



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **German 2661** *Specification*

**GERM3     Listening, Reading and Writing**

# **Report on the Examination** *2010 examination - June series*

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

Copyright © 2010 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.

---

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

---

## Unit 3

### General comments

The majority of candidates were appropriately entered for this component and there were some exceptional performances across the range of questions on this multi-skill paper.

Most candidates produced legible scripts in the requisite black ink, although a minority did not follow this instruction.

For the most part, candidates attempted the appropriate questions in Section B of the paper for the topic they had prepared. Some candidates did however produce responses to questions which were not intended for their chosen area of study. This was particularly the case in Questions 13-15. Whilst AQA treated this matter with leniency this year, this will not be the case in future sessions and centres should re-emphasise what is already made clear to candidates on the exam paper itself.

The mean mark was 75.2.

On-screen marking was used for this unit and candidates should be reminded that they must answer the questions in the spaces provided, as instructed on the front cover of the question paper. It is also very important that the instruction to candidates to write in black ink or ballpoint pen is adhered to, as answers written in blue ink or pen are very difficult to mark on screen. Unfortunately, a few candidates were careless in their writing and some of the letters they used in answering the comprehension questions were very hard to decipher.

### Section A

#### Question 1

This question proved accessible to candidates. Most candidates gained marks for (a), (b) and (c). 33% of candidates produced an incorrect response for (d).

#### Question 2

Almost 70% of candidates gained full marks on this item and the vast majority gained at least 5 marks. All candidates scored at least 2 marks.

#### Question 3

Candidates performed generally well on this item, with (c) and (d) proving the most accessible questions. Candidates found (f) and (g) the most challenging questions.

#### Question 4

Most candidates followed the instructions given to underline the incorrect word/item and replace it with the correct version. Some did however underline whole sections which invalidated their responses.

Candidates found this item generally accessible, although questions (b) and (c) were clearly less challenging than (a) and (d).

#### Question 5

Some candidates were seriously tested by this item, which proved to be a good discriminator. The most accessible question was (a) whilst (c) and (f) proved the most challenging.

---

---

**Question 6**

This item was generally accessible to all candidates with (b) and (e) answered correctly by over 90% of candidates and over 75% of candidates gaining full marks.

**Question 7**

This question proved to be challenging and an excellent discriminator. Approximately 30% of candidates gained full marks and the vast majority gained at least 3 marks. Less able candidates struggled to recognise the appropriate grammatical item required, failing to match the gap in the sentences with a correct gender or part of speech.

**Question 8**

Almost all candidates gained at least half marks on this question, with 22% gaining full marks and 66% 6 or more marks.

**Question 9**

The quality of response for this item varied greatly; there were some excellent translations which demonstrated impressive knowledge of grammar and vocabulary along with a flair for translating. At the other end of the spectrum, some candidates struggled to come to terms with the context and the vocabulary, left many gaps and clearly guessed on many occasions, showing little appreciation of the tenses or structures tested. This question carries 10 marks and translating is a skill which needs much practice.

Almost 27% of candidates gained 7 marks or more for the item, with 6% gaining 9 or 10 marks. 1.4% of candidates gained 0 marks.

One major problem encountered was the omission of small details – *deutlich langsamer, immer beliebter, mehr als ein Drittel*. Candidates must be aware of the need for precision in translation. In the same vein, candidates often failed to recognise the pluperfect tense – *war geklettert* or to note the superlative in: *die rasantesten Wachstumsjahre*. Candidates often used a comparative where none was required: *geringe Bildung*. Additionally, they frequently muddled the singular and plural in: *die Schwierigkeiten dieser Minderheit*. *Bundesbürger* was often rendered as citizen. Occasionally, candidates missed out whole phrases. Vocabulary items which seemed unfamiliar to many candidates included: *rasant, Anteil and voriges*.

**Question 10**

As with the previous question, the quality of responses varied greatly here. Whilst 11% of candidates gained 8 marks or more 14.5% were awarded 2 more marks or less. The need for grammatical knowledge and background is clear on this item. Practice in the structures set out in the specification is essential if candidates are to reach the higher marks on this set of questions.

The major problem areas included capitalisation of nouns and the need for inversion of the verb if the sentence begins with eg "*Heutzutage*". Many candidates struggled with the translation of: 'more and more' and many were unaware of the need for the present tense after *seit*. Only the strongest candidates rendered the genitive of *Erwachsene* correctly. The use of the accusative was an issue for many – e.g. *haben keinen Internetzugang*. Many candidates did not know the plural of *Teenager* and some struggled with the plural of *Schule* and the adjectival agreement on *deutsch*, which was frequently spelled with a capital. Many candidates overlooked the need for a dative with *helfen*

---

## Section B

Most essays exceeded the minimum 250 words by some margin. Candidates should be aware that it will be possible to reach the upper bands of the mark scheme by writing concisely, precisely and succinctly. There were however some excellent responses to all questions in this section. Many were full of detailed content, exemplification and evaluative comment. Many essays had a logical structure and were well organised and planned. Few essays were irrelevant. The best essays contained a conclusion which drew things together and did not simply repeat the arguments of the piece.

There were some essays nevertheless, where the message was impaired by poor command of language. Some essays contained a plethora of pre-learned phrases – *es ist nicht zu leugnen, dass, es liegt auf der Hand, dass, zusammenfassend*. Some essays contained a conclusion which simply repeated over a few pages what had already been stated in the essay.

There was an even spread of responses between the topic areas on the paper.

### Question 11

11(a) was often done quite badly – candidates gave a résumé of industrial features of the region without reference to the problems which still needed to be resolved.

The majority of candidates opted for 11(b)

A variety of regions were selected, with the Ruhr, Mecklenburg Vorpommern, Bavaria and Berlin popular choices. Some candidates chose cities such as Munich or Vienna on the basis that they were native speakers or had visited on a school exchange. Candidates gained the highest marks if they offered reasons **why** they found the region attractive. Some responses did read like a list of things to see or do. Candidates wishing to study a city should be aware that adequate source material must be available to allow them to answer in sufficient depth.

### Question 12

12(a) Many candidates chose Gorbatschew – a valid choice. It was possible to write well on just one personality and many did so. Less able candidates tended to pick several people and write a little about each without going into sufficient detail or answering in sufficient depth.

12(b) Good responses tended to treat a number of aspects of the chosen period before coming to a conclusion. Some candidates chose a very narrow time frame (e.g. the fall of the Berlin Wall) rather than, for example, 1961-1989. This often made it difficult to answer in sufficient depth.

### General points of relevance to Q13-15

Many candidates displayed genuinely thorough knowledge of texts/plays/films with points well supported by frequent reference to works studied. There was evidence of knowledge of the task and candidates adhered to the question set. Many essays contained personal opinion and were not confined to: *es war interessant*.

### Question 13

13(a) Only the better candidates evaluated the portrayal of themes, rather than simply listing them.

13(b) Again, less able candidates tended to 'tell' rather than explain, simply listing aspects of the character's actions or personality. More able candidates managed to interweave material about the characters with their own evaluation.

---

### Question 14

- 14(a) As was the case in 13(b), there was a tendency for some to relate the story rather than provide an explanation. The more able candidates provided excellent evaluation.
- 14(b) This question was often well done by good candidates, who outlined their perception of the author's goals, gave examples from the work(s) and evaluated them.

### Question 15

Candidates should refer in their answers on this topic to work produced by one person; a film on which two directors worked in collaboration, for example, would not be appropriate.

- 15(a) There were a number of weak responses on musicians, where it seemed that candidates had done their own (very limited) research and were unable to explain what made the work effective in any detail. Comments such as "*Der Text passt gut zu der Musik*" needed expansion and exemplification. There were however, some excellent responses on film directors, where candidates analysed a number of aspects of the work, perhaps the lighting, sound and the use of location and made perceptive comments about why these aspects were/were not effective.
- 15(b) There were many good responses here, for example with reference to *Good Bye Lenin* or *Das Leben der Anderen*.

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.