



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
in German (WGN03/01)

Unit 3: Understanding and Spoken Response

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2022

Publications Code WGN03_01_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Format of the Test

There are two sections.

Section A includes an optional introduction of the chosen topic lasting up to one minute followed by a debate on the chosen issue in which the interviewer and candidate maintain opposing standpoints and candidates use the language of debate. Section A should last for a maximum of 5 minutes in total.

Section B is a discussion of at least two further unpredictable issues taken from the General Topic Areas (GTAs) given in the specification and should last for between 6 and 8 minutes.

The test should conclude within 11-13 minutes, but section A must finish at 5 minutes.

Assessment Principles

This unit assesses communication in spoken language and critical analysis. It also covers understanding, which is in essence, a test of listening skills.

It is marked positively out of 40, by Edexcel examiners.

Spontaneity and development is marked out of 20 and assesses performance in relation to spontaneity, discourse and development during both sections of the test.

Quality of language is assessed out of ten marks with five marks available for Accuracy and five marks for Range of lexis. Pronunciation, intonation, the structures employed, lexis and grammatical accuracy are all taken into consideration when awarding these marks.

Reading and research accounts for up to five marks and assesses evidence of the candidate having read German texts and sources in preparation for the debate. Candidates should refer to at least two such sources, giving the names of the sources. These marks are awarded purely for Section A.

Critical analysis is awarded up to five marks. Here, examiners assess how well the candidate is able to link ideas and whether they give a full evaluation of the key issues.

Centres should be aware that Pearson Edexcel publish the guidance to examiners on the website. This explains and defines the standards for spontaneity, discourse, development and other key assessment principles.

Candidates' Performances

Overall, there were some excellent assessments featuring genuine discourse. It was a pleasure for the examiners to listen to the views of young people worldwide on such a range of topics. Many candidates spoke with passion about their chosen issue.

There was excellent examining in most cases. Teacher/examiners played their part in the debates with energy and enthusiasm, and many were exceptional in the way in which they challenged the candidates and drew them out, which gave the candidates every opportunity to link ideas and present coherent arguments.

Only a handful of assessments in this session were lacking in spontaneity. Most candidates spoke spontaneously and developed their responses in detail. Linguistically, most candidates were highly accurate and there was a pleasing range of lexis, even amongst non-native speakers.

However, it was disappointing that so few candidates mentioned written sources by name in Section A as evidence of Reading and research. A mark of four, or above, can only be awarded if candidates do so according to the marking principles, which are available on the Pearson website. In Section B there was, unfortunately, a lack of good discourse in many centres. If the teacher/examiner asks only three questions throughout Section B, there clearly will be a lack of discourse.

Section A

This part of the assessment is intended to be a debate, rather than just a discussion or presentation. The teacher/examiner must take the opposing view to that of the candidate, and they should seek to challenge what the candidate says. This will enable the candidate to use the language of debate, as required by the specification. Where this is not the case the candidate cannot access the top mark bands for Spontaneity and development and Critical analysis.

It may be helpful to centres to consider it somewhat in the nature of a role play. It is not intended that the candidate should speak without interruption for extended periods of time, as this then becomes a presentation. The candidate and teacher/examiner should respond to what the other says.

It is particularly important that when selecting the issue for debate candidates should bear in mind that they will need to refer to a minimum of two written **German sources** on the issue. Referencing an American or British website is not helpful, as the examiner has no way of knowing what language the candidate read the website in. It is essential that candidates refer to at least two such sources by name as evidence of Reading and research.

Personal opinions are not sufficient for candidates to access the higher bands of the Reading and research mark grid. Unfortunately, most candidates in this session did not mention any sources and tried to rely on opinions to make their case. Where there was evidence of Reading and research in the form of statistics, facts or specific examples (not based on personal experience), examiners were able to credit this. In such cases a mark of 3/5 could be awarded. Centres have an important role to play here in steering candidates away from issues which they may feel passionate about, but where it could be difficult to find written sources to draw on. An example of this would be, "Ich bin für ein generelles Duzen aller Lehrpersonen".

When the candidate initially outlines their stance there is no need for it to be more than one or two sentences and it should not extend beyond the one minute allowed. Candidates do not have to use the time in this way and, given that five minutes is fairly brief, centres may wish to begin straight away with the debate. That way the candidate has the full five minutes to demonstrate their use of the language of debate. Alternatively, centres and candidates may

feel that using the one minute allows the candidate to mention one or two of their sources at the very start of the assessment. It is completely up to the centre in discussion with the candidate to decide what best suits each individual candidate.

A close eye needs to be kept on the timing of this section of the examination as it should not exceed five minutes, starting from when the candidate begins to speak. If Section A is longer than five minutes, it erodes the time available for the discussion of the unpredictable topics in Section B which will impact on the marks awarded.

Popular issues in this examination session were:

Abortion – both for and against

Assisted suicide – both for and against

Experiments on animals – mainly against, but some candidates argued in favour for medicinal research purposes

A vegan diet – both for and against

Capital punishment – mainly against, but some were in favour

Electric vehicles -mainly in favour, but some were against

Less successful issues were ones where either there were no/few written sources available, or ones which did not lend themselves well to debate, such as:

“Vorurteile und Stereotypen – ich bin der Meinung, Vorurteile sollen und können abgebaut werden”

“Fußball – ein gesellschaftliches Phänomen”

Section B

When selecting the unpredictable topics for discussion in Section B centres need to ensure that the topics and questions are challenging enough for A2 level. The topics from the AS specification are, of course, suitable for use in this examination, however, there needs to be evidence of progression from AS. Reproducing AS Level work leads to a poor outcome. A2 requires students to show an ability to handle abstract concepts. Topics which were discussed, but perhaps do not lend themselves well to abstract discussion, were school uniform and sport in schools. Any topic where the candidate might be tempted to draw on detailed personal experience is best avoided.

At least two unpredictable areas should be discussed in Section B. In the case of some candidates the teacher/examiner unfortunately did not progress the discussion on to other areas and remained with aspects of the initial issue throughout the entire assessment. In line with the marking principles, this has an impact on the marks which can be awarded for Spontaneity and development and for Critical analysis. The same applies if only one unpredictable area is discussed in Section B. However, it is perfectly acceptable for only two

unpredictable areas to be discussed. It is better to discuss two topics and in depth, than a number of areas which are covered superficially.

The topics discussed in Section B should be unpredictable. It is therefore not good practice for a centre to ask all candidates about the same topics. Candidates are likely to compare notes when coming out of the examination and this would lead to the candidates who are assessed later having an advantage.

Teacher/examiners must select topics for discussion which are taken from the list of General Topics Areas (GTA) given in the specification.

The IA2 General Topic Areas are Technology in the German-speaking world, Society in the German-speaking world and Ethics in the German-speaking world. If candidates are asked questions on these IA2 specific General Topic Areas which do not place the issues in the context of the German-speaking world, these candidates will be unable to access the full range of marks for Critical analysis. It is not sufficient for the teacher/examiner to refer to the German-speaking world in the question, if it is never mentioned again in the ensuing discussion. The candidate should refer to the German-speaking world in their response. Examples might be "Also, hier bei uns in der Schweiz..." or "In Deutschland ist es der Fall...".

Spontaneity and development

Spontaneity

Lack of spontaneity was much less of an issue in this session than it has been previously. However, centres are reminded that a question-and-answer approach does not work well. Instead, teacher/examiners should respond to what the candidate says, thus providing candidates with an opportunity to move away from prepared material. Questions such as "Wieso?", "Wie meinen Sie das?" or "Können Sie ein Beispiel dafür geben?" encourage a spontaneous discussion. To access a mark of 11 or above candidates must demonstrate many examples of spontaneous responses to questions. 'Many' implies that spontaneity is a clear characteristic of the test.

Discourse

Discourse is also assessed as part of Spontaneity and development. Examiners seek evidence that both the candidate and examiner are interacting with each other, beyond a simple "one question per issue" format. When this approach is taken, it is difficult to find evidence that the discourse element of the grid has been addressed, and so marks are unlikely to be in the highest band.

Fluent discourse refers to a natural conversation within the context of an assessment. It describes the exchange of opinion and information on an issue between the candidate and teacher/examiner. This means that each participant addresses the points made by the other. The teacher/examiner might, for example ask, "Why do you say that?", "What evidence is there to support that?", "I agree with you to some extent, but...".

Unsatisfactory discourse often prevented candidates from being able to access the highest mark band for Spontaneity and development. The teacher/examiner has a crucial role to play here. Candidates must not be allowed to 'present', and the teacher/examiner should, where possible, respond to what the candidate has said so that a naturally developed conversation can occur.

There were some excellent examples of teacher/examiners doing this in a few centres.

Development

Development pre-supposes that the candidate has fully understood the question, and is then able to produce a detailed response, giving more than a single sentence reply, expanding on an idea and point of view. The ability to present two opposing points of view and the reasons for these, along with an evaluation would demonstrate excellent development.

Quality of Language (Range of lexis)

Examiners look for evidence of topic specific lexis as well as comparing what they hear to the specified list of grammatical structures. Progression from GCSE and AS level is required here; therefore, the most successful performances would feature active use of a wide range of these elements.

Quality of Language (Accuracy)

This accounts for five of the 40 possible marks. A mark of five does not constitute faultless language. Non-native speakers must have access to the full marks available here, and the examiners are standardised with this fundamental principal in mind. It should be noted that five out of 40 marks is a relatively small proportion. This will explain why many grammatically perfect performances do not achieve full marks overall, as they must also satisfy the criteria in other mark grids.

Reading and Research

Five marks are allocated for evidence of Reading and research. This applies purely to Section A where candidates must cite written German sources as evidence of their reading and research.

Critical Analysis

Evidence of an ability to respond using beliefs, morals and political views beyond the realm of the more concrete topics which form the basis of AS and GCSE work is required at this level. Candidates should attempt to link ideas and to show an ability to evaluate, rather than simply providing facts. They should, where possible, provide evidence for their views and demonstrate an ability to see both sides of an argument. The most successful candidates provided frequent examples of the ability to do this.

Advice for Future Examination Sessions

For Section A candidates must select an issue which can be debated, and not only discussed. The candidate should take a definite stance and the teacher/examiner the opposing one. Issues which cannot be debated will have an adverse effect on the marks awarded for Spontaneity and development and Critical analysis. Centres are reminded that this is a debate not a presentation, which means that the teacher/examiner will engage with the candidate by challenging their views. It is not appropriate for the teacher/examiner to ask such questions as, "What else do you know about nuclear power?" or "Would you like to explain anything else about electric vehicles?"

When the candidate is choosing their issue, centres should steer candidates towards topics where there is a wide range of German sources available for them to draw upon as evidence of reading and research. The issue does not have to be based on the German-speaking world, but the sources the candidate uses should be in the German language. A minimum of two such

sources should be cited. Websites are obviously acceptable, and they should be ones written in German.

Section A should not exceed five minutes, which includes the optional one-minute introduction by the candidate. The purpose of this one minute is for the candidate to briefly outline their stance and to 'settle' them into the examination. It is not intended for the candidate to give detailed background information. It is perfectly acceptable for the candidate not to use this time outlining the issue. The examiner has a copy of the OR3 form and is aware what the issue for the debate is.

The two main things being assessed in Section A are the candidate's ability to use the language of debate and the depth of reading and research they have carried out.

In Section B the issues discussed should only come from the list of General Topic Areas. There should be a discussion of at least two topics, which are quite distinct from the issue debated in Section A. However, two topics are quite sufficient, as this will probably lead to greater depth. The topics selected should be appropriate to A2 level and therefore challenging in their content. School uniform, for example, is not an especially challenging topic. It could, perhaps, be made challenging if there is a conversation about the role uniforms play/have played in society. It is not a suitable topic if the discussion consists of the candidate explaining whether they personally would prefer a uniform and how this would fit in with their family's laundry schedule.

All candidates in a centre should not be examined on the same unpredictable topics, as these will then not be unpredictable.

If the issue being discussed in Section B is part of the GTA Society in the German-speaking world, for example 'Gleichberechtigung für Frauen', there must be reference to a country where German is spoken.

If the issue being discussed in Section B is part of the GTA Technology in the German-speaking world, for example 'Genforschung', there must be reference to a country where German is spoken.

If the issue being discussed in Section B is part of the GTA Ethics in the German-speaking world, for example 'Sterbehilfe', there must be reference to a country where German is spoken.

Where this is not the case, the candidate loses one mark for Critical analysis, in line with the marking principles.

The timing for the assessment overall is 11-13 minutes. It is perfectly acceptable for the assessment to be closer to 11 minutes than 13. There is no merit in assessments exceeding 13 minutes, as the examiner stops listening at the 13-minute point.

Centres are reminded that the minimum timing is 11 minutes. In this session very few assessments fell short of that. However, in fairness to all candidates, where this is the case, it has a quite considerable impact on the marks which can be awarded.

Summary

The examiners marking on the unit would like to thank centres for the effort they put in to ensure the assessments run smoothly for their candidates and to allow them to reach their full potential. The hard work that goes into preparing candidates for examinations is also appreciated and we seek to reward this whenever possible.

Grade Boundaries

Much work has taken place on the comparability of the speaking units for French, German and Spanish. The senior examiners continue to work closely together to ensure their application of the common marking guidelines is consistently applied across the three languages.