

FRENCH 2

1. GENERAL COMMENTS

The paper was comparable in standard to that of previous years. Performance in general was lower than that of last year.

2. A SUMMARY CANDIDATES' STRENGTHS

- (1) There were only a few cases of deviation as candidates followed the guidelines.
- (2) Organisation of the essay in most cases was good.
- (3) Some candidates used very good expressions, hardly seen at this level. E.g.
 - (a) Nous nous mettons en rang.
 - (b) On peut citer des gens importants comme
 - (c) Le ministre nous parle de son plan de développement pour le pays ...
- (4) In the second essay question, some candidates displayed knowledge of football terminology like 'drapeau', 'arbitre de touche', etc.

Candidates should be encouraged to read widely or to listen to radio commentaries to acquire such vocabulary.

3. A SUMMARY OF CANDIDATES' WEAKNESSES

The following were some of the difficulties of the candidates:

- (1) Basic errors in grammar. E.g. *les gens importants sommes* (conjugation)
- (2) Some confused 'et' and 'est', 'son' and 'sont'.
- (3) Spelling errors due to sheer carelessness e.g. *professeur/professure, quatre/quart, trouver/trover*.
- (4) Errors due to translation from English e.g. *surlundi* (on Monday).
- (5) Tautology: e.g. *Le nom de mon école s'appelle ...*
- (6) Omission of accents, especially on à, preposition.
- (7) Coining of French words from English words: e.g. singer, adviser as verbs from the English verbs to sing and to advise respectively.
- (8) Lifting passages from comprehension text.
- (9) Ignorance of basic sentence structure like S + V + O.

- (10) Wrong position of definite article in date when the day of the week is there. E.g. *Le lundi 20 mars 2017* NOT *Lundi, le 20 mars 2017*.

4. **SUGGESTED REMEDIES**

- (1) Candidates are advised to read over their work to avoid writing wrongly a word they have written correctly earlier.
- (2) Teachers should draw pupils' attention to homophones because of difference in meaning and usage.
- (3) Candidates should avoid reproducing model essays because they do not always fit the context and this results in deviation.
- (4) Essay-writing should be a regular class exercise.

5. **DETAILED COMMENTS**

Question 1

Candidates were required to write an essay describing a visit to their school by the Minister of Education. They were given ten (10) guidance questions (a – j).

The first and second guideline questions – name and location of the school (a & b) were comfortably handled by candidates. In (a) instead of simply writing “*Le nom de mon école est...*” some of the candidates wrote: “*Le nom de mon écoles ’appelle ...*”. Candidates were obviously used to “*Mon écoles ’appelle...*” and might have been confused by “*Le nom de ...*”. Some of them retained the possessive adjective “*votre*” in the guideline.

Although guideline (c), on the population of the school, was also well handled, some of them did not know “*nombre de professeursetd ’élèves*” was just an elaboration of “*population*”. So they retained the two words without any linking word, e.g. *La population nombre de professeurs et ...*

In (d), candidates were to indicate date and time of arrival of the Minister. Most of them got the answers right but a few answered one and left the other. In expression of date when the day of the week is indicated most candidates failed to place the definite article before the day, e.g. *Le lundi 20 mars*. This error has been recurring and from the coordination it was gathered that a lot of teachers did not know the correct way. Candidates were able to express time except for the omission of the plural mark “s” e.g. “*Sept heure*”.

Guideline (e) was on activities performed to welcome the Minister. Quite a number of candidates indicated what was done – singing, dancing, etc. those who started the

sentence with the guideline “*Les activités pour l’accueillir...*” could not correctly complete the sentence. A few of them also failed to indicate what they did individually.

In (f) candidates were to talk about dignitaries who came to the school as a result of the visit. Some avoided this part but others mentioned especially chiefs and even the President.

Guidelines (g) and (h), were about what the minister said during his speech. This proved difficult for some candidates because of the “reported speech” involved. There were, however, some excellent answers like “*Pendant son discours le ministre nous demande de prendre nos études au sérieux et de respecter nos parents et les enseignants*”.

Since the minister could have promised something in his speeches question (g) was in some way linked to (h). Some candidates cleverly repeated the same thing.

(i) which was on the minister’s time of departure, was no problem for candidates but the majority of them could not construct the sentence correctly. “*Le ministre départ*” run through most essays. Only a few correctly wrote “*Le ministre quitte...*”. None of the candidates wrote “*Le ministre part à ...*”

Instead of talking about the importance of the visit in (j), a lot of candidates only described it, e.g. *Le visite est intéressant*.

Question 2

Candidates were required to describe a football match with the help of pictures and questions.

A few candidates described how a football match is played with little reference to the pictures which point to a particular match. Those candidates scored low marks because they did not respond to the specific questions posed.

(A): Picture showed a football field with the inscription ‘STADE D’ACCRA’. They could answer *C’est un stade, C’est le stade d’Accra, C’est un terrain de football*.

Candidates had no problem with this question.

(B): This was a question on the officials, the referee and two linesmen. Subquestion (i) was easily answered. Subquestion (ii) proved difficult because apart from the referee (arbitre). Few candidates knew the technical word “*arbitre de touche*” (linesman). Most of the few candidates got the word “*drapeau*” right.

(C): Candidates were expected to say that the two teams or players were on the pitch, ready for a match. It was not difficult for them.

(D): Player No. 5 scores a goal and candidates were asked what he had done. “*Il marque un but*” was the answer given by a lot of candidates. (ii) for the reaction of the supporters a lot of them got it correct “*Ils rient*”.

(E): Question asked why the game continued and the correct answer was that it was not full-time. Some candidates got it correct.

(F): The referee whistles for the end of the match and to the question “*Qui declare la fin du match?*” Most candidates answered it correctly.

Question 2 was not popular but the few who handled it did quite well.

