bibliographies are recommended for the Folio pieces. There is also an over-reliance on Wikipedia, which is not always the most accurate of sources. Essays on literary texts should clearly demonstrate that the candidate has read the original in Italian.
- Candidates should aim to stick to the 750 word Folio essay limit.