



Examiners' Report June 2013

GCE German 6GN02 01



Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at <u>www.edexcel.com</u> or <u>www.btec.co.uk</u>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at <u>www.edexcel.com/contactus</u>.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <u>www.edexcel.com/resultsplus</u>. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2013

Publications Code US036061

All the material in this publication is copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

This unit requires candidates to understand and convey their understanding of Germanlanguage recordings and texts. In addition, candidates produce a piece of continuous writing in which they can demonstrate their ability to manipulate German. The content for the unit is drawn from the four general topic areas (and a definitive list of linked subtopics) listed on page 30 of the specification. The overall time allocation for this unit is 2 hours 30 minutes.

Section A is out of 20 marks and assesses candidates' listening skills. There are four extracts which last around 5 – 6 minutes and which are recorded onto CD (or are available for centre download as an mp3 file). Candidates have individual control of the listening material and must complete Section A within the first 45 minutes of the examination.

Section B is also out of 20 marks and assesses candidates' reading skills. There are three authentic texts in German each followed by a different task type. Candidates are free to complete this section immediately after Section A, or they may choose to complete Section C first and come back to this section later in the examination.

Section C is out of 30 marks and assesses candidates' writing skills. Candidates are required to write 200-220 words in the form of eg an email, a letter or an article in German, based on a short German language stimulus. A number of linked bullet points define the content. Candidates are free to answer this question after the listening and before the reading sections if that suits them better.

All questions in Sections A and B are marked according to a specific mark scheme which is updated at the standardisation meeting to take account of the range of candidate responses.

Candidates should be aware that examiners assess responses in Q4, Q6 and Q7 in the order elements are given by candidates, and consider no more elements than the number of marks available. Thus, in a 2 mark question, only the first two elements can score, whereby repeating or re-working of the question or preambles to an acceptable response do not count as elements in the response. In addition, credit is not withheld for irrelevant additions to a correct answer, but incorrect additions which negate will result in candidates losing the mark for a correct answer.

Question 2 requires candidates to select the four correct statements in German from a list of eight. Thus, there are four marks available for this question.

In cases where candidates crossed more than four statements, one mark was withheld for each cross offered in excess of four. Thus, six crosses, including four correct ones, would gain two marks in total.

Question 3 (a)

Question 3 is a summary with gap fill in German and is worth 4 marks. Candidates are provided with a pool of answers from which they select the correct word to complete the sentences of the summary.

If the response selected was not transcribed entirely correctly, but could not be confused with another word in the pool, it earned the mark.

Question 4

Question 4 carries eight marks and requires candidates to produce verbal responses in German to questions set in German. Lifting is allowed, although this can lead to transcription errors. However, candidates need to remember that any such lifts must be targeted - indiscriminate transcription of what they have heard is not a guarantee of a mark. Quality of language is not assessed here, but candidates must communicate their answers unequivocally. A mark is withheld only for the first misuse of tense.

Full sentences are not required in this task but candidates should be aware that full and detailed information is needed. They should also be aware that some questions will be more challenging than others to achieve the required discrimination in performance.

Overall, candidates have become more proficient in their handling of this question.

Marks were lost by allocating answers to the wrong question. This is becoming almost a trend.

a) Whilst this was generally well answered, some candidates focused on irrelevant material, including in their answer information about the Germans loving reading and technology for which no credit could be given. Many of those who could pick out the attitude of the Germans towards E-Books lifted *abgeneigt* but some were unable to spell it in any way near enough to make it comprehensible. Better candidates were able to express the idea more simply in their own words eg *Sie mögen nicht E-books*. Unfortunately, it was not uncommon for the *warum* part of the question to be omitted. Where it was attempted, *sich lesen lassen* presented a challenge to some and *lesen* was frequently given as *lessen*.

b) Some candidates gave answers here which would have scored a mark for a) but could not be credited in b). Most opted for the appropriate, direct lift, which was fine although there were some interesting spellings of *Skepsis*, some versions of which were unacceptable eg *Specte*.

c) As ever, there is a need for precision and attention to detail when answering these questions. Responses such as *E-book-Readers haben keine Nachteile* – ie omitting the concept of *Lesen* - could not be rewarded as they did not reflect the message of the listening text. There were many references to *Das Lesen auf Papier ist schön/entspannend* which would indicate that candidates had not been able to distinguish between the expectation of readers and the actual outcome of the study or that they are listening for just gist rather than detail. Transcription of *gedruckt* proved problematic for some eg *gedockt*.

d) This was generally well done, although the verb forms varied in correctness eg *man kann Informationen besser/schneller verstanden*. Sometimes communication was impaired eg *fürschtanden, fahr standen*.

e) This question discriminated well and candidates had to listen very carefully for the detail. Some candidates gave imprecise answers suggesting older readers were faster than the younger ones, or omitted important words like *gleich (schnell)*. Many answers contained both possible parts of the answer for one mark.

f) Almost all candidates scored a mark for identifying that e-book readers save on paper and/or energy and/or greenhouse gases, although very few indeed picked up on the point about reading e-newspapers could protect woods/trees and the climate.

Hörtext 4 Buch oder Bildschirm? 4 Sie hören ein Interview mit Werner Schmidt, Leiter des Instituts f
ür Lesewissenschaft. Beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen auf Deutsch. (a) Wie stehen die meisten Deutschen zu E-Books und warum? (2)Sie sind alopeneigt geopen über E-Books und digitalen lesen Gerieten, Weil dos Texte aug Papier besser als Texte aus Schirme ist. (b) Was wollte die Studie herausfinden? (1)Die Studie woute die Gründe für dieses Stepsis hereusfinden (c) Was war das Ergebnis der Studie? (1)Das Lesen eines Biches auf Papier sectivichen, ist die schönste sei (d) Wie haben Leser von E-Book-Readers oder Tablet-PCs während der Studie profitiert? (1)Sie haben das Informationen schneller und besser versieanden (e) Welchen Unterschied hat man zwischen jungen und älteren Lesern festgestellt? (1)Die älteren denken, dass das E-Book deutlich schneuer ist. (f) Was sind die Vorteile des digitalen Lesens für die Umwelt, laut Werner Schmidt? (2)Es sparen Papier Treibhauspase und Energie ES SCHÜNZE Klimalangegriptig **Examiner Comments** This candidate scores 4. (a) The first line of the answer is correct and can be rewarded. Unfortunately the information given in the second line after weil is not precise enough: there is no reference to the Germans' perception that it is easier to read printed texts. So 1 mark here. (b) 1 mark here. (c) This response does not address the question and thus does not score. So 0 here. (d) 1 mark here. (e) This response conveys a different message from that **Results^Plus** conveyed in the listening text and cannot score the mark. So **Examiner Tip** 0 here. (f) The first line of the response is correct. However, the Candidates should ensure that second line lacks the reference to reading digital newspapers their answers are precise and that and so cannot be rewarded. 1 mark here. they convey all the required detail.

Question 6 requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to transfer meaning accurately from German into English. The text is factual and candidates are not expected to infer meaning. There are five separate questions in English to which candidates respond in English. Full sentences are not required, but the rubric instructs candidates to *convey* **all** *the relevant information* – thus answers must include all details required to address the question fully and appropriately.

Whilst most candidates undoubtedly understood this text, many struggled to transfer the meaning precisely and to give sufficient detail. This question requires a good deal of practise, as very many candidates give approximations which will not be accepted. Greater attention to the detail of the German text would lead to a higher score in many instances.

a) This proved accessible on the whole – where candidates did fail to score the mark, this was usually because they had omitted *many / a lot of* (in front of *children*).

b) Most candidates understood *gute Beziehungen* and were able to render it felicitously eg *they have/had a good relationship with their parents* - sometimes adding *and with other children* which was acceptable since it was a harmless addition. *Zufrieden* seems to have presented a challenge to some candidates and this led to clear guesses eg *The parents were strict, They had lots of freedom, They are happy*.

c) *Unterstützen* was accessible to most candidates, although some did suggest it might mean *understand*. Other incorrect answers referred to *children from/living in the South/ Bavaria*.

d) Most candidates were able to gain the mark here by offering in *big towns/cities* which was enough on its own although many added *for example Berlin/Hamburg* and *towns in Nordrhein – Westfalen*. Some candidates misinterpreted Nordrhein-Westfalen to give an answer focusing on *the north or the North-West of Germany*. Some also cited *Bayern und Baden-Württemberg* here, presumably misunderstanding *abschneiden*.

e) Many candidates understood that these children were in single parent families, some also added the information about unemployed parents. Misconceptions were generally along the lines *of parents being too busy/at work to look after/help their children* presumably because they had not read the last 6 words of the text carefully enough.

Read the passage above and answer the questions in English. Your answers must relate exclusively to the passage and convey all the relevant information provided. (a) What conclusion did the latest UNICEF report reach? (1)Geners is no pradige for children. There are great requalities between different regions (b) What did most children say about their parents, according to the report? (1)They are shisted that this they have been aided well by heir parents (c) Which particular children perform well in school? (1)The Children that Reform well have parents who Con support them in # school. (d) Where do children typically do less well? (1)Children do Less well in large cities such as Oalin or Humburg or the abes in Nordchein-Westfalen (e) Why are these children disadvantaged? (1)These Children often live with a Signer mother or Papents Who doit have a job. This means they get less SUPPORt From their Pavents. (Total for Question 6 = 5 marks) **lesuits Examiner Comments**

This candidate scores a total of 3 marks.

(a) This response scores 0. The first part of the response is along the correct lines, but unfortunately does not contain the crucial 'many'. The second part of the response is a harmless addition. A score of 0.

(b) This response is incorrect. A score of 0.

(c) This response was rewarded as examiners felt that the candidate had demonstrated full understanding of the key concept. A score of 1.

(d) An excellent response. A score of 1.

(e) The first part of the response contains both possible answers - either one of these would have been sufficient to score the mark. The second part of the response is a harmless addition. A score of 1.



Candidates must ensure that they transfer the meaning precisely, including all the relevant detail.

Question 7 requires candidates to respond in German to questions set in German. Quality of language is not being assessed here, therefore under the terms of the mark scheme misspellings and grammatical errors are tolerated as long as the answer is comprehensible and unambiguous. In this context, an inappropriate possessive adjective impedes communication and a mark will be withheld for the first misuse of a possessive adjective. Similarly, a mark is withheld only for the first misuse of tense. Full sentences are not required but sufficient detail must be included in the response to answer the question completely.

As in all previous series, **targeted** lifts were accepted. However, candidates should avoid lifting whole sections out of the German text in the hope that the answer might somehow be found in the 4 or 5 lines copied. This of course no longer constitutes a targeted lift and no marks can be gained in this instance. Candidates should also pay attention to the need for the lifted material to answer the question as set and should be aware that it may not be possible to lift answers from the text for all questions. It is important to reiterate that whilst targeted lifts are accepted, indiscriminate ones which indicate that candidates have not understood either the question, or what they are writing as a response, are not. Targeted lifts means that candidates do not have to answer using their own language and may rely on the language in the text when this is appropriate.

a) This proved accessible to many candidates and most correct answers listed all 3 categories of jobs rather than just *frauenuntypisch*. Incorrect answers usually referred to *einmal im Jahr stattfindender Aktionstag*, presumably due to not understanding the word *Ziel* in the question.

b) Candidates understood this question and it was possible here to lift from the text to score the 2 marks – there were plenty of options available. Where candidates did not score a mark, this was mainly due to lack of precision eg *mit Computern arbeiten.*

c) This was a more discriminating question. Less successful candidates simply lifted from the relevant paragraph but omitted crucial information. Ideally, the answer required a full sentence and unfortunately, not all candidates were able to manipulate the language from the text successfully. This resulted in communication being impaired. Many candidates lost a mark by writing *frauentypisch* – whilst this might well have been a spelling error, it did affect communication so the importance of proof reading should be stressed here.

d) Here again it was possible to gain both marks by lifting from the text. Surprisingly many candidates were satisfied with giving just one part of the answer required for 2 marks. Several mentioned *Begabungen* but without elucidating, whilst others missed out elements of *sprachlich/künstlerisch* and *naturwissenschaftlich/technisch*. Examiners suspected that many candidates did not understand *Behauptungen* in the question since a frequent answer was *wie stark die Interessen und Orientierungen... usw.'*

e) This question discriminated well. Again, Examiners suspected that many candidates did not really understand *Entwicklung* and/or *Studiengängen* in the question. Incorrect answers focused on the fact that girls are not poor at maths etc. or failed to identify the increase in numbers of girls taking these subjects/courses. Candidates struggled to convey correctly the idea of *zulegen* in the text or even lift successfully.

f) This was a more accessible question, with many candidates gaining 2 marks by lifting relevant parts of the text. Unfortunately, others focused on the *unfairness* of having only a Girls' Day and boys having to go to school.

7 Beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen zum Text auf Deutsch. (a) Was ist das Ziel vom Girls' Day? Wollen Mädchen mobivieren lon mohner (b) Was können Mädchen am Girls' Day beispielsweise machen? Können Laborinkensiver BAUFR problem (omputerh ren z.B. einen 14 ren ar ₿ E (c) Warum braucht man eigentlich einen Girls' Day, laut dem Text? Madchen Alla MUSSP iesch Industrie Branch wo kaum Verheret. (d) Welche Behauptungen stehen momentan zur Debatte? (2)hen sind besserer mit bral (e) Welche Entwicklung hat mah bei den "männertypischen" Studiengängen festgestellt? (1)Nullic ZUQ vnge (f) Aus welchem Grund hat man 2011 den Boys' Day eingeführt? (2) Ungla sollen au (Total for Question 7 = 10 marks)

Examiner Comments

This candidate scores 6 marks.

(a) This response scores 1 mark. The mark scheme allows männertypisch as a synonym for frauenuntypisch.

(b) This response can score 1 mark. Examiners felt that *Laborintensive Berufe* did not communicate unambiguously *Experimente im Labor machen* and so did not credit the first part of the response. However, the second part of the response was rewarded. On its own *mit Computern arbeiten* would not have been precise enough to atrract the mark, but the candidate then went on to give an example and could be credited.

(c) This response scores 2 marks, as per the mark scheme.

(d) This response scores 1 mark. Unfortunately, the candidate has written *kunstliche* which does not convey the same idea at all as *künstlerische* and is thus ambiguous. The mark is awarded for the second part of the response.

(e) This response scores 0 since it fails to communicate the required answer.

(f) This scores 1 mark. The first part of the response could not be credited as this is not a reason given in the text and the candidate has not read closely enough. The second part of the response could be credited however as it was felt that this conveyed the correct idea.

This section consists of one writing task.

In question 8 candidates first read a short (55-75 words) stimulus in German which serves to provoke and support a response in German of 200 - 220 words. The rubric (in German) for this task includes a number of bullet points (between 4 and 6) which candidates must address in their response. The piece of writing is assessed positively according to assessment criteria grids. These grids reward students for content and response (15 marks) and quality of language (15 marks).

Candidates need to gain at least 1 mark for content to access marks for quality of language. The word limit is observed and examiners read no further than to the end of the sense group after 220 words.

Fortunately, overlong answers were very much less of a problem this session. However, there were essays which stretched well beyond 220 words. This was often because candidates became so engrossed in the first 2 bullet points that they ran out of words (and time) thereafter. Candidates should be aware that any information which comes after the 220 words will not be assessed. The omission of one complete bullet point automatically reduces the content mark to a maximum of 9. Centres are advised to read the marking principles (at the end of the mark scheme) which detail exactly what will happen when a candidate completes a bullet point only partially, or indeed fails to address a bullet point at all.

Examiners were pleased to note that candidates found this session's task accessible: they were prepared for the topic of smoking and the related vocabulary seemed to have been well learned. Many were also prepared for the format of writing a letter although there were some informal *Hallo! Ich heisse* ... , but most candidates used the correct register. Many continue to struggle with *Sehr* **geehrte** *Damen und Herren* eg *geharte/gehurte* and *Heeren, Sehr geräte Damen und Herren*, *Sehr geehrliche Herren* and some forgot to 'sign off' at the end. The overwhelming majority understood the stimulus, the rubric and the task, and went on to cover the points in a structured way – fairly evenly, one after the other, which is by far the best strategy. More successful candidates were able to link the points and go beyond the stimulus material to include information and ideas of their own. Such candidates used the stimulus material very selectively – mostly in the 3rd bullet point where some expressions were lifted - *attraktiv zu machen/ zu verhindern/mit dem Rauchen experimentieren*. Less successful candidates relied more on the stimulus without adding much in the way of original ideas of their own.

Examiners noted some fairly long introductory comments (perhaps up to 40+ words) which had nothing to do with the task. Since such an introduction was irrelevant, this did affect the mark for Content.

The first two points were dealt with very well by almost everybody.

Bullet point 1:

Less successful candidates tried to cover the this point by just stating that *eine rauchfreie Schule ist attraktiver* or *wir sollten uns alle für eine rauchfreie Schule engagieren undalle vor dem Rauchen schützen* rather than explaining **why**. More successful answers included cancer, heart disease etc., the costs, the fact that smoking is antisocial, passive smoking and *es stinkt* and can lead to yellow teeth and fingers.

Bullet point 2:

This point was probably the most successfully developed as candidates linked thoughts to build a logical argument. Several reasons were offered and these included peer pressure, stress at school, copying parents who smoke, smoking still being seen as cool, influence of the media, adverts, difficult to give up smoking once you have started. Less able students could not always express themselves correctly in doing this but communication was rarely impeded.

Bullet point 3:

This bullet point proved to be the most difficult and was not well executed in many cases. Some candidates were unable to develop their response beyond the ideas given in the stimulus material. More independent responses however, suggested visits to hospitals to visit people with lung cancer as well as projects at school such as lectures/talks by former smokers, shock-tactics like pictures of cancerous lungs, more sport and anti-stress activities in school etc. The role of parents was also mentioned: they should encourage their children not to smoke!

Bullet point 4:

This was well developed on the whole. There were some awful stories about parents or other family members contracting cancer and dying. Most candidates claimed they were not smokers themselves but some admitted to their smoking habit and many were able to offer opinions on or give reasons for their (not) smoking. Unfortunately, some candidates had almost run out of words by this stage and wrote most succinctly that they had no experience of smoking.

Language

Most candidates seem to have been well prepared for this topic and were able to handle the lexical items needed eg Gruppenzwang, Lungenkrebs. There was some confusion between *Schüler* and *Schule*, *rachen* often appeared for *rauchen*, and there were many variations on the spelling of Zigaretten.

Almost all candidates attempted some complex structures eg subordinate clauses (mostly *weil* and *obwohl*), relative clauses, the conditional and occasionally the passive – although this appeared in pre-learnt phrases such as *es kann nicht geleugnet werden* or *es muss gesagt werden*.

It is perhaps disappointing that a number of candidates have only a weak grasp of verb endings/forms eg *ich heißt* followed immediately by *und ich denkst, ich bin schreiben* for the present continuous and *gelessen* –a high frequency verb.

However, there were very few instances where the accuracy of language posed very real obstacles to communication.

Sie lesen diese Fakten zum Projekt Rauchfreie Schulklassen in einer Online-Jugendzeitschrift. Schreiben Sie einen Brief an die Redaktion der Zeitschrift auf Deutsch (200-220 Wörter), in dem Sie auf Folgendes eingehen: warum man sich für ein rauchfreies Leben engagieren sollte 50 98 Willyshould you have a ondre free i ye wieso Jugendliche zu regelmäßigen Rauchern werden 60° 67 Why do (00 of youth Brocke? wie man Schüler motivieren könnte, gar nicht mit dem Rauchen anzufangen 5 How can you be notivatied to stop smaking Ihre persönlichen Erfahrungen mit dem Rauchen. 4524 personal experience we making (30)Ich have aus en Bardige Antwort Plan haben. benshill alsupol Kann Kalo lungen creby verursachen schue Stross toot - Bezieningen - Nio en JOIO UTTURPLYZWOI en selbszie Damen und Jehr Guertitos Wir sollen alle ein rauchfreus Leben engagienen, es villenventeilles Vorteilen biller. Beispielweise, Kann man aesunder ebensstil haben. Ola rauchen eine venursachen. Hulserden blockvert der Lungen krebs Bronchien, Darüberhingus, bedeudet eine Kauch all rauchpreses Leben, dows man realimabiae Korperliche Benearing zu bleiben. Meiner zu rehmen kann, um due Beste Ansicht eur rauchpreues Leben nach Viet lagest INF geounder ist, acich denke ich, dass es a v en billiga Leben ust viele Jugendliche regelmatigen 101 glaube dass ichlin unter Stress sind werden aa SIR Rauch foucher) um der WRAZL Stress von denke ich, dass thre Ho

machen oder personuich Beziehungen Probleme. grund, deren Gruppenzwang, kann man zu drucken. Nevner Meinung nach terret Quelle von 1 weil es une enial eure neu SIL Mogen eventuelle, abhanaja es davon due Nikotine. Wenn man rauchen authort, sollte man einen Selbstziel machen. Zum Beispiel, Kann man Greschenke für dich haben. ende Oder Kan Vortelle denken, beispielweise B. spart wan dos Greid, ade He gesunder Karper. Linde the ich, dass Kouchen außerst leiner Ansicht rlich Ist. 100.00 sterben dich sind! ist, dia sie langsam ein baldliche Antwort haben. eundlichen Grüßen,

Results Plus Examiner Comments

This essay was awarded a mark of 9 for Content and response and then a mark of 10 for Quality of language to give a total of 19.

Bullet points 1 and 2 are well developed. Unfortunately, the candidate has used up over half the allowed word count on these 2 bullet points which has implications for the other 2 points. Bullet point 3 is not addressed. There is some evidence here of misunderstanding of the point. The task requires candidates to suggest ways of motivating school students not to start smoking, whereas this candidate has focused on how one might set about motivating someone to stop smoking which is not the same thing at all. Bullet point 4 has been addressed but somewhat superficially since the candidate has now run out of words. Given that one bullet point has effectively been omitted the candidate can score no higher than 9 and it was felt that a mark of 9 was merited.

The candidate has used a good range of structures and a good to very good range of vocabulary. In addition, communication is generally sound. The weak point here is the level of inaccuracy. As a best fit, a mark of 10 was awarded.

Paper Summary

a) Candidates should devote adequate time to the practice of transferring meaning fully, accurately and appropriately from German into English. This is a very useful skill in any case and will pave the way for the translation in A2 Unit 4.

b) Candidates should be familiar with the various marking principles detailed in this report. This will help to maximise performance.

c) Basic grammatical knowledge remains essential. This is evident in Section C: Writing, of course, but it also helps to ensure unambiguous communication of responses in German in both Q4 (in the listening section) and Q7 (in the reading section).

d) Sufficient time must be accorded to Q8 since 30 of the total 70 marks are allocated to this question.

e) It is crucial to the content mark in Q8 that each bullet point is addressed directly and fully. Examiners would recommend that the bullet points be addressed sequentially.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link: http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx





Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828 with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE