

Report on the Units

June 2007

3862/7862/MS/R/07

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE German (7862)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE German (3862)

REPORT FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2661	Speaking	1
2662	Listening, Reading & Writing	7
2663	Reading & Writing	11
2664	Speaking & reading	13
2665	Listening, Reading & Writing 2	17
2666	Culture & Society (Written Paper)	21
2667	Coursework	27
*	Grade Thresholds	31

**German 3862
Advanced Subsidiary GCE**

**Examiner's Report June 2007
2661 German Speaking
General Comments**

As expected, most candidates were aware of the requirements of the AS speaking examination. Most had prepared themselves at least adequately and some extremely well. Many teacher/examiners set a friendly tone and interacted naturally with their candidates. The use of a beeper to time the oral examination correctly is welcome, although it should be set at the start of the examination and not reset between role-play and presentation. Most of those using a beeper this series correctly drew the examination to a close soon after the final beep.

Role-play

The Randomisation Sheet sequence on page 2 of the Examiner's Booklet was correctly used by almost all teacher/examiners, and therefore role-plays A and C were the most frequently used. Most candidates used the *Hilfsvokabeln*, although pronunciation of these items was frequently poor. Markers and moderators reported no great differences between the four role-plays and performances were even. As mentioned in previous reports, a considerable number of candidates find difficulty in wording the initial two questions correctly, despite the large number of role-plays set for this specification since 2001. Criterion 1A assesses response to the stimulus material and centres should be aware that more than a mere summary is required. Many candidates were able to provide enough information to score 3/5, but the higher marks can only be awarded if all or virtually all details are conveyed. In a similar way, those candidates offering a good range of structures and vocabulary gain access to the higher marks on 1C, provided that the basics are also sound. Unfortunately, serious errors involving basic verb forms, word order and subject/verb agreement are still common. This series, some candidates seemed again to be reading out a translation of parts of the stimulus material. Centres should strongly discourage the writing of full sentence translations on the Candidate's Sheet during the preparation time. It is much better for candidates to make brief notes and use the stimulus material itself during the actual examination. Relatively few candidates gave a really convincing, imaginative performance full of initiative (criterion 1B). Many simply responded only adequately to questions posed by the examiner.

It has frequently been stated in reports to centres and at Inset meetings that teacher/examiners have a crucial role to play in exploiting the stimulus material. Unfortunately, there were instances this series, as in previous series, where the teacher/examiner simply read out questions from the Examiner's Booklet, ignoring what the candidate was saying. This often occurred after a candidate had already provided the required information and caused unnecessary confusion. The function of the questions on the Examiner's Sheet is to stimulate the candidate into providing the information. They should **not** be used as a script. Listening to what the candidate is saying is vital. A good teacher/examiner listens attentively, reacts to the candidate and suggests further stimuli designed to extract more detail if necessary, without, of course, providing the vocabulary.

Teacher/examiners should **not** expect candidates to deliver a monologue on the stimulus material, nor wait till the candidates finish before intervening. A successful role-play is one where there is much interaction, in particular where the teacher/examiner realises that candidates have omitted details. The importance of good preparation by the teacher/examiner has been emphasised on countless previous occasions. Good teacher/examiner knowledge of the stimulus material **and** the Candidate's Sheet is therefore vital. If candidates fail to express adequately what is in the stimulus material, the role of the teacher/examiner is to encourage them to supply further details. Although most tests were quite well conducted, one feature this

year seemed to be the number of examiners who finished the role-play at around 4 minutes without encouraging their candidates, in many cases on 3/5, to seek to attain higher marks on grids 1A and 1B.

Undeniably, many teacher/examiners prepared the examination very well. Many have learnt the art of exploiting the stimulus material skilfully, giving candidates the opportunity to gain higher marks, especially on criterion 1A. Few candidates mentioned the photographs and visuals supplied with each role-play. Timing of the role-play continued to be good from many centres. Where role-plays exceed the time allowed, assessment ceases after five minutes.

The rephrasing of the initial two bold items into questions did not improve this series. Often, a change of word order and verb ending are all that is required to make a successful question. Three of the four role-plays this series involved the teacher/examiner being the penfriend/exchange partner. This meant that candidates should have used to *du* form. Examiners using Role-play B were supposed to be the father/mother and addressed in the *Sie* form. Some candidates seemed blissfully unaware and used both in the same role-play.

Comments on Individual Questions

Role-play A: Oxford Culture

This role-play was the one most frequently used, being the first in the Randomisation sequence. Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at conveying the details contained in the stimulus material. The two initial questions were not always done well. Those candidates practising role-plays frequently should be aware that minor changes have to be made. "Wann er/sie den Ausflug machen möchte?" does not make sense, but was heard all too frequently.

Many had a good overview of the text but details were often either omitted or expressed poorly. Despite the words *Universitätsmuseum für Naturgeschichte* appearing on the Candidate's Sheet, the first museum had a variety of titles, often involving the use of *naturell / natürlich*. Only few managed 'was opened' successfully and few knew the differences between *geöffnet / eröffnet / offen / auf*. Sometimes, the museum was open in 1860 and not since. The year 1860 itself caused problems, as numbers seem to do each year, *achtzehntausendsechzig* being not uncommon. Students were often *Schüler* and teaching was often *lernen*. Only the best knew Victorian and those who attempted to rephrase it sometimes lost their way (*im 18. Jahrhundert / in Jahr 1800 / 100 Jahre vor*). Building itself was not infrequently *Bildung*. The final part of the first paragraph (thousands of other items from the University's huge natural history collection) was often simply *viele andere Dinge*.

Some candidates had difficulty in pronouncing Pitt Rivers correctly, who often became Pitts River and even Pitt Livers. Surprisingly, 'collect' was often unknown and statements such as *er hat das Museum gefunden* were made. The 'father of archaeology' caused problems and Pitt Rivers was sometimes *der Vater der Gebäude / der Artefakte*. *Werkzeuge* was often pronounced *Werkzuge*. To many candidates the words textiles and boats proved too difficult to attempt and were ignored. General (often pronounced as in English) and army proved to be a hurdle for some and Pitt Rivers apparently served in the *Bundeswehr* or the *Wehrmacht*. Few attempted to render 'first to classify'. Opening times caused the perennial number problems, with 16.30 variously rendered as *halb vier* or *halb siebzehn*. Under one roof had a variety of responses such as *unter einem Hause / unter einem Deck / unter eine Rufe*. Free admission was mostly done adequately, although statements such as *die Eintrittskosten sind kostenlos* could be confusing. Candidates struggled with one of Europe's finest, making Blackwell's the best bookshop. However, it mostly seemed to contain a large number of beech trees rather than books. For those who struggled with the earlier numbers, 250,000 was a number too far.

Although the word *Buchhandlung* had been provided, it was sometimes ignored and *Buchkaufhaus* offered instead. Where it was used, it sometimes became *Buchladung* or even *Buchlandung*.

The final bullet point asked the candidates to suggest a reasonable way of organising the day. Most coped by repeating the order in which the attractions appeared in the stimulus material. A minority of examiners failed to grasp that the museums were only open in the afternoon and asked *und was machen wir am Nachmittag?* A few candidates had a pre-prepared response ready: suggestions such as phoning and using the internet seem rather out of place when there is no charge for admission and are inadequate in addressing the problem.

There were many good responses and the majority of candidates were able to convey details with at least adequate success. However, as with all the role-plays, the many candidates scoring 3/5 on 1A might have been helped to score at least one more mark with better teacher/examiner help.

Role-play B: Ingleton Waterfalls Walk

The candidates' task was to describe this walk to the penfriend's father/mother. Most coped at least adequately with the text, but considerable detail tended to be omitted, including the last sentence of the first paragraph, presumably because spectacular scenery and admire nature were unknown. Candidates had often to be encouraged to state why this was such a good walk. As expected, 1885 caused problems, as did the other numbers in the text. Four and a half miles often turned into four and a bit kilometres, and forty foot was often *40 Meter*. Hills was not commonly known, and surprising numbers encountered difficulties with village and car park (often *Autopark*). Only the best were able to convey return path and alongside the river. On the edge of (often *Ecke*) caused problems, as did path and wet (often *wett*). Astonishingly, main roads was not known by all, many offering *Autobahn*. The final sentence was conveyed better, although suggestions as to what might be traditional home-cooked food seemed to be restricted to fish & chips, Yorkshire pudding and even Pizza. The final bullet point asked candidates to suggest what else to take along. Many good suggestions were heard including water, a raincoat and jumpers. Weaker candidates seemed at a loss to think of anything, or offered *Wasserkleidung / Wetterkleidung / gut laufende Schuhe / eine Mappe / ein Wasserprüfmantel*.

Role-play C: Feriendorf Schwarzholz

This role-play, the only one in this series situated in Germany, invited the candidates to describe a holiday village. Several candidates did not make the connection between *Feriendorf* and holiday village. Some did not realise that the candidate's family had booked the holiday for the coming summer, claiming that they had visited *Schwarzholz* the previous summer. The text itself proved accessible and most candidates managed to express about half of the points or more, although some achieved this with considerable teacher/examiner help. Weaker candidates simply listed some of the many items in the text. Stronger candidates amplified and expanded.

Pronunciation of given items was often poor: *märchenhaft* was often *mädchenhaft*, and the *Bayrischer Wald* often contained bears. *Schwarzholz* itself caused trouble, rendered as *Schwarzwald / Schwarzhals*. Most knew South but not all could manage East. As expected, many stumbled over the pronunciation of *Viechtach*. Castles was often *Schlössen* and not all coped with canoe or hire. Just a 15-minute walk away proved to be a hurdle, and many offered 50 and some version of *fahren*. Quite a few items in the third paragraph (centrally heated / cable / well-equipped / electricity / cleaning) caused difficulties. Sometimes, the words chosen did not adequately express what was in the text (*es gibt 6 Schlafzimmer / Kinderplatz / Kleidermaschine / kulturelle Seiten / Kabel für die Fernsehen / ein Restaurant – das ist sehr lecker*). The facilities on-site were done better, although indoor pool and launderette caused problems for weaker candidates.

Surprisingly, the word toy (museum) seemed unknown by many, and this was often inadequately rendered by *Kindermuseum* / *Spielmuseum*. *Passau* was often mispronounced, as was *Donau*. On the Austrian border was not always adequately expressed. The final bullet point asked candidates to explain why this was such an ideal place for a family holiday. Most candidates did this at least adequately.

Role-play D: The Caves of Nottingham

This role-play, a visitor attraction, was the least frequently used. Numbers seem to cause candidates difficulties on a regular basis, but are crucial. 1994 / over a quarter of a million / 15th century proved troublesome for some. The second sentence was not done well. Many expressed what one could see and experience in the caves at least adequately. Clarity of expression suffered on occasions (*die Höhlen haben in 1994 begonnen* / *das war die Gerberei, wo die Leute machen Bier* / *Nottinghams entspannende Geschichte* / *die Höhle kostet £4.50*). The final sections concerning the Audio-Guides and entrance charges were done reasonably well.

Conclusion

By offering the weaker candidate the chance to express some basics and challenging the stronger candidate to use initiative and imagination, the role-play is a good test. The level of language heard was as in previous series. Weak candidates restrict themselves to simple sentence patterns/ *es gibt*/ forms of the verb *sein*, and they often have difficulties with basic verb forms, agreement and word order. At the other end of the scale, strong candidates have not only a sound grasp of the basics, but also impress with their use of ambitious language and complex structures such as relative clauses, passives in the right context and subjunctives.

Topic

Topic discussions this series ranged from extremely impressive to very weak. As in previous series, most candidates were well prepared for this part of the examination. Presentations were mostly well timed at between two and three minutes, and fewer lasted longer than the maximum three minutes. Teacher/examiners are again reminded that in such cases they **must** intervene after three minutes. The topic discussion should last 7-8 minutes and follow the headings on the Oral Topic Form, starting with the first heading. Most headings should be covered during the course of the discussion but not at the expense of good timing. Oral Topic Forms should be sent to markers and moderators with the Working Mark Sheets (WMS), cassettes and Attendance Register. WMS should be sent in recording order.

Discussions should encourage much spontaneity and an important role of the teacher/examiner should be to explore statements made by candidates. Generalisations should be challenged (not all Germans eat *Grünkohl* or play football) and examples asked for. The best discussions are those where a great deal of genuine interchange takes place. This occurs naturally when discussions have not been over-rehearsed. Unfortunately, some centres still allow pre-rehearsed mini-monologues to take place where there is little or no spontaneity. Such candidates penalise themselves on 1E, often severely. A good oral examiner prevents candidates from delivering a series of pre-rehearsed statements and encourages them to speak naturally. A series of prompts from teacher/examiners followed by a series of statements from candidates with no interaction means there cannot be spontaneity.

Almost all topics this series related to a German-speaking country. Those candidates choosing topics where no reference to Germany/ Austria/ Switzerland takes place restrict themselves to a maximum of 8/20 on 1D. Teacher/examiners allowing candidates to offer such topics are advised to read the Specification. Headings on the Oral Topic Forms were often well presented. They should be headings, not sentences, and limited to a few words. Their only function is to remind both candidate and examiner of the outline structure of the discussion. It is counterproductive to regard the headings as an excuse for a mini-essay. Timing of the topic (presentation and discussion combined) was often good. Centres are again reminded that overlong topics gain the candidates no further marks as assessment ceases after ten minutes.

Thankfully, the number of candidates offering *das deutsche Schulsystem* seems to have declined, although *Essen und Trinken / Weihnachten in Deutschland* feature regularly. Too often, these lack depth and prove to be GCSE-type topics treated in a superficial way. Angela Merkel is gaining popularity whereas Michael Schumacher seems to be on the decline. One is not better than the other: both excellent and weak discussions were heard on both people. Films are also becoming more popular, although, as with literary texts, more than a mere treatment of the plot is required. Individual and unusual topic choices such as *die deutsche Photographie / Geburtenzahl in Deutschland / „Heimat“ / die deutsche Pharmaindustrie* often reveal excellent private research. Markers and moderators are grateful to those centres offering a range of topics. Centres where all or most candidates offer the same topic are greeted with less than enthusiasm. Centres should encourage candidates to research in depth some aspect with a German perspective and for the purposes of the speaking test become an expert in that particular field. Just to have a mild interest in a topic but to have done no research does little to impress.

Some discussions were excellent and very well informed. Others often included seemingly random statements with little in terms of depth of factual knowledge. Pronunciation remains a problem and 3/5 is a common mark, where candidates have yet to conquer some or all of the ei/ie/st/sp/ch/r/z sounds. Accuracy relating to subject/verb agreement, verb forms and cases is still a major difficulty with weaker candidates, as are verb second idea and word order in subordinate clauses.

To hear successful interchanges of ideas and opinions in the foreign language is a rewarding experience for teachers and examiners. Many topic discussions do achieve this. The best discussions are lively, enthusiastic, spontaneous, full of factual details on the chosen topic and accurate. Candidates can, and often do, research a particular topic well. The internet and written sources often provide excellent information. However, this information is often in a non-spoken format which sounds inauthentic if simply learnt by heart and regurgitated. One of the candidates' main tasks is to process this information into a form which sounds natural in an oral context. They should, for the purposes of this part of the examination, become an expert on some aspect of a German-speaking country which engages them and which they can explain in a lively way.

Report to Centres

2662 German Listening, Reading and Writing 1, June 2007

General Comments

The candidature of some 2,200 has remained reasonably constant since June 2006. Unlike the January examination where there is a considerable minority of native speakers, the candidature in June is composed mainly of students whose mother tongue is English. It is thus particularly satisfying to be able to report that there were many scripts of a really high standard. The marks obtained covered the whole range from the teens to the maximum, but very poor scripts were few and far between. Candidates have become quite sophisticated in organising their time round the varying demands of this paper, and it was rare to find a script incomplete because of lack of time. Similarly there were very few rubric errors. Candidates seemed to find the paper accessible, and tackled it with a degree of confidence. A general comment would be that their understanding of spoken and written German is at a high level: problems arise with their construction of written German, in particular with case, gender, prepositions and word order. The rendering of the German passage into English caused particular problems this year for some candidates (see below).

Specific Comments

1: *Das Wetter*

This listening passage proved accessible to most candidates but errors with the numbers and alphabet proved all too frequent. In particular *ZDR* proved difficult for a good number of candidates. Also some did not listen carefully enough to render the final answer of 27 for (b). On the other hand most were able to render the telephone number correctly. These early questions have to be tested in a non-verbal way: therefore examiners are likely to make frequent use of numbers and the alphabet.

2: *Die Deutschland-Rad-Tour*

Most candidates scored well on this question, with questions (a) and (e) posing what difficulties there were. The varying nationalities and names necessary for an international event did not prove problematic.

3: *Welche Pizza macht mich fett?*

This question too proved very accessible with most candidates scoring well. Many of the questions have a similar format, and those candidates who score particularly well are those who read carefully enough and have a wide-enough vocabulary to differentiate between what are often minor changes. Question (s) was the only one to be misunderstood by a significant number of candidates: perhaps because of a lack of comprehension of *ab und zu?*

4: *Auf dem Weg zum deutschen Popstar*

This question proved to be more accessible to candidates this year. Those who understood the passage well were more often able to capitalize on this understanding as the grammar content of the gap-filling questions was not too challenging. Thus the question proved to be a good and effective discriminator of its type. The most common error was in question (i) with a substantial minority of candidates having the *Deutsch-Türken* beginning their careers in a disco rather than in Turkey.

5: *Frau Klinge am Telefon*

This question tackles both the listening skills of the candidates, and their ability to communicate the answers in German. The first part of the exercise they achieved with relatively little difficulty, whereas the second part proved more challenging. Examiners are mindful of the fact that this is a listening exercise, and are therefore prepared to accept versions that a sympathetic native speaker would be prepared to understand. The quality of German seemed mostly of a reasonable standard. In (a) most candidates did not realize that *Lebensmittelfirma* should be rendered as a compound noun, and perhaps inevitably in (b) the complaint for some was about churches rather than cherries. Perhaps understandably *Streik* in (e) caused difficulties for many, although in the second half of this question candidates seemed to understand the import of a *Kühlanlage*, even though correct spelling eluded a significant number. Most candidates correctly identified the 50% and 30% in (f) and (g) respectively, and most grasped the significance of (h). In question (i) it was vital for the candidates to not only understand but also effectively render into German who was delivering what to whom. Several examiners commented that incredibly *Blumen* did not seem to be understood by a significant minority. Question (j) was not found difficult, and candidates seemed to understand the significance of question (k) with a pleasing number understanding *versichert*. However, *zurückkriegen* was often not correctly spelt, either because of the misplaced umlaut, or failure to render the *ie* correctly. Here examiners were quite willing to accept suitable synonyms such as *bekommen*. Grammatically the most successful candidates are those who can manipulate persons and adjectives effectively as in questions (i) and (k). Time spent practising such skills on such questions would be well spent. Nevertheless there were many pleasing answers, and generally speaking candidates seem to be getting to grips with this challenging type of exercise.

6. World of Work –Reading

The format of this type of question is now well-established. Candidates are always asked to write a memo for their employer. Although they will not be penalized for translating, it will allow the rendering to flow much better, and therefore be more cogent if the memo style is adopted. It was very marked this year that some candidates, even some quite able ones, disadvantaged themselves by giving a rendering that was much too free. Examiners have a very precise mark scheme which follows the text exactly, and candidates who miss out whole chunks, or who change the order without good reason are usually heading for disaster. This question accounts for a quarter of the marks for the whole paper and on this evidence a significant number need to spend more time on practising this skill. *Käufer*, *Warenhaus* and *Kette* all proved difficult for candidates, although in the case of *Warenhaus* they were obviously not penalized twice if the error was repeated. *Beeindruckt*, *geschmackvoll*, *schätzen* and *absetzen* all proved difficult for some, but the major difficulty was the correct rendering of the various types of crockery mentioned. It was disappointing that a significant number of candidates did not render correctly *im Laufe des Jahres*, failing to recognize the genitive ending and assuming that a word ending in 's' must necessarily be plural. Candidates are again reminded that they should put in all the relevant information, and should practise beginnings and endings of formal letters in English. Many candidates were able to combine the necessary accuracy from the foreign language with the high level of competence in English grammar, punctuation and spelling required for very high marks, and examiners commented that the standard of English generally seemed higher this year.

7. Letter to Herr Schmidt

This letter is invariably topped and tailed for the candidates, and they do themselves no favours by inserting their (sometimes incorrect) beginnings and endings. It cannot be stressed too much that this question is always part of the 'World of Work' section of the paper, and thus this letter **must** be written in the polite form. It is appreciated that pupils are taught 'du' and 'dein' from a very early age, but 6th form study requires the mastery of a more formal genre. As this is invariably a business-orientated letter, revision of the adjectives and pronouns associated with the polite form (Sie, Ihr, Ihnen etc.) will pay dividends. Small is beautiful, and the most successful candidates can answer the task very well by constructing the bare minimum of perfectly formed sentences. This is not primarily a vocabulary exercise: candidates will (and generally did) find most of the words they need in question 6. In this respect there has been a significant improvement over the last few years. Many failed, however, to thank for the letter, which should be standard practice material. The idea of enclosing the brochure was often lost and there was often no distinction between supplying and making the goods, although it was heartening to note a significant minority of candidates who not only knew but could manipulate *herstellen*. It is worth reiterating that candidates disadvantage themselves by quoting pre-learnt sentences and formulaic constructions of doubtful relevance to the task in hand. There were, however, quite a number of delightfully concise and accurate answers. Otherwise this question produced the usual range of German of varying competence, although examiners noted that overall the standard of German seems to be steadily improving.

Principal Examiner's Report: May 2007
AS German: Reading & Writing 2663
PE: Hazel Sutcliffe

1 General Comments

This session's paper seems to have been set at an appropriate level for it has produced a full range of responses. Candidates are by now familiar with the demands of these tasks, so there are rarely rubric infringements. The new format of Q.4 - the Cloze Test - seems to have posed no difficulties, except for the very few candidates who ignored the instruction to turn over at the bottom of page 9. The candidates are not pressed for time on this paper, as is illustrated by the length and thoughtfulness evident in many of the responses to Q.3. Examiners were of the opinion that standards are still improving.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- 1 Identifying the seven correct statements about Matthias Schoch proved to be quite a demanding task. Only the most competent and careful candidates achieved full marks because a detailed study of the text was required. A surprising number were led astray by **(b)**, confusing *Gymnasiast* as someone who did gymnastics rather than as a grammar school pupil, although this was reinforced by the mention of the actual school in the next couple of lines. **(i)** and **(l)** were often ticked incorrectly: not, one suspects, because of comprehension problems but through insufficiently careful reading. **(m)** was also a frequent choice, as *geschwänzt* seems not to be in every AS students vocabulary.
- 2 The matching of beginnings and ends of sentences is a daunting task for many candidates but there were some who achieved full marks here, whilst failing to do so in Q.1. Some of the weakest candidates just guess. It was difficult to observe a pattern to the wrong answers except in 4 where **H** was frequently chosen and **M** for 9. This task produced the full range of marks.
- 3 This text about a car sharing project in a German town was generally well understood and most candidates managed to achieve 5 or 6 of the available 14 comprehension points for **(i)**. Marking was generous where candidates had referred to *Sonnhild Breitling* rather than to the organisation in general, except where they had incorrectly credited her with founding the organisation ten years ago! There were a few very accessible points concerning numbers but the least frequently achieved, and the most complex, was point 11 on the mark scheme explaining the success of the venture.

There were two questions for **(ii)**. Candidates were not penalized if they did not address both, but it seemed rather perverse on their part to ignore such a straightforward question as *Wie reist man am besten?* Most had sufficient vocabulary at their command to express their own ideas on the subject, although some candidates interpreted car sharing in the English sense of the term – i.e. people getting together to commute - which slightly missed the point. Most candidates elaborated on points from the text and the essays were therefore perhaps slightly less original and lively than in the previous series. The majority seemed to agree that this venture is a good idea but they probably would not want to do it themselves! It is always worth reminding candidates that there are equal marks available for parts (i) and (ii) of this question and that an excessively lengthy answer to (i) cannot compensate for a four line answer to part (ii) and vice versa.

The Language is assessed over both parts (i) and (ii) according to Grid 3A. Most Examiners agree that the general ability to communicate is improving, but always comment on what seems to be an unnecessary lack of accuracy in basic grammar: incorrect subject/verb agreements, genders of common items of vocabulary, use of prepositions and capital letters. These sorts of errors and difficulties with basic word-order often occur in work that contains sophisticated constructions.

The level of language produced in the two parts of Q.3 is also often uneven: some candidates have learned to manipulate the language of the text well for the first part but then collapse when it comes to expressing their own ideas whilst others are clearly more at home with their own ideas and struggle to summarise the text. It is pleasing to note how few candidates tried to lift their answers directly from the text. Some, at the other end of the scale, need to be reminded that they are expected to manipulate what is there and not to struggle to find synonyms throughout – especially for numbers! Many do not exploit the Cloze Test sufficiently for alternative vocabulary nor for clarification of the content of the text. Candidates should always be encouraged to check their work and look for help from both the text and the Cloze, especially for spelling, gender and plural forms. The most glaring example in this series was the word *Projekt*, which despite appearing in bold as the title, complete with gender, could re-emerge as *der*, *die* or *das*, and sometimes all three alternatives, in candidates' work. Spelling was not always consistent either.

Some of the other common problems in this examination series were:

- Confusion between *eigenes* / *einiges*.
- Because *Mitglieder* appeared in the dative plural in the text, many candidates reproduced it with *-n* even though it was no longer in the dative case.
- There was an obvious need for 'public transport' as an item of vocabulary but it did not appear either in the text or the Cloze and many candidates struggled to render it comprehensibly.
- *Ökologisch* was separated from *sinnvoll* and used as an equivalent of *umweltfreundlich*
- *Kaum* was not widely understood, and this led to misinterpretations in the final sentence of the text.
- Every possible gender and adjectival ending in the rendering of *eine gute Idee*
- Several perennials like *überall* which is often used to mean 'over all', *mann* instead of *man*, which seems to occur with increasing frequency, and the subsequent drift into *sie* / *Sie* / *du* forms, *das* and *dass* are often confused.

- 4 This task was done better than usual this series with the vast majority of candidates achieving over half marks. It seemed to correlate better with the mark for language in Q.3 than previously. The main stumbling blocks were in **3** where *wegen* was the most frequent incorrect choice. *Da* would be a useful addition to most candidates' conjunction armoury! The separable verb *zunehmen* in **6** caused problems for many, as did the tense in **7**. In **5** most identified *sein* as the correct possessive for *man* but did not transfer this to their own writing, where most seem at a loss when a possessive for *man* is required.

2664: German Speaking and Reading – General Comments

It was felt by many of our regular team of examiners that there had again been an improvement in candidate performance this year, and it is certainly true to say that most Centres and candidates are by now thoroughly familiar with the format and demands of this particular examination. It was particularly pleasing to hear less in the way of “text lifting”, by which is meant merely reading out parts of the text without manipulation or “own words”, and fewer “unprepared” candidates, that is to say people who for whatever reason do not prepare a topic but waffle vaguely on the general subject of their title. Very few candidates fail to deal with aspects of life in a German speaking country as required by the Specification, and similarly nearly all Centres are now aware that an “up-to-date” topic is required, in other words one dealing with current issues or at least events or issues relevant within the past seven years. It is sometimes regretted that literary topics are precluded by this regulation, but this need not be the case if a modern writer is chosen, or one whose themes or influence can be linked to the present day situation. One appropriate example this year was “Die Günter Grass-Kontroverse”.

As far as the questions on the text offered on the Examiner’s sheet are concerned, it is worth repeating that these are merely a guideline as to what might be asked and not a script to be followed by the teacher. The teacher-examiner’s task is to elicit as much information as possible from the candidate on each of the four paragraphs, and this is certainly not possible simply using the four suggested questions, which are a bare minimum. There was also another slightly worrying development this year, though one that has fortunately not spread to many Centres. It is by now well known that the text is divided into four paragraphs and that each paragraph must be addressed, at least briefly, for maximum marks to be accessed on Grid 4a (Understanding of Article). This being the case, some candidates are obviously being encouraged to write out a summary of the main points of each paragraph during the twenty minutes’ preparation time and to read these out as their “responses” in part one of the examination. The worst example was an examiner who merely said: “Fassen Sie den Text zusammen!” and then sat back. This approach will attract very few marks indeed on grid 4b (Response to Examiner) and is thus to be avoided at all costs. Even an extremely fluent candidate who does not take part in any interchange with the examiner and is not offered any “unexpected” or challenging questions can expect to lose some marks. This applies still more to the equivalent responsiveness grid for the topic conversation (4c).

There are still some Centres who encourage their candidates to pre-learn their responses to “prepared” questions on their topics. Please note that anything that sounds like “written German” will attract very few marks on this criterion. Anecdotal evidence from OCR’s team of examiners suggests that pronunciation has improved this year, grammar perhaps less noticeably so, that there are fewer problems with bad recordings and lack of paperwork, whilst there are fewer “general” topics such as Umwelt, Drogen and Internet that are difficult to relate to Germany. It is not enough for the examiner to add “in Deutschland” to all his or her questions, if the information offered is not actually specific to Germany. Some tests are far too long, and please remember the maximum time, which should be 18 minutes. Overall, however, things appear to have gone well.

Comments on Individual Questions

Text Discussion

A Die Familie ist nur zweite Wahl

This text proved to be slightly more difficult to come to terms with than the other two, possibly because the information did not always appear in the obvious order. However, there were some excellent performances, and as usual, if examiners approached it carefully enough, even weaker students could make something positive out of it, especially as the general topic of family and relationships was familiar, even from as far back as GCSE oral days. The last of the “general issue” suggested questions, dealing with the nature and success of opinion polls, which had been expected to be more difficult, was surprisingly frequently asked, and, encouragingly enough, often very effectively tackled.

Some examiners came up with some excellent re-phrasings of the suggested questions or invented their own (as is the intention, of course). For example:
Helfen uns solche Umfragen, die Probleme der Gesellschaft besser zu verstehen?
Wären die Ergebnisse einer ähnlichen Umfrage in England auch ähnlich?
Welche Wirkung hat die moderne Gesellschaft auf unsere Verhältnisse miteinander?

Similarly, some candidates provided excellent simplifications of the text by way of explanation. For example, when referring to the “Studie” (which, incidentally, still far too many people mispronounce as “Shtoodee”, despite the fact that this is commented upon most years), one candidate explained correctly in simple German: zuerst war sie in einem Jugendklub und dann wurde sie größer”, whereas most people did not explain this at all. Referring to the role of the opinion pollster, one candidate just called him “ein Experte” and another was able to produce “er weiß, wie man die Ergebnisse interpretieren soll”, whereas again many people were satisfied with quoting the text (incorrectly): er ist “einem erfahrenen Meinungsforscher”.

In the text itself some points to note were as follows:

- some candidates did not realise young people **wanted** a better relationship with their fathers
- numbers were mostly well done
- some points were missed out, such as mention of the questionnaire that the youngsters produced, the fact that the respondents were less disappointed with their families than the interviewers had expected and the suggestion that girls need a lot of attention!
- pronunciation was poor in Beziehung, Studie, körperliche Nähe and Kai Ziesemer, (the “Meinungsforscher”)
- difficult vocabulary items to understand, use, re-word or manipulate were: sich wenden an, stichhaltig machen, am häufigsten, Lob, Anerkennung, Vorfälle, Vernachlässigung and Untreue.

B Operation Schönheit

This text seemed to work well and stimulated some interesting discussions on the pros and cons of cosmetic surgery, not least some lively debates about the “improvement” (or not!) in Michael Jackson’s appearance since his operations.

The example in the text was not quite so well handled, as firstly Chiara Ohoven was hard to pronounce, though some people had evidently heard of her, or described her as “eine Prominente”, and secondly because Chiara’s “wenig vorteilhaft aussehende Lippen” suffered considerable further abuse at the hands of some of our candidates!

Only the better candidates were able to convey the first paragraph in any detail. Some text items that were not always mentioned were the fact that Barbara BÜchner had written a book, the question that the plastic surgeons tend to ask prospective patients, the point that operations are often recommended for children who are “permanent verspottet” and the fact that that these operations can be paid for by the Krankenkasse only “unter Umständen”.

Some examiners found neat additional questions to encourage focus upon a specific part of the text, for example: wie häufig sind diese Operationen? or Unter welchen Umständen werden Operationen empfohlen?

Some candidates found quite charming responses, for example the candidate who when asked if she would have plastic surgery in the future replied: “Obgleich ich nicht die schönste bin, würde ich das nie machen lassen!”

Examiners also came up with some good additional general questions, though the three on offer seemed quite popular and it was good to hear some good economic debates on “who should pay”. Some of the general questions encountered included: Was für ein Schönheitsbild wird in den Medien gezeigt?

Was für Menschen findest du schön? and Was sollte ein junger Mensch machen, der denkt, dass er oder sie nicht gut aussieht?

In the text there were not many major difficulties, though

- “aussehende” was misunderstood as “sticking out”
- “abstehende”, the correct word from the text, was overlooked
- “Chirurgen “ proved difficult to pronounce
- “Nase” was, surprisingly, also often mispronounced

C **Mobilitätstag**

This text also worked well and led to some lively discussions. Most parts of the text were well covered, though sometimes some quite easy points were inexplicably left out, such as for example the details of what the various classes learned during the project or details of Claudia's "accident". The very last point about the youngest children handing over warning notices "direkt an die Verkehrssünder" was not well understood, or at least rarely mentioned, and the point about adult pedestrians in Germany not always waiting before crossing the road "bei Rot" was thought to refer to car drivers, possibly a cultural point that would not necessarily be obvious unless you had visited Germany, though perhaps a sharp-eyed candidate might have noticed it was "gehen" not "fahren". There were some good "own words", such as: "der Unterricht wurde je nach Alter organisiert"; or "es war nicht tragisch" or "es was keine Tragödie" instead of "kein Desaster"; "es war ein virtueller Unfall" and, unfortunately, "es war nur eine Stimulation" (sic)!

As in all three texts this year the numbers were handled a lot better than usual, though some of them were admittedly fairly easy. However, 2637 caused some slight difficulty. As far as the "general issues" were concerned, it was quite gratifying how well the final suggested question: Ist das Auto ein Segen oder ein Fluch?" was handled, frequently without even being re-worded. There were some quite good additional questions from teacher examiners, amongst them: Ist 17 zu jung zu fahren? Könnten wir ohne Autos leben? Was könnten wir machen, um die Zahl der Toten auf den Strassen zu reduzieren? Wäre es nicht besser, öffentliche Verkehrsmittel zu benutzen?

In the text itself the following caused some difficulty:

- Ich trinke nie Alkohol, which was taken, surprisingly, to mean "I won't drink alcohol (again)"
- Sucht-Prävention (pronunciation)
- Erste Hilfe, which wasn't always recognised as meaning "First Aid"
- Vocabulary of the final paragraph, as mentioned above

Topic Discussion

Few centres now get all their candidates to prepare the same topic and there also seemed to be relatively few centres encouraging pre-learned material, or material that sounds like "written German": both very good developments. Some centres still list 3 sub-topics and discuss all three, which is not a good idea, nor is it permissible to prepare only one topic for discussion. Prepare two, and discuss one or two on the day is the best advice. There was a nice variety of topics from many Centres and a lot of candidates showed a great deal of creativity in the way they tackled them. There was an interesting one on "Dentistry in Germany", for example. Some candidates had issued their own "Fragebogen" to base their topic around, and one person had even received 40 replies. This would be something for other centres to encourage. Most information was up-to-date and the "seven year" rule in the specification was mostly adhered to. Please remember that opinions are also important, if based on the factual knowledge offered, but opinions without a sound knowledge base are worth very little.

Principal Examiner's Report: June 2007

2665

Advanced GCE German: Listening, Reading and Writing 2

PE: Elizabeth Hamilton

General Comments

Examiners had the impression that this year's paper was set at an appropriate level, with candidates performing much as they expected. Although some candidates clearly found the whole paper over-challenging, the majority of candidates coped well and many impressed examiners with their good command of German. There was evidence that candidates had sufficient time to complete all the questions and check their work, although not all did so. In general, candidates found the Listening section rather more challenging than the Reading and Writing sections. Some candidates had difficulty in fitting their answers into the space provided, despite the instruction on the front cover, and would be well advised to draft their answers in rough first. Many candidates also seemed not to consider the fact that if only one line is given for an answer, then a short answer, rather than one continuing for three or four lines is required.

Comments on Individual Questions

Listening

In general, candidates lost marks if they simply transcribed what they heard without really thinking about what the question was asking. This meant a loss not only of comprehension marks, but also of language marks, as the lengthy phrases written down usually contained numerous language errors as well as demonstrating a lack of understanding. Some candidates went through the questions first, highlighting or circling key words, which gave them a clear focus before they started to listen.

Aufgabe 1

- 1a** Many candidates were able to gain this mark, although *geprobt* was clearly not always known or understood. The spelling of *Theater* also caused some problems.
- 1b** *Wofür* clearly puzzled some candidates. Those who did understand often missed the point because they failed to mention that it was her role in a film. For those who decided to use it, *Darstellerin* often presented problems. A number of candidates were unable to distinguish between *his* and *her*.
- 1c** Most candidates attempted to transcribe what they heard, but many lost the mark through writing down *Türken* rather than *Türkin*.
- 1d** *wirklichkeitsnäher* proved elusive for some. More able candidates demonstrated understanding by using *realistischer*. Examiners only accepted answers which showed some sort of comparison.
- 1e** This question was usually answered well, although a few candidates, failing to see that it was a linguistic problem that they should focus on, included much irrelevant material, full of language errors.
- 1f** Most candidates gained this point although many were not able to express themselves succinctly.
- 1g** This was answered well, although occasionally candidates appeared to believe that the word *liberal* had something to do with *Liebe*.
- 1h** Candidates unsure of the spelling, or meaning, of *Vielfalt* were wise to paraphrase their answer, as otherwise they risked losing the mark.
- 1i** Most candidates were able to gain this mark, although the spelling of *wäre* sometimes suggested a lack of understanding.

Aufgabe 2

Marks for this task, apart from for **b** and **c** were harder to attain, and less competent candidates, despite writing down a great deal of what they thought they heard, failed to score well.

- 2a** Although the word *Egozentrik*, being a cognate, was not hard to identify, many candidates lost the mark by writing down an answer that did not make sense. Less wise candidates attempted to transcribe the word *geprägt*, which emerged with many spellings, *geprickt* appearing most often.
- 2d** Answers to this question were usually very long, only a minority identifying the word *geschickt* correctly. There were many who thought it had something to do with history.
- 2e** This mark was gained by very few candidates, as although many identified *Vorteile, in unserer Leistungsgesellschaft* tended to be omitted.
- 2f** *Vor allem*, although not tested as such, appeared unfamiliar to a surprising number of candidates. The verb *verwirklichen* was not always understood.
- 2g** The word *anfällig* proved a barrier to understanding for many, and resulted in many strange transcriptions.
- 2h** A number of candidates gained at least one of these two marks, although *fühlen* was frequently rendered as *füllen*, *Ereignisse* was often not known, and *reagieren* was often thought to have connections with the government.
- 2i** As was to be expected, the word **nicht** was often ignored, and not many candidates were able to express their answer correctly.

Reading

Aufgabe 3

Most candidates scored quite well on this text, although examiners were struck by the number of candidates, who lost language marks because of poor copying of words that appeared in the text and a disregard for capital letters. *Zahnarzt* was commonly misspelt, as was *Weihnachten*. Strong verbs caused some problems, the past participles of *bekommen* and *vorschlagen* often appearing as *bekommt* and *vorgeschlacht*, the latter even appearing in its correct form half an inch away in the question. The present tense of the verb *lesen* proved a challenge for some, and there were quite a few candidates who appeared not to know the third person singular verb ending. One candidate, puzzlingly, answered in the third person plural throughout. As in the listening tasks, *his* and *her* were not always known. The rubric at the beginning, instructing candidates not to copy out long sections and to use their own words as far as possible, was ignored by some and interpreted too literally by others, who, quite unnecessarily tried to find synonyms for everything. As a rule questions are phrased so that manipulation of the given language is required to answer a question succinctly. The most successful candidates were those who had the linguistic skills to do this.

- 3a** Some candidates thought she wanted to become a dentist, otherwise most answered this question correctly.
- 3b** Surprisingly, very few candidates understood *Wozu?*, with the majority thinking they were being asked where she was going. One candidate indignantly wrote "*Nicht im Text!!!*" as an answer to this question.
- 3f** This question appeared to confuse some candidates, who failed to gain the point by simply copying out "*Protestieren bringt nichts*"
- 3g** A number of candidates failed to identify *Arbeitsmöglichkeit* as the key word, and wrote about the *Arbeitslosengeld* instead, or as well.
- 3e** There was frequent confusion of the pronouns *sie* and *sich*, otherwise most understood this.
- 3m** The separable prefix *ab* sometimes meant that the question was misunderstood, but many managed to answer this correctly.

Aufgabe 4

Despite the fact that *Azubi* has appeared in previous papers, it was new to some. A number of candidates thought it was a foreigner, perhaps confusing it with *Asylbewerber*. The majority of candidates were able to explain these five concepts, although it was clear that many believed *Job*, *Stelle* and *Beruf* to be synonymous.

Exercise 5

Only one candidate this year ignored the rubric and answered all the questions in German, although, strangely enough, a few candidates answered **c** in the wrong language. This exercise discriminated well: it was rare for candidates to score very badly, and there were a number of candidates who gained full marks, generally not the German native speakers, as they were often imprecise in their answers or did not have the appropriate English vocabulary. A number of English native speakers had difficulty in answering questions directly, as well. The word *paradoxical* in **g** seemed to cause a few problems, although *mangelnden Nachwuchts* was also a stumbling block in this question. Question **h** clearly asked about children's **physical** condition, which sparked off many answers about Play Stations and birthday parties. Many also lost marks in this question through not knowing *Bewegung* or not thinking it necessary to mention that there was a **lot** of illness. One candidate insisted that there was nothing in the text about their physical condition. In **j**, although the question clearly asked about **eating** habits, there were a surprising number who talked about aggression, depression, hyperactivity etc. Many also lost a mark here for rendering *nichts mehr zu essen* as "eating too little". Questions **a**, **b(ii)**, **c(i)**, **d**, **e**, **f**, and **i** were very often correctly answered, the phrase *materiellen Mangel* causing some problems in **b(i)** (even when *Mangel* was understood it was frequently rendered as "lack of materials") and the word *Rente* in **cii** often causing difficulty. Not surprisingly, **k** was answered correctly only by the better candidates, although the second mark was scored by many.

Writing

Aufgabe 6

The issue of student fees was clearly close to the hearts of candidates and nearly all found plenty to say about it when asked for their own opinion. While complaining bitterly about the fees, most felt that they were necessary and mentioned improvements to the universities. It was clear from answers to question (v) that many Centres train their students to learn and include set phrases to express their opinions and also to try to use subordinate clause and a variety of tenses. The candidate who wrote "*Man kann nicht sagen, dass ich eine schlechte Ausbildung bekommen hätte, wenn ich 1977 auf die Uni gegangen wäre*" must be applauded for showing off his/her tenses. This certainly helped to raise individual candidates' marks, particularly if they found it difficult to express concepts in (i) to (iv). There was often a wide gap between the standard of the language skills in the personal statement and in the answers to the first four questions. The language required to convey "to ask for", "charge" "forbid" "overturn", "rule" and "decree" was too much for some, and there were answers that made little sense. The word "loans" was rarely known and a few invented the word *Lohnen*. However, the better candidates were more skilled at paraphrasing and sidestepping the problems. Overall this exercise provided a good indicator of candidates' ability.

Report 2666

AL German Culture and Society Essay Paper June 2007

General Comments

At this year's examination there were 172 candidates whose essays covered nearly all the topics and texts set on the paper. The range of achievement was similarly wide, as far as both knowledge of the subject matter and linguistic competence were concerned. Candidates at the top of the range produced some excellent essays, which showed an impressive command of grammar and idiom and a thoughtful analysis and perceptive evaluation of their detailed knowledge. A relatively small percentage at the bottom of the range had very little information to offer and lacked the linguistic skills to communicate it. At this level and among many much more competent candidates there were surprising gaps in knowledge of vocabulary and only a very hazy grasp of the gender and spelling of common words, even those which could fairly be described as essential topic vocabulary. Case endings and the use of prepositions also presented problems. Although there were mistakes in word order, most candidates at this level seem to have a creditably good basic understanding of German syntax. Verb conjugations, however, were often not known, particularly those of modal verbs or when using the passive.

Two points are especially important for candidates' success in tackling this paper: a good detailed factual knowledge of the text or topic and in the case of the topic it must be factual knowledge about the target country, plus an ability to address the question and use relevantly the factual information that they do have. Analysis and evaluation have to be based on sound knowledge. For native speaker candidates it is important they be familiar with the rubric and do not attempt more than two questions. They should note that paraphrasing the extract on the examination paper from a text they have not read cannot gain marks.

The most popular literary text by far was *Andorra*, followed by *Der Besuch der alten Dame* and then *Die Verwandlung* and *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*. Among the non-literary topics *Gesundheit* in Deutschland accounted for nearly a third of the essays. The next most popular topics were *Deutschland 1919-1933*, *Die Medien*, *Das deutsche Kino* and *Eine Gegend oder eine Stadt in deutschen Sprachraum*.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

Q. 1 a/b All candidates chose (b). Most answers were good and many excellent, analysing how the violence of press and state, represented by the police, produced the catastrophic destruction of a personality which ended in murder. The better answers dealt with the effects on the Blornas and only a few examined the role of Sträubleder and the misuse of political power.

Q.2 a/b One answer to (a). It is important to examine the social circumstances of both families and not just rely on the extract. Karin's parents' support of and involvement in the DDR state and their disapproval socially and politically of Frank's family are a major factor in the problems of the young people's relationship.

- Q.3 a/b** Answers to (a) were disappointing in that they tended to narrate and describe and there was little evaluation of the reasons for the advantages or otherwise of Shen Te's decision and any conclusion was lacking. Most candidates chose (b) and were well aware of Brecht's aims in general and in particular. The most successful answers were those that used the Epilog and the title as starting points for a careful analysis of relevant parts of the text. References to Brecht's use of the *Verfremdungseffekt* were sometimes made without relating it to the question.
- Q.4 a/b** Candidates' essays were fairly evenly divided between the two questions and there were many perceptive and well-reasoned answers. Some candidates failed to refer to the moments in the play which might show the emotional reasons behind Ill's statement in (i) and the answer to (ii) focussed on narrating the events rather than Ill's attitude to them. The answers to (b) varied similarly, with only a minority fully explaining the techniques used by Dürrenmatt in each act.
- Q.5 a/b** This was the most popular literary text and about two thirds of candidates chose (a). Knowledge of the text was good and the first question (i) was usually done competently, although analysis of the effects on his character did not always draw on all or enough of the instances in the text which reveal it. For (ii) answers varied in depth and in the aptness of the examples, but candidates mostly avoided simple description. A few candidates ignored the minor role played by the Mutter completely. Those candidates answering (b) began competently and tackled analysing the statement well. Some then lost focus on the title and narrated events in the plot rather than selecting examples.
- Q.6 a/b** Candidates knew the text very well and the reasons for Z's lie were well understood. The explanation of the Lehrer's actions the previous night was usually perceptive, although the evaluation of whether it is too late at this point was often ignored. Analyses of the extent of his guilt were sometimes disappointing. The second question was well answered by nearly all candidates and elicited some excellent analyses of the nature of the work as Bildungsroman and as a political and social commentary on the era.
- Q.7 a/b** All the essays were answers to (b). A good knowledge of the text was shown, but selection and analysis of the points which reveal changes in the sister's attitude sometimes amounted to a re-telling of the story and a few ignored both the very beginning and the end of the relationship. There were some excellent essays on this text.
- Q.8 a/b** There were no answers on this text in this series.

Section B

- Q.9** Candidates found this a very approachable question and there were many perceptive and detailed responses. There were excellent essays on ***Jugend ohne Gott***.
- Q.10** Both ***Andorra*** and ***Biedermann*** were texts chosen by candidates. Some essays on *Andorra* were no more than narration of the plot. In another case, the focus was on the characters of the Soldat and the Pater, as symbols of a male-dominated society. The reasoning was valid, but many relevant points about the principal characters and their relationships were ignored. For ***Biedermann*** the points made remained disappointingly superficial and descriptive.
- Q.11** Essays were on suitable texts, such as ***Mutter Courage***, where answers put forward cogent points about Brecht's aims in writing about this period, backed up with good reference to the text. An excellent response was made based on ***Im Westen nichts Neues***.
- Q.12** The question presented problems for some candidates answering on ***Andorra***. They were very uncertain about what they considered a rebellion and what were the interests of society and a clash with the individual. The reasoning was convoluted and unclear. This question is not an obviously good match for *Andorra* and their knowledge of the text would have been displayed to better advantage if they had tackled either of the question on the text in Section A. There was a similar problem for those tackling the question using ***Biedermann und die Brandstifter***: the answer was only successful if the individual and the society were clearly identified from the outset. Texts such as ***Ich fühle mich so fifty-fifty*** and ***Die Leiden des jungen Werther*** as well as ***Der Besuch der alten Dame*** and various ***Böll*** texts were more suitable works to consider in relation to this question.
- Q.13** One text examined here was Goethe's ***Die Leiden des jungen Werther*** and it provided appropriate and well-illustrated proof that the saying is not always true.
- Q.14** The only answer was based on ***Andorra*** and there was a clearly a misunderstanding of the question and a very unclear line of reasoning. Again the candidate's knowledge was not shown to the best advantage.

Section C

- Q.15 a/b** The answers to these questions were amongst the most competently done on the paper. Many candidates had a very good knowledge of the period and responded relevantly. There were still one or two who confused the economic crisis of 1923 with that of 1929. Some candidates failed in (a) to evaluate the responsibility of the political parties and merely described economic conditions and political events. Similarly in (b) the tendency was to concentrate on the economic consequences and neglect the political ones.
- Q.16 a/b** This topic was one of the four in second place as regards popularity of choice. Two thirds of the candidates chose (a). Several candidates writing on (b) chose to discuss new elements in television rather than other areas of the media, although there were some successful analyses of internet developments and dangers. It is important that candidates have information about factual developments in the German-speaking sphere and do not just write generally. The responses to (a) often consisted of very general comments about distraction from homework, alienation from friends, the negative effect of violent films without ever mentioning a German programme or film or giving any proof that these generalisations applied to Germany. It should be noted that essays which do not have a firm factual link with the target countries cannot be awarded more than 7 in the Poor category on Grids 6A and 6B.
- Q.17 a/b** This topic was one studied by nearly three times as many candidates as any other and more than half of them chose (b). The most successful essays were those which concentrated on the problems of young people as one of the classes most affected by alcoholism, as well as the unemployed. Candidates had more factual information to offer about young people and integrated this well into their general knowledge of the problem in Germany. For this topic too many candidates had little or know factual information to offer and the generalisations could be and are true of many countries. To gain good content marks on this paper specific factual information is needed and the general knowledge gleaned from a textbook or even from being a young but poorly informed native German is insufficient. The same holds good for answering question (a) adequately. The problems of those on drugs and their treatment were often couched in very general terms and there was no evidence of any knowledge of the target country. In addition, *Drogenmissbrauch* refers to abuse of illegal drugs, since alcohol and smoking are different sub-categories of this topic.
- Q.18 a/b** This topic was also in position of equal second most popular and was well done by most candidates. One third of the responses were on question (a) and this question was in general less successfully treated because there was insufficient consideration of the role of the director and the part played by the script in the actor's success. Candidates tended to concentrate on how good their chosen actor was and to describe rather than evaluate. For (b) most candidates did try to analyse the differences or similarities and only a minority narrated. A wide range of films had been viewed by candidates, although recent successes like ***Sophie Scholl, Der Untergang*** and ***Goodbye Lenin*** recurred often.
- Q.19 a/b** Few candidates had a good knowledge of how German sport is organised and how its practice is being encouraged, although some did mention the splendid World Cup organisation, without being able to be very specific even here. Answers to (b) showed that a number of candidates had researched the question of drugs and the well-known cases very well, but there were still many who gave neither dates nor details and who were unable to evaluate the success of any policy in place to fight drugs in sport.

Q.20 a/b Only five candidates tackled question (a) and most had insufficient knowledge of the measures put in place to make a valid evaluation of Germany's contribution to solving the problem. For (b) there were several very good answers, which showed sound knowledge of the measures which have been enacted, even though not all candidates evaluated rather than described.

Q.21 a/b A large variety of towns and a range of problems were described for (a) and in most cases analysed. Mostly reasons were given for the emergence of a chief problem, for instance, unemployment, immigrant workers, Aussiedler or flood problems. Surprisingly, a considerable number of candidates had failed to research their chosen town or area sufficiently to provide factual evidence to support their contentions. Far fewer attempted (b) and here the lack of firm proof for statements about the effects of technological development on the environment was very evident.

REPORT FOR PUBLICATION TO CENTRES

JUNE 2007

2667 GERMAN (COURSEWORK: CULTURE AND SOCIETY)

General Comments / Administrative Matters

Coursework remains the more popular option for candidates, many more opting for Coursework than the Written Paper. The majority of centres met the deadline for submission of coursework and complied with all the requirements concerning wordcounts, length, bibliographies, plans, mark sheets and authentication forms, enabling moderators to carry out their task efficiently. However, several moderators commented that they had encountered problems with centres not sending all that was required: there were examples of signatures missing, no bibliographies, cover sheets incorrectly filled in or lacking such details as names or candidate numbers and, perhaps most worryingly, the IMS incorrectly filled in. Occasionally candidates had not counted their words or had deliberately misled their teachers by giving a false word count, and there were several instances of moderators discovering that essays were far too short and should have been penalised. Conversely there were essays which were far too long and, again, should have been penalised. It was felt by moderators that there are still a few centres who seem unfamiliar with the 'Coursework Guidance for Teachers' booklet, multiple copies of which are sent out to all Centres.

The Level of Research

Many candidates clearly approached their topics with much personal engagement and enthusiasm, and the level of research and the quantity of information provided was impressive. They were not always as skilled at selecting their information and putting it together coherently. Where content marks had to be reduced by moderators it was very often because an essay was full of factual information but was lacking in focus or argument.

The Internet

Finding sufficient factual information is no longer a problem for candidates, and most rely on the Internet, with *Wikipedia* being the most popular provider of information. Bibliographies did not, however, always give full web page references, many candidates believing 'Wikipedia' to be sufficient. The number of candidates providing proper footnotes for their quotations was also rather low. This is an area in which Centres still need to train their students. There were several instances of plagiarism being discovered by moderators, an issue which Centres themselves need to be aware of. A Google search picks up plagiarised material quickly and easily. The other use some students appear to be making of the Internet is the translation tool. Unfortunately the 'German' that emerges is, to a large extent, incomprehensible. This resulted in some poor marks, both for language and for content (since it was largely unintelligible) this year. Fortunately there were not too many of these.

Choosing Topics

Many centres clearly encourage their students to pursue their own individual interests, which can lead to a range of totally different topics and titles from the whole centre. Some of this work is highly successful, and moderators were again impressed by the amount of individual research engaged in by candidates, as well as the support given by teachers in assistance with titles and plans and finding suitable source material. When given completely free rein, however, weaker candidates were occasionally unable to cope with the complexity of the language of their source material and did not perform so well. Clearly some centres address this problem by covering certain topics in class and then suggesting that candidates choose a particular aspect to investigate further. This approach, however, can lead to several candidates writing on the same topic, which is to be discouraged; this year, for instance, five from one centre wrote on the headscarf ban.

The most popular general topics were:

- Integration of foreigners/ multiculturalism
- Germany since reunification
- The Berlin Wall / issues leading to reunification (often not successful, as the approach tended to be too narrative)
- Environmental issues (particularly energy)
- Unemployment
- Neo-Nazis
- The Nazi period
- Sophie Scholl
- Dietary habits / the health of the Germans (often rather simplistic and not particularly successful)
- The influence of English on the Germ

Many centres chose to read and discuss a work of literature. Where all candidates wrote on the same book, success was variable. If there are very few candidates in a centre and the work in question has sufficient depth and richness to invite studies of totally different aspects, then it can lead to original essays. Sometimes, however, it was clear to moderators that students had been fed quotations and ideas in class that they then tried to reproduce in their essays, whether they understood them or not.

Works of literature studied included:

- Horvath: Jugend ohne Gott
- Schlink: Der Vorleser
- Brecht: Der kaukasische Kreidekreis
- Böll: Katharina Blum
- Dürrenmatt: Die Physiker
- Dürrenmatt: Der Richter und sein Henker
- Frisch: Andorra
- Frisch: Biedermann und die Brandstifter
- Wedekind: Frühlingserwachen
- Mann: Der Tod in Venedig

As in previous years, the two most popular films studied were Lola Rennt and Good Bye Lenin. Where just one or two candidates from a centre wrote on films, there was no problem, and fresh and interesting essays often emerged. However, it was clearly difficult for one or two large centres, all of whose candidates wrote on films, to identify sufficient variety of title. Inevitably there was some overlapping, and candidates often did not perform so well.

Titles

There seemed to be more language errors in titles this year, and also in plans, an area where teachers are allowed to help their students. Most titles fitted the plan and the essay. There were some instances, however, of titles, or sections of titles, being largely ignored, leading to poor marks for 6A1, which includes relevance to title. Occasionally it looked as though the essay had been written before the title: a rather rambling title would accompany a rather rambling essay. The importance of deciding upon a good title before the actual essay is written cannot be overemphasised. The best titles were clearly those that the candidate had developed together with the teacher, and that fitted the material the candidate had already researched. There were many good titles (not necessarily all answered well), which could have led to the development of an argument. It was pleasing to see that many centres are giving thought to the phrasing of titles in order to provoke a response that goes beyond the narrative. The majority of titles fell into this category.

Examples:

Inwiefern ist das Bild der Gesellschaft eine lebensnahe Schilderung der Zeitepoche?
Welche Rolle spielt die Lüge in 'Good Bye Lenin'?
Englische Wörter in deutscher Werbung: Etwas Positives?
Kann Neonazismus in Deutschland als eine Bedrohung der politischen Stabilität betrachtet werden?
Michael Schuhmacher: Held oder Bösewicht?
Inwiefern war das deutsche Volk für das Ende der DDR verantwortlich?
Arbeitslosigkeit: ein unlösbares Problem unserer Zeit?
Inwiefern hat die Schweiz die Nazis unterstützt?
War das Alltagsleben in Ostdeutschland vor oder nach der Wiedervereinigung besser?
Wird in Deutschland der neugefundene Patriotismus lange halten?

Titles that did not work so well were simply labels, however, which did not necessarily encourage the candidate to develop an argument.

Examples:

Integration der Türken in Deutschland
Das österreichische Schulsystem
Wien und seine Sehenswürdigkeiten

Quality of language

The quality of language remained patchy. In the majority of cases, however, candidates had grasped the rules sufficiently well for the reader to follow the essay with relative ease. There were some candidates who were very proficient at dealing with German grammar. Problems arose, as mentioned above, when candidates tried to translate English source material. Fewer candidates seem to be prepared to use a dictionary carefully, and there were many instances of even good candidates selecting the wrong word. One candidate, writing about Hitler's racial policies, used the word 'Rennen' for 'race' throughout. Proofreading was also a problem for a number of candidates, inasmuch as many did not seem to consider it necessary. This may be due to the fact that they submitted the essay very late and did not allow themselves sufficient time. An earlier internal submission date would give candidates time to check their work.

Centre assessment

Some centres provided background information, or details of how they reached their assessment, in the space provided on the cover sheet. These 'Teacher's Notes' were always helpful, although it is not mandatory to complete them. Adjustments to marks were necessary mainly when centres had overmarked the content of the essay, usually because of a tendency to narrate and describe rather than structure, argue and evaluate. The assessment of language was generally more satisfactory, although some centres awarded the full range of marks when it was not appropriate. Sometimes in the case of native speakers, although full marks were deserved for language, at times the content marks were overvalued by the centre. In the majority of cases, however, it was pleasing to find that assessment was accurate.

Advanced GCE German 7862

June 2007 Assessment Series

1 Unit Threshold Marks

<i>Unit</i>		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2664/01	Raw	60	48	43	38	33	29	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2665	Raw	80	64	56	49	42	35	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2666	Raw	60	46	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2667	Raw	60	50	45	40	35	30	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

2 Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

3	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7862 (Agg Code)	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

4	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
7862 (Agg Code)	34.96	61.71	81.53	94.05	98.20	100.0	1110

1110 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE German 3862
June 2007 Assessment Series**

5 Unit Threshold Marks

<i>Unit</i>		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2661/01	Raw	60	47	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2661/02	Raw	60	47	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2661/03	Raw	60	47	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2662	Raw	80	65	58	51	45	39	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2663	Raw	60	48	42	36	30	25	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

6 Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

7	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3862 (Agg Code)	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

8	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3862 (Agg Code)	24.98	47.21	64.86	79.45	91.83	100.0	1309

1309 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553