



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **German 5661** *Specification*

**GR02**      *Aspects of Society*

## **Mark Scheme**

*2008 examination - January series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## Unit 2

	% of AS	Marks per question
AO2 Response to written language	10	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	30	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	30	54

### Annotation of Scripts

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

<b>AO2</b> (Reaction and Response)	<b>AO4</b> (Content)
® written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 where this includes reason/justification of opinion.	© written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from a source other than the current Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
R written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 when no justification is given.	C written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from the Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
	T written in the margin to indicate information generally relevant to the topic.
Rep written in the margin to indicate repetition of information relevant to AO4 or AO2.	
Irr vertical line in the margin = irrelevant/inappropriate material.	

The mark for AO4, AO2 and AO3 respectively written at the foot of an answer accompanied by a word or phrase quoted from the criteria for assessment as published in the specification.

**Question 1(a)**

**Wählen Sie ein Medium und besprechen Sie seine Rolle im Leben der jüngeren und der älteren Deutschen.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
<sub>irr</sub>	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate deals in detail with any <b>one</b> medium and tries to look at both similarities and differences in the role it plays in the life of the two age groups (or even three age groups – young, middle and retired).
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some R. Or candidate deals mainly with only one age group, but in detail.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate writes at length about one age group and superficially about the other(s). The candidate deals with more than one medium (eg television for older and internet for younger). Descriptive of what is available but less evaluation.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate writes about various media and makes little, if any, attempt to consider their different roles; little said about how the Germans use them.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Random information about the media in very general terms nothing about Germany.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this answer, ‘younger and older’ are not fixed: the candidate can make his/her own decision but there <b>must</b> be some clear distinction drawn.</li> <li>• Computers and Internet be treated together as one medium but either on its own is also acceptable (eg Internet as only use of computer to be dealt with)</li> </ul> <p>© for statistics of young people’s viewing habits – this should link to whether or not TV plays a part in their life. Same for older people. Could include types of programmes favoured, if some ‘reaction’ is shown.</p> <p>© for information about the extent to which/the ways in which newspapers and magazines play a part in German people’s lives, and how age affects this</p> <p>© for information about developments in mobile phone technology and how much it affects young/older people</p> <p>© for role of radio in people’s lives</p> <p>© for information about music downloading  <b>C</b> for information about the internet as entertainment/amusement for young people - if taken from Preliminary Material and © if this is developed/expanded upon from other sources</p> <p>© for information about whether older people use the internet as source of entertainment – and if so, what kind of sites?</p> <p>© for who uses internet for shopping/booking holidays etc/chat rooms/blogs etc</p> <p>© for information about uses of computers other than for internet access, such as homework writing for younger people, finance spreadsheets etc for older</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 1(b)**

**Welchen Gebrauch machen die Deutschen vom Internet? Was finden Sie gut oder schlecht daran?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The answer looks clearly at a range of different uses – possibly in differing age groups, possibly by gender – which have a specific German slant (even though they may not be exclusive to Germany). There are opinions on each use.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ©, but also some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The answer is reasonably strong on descriptions of usage in general but less of a German focus and/or fewer opinions.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The information is superficial, and no clear link to Germany is made. Very descriptive.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Random information about the internet or simply about the media in general.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for reference to the activities given in 'Die bunten Seiten des Internet' (which should of course be commented on) and © for other examples of similar uses not listed in Preliminary Material</p> <p>© for use of appropriate internet vocabulary if not found in Preliminary Material</p> <p>© for use of the internet to help with school/academic work</p> <p>© for the use made of chatrooms/blogs</p> <p>© for information about downloading music/films</p> <p>© for information about internet shopping/banking etc</p> <p>© for detrimental health/social effects of sitting at the computer</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 2(a)**

***Inwiefern ist Deutschland in den letzten Jahren ‚grüner‘ geworden? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort mit Beispielen.***

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The answer makes clear whether progress has been made in environmental awareness/action, and if so in what ways has it been achieved; if not, what has prevented it.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some <b>R</b> .
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Writes more generally about what is happening in Germany, but does not deal with change/progress. Or it takes a historical view but does not show what has subsequently happened.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The answer deals at too great length with the environmental issues rather than the action or the solutions. Lacks a focus on Germany.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Random facts about the environment.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.



AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><i>'In den letzten Jahren'</i> can go as far back as the 1970s but it need not, depending on what aspects the answer concentrates on BUT there must be at least two points of comparison to show change.</p> <p>© for information about recycling if taken from Preliminary Material text 4, but © if this is developed or if taken from other sources (eg <i>Pfandflaschen</i> or <i>grüner Punkt</i>)</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	<p>© for information about transport policy if taken from Preliminary Material text 3, but © if this is developed or taken from other sources (eg policy on motorway traffic/HGVs etc)</p> <p>© for information about atomic/fossil/alternative energy sources and their use in Germany and the closure of atomic power stations</p>
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	<p>© for information about energy-saving initiatives and/or water-saving initiatives</p> <p>© for information about river-cleansing operations (eg the Rhine) or <i>Wasserschutz</i></p>
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	<p>© for information about energy-efficient modern house building and its environmental impact</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	<p>© for information about what larger industrial concerns and supermarkets are doing to reduce their pollution and waste</p> <p>© for information about <i>Ökosteuer</i></p>
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	<p>© for information about government support for environmental initiatives</p> <p>© for information about improvements in the former GDR</p>

**Question 2(b)**

**Kommentieren Sie die Rolle, die das Recycling beim Umweltschutz in Deutschland spielt.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
<sub>irr</sub>	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The answer shows the ways in which recycling is encouraged and carried out in Germany, explaining how/why this contributes (or does not contribute) to Germany's overall environmental policies.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Initiatives and procedures are described in reasonable detail, but the candidate is less successful in showing how they impact on Germans or on the environment in general.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Superficial information about recycling (not necessarily with a German perspective) and no real attempt to comment on them.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Random facts about recycling and/or the environment.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>Though the question asks about Germany, the <u>occasional</u> comparison with other countries is permissible if it helps the candidate to emphasise a point. Equally other environmental issues may be mentioned for comparison purposes, but answers which dwell excessively on these cannot gain high marks.</p> <p><b>C</b> for the information in the text about recycling if not developed or expanded on</p> <p>© for information about different rubbish containers and their purpose</p> <p>© for information about use of <i>Sammelstellen</i> for such items as old tyres, batteries, paint etc</p> <p>© for information about <i>Sperrmüll</i></p> <p>© for information about <i>grüner Punkt</i>, <i>blauer Engel</i> etc</p> <p>© for information about <i>Biomasse</i>, <i>Fernenergie</i> (which are tangentially recycling)</p> <p>© for information about the use of recycled paper (eg in schools)</p> <p>© for comparison with role of other aspects of environmental policy in Germany</p> <p><b>T</b> for what the candidate does/what is happening in his or her own area if it is not compared to Germany.</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 3(a)**

**Welche der Ausländergruppen hat es Ihrer Meinung nach am besten in Deutschland? Warum sind Sie dieser Meinung?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	An answer in this band will consider at least two different groups before concluding which group is best off. It should look at what is good and what is bad (or at least less good) in each chosen group.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some R. Or only one group dealt with but in a lot of detail.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	There is a lack of 'balance'; eg only good aspects of life or only bad aspects are dealt with - though a conclusion may be reached. Or groups are not clearly distinguished.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The answer is very general about foreigners (and probably their problems) and does not make any attempt to differentiate or comment on them.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Random facts about foreigners in Germany.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>Despite the use of the present tense in the question, it is inevitable that many candidates will write about <i>Gastarbeiter</i> in the 1950s; this is permissible.</p> <p>© for information about what differentiates the various groups – eg ethnicity, reasons for coming to Germany etc, but this should furnish a background for explaining/considering what makes a group ‘well off’ or ‘badly off’</p> <p>© for information about how the group is treated in the media</p> <p>© for information about educational opportunities and successes</p> <p>© for information about advances in public life (eg sport, media, politics)</p> <p>© for information about employment</p> <p>© for information about how the group is treated by officialdom</p> <p>© for information about housing</p> <p>© for information about the extent to which they are victims of xenophobia</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 3(b)**

**Wenn die Deutschen unsere Religion und unsere Lebensweise nur besser verstehen würden, so wäre die Integration viel einfacher.' Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage eines Einwanderers?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The question requires a good answer to a range of factors which affect integration; that is, it should (dis)agree with the statement, but only after balancing it against other factors. It might also consider: is this statement valid 'the other way round'?
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ©, but also some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate deals in some detail with the issues in the title, but does not consider much else. Or it does consider a wider range but it does not reach clear conclusions.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The answer writes in general terms about the life of foreigners in Germany.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>Candidates should try to show how different groups of foreigners may be affected differently by the factors which they consider.</p> <p><b>C</b> for material from the Preliminary Material, which shows that some attempt to make Germans aware of different religions is being made.</p> <p>© for further examples of attempts to bring different religious groups together or at least to integrate the into the wider community</p> <p>© for explanations of '<i>Lebensweise</i>' and what it is about it which may block integration</p> <p>© for information about ingrained attitudes and prejudices which can lead to non-integration or even to violence</p> <p>© for information/comments on 'myths' about foreigners which slow down or prevent integration</p> <p>© for information about campaigns in the workplace (posters etc) to fight xenophobia and encourage integration</p> <p>© for initiatives to set up inter-racial youth clubs or similar</p> <p>© for information about 'closed communities' or immigrants keeping to themselves – attempts to overcome this</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 4(a)**

***Deutschland hat durch die Ost-Erweiterung der EU viel gewonnen und wenig verloren.' Erklären Sie, warum Sie derselben oder anderer Meinung sind.***

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The answer looks not only at financial/trade aspects of the expansion but also at such aspects as culture and understanding of other nations. In what ways has everyday life been enriched or impoverished by the expansion? Have wartime 'enmities'/resentments been diminished?
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The answer deals in part with the specific issues but it also deals in some measure with Germany's general relationship with Europe.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Random facts about Europe.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for Preliminary Material information about Eastern European (Polish) workers finding jobs in Germany and whether Germans are finding work in other countries</p> <p>© for information about whether Germany has benefited from the new trading possibilities</p> <p>© for information about cultural benefits or disadvantages</p> <p>© for information about the effects of expansion on housing and other social infrastructure</p> <p>© for information about changes to crime patterns – provided it is clearly linked to Eastern Europe</p> <p>© for information about travel/holiday possibilities – provided it is linked to Eastern Europe; otherwise <b>T</b></p> <p><b>Irr</b> for reference to older benefits such as Erasmus</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 4(b)**

**Die EU ist gut für Deutschland; Deutschland ist gut für die EU.' Erklären Sie diese Aussage und geben Sie Ihre Meinung dazu.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The answer considers the contributions (financial, ideological etc) made by Germany to the growth and success of the EU, and looks at what Germany gets in return from others states. It should conclude with an agreement (or not) with the title.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some <b>R</b> .
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The answer is reasonably detailed on one side of the question but not of the other or it is superficial (if relevant) on both sides. It describes Germany's role with little evaluation.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	There are random facts about Germany and the EU, but minimal attempt to consider whether Germany's contribution is beneficial or not.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for information from Preliminary Material about Germany's attempts to make a positive contribution to the direction the EU is going in</p> <p>© for information about Germany's role in the introduction of the Euro, and its success or otherwise</p> <p>© for information about Germany's role in the recent expansion of Europe</p> <p>© for information about Germany's financial clout in the EU</p> <p>© for information about Germany's views on an EU constitution (by any name)</p> <p>© for information on how attitudes towards Germany may have been changed by its role in the EU</p> <p>© for information about trade success for Germany from dealing with EU partners</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 5(a)**

**Welche Aspekte des Lebens im deutschsprachigen Raum haben Sie besonders interessant gefunden? Warum?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate should show detailed knowledge of two/three aspects of life in Germany, and critically evaluate them to explain their interest (eg difference from UK, link to candidate's own personal interests)
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some <b>R</b> .
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The answer describes aspects of life reasonably well but does not have a thorough evaluation. Or too many aspects are dealt with, suggesting that the candidate has not found a particular interest.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The answer is a collection of random, probably superficial/anecdotal, facts about life in Germany with (virtually) no attempt to explain the interest.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.

<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<p>The candidate has a totally free choice of aspects of German life, and markers should allow any sensible interpretation of 'Leben', including history. The answer could well draw on other topic areas in the Preliminary Material.</p> <p>Reward with <b>C</b> (Preliminary Material) or <b>©</b> (non-Preliminary Material) any appropriate correct information used. Possible topic areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• education</li> <li>• environmental awareness</li> <li>• transport</li> <li>• post-war history</li> <li>• food &amp; drink</li> <li>• community involvement</li> <li>• industry</li> <li>• festivals such as carnival</li> </ul>

**Question 5(b)**

**Vergleichen Sie zwei Teile des deutschsprachigen Raumes, zum Beispiel in Bezug auf Geschichte, kulturelles Leben, Industrie, Touristenattraktionen.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
 irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b> As usual, the word 'Teile' can legitimately be interpreted in different ways (town, region, country)
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate has not simply described similarities/differences but has commented on them and/or tried to explain them.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with many points detailed enough for ®, but also some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate gives some facts about/descriptions of a region but the reasons for choosing these as evidence are vague or not well linked to the question. Mainly R.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate describes a region – possibly in very general terms – and does not make comparisons. Very few R.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>The candidate's choice of region will determine exactly which features are compared and the candidates may deal with as many as they choose; the list in the question is no more than a suggestion.</p> <p>Markers should reward with <b>C</b> (Preliminary Material) or <b>©</b> any appropriate, correct information in the answer, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the main sources of employment</li> <li>• the 'nature of the terrain'</li> <li>• the characteristics (alleged or otherwise) of the inhabitants</li> <li>• contrasts between big city and rural life</li> </ul>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	