

# Teacher Support Booklet

Exemplar Responses with Commentaries

# Contents

The recordings of these examinations can be downloaded free of charge from Interchange. They can be found by following the link : Resources & Materials/exam resources/past papers and mark schemes. Select AS/A Level GCE, select German, click on folders named : “F711 German – Exemplar Speaking Responses 1 and 2”.

---

## **Candidate A** **3**

Commentary

Role play A : Youth Theatre (January 2010)

Topic Discussion: Bringt das Internet immer Vorteile für die Deutschen?

---

## **Candidate B** **5**

Commentary

Role play A : Youth Theatre (January 2010)

Topic Discussion: Vegetarismus in Deutschland

---

## **Candidate C** **7**

Commentary

Role play A : Youth Theatre (January 2010)

Topic Discussion: das Auslandsjahr

---

## **Candidate D** **9**

Commentary

Role-play C : Land's End (January 2010)

Topic Discussion: Essstörungen

---

## Candidate A

### Role-play A Youth Theatre (January 2010)

#### Use of Stimulus Grid A

The candidate had a very good understanding and overview of the stimulus material, and she was able to convey nearly all of the points successfully. She did not convey: in recent years / we're interested in you, and a few minor details such as amateur / rewritten. At times she gave the impression that she had not quite conveyed all the information, but often followed this up with further statements which allowed the full mark to be given. For example, *man kann weitere Auskunft finden* does not quite convey "if you'd like to help in any way", but she continued with *man kann mit Kleidung oder Schmuck helfen, man kann die Kunst machen oder so*. **13/15**

#### Response to Examiner Grid B

This was a lively, confident and convincing performance. The candidate responded very well to frequent examiner intervention, and was often in charge of the conversation. Asked who Fred Driffield was, she offered *ja, er ist ganz toll*, and she sensibly claimed she had been a member of the group for two years. She used initiative and imagination to convince us she had made friends there, it was *fantastisch, man kann so viele Leute kennen lernen*. Her last play was Alice in Wonderland, but she hadn't acted too well in that. Her responses to the extension bullet points were fine: she knew that one had to pay some small sums, but it wasn't all that expensive, and that it took up more time if one had a major role. Overall, she impressed with a fluent performance. **9/10**

#### Quality of Language Grid C1

In this criterion the performance was somewhat patchy and inconsistent. Many of the basics were sound, and mostly showed control over verb second idea and modals. In addition, the candidate attempted quite a lot of ambitious language, more than many candidates do in the role-play: *sie glauben, dass es wichtig ist, dass alle mitmachen kann, und deshalb kann man Hilfe bekommen, wenn man nicht so viel Geld hat / vor allem, wenn man die Hauptchauspieler ist / ich glaube, dass es sich lohnt, weil ich viel Spaß mache*. To counterbalance these good attempts, there were times when control was rather looser: *jeder Donnerstag / von halb acht bis halb zehn nachmittags / im September werden es Vorsprechproben geben / weil ich noch nicht es lesen*. **3/5**

## **Topic: Bringt das Internet immer Vorteile für die Deutschen?**

### **Ideas, Opinions and Relevance Grid D**

The candidate had researched her topic extremely well, and offered well-chosen, relevant information to develop a range of ideas and to justify points of view. The conversation started and ended with her own involvement, and many different facets of the topic were dealt with. Whatever aspect was being discussed, she was able to refer in specific terms to factual information, where some candidates would have been content to chat in vague terms on this topic. She was able to quote the names of German websites, whether it was a matter of online shopping, university websites, social networking or online newspapers. Often she gave several examples, not just one. Furthermore, she had statistics to hand on the number of website visits, the problem of plagiarism, *Rechtsextremismus* etc. She demonstrated the very best combination of relevant, detailed factual knowledge with ideas and opinions. **10/10**

### **Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E1**

There could be few more impressive performances than this. The candidate maintained an extremely fluent pace, and gave a very convincing, confident performance for the whole length of the discussion. She was totally in charge, and knew her material well. Examiner intervention proved she was responding genuinely and spontaneously at all times. Near the end of the discussion she was invited to add anything further, and she took the opportunity to offer yet more detail. **10/10**

### **Quality of Language Grid C1**

The candidate was able to improve upon her role-play mark in this criterion. She increased her usage of complex structures, many of which were correct. From her use of good structures such as *springt sofort ins Auge* to confident use of complex relative clauses (*bei der jeder mitschreiben kann / für Situationen, in denen man das Haus nicht verlassen kann*) and passives (*dann werden die Waren ins Hause geliefert / seien entdeckt worden*), the performance was impressive. Although it did contain language errors (*wenn wir das Internet zum Lernen brauchen, es ist ... / ich bleibe auch ins Kontakt mit meinen Freunden / ich kenne ein paar Freunden, die das gemacht hat*), the sheer weight of numerous impressive structures allowed a mark near the top end of this category. **4/5**

### **Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G**

There were some difficulties with ch and r sounds, and a few isolated words were mispronounced, but pronunciation and intonation were largely accurate, given the total speed and volume of the candidate's language. **4/5**

**Total 53/60**

## **Candidate B**

### **Role-play A Youth Theatre (January 2010)**

#### **Use of Stimulus Grid A**

This candidate also had a good overview and managed to convey the vast majority of information from the stimulus material. Items omitted were: we're interested in you / amateur / in recent years / rewritten. All other elements from the text were successfully conveyed and she was able to score an impressive **13/15**.

#### **Response to Examiner Grid B**

The performance had a slow, deliberate style of delivery bordering on hesitancy at times. On balance, responses were deemed to be satisfactory rather than good. The candidate was able to respond to all the examiner's questions, producing answers which were mostly sensible, but she did not respond readily with a good deal of imagination and well developed answers. Her responses to unknown questions (and the examiner was correct in asking these) tended to be fairly short as she worked out the answer in her head (e.g. her answer to the first extension bullet point was *es kostet ziemlich viel, aber es ist nicht ein Geldverschwendung*). In consequence, the performance deserved a mark in the middle band. **6/10**

#### **Quality of Language Grid C1**

The quality of language showed a fair understanding of grammatical usage. The candidate attempted some usage of complex grammatical structures, such as subordinate clauses with the verb at the end after *wenn, weil* and *dass*. The language did contain some error, however, such as *ich bin Mitglieder / es war über 20 Jahre seit gegründet / wir wollen junge Leute helfen zu zusammenarbeiten / weil man praktischen muss*. As a result, the performance was inconsistent. **3/5**

## **Topic: Vegetarismus in Deutschland**

### **Ideas, Opinions and Relevance Grid D**

The performance began with a definition of vegetarianism, and the discussion touched on various reasons why people become vegetarians, what they could eat in Germany, the first German club and the roles of such organizations in advising people. Personal details regarding friends' experiences were mentioned, as was diet and Austria. Everything stated was relevant, but the impression left by the end was that more factual information could have been offered and ideas and opinions taken somewhat further. The candidate certainly showed "some ability to develop and explain ideas" on this topic. More evidence might possibly have increased her chances of attaining a mark beyond the middle category. **6/10**

### **Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E1**

As in the role-play, responses were sound rather than good. Although not ponderous, the candidate seemed hesitant at times, which rendered fluency and spontaneity adequate, rather than good. Many of her responses were not "brief and sometimes inadequate"; she did respond, albeit sometimes with some caution and deliberation. **6/10**

### **Quality of Language Grid C1**

As with the role-play, the quality of language was mixed. There were some examples of ambitious sentence structure where word order in subordinate clauses was good (*wenn ein Produkt für Vegetarier geeignet ist, dann hat ... / dass so viele Leute Vegetarier sind / wo man ... finden kann*). In contrast, there were also errors with word order in subordinate clauses (*sie glauben, es nicht recht ist / so ich glaube, dass die Regierung wissen nicht / ... / dass viele Leute haben es nicht verstanden*) and a liberal sprinkling of other errors such as *ich habe ein Freund, die Veganer ist, und er ... / die größte Gründe sind ethischen / in manche Plätze / es ist gesundlich* etc. **3/5**

### **Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G**

The r sound was not particularly good, but pronunciation and intonation were generally accurate. **4/5**

**Total 41/60**

## Candidate C

### Role-play A Youth Theatre (January 2010)

#### Use of Stimulus Grid A

For the most part, the candidate made good use of the stimulus material, conveying about three quarters of the points successfully. Minor points she missed were: amateur / some serious, some humorous / rewritten. Points she raised but not totally successfully were *sie sind alle über Theater* and plenty of fun to be had en route. The final paragraph was not attempted and this is where she could have been encouraged to supply the information and probably score more marks. **10/15**

#### Response to Examiner Grid B

The responses given did not always suit the question. For example, when the candidate was asked *wann trifft ihr euch so?*, she replied with *unsere Gruppe könnte die Möglichkeit geben für neue Leute kennenzulernen*. The examiner played her role well and asked good questions to stimulate conversation. The candidate was often able to produce some appropriate responses, although few of these were really developed. She used a little initiative when answering the extension questions. Overall, the performance was judged to be sound rather than good, and deserved a mark in the middle band. **6/10**

#### Quality of Language Grid C1

The quality of language contained some stronger and weaker elements. On the one hand, the candidate seemed to have a good idea of word order in subordinate clauses, especially after *wenn*. In addition, she attempted a passive with *ist modernisiert worden (wurden?)* and a relative clause with *Weihnachtsshow, die Aladdin ist*. On the other hand, verb forms themselves and agreement were often poor (*die Gruppe ist begonnen / er hat für uns viel geschrieben in die letzte 5 Jahr / sind gespielt / wir wollen, dass junge Leute arbeiten zusammen kann / man kann die Jugendliche helfen / an anderes Tag*). This resulted in inconsistency and therefore deserved a mark of **3/5**.

## **Topic: das Auslandsjahr**

### **Ideas, Opinions and Relevance Grid D**

This particular candidate was not easy to assess for this criterion. By the end, some ideas and opinions had been discussed, but very little if any factual information had been offered. The whole topic was based on the idea of spending a year abroad, possibly at a German university, or working with a company, but probably in a school. Time spent in a foreign country, meeting new people and gaining experience is undoubtedly very valuable, but there was so little evidence on offer, which made the choice of topic a poor one. It remained a summary of personal aspirations with little substance to be conveyed. **5/10**

### **Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E1**

The candidate responded reasonably promptly to the examiner, though with occasional hesitation. She understood the questions and was able to reply with reasonable fluency and with genuine spontaneity. For much of the time, she seemed to be in the middle band. However, she did manage to keep the momentum going, and by the end had edged into the band above. **7/10**

### **Quality of Language Grid C1**

The quality of language maintained the standard set in the role-play, a mixture of stronger and weaker elements. Word order in subordinate clauses tended to be inconsistent, with the verb only sometimes sent to the end of the clause (*weil ich hab das Land / wenn ich in ein Schule arbeiten / nachdem ich das Studium abgeschlossen habe, würde ich ...* . Verb forms, agreement and cases remained often poor (*man solltest / ich habe mit meinem Bruder gesprochen / wenn man ein Auslandsjahr machen / bevor ich in das Land lebe*). The topic discussion lasts 9-10 minutes, where the role-play lasts 5-6 minutes. Consequently, the volume of language heard in the topic is bound to be greater, and markers are aware of this in their expectations. The performance was a typical mixture of rewardable ambition and not so rewardable accuracy. **3/5**

### **Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G**

Local and regional accents are not penalized. The most significant feature of this candidate's pronunciation was the ch sound, which invariably became ck (e.g. *macken* instead of *machen*). This became intrusive, as the sound occurs so frequently. *Wäre* was pronounced *ware*, but not on every occasion. **3/5**

**Total 37/60**



## Candidate D

### Role-play C Land's End (January 2010)

#### Use of Stimulus Grid A

The candidate seemed nervous throughout the role-play and did not use the opportunity to best effect. For much of the time she conveyed only small sections of the stimulus material, offering details rather than whole items. The attempt at the first paragraph was very sketchy, although at the very end of the role-play she did fill in more of the details. The second paragraph was little better. The Last Labyrinth was *ein toll Medien besuchen*, which omitted most of the information. The whole bullet point relating to modes of transport was omitted. With The Relentless Sea, the examiner recognised that she could not produce *Ausstellung*, and helped out with this word, but the candidate could do little with it. Her attempts at shopping and refreshments (*viel Essen*) tended to be simplified versions of what the text actually stated. She did a little better with the visitor centre information, and at the end managed to add some further information from the first paragraph. This raised her level to a mark at or about the bottom end of the middle band. **7/15**

#### Response to Examiner Grid B

For most of the role-play, the candidate was hesitant. Her responses were brief and often inadequate. The examiner made valiant attempts to encourage her to respond, offering various stimuli in the hope that she would be able to make some more positive response. Asked about swimming, the candidate replied that it was dangerous, but did not expand this idea. She could not suggest what the car park charge might be, nor did she respond well to the question about visitors. On the whole, she seemed to be unresponsive. **3/10**

#### Quality of Language Grid C1

She did not make the best start with the initial question *Wo genau sollst du der Urlaub stattfinden?* At times she could not control basics (*man müssen Land's End besucht, weil es ist ... , / man kann besuchen ...*). Later, she did prove that she could handle some modals (*man kann Geschenke einkaufen*), and even attempted something slightly more ambitious with *um die weltbeliebt Küste zu sehen*, but largely her language was restricted. **2/5**

## Topic: Essstörungen

### Ideas, Opinions and Relevance Grid D

This candidate proved to be more confident when she moved from the role-play to the topic discussion. The conversation touched on a range of issues including *Magersucht*, *Bulimie* and *Übergewicht*, and the fact that some people moved from one end of the spectrum to the other. The discussion included possible causes, emotional and physical changes during puberty, and then peer pressure, followed by the role played by the media. The conversation was not just vague and generalised; the candidate had done some research and made reference to the *Robert Koch Institut* and the institute for *Ernährungsmedizin*, citing statistics to make her point. Although she could have offered some further detailed evidence, she did relate her topic to the target language country, and she was able to convey some information, explain ideas and express opinions. **6/10**

### Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E1

In this category, where she felt more confident, she was able to respond more readily than in the role-play and take more of the initiative. She was more in charge in the topic discussion than she was at the start of the speaking test. For much of the time she held her own and kept going, despite the occasional hesitancy. Where she felt she knew her material, she was able to offer more in terms of fluency and spontaneity. Her contributions were well-prepared but not over-prepared, and the examiner ensured she did not simply reel off pre-learnt statements then stop to wait for the next question. **7/10**

### Quality of Language Grid C1

Her increased confidence where she felt more at home with the subject matter was also reflected in the quality of language mark. There were several examples of subordinate clauses with the verb correctly positioned at the end (*weil ich eine Jugendliche bin / ...*, *warum Menschen Übergewicht haben / wenn sie nicht nötig sind*). Not all subordinate clauses were correct, but she did want to prove that she could make attempts at more than basic structures, including *um ... zu*. Basics were often under control, and consequently she deserved the middle band mark of **3/5**.

### Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G

As with the previous candidate, the ch sound was mostly pronounced ck (*sprechen / auck*). The ü sound was not always pure, and the Umlaut often seemed omitted (*Korper*). *Medien* was pronounced *Midien* and she encountered difficulties with *bequem*. Intonation was fair. **3/5**

**Total 31/60**