

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units

June 2005

3862/7862/MS/R/05

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 mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
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)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2661	Speaking	1
2662	Listening, Reading & Writing	9
2663	Reading & Writing	19
2664	Speaking & reading	31
2665	Listening, Reading & Writing 2	39
2666	Culture & Society (Written Paper)	49

REPORT FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2661	Speaking	56
2662	Listening, Reading & Writing	61
2663	Reading & Writing	63
2664	Speaking & reading	66
2665	Listening, Reading & Writing 2	70
2666	Culture & Society (Written Paper)	72
2667	Coursework	76
*	Grade Thresholds	77

**Mark Scheme 2661
June 2005**

Components 01, 02 and 03 Speaking**Total: 60 marks****Section A Role-play**

Response to written text	5 marks (AO2)	[Grid 1A]
Response to Examiner	5 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1B]
Quality of Language	5 marks (AO3)	[Grid 1C]

Section B

Topic presentation	20 marks (AO4)	[Grid 1D]
Topic discussion		
Spontaneity and fluency	15 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1E]
Pronunciation and intonation	5 marks (AO1)	[Grid 1F]
Quality of Language	5 marks (AO3)	[Grid 1C]

Section A Role-play: Grids 1A and 1B**10 marks****Grid 1A: Response to written text****0-1 Very Poor**

Little use made of stimulus material. Supplies one or two of the key points, but with many gaps and no detail.

2 Poor

Some attempt made to use the stimulus material, but covers less than half the key points. Many omissions or points not conveyed clearly.

3 Adequate

Performance is inconsistent. Makes a reasonable attempt to use the stimulus material. Covers about half of the key points, but there are some gaps.

4 Good

Makes good use of stimulus material. Covers over half the key points with some detail, but does not extend quite far enough to qualify for very good.

5 Very Good

Makes full use of the stimulus material. Covers virtually all the key points clearly supported by detail.

Grid 1B: Response to Examiner**0-1 Very Poor**

Barely able to respond to many of the Examiner's questions. Shows very little initiative or imagination. Unable to react to Examiner's comments.

2 Poor

Some attempt to carry out the task but with limited success. Responses to the Examiner frequently inadequate. Shows little initiative or imagination.

3 Adequate

Inconsistent. Responds satisfactorily to the Examiner, but does not extend a great deal. Some quite good replies but some omissions.

4 Good

Completes the task successfully, showing initiative and imagination most of the time. Is able to keep the momentum going. Extends quite well, but could have gone a little further.

5 Very Good

Completes the task successfully, responding fully to the Examiner's questions and showing initiative and imagination throughout. Takes charge of the conversation. A convincing performance.

Grid 1C: Quality of Language**5 marks****0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors. Only simplest sentence patterns.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but not always successfully. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally good. Shows sound grasp of AS structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures.

Section B**45 marks****Topic presentation: Grid 1D****20 marks**

Note: The Examiner awards a mark for this grid on the basis of candidates' presentations. Candidates are initially placed in the middle of the mark band, which is considered to be appropriate to their performance in the presentation. Following the subsequent discussion the mark may be adjusted within the band or even into a higher or lower band.

Note that it is not possible to be specific in the following grid because of the diversity of topics presented. The Examiner should adapt the general statements below to the specific topic being addressed. Grid 1D focuses on (i) knowledge and factual information; (ii) evidence of planning and preparation; (iii) quality of exposition and presentation. Other issues, such as ideas, opinions and the ability to enter into debate about the topic are dealt with when assessing the discussion (see Grid 1E).

0-4 Very Poor

Conveys very little information about the subject. Material very thin and vague. Much waffle or superficiality. Gives the appearance of not having studied the subject seriously, and not to have planned with care. Poor and hesitant presentation.

5-8 Poor

Little information beyond the obvious or commonplace. Material thin, rambling, repetitious. Some evidence of planning and preparation, but presentation is pedestrian.

9-12 Adequate

Solid base of information with evidence of preparation and planning. Material is factually adequate, but with no evidence of wider reading. Material may not always be relevant. Exposition of topic is worthy but somewhat stilted.

13-16 Good

Good exposition and sound organisation of the topic. Makes relevant factual points. Well-informed with a range of relevant factual information. Well planned and organised material. Good exposition of topic.

17-20 Very Good

Shows well-informed and consistently well-illustrated factual knowledge of the subject. Knowledge is allied to a clear grasp of the subject and understanding of the context and wider issues. Detailed planning evident and topic presented with style and flair.

Note: If candidates fail to relate the Presentation/Discussion to aspects of the society or culture of the country or community where the language is spoken then the maximum mark that can be achieved is 8/20 on Grid 1D.

If, in response to the Examiner's questions, there is some superficial reference subsequently made then this could rise to a maximum of 9/20. If more than a superficial reference is made then the full range of marks in the Adequate band can be accessed.

Topic discussion: Grids 1E, 1F and 1C

25 marks

Grid 1E: Spontaneity and fluency

15 marks

0-3 Very Poor

Has very little to offer by way of ideas and opinions. Much irrelevance or superficiality. Cannot really cope with Examiner's non-factual questions. Slow, with frequent pauses. Fluency confined to pre-learnt material.

4-6 Poor

Beginning to develop ideas and opinions, but very patchy. Can respond intelligently to a few of Examiner's non-factual questions. Beginnings of fluency but with some inconsistency or hesitancy.

7-10 Adequate

Shows some ability to develop ideas and opinions and can respond intelligently to a number of the Examiner's non-factual questions. Reasonably fluent and spontaneous.

11-13 Good

Increasing ability to develop ideas and opinions. Can respond intelligently to almost all the Examiner's non-factual questions. Fluent and spontaneous much of the time.

14-15 Very Good

Able to develop ideas and opinions well. A very fluent and spontaneous performance throughout.

Grid 1F: Pronunciation and intonation**5 marks****0-1 Poor**

Only comprehensible with difficulty. Heavily influenced by mother tongue. Many sounds mispronounced.

2-3 Adequate

A number of errors, with particular problems with more difficult sounds. Otherwise intonation and pronunciation mostly acceptable.

4 Good

Pronunciation and intonation mostly correct, although there may be occasional mispronunciation with more difficult sounds.

5 Very Good

Only occasional errors of pronunciation and intonation. Sounds authentic most of the time.

Grid 1C: Quality of Language**5 marks****0-1 Very Poor**

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors. Only simplest sentence patterns.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but not always successfully. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

4 Good

Accuracy generally good. Shows sound grasp of AS structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be errors in more complex areas.

Ambitious in use of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor errors and slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures.

**Mark Scheme 2662
June 2005**

Please indicate marks awarded as follows.

1. Tick each relevant point for which a whole mark is awarded. Indicate in margin by 1 or 0.
2. Draw a single line under any language errors [in parts of the examination where language is to be marked, i.e. Sections 2A, 2B and 2C].
3. Indicate omitted information by a caret sign.
4. Indicate superfluous information by brackets.
5. Use a wavy line to indicate clumsy expression.
6. Use arrow to indicate error in word order.
7. Where candidates give alternative answers, only the first one written, or the one on the line should be marked.
8. Where a correct answer is invalidated by later incorrect information, indicate with 1 – 1.
9. For each question or section, write the mark awarded in the right-hand margin*. At the end of the exercise write the total marks, **and ring this figure**. [*Left-handers may use the left-hand margin.]
10. In Section 2A and 2B place ticks in the body of the candidate's answer to indicate points for which marks are awarded.
11. At the end of Sections 2A and 2B, add the mark awarded for Quality of Language to the mark gained for comprehension as + X, and then enter and ring the combined total mark.
12. In Section 2C tick in the left-hand margin those points of communication attempted in accordance with the markscheme.
13. Transfer the marks for each task to the front cover and enter the final total. On the OMR marksheet, enter the final total only.

Section 1A - Listening

1 *Autosport: Sieg für Porsche*

One mark for each of:

- (a) 24
- (b) GT3 RS
- (c) 695
- (d) 20 or 19

Max. 4 marks

2 *Kein Erfolg für Deutschlands Handballspieler*

One mark for each of:

b, d, f, g, h, l, n, o, q

Max. 9 marks

3 *„Jugend musiziert“*

- (i) C
- (ii) B
- (iii) C
- (iv) A
- (v) A
- (vi) C
- (vii) B

Max. 7 marks

Total for Listening : 20 marks

Grid 2A: Listening

0-1 Very Poor

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in spellings, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.

2 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, in spelling, agreements and transcriptions from the spoken word.

3 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Still recurrent errors in more complex areas and/or a number of minor errors in spelling and transcriptions from the spoken word.

4 Good

Accuracy generally quite consistent, but there may be errors in more complex areas and/or a number of minor errors in spelling and transcriptions from the spoken word.

5 Very Good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Only minor slips. Confident and correct use of a range of structures. Virtually no problems in transcriptions from the spoken word.

Section 1B - Reading**4 Zwei neue Figuren für *Sesamstraße***

- (a) Erfolg
- (b) lernen
- (c) eingeführt
- (d) geändert
- (e) bunter
- (f) Enthusiasmus
- (g) regelmäßiges
- (h) ängstlicher
- (i) lange
- (j) besseren

Max. 10 marks**Total for Reading : 10 marks****Section 2A - THE WORLD OF WORK – Listening****5 Frau Busch am Telefon:**

- (a) B / Esswaren [1]
- (b) sie verkaufen sich gut / der Verkauf ist gut [1]
- (c) 1100 [1]
- (d) C / 39 [1]
- (e) der Geschmack der Waren gefällt ihnen gut [1]
fast alle finden die Verpackung zu altmodisch [1]
- (f) (i) sie haben darüber / über sie gelacht [1]
(ii) die Reaktion ist nicht so stark [1]
- (g) um (Herrn Hawkins) zu warnen / sie will ihn warnen [1]
- (h) er sollte mit der Design-Abteilung sprechen [1]
und etwas anderes entwerfen [1]
für den Exportmarkt [1]
- (i) sie ist (damit) sehr zufrieden [1]
- (j) sie freut sich darauf [1]
- (k) C / 6er-Packungen [1]

15 marks for Content plus 5 for Quality of Language (Grid 2A) = 20 marks**Total for Listening : 20 marks**

Section 2B - THE WORLD OF WORK – Reading

6 Memo in English : A mark each for any of these points clearly made:

- 1 They asked 7 questions.
- 2 Here is a summary of the results.
- 3 Many customers have problems with (recognizing) the name ‘Yorkshire’ ;
- 4 over 20% connect it with New York;
- 5 think OYKP are American.
- 6 54% find the quality ‘Very Good’.
- 7 More people think the Pies are better value than the Puddings.
- 8 Only male customers are dissatisfied with the portions.
- 9 Almost all find the packaging ‘old-fashioned’.
- 10 Only 5% could name the Barnsley Veggie Pies as suitable for vegetarians.
- 11 23% have bought OYKP products more than once.
- 12 Best response is from female customers aged 40-60.
- 13 Young(er) customers showed a lack of interest.
- 14 *Sparmarkt* attribute this (lack of interest) to / this is because of
- 15 the generally negative reaction to the packaging

Total for Reading: Max. 15 marks for content plus 5 marks for Quality of Language (English) using Grid 2B.

Grid 2B: Quality of Written English**0-1 Very Poor**

Major and persistent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

2 Poor

Frequent serious errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling

3 Adequate

Still a number of errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling, some of them serious.

4 Good

Very accurate with only a few minor errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

5 Very Good

Excellent, almost faultless grammar, punctuation and spelling.

WORLD OF WORK – Writing

7 Letter to Frau Busch: *Marked according to Quality of Language grid 2C. Half mark (½) then deducted for any of the points below not attempted.*

The 10 points to be made are:

- 1 Thank Frau Busch for her message and the report.
- 2 I was surprised
- 3 by the reaction of customers
- 4 to the packaging.
- 5 I am not happy with the idea of
- 6 a different logo for the export market.
- 7 I am discussing the matter today
- 8 with my Design Department.
- 9 We look forward to
- 10 working with *Sparmarkt* in the future.

Total for Writing: 10 marks

Grid 2C: Writing

0-2 Very poor

Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders. Only simplest sentence patterns, and those mainly incorrect.

3-4 Poor

Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.

5-6 Adequate

Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language and shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task but work is characterized by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.

7-8 Good

Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of AS and/or A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.

9-10 Very good

High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. The overall impression is one of competence. Confident and correct use of a varied range of structures.

Transcripts of Listening Passages:**Hörtext eins: Autosport: Sieg für Porsche**

Männerstimme: Großer Erfolg für Porsche bei dem 24-Stunden-Rennen von Daytona/Florida. Das Werksauto Porsche 911 GT3 RS setzte sich nach 695 Runden durch. Es war der 20. Sieg für Porsche bei dem traditionellen Langstreckenklassiker.

Hörtext zwei: *Kein Erfolg für Deutschlands Handballspieler*

Frauenstimme: Enttäuschung für die deutschen Handballer bei dem Weltmeisterschaftsfinale. Der Traum vom dritten Titelgewinn nach 1938 und 1978 hat sich am Sonntag vor 12 000 Zuschauern in der ausverkauften Sporthalle in Lissabon nicht erfüllt. **[Pause]** Ohne die verletzten Stefan Kretzschmar und Volker Zerbe verlor die Nationalmannschaft gegen Kroatien mit 31:34. Die Silbermedaille für Bundestrainer Heiner Brands Team war dennoch der größte Erfolg für den deutschen Handball seit der Bronze-Medaille für die DDR-Spieler bei der Weltmeisterschaft im Jahre 1986.

Hörtext drei: „Jugend musiziert“

Männerstimme: In diesem Jahr findet der Bundeswettbewerb *Jugend musiziert* zum 40. Mal statt. Bei der diesjährigen Preisverleihung erklärte die Ministerin für Familie und Jugend, Renate Schmidt: **Frauenstimme:** „Der Wettbewerb hat dieses Jahr alle Rekorde gebrochen. Über 19 000 junge Musiker und Musikerinnen nahmen auf Regionalebene teil; 6268 haben es bis zu den Landeswettbewerben geschafft, und 1700 bis zum Bundeswettbewerb. Der neue Rekord zeigt, welche große Bedeutung der Wettbewerb für die musikalische Jugendbildung hat.“ **Männerstimme:** Und das ist tatsächlich der Fall: Bei einem Budget von 7,5 Millionen Euro für die Förderung kultureller Jugendbildung fließt über 40 Prozent in den musikalischen Bereich. *Jugend musiziert* ist das größte Einzelprojekt im Jugendplan des Bundes.

World of Work: Frau Busch am Telefon

Frauenstimme: *Hier Elfi Busch von der Lebensmittelfirma Sparmarkt. Ich rufe wegen unserem Pilot-Projekt an. Ihre Waren verkaufen sich gut bei uns; aber ein Problem: Wir haben elfhundert Kunden in unseren 39 Filialen interviewt. Der Geschmack der Waren gefällt ihnen gut, aber fast alle finden die Verpackung zu altmodisch. Die alte Frau im Logo, zum Beispiel – darüber haben viele gelacht. In der ex-DDR ist die Reaktion nicht so stark, aber die neuen Bundesländer stellen nur einen kleinen Teil unseres Umsatzes dar. Mein Bericht ist mit der Post unterwegs; ich dachte nur, ich sollte Sie warnen. Vielleicht können Sie mit Ihrer Design-Abteilung sprechen und für den Exportmarkt etwas anderes entwerfen? Ansonsten sind wir mit der Qualität der Produkte sehr zufrieden und freuen uns auf eine weitere Zusammenarbeit mit Ihrer Firma. Und noch etwas: Wie wäre es mit Sechser-Packungen für die Tiefkühltruhe?*

**Mark Scheme 2663
June 2005**

Modern Languages at Advanced Subsidiary

UNIT 2, Listening, Reading and Writing, and UNIT 3, Reading and Writing

(June 2005)

The following general principles apply to the marking of Units 2 and 3 in French, German and Spanish.

- 1 Obliques indicate alternatives, any one of which scores the marks indicated.
- 2 Bracketed points indicate information or words not essential to score the full marks.
- 3 Alternatives: The award of marks is not necessarily dependent on the specific wording in the mark scheme; other wordings will score the marks, provided they are semantically equivalent. Acceptable alternatives will be discussed at the examiners' meeting and the mark scheme amplified accordingly.
- 4 Copying of material: Candidates are instructed that they may use expressions of up to 5 words from the text **unchanged**. In practice, there is likely to be little opportunity for extensive "lifting" to occur (only in extended writing exercises); where it does happen, the general rule is that the lifted material should be bracketed and discounted for the purpose of assessing the quality of the language.
- 5 Grammar and spelling: In **UNIT 2, Section 2C** and in **UNIT 3, Section B** the quality of the FL in which the Writing task is expressed is assessed under the appropriate assessment grids. In the English exercise in **UNIT 2, Section 2B**, spelling, punctuation and grammar should be assessed under grid 2B.
- 6 Rubric infringements: The most likely rubric infringement in these papers would be answering in the wrong language. Where this occurs, no marks should be awarded.
Any other rubric infringements should be drawn to the attention of the Principal Examiner.
- 7 Particular points relating to Unit 2
 - 7.1 If some of the verbal questions have been omitted, Quality of Language (grid 2A) should be assessed as normal and then the resulting mark will be reduced pro rata (see additional grid in mark scheme).
 - 7.2 Incorrect answers in the target language: assess the language element provided that the candidate has attempted a response to the question.
 - 7.3 Totally irrelevant, or pre-learnt all-purpose answers should score no marks.
 - 7.4 Answers in English, other than in Unit 2, Section 2B, should score no marks.

- 7.5 The use of the familiar pronoun in the Writing task should be regarded as a "serious error" in the language criteria
- 7.6 Transfer of meaning exercise: if a candidate has only attempted part of the translation, assess as follows:
if they have attempted 50%+ of the translation, assess the 2B mark as normal and do not adjust
if they have attempted 25-50%, maximum 2B mark = 3
if they have attempted less than 25%, maximum 2B mark = 2

- 7.7 The 'sympathetic English reader' should be **very** sympathetic in assessing comprehension. $\frac{1}{2}$ marks to be allowed in comprehension questions (to be rounded up at the end of the **paper**).
- 7.8 Fluency of style and appropriateness of vocabulary should be ignored under grid 2B but will be discussed under the details of the comprehension points.
- 7.9 Transfer of meaning into the target language (grid 2C): if the task is incomplete or if candidates have omitted essential sections of the message, this should be reflected in their language mark (there should be no further penalty). For each point not attempted, deduct $\frac{1}{2}$, **after** arriving at the overall language mark.
- 7.10 Vocabulary should be considered under 'structure'.
- 7.11 Do not penalise candidates who write more than 100 words.
- 7.12 Inappropriate register should be reflected in the language mark.
- 8 Particular points relating to Unit 3
- 8.1 Section B: Writing. A maximum of 170 words to be permitted. No additional words to be assessed. A line should be drawn where marking has ceased. Examiners are not required to count words precisely
- 8.2 Short answers. Assess for language (grid 3A) as normal, then:
- 0-50 words written: 1/3 of global language mark awarded
50-80 words written: 2/3 of global language mark awarded
80+ words written: no adjustment
- 8.3 To avoid penalising candidates twice for the same fault, the language must be marked fully, even where the mark under 3A is very low or zero. In the case of a totally irrelevant piece of writing, the script should be referred to the Team Leader.
- 8.4 Annotation of scripts: mark with a circled number any content point (show the mark in the right-hand margin). Mark with a tick in the left-hand margin any personal additions or imaginative points made by the candidate
- 8.5 Rubric infringements are unlikely to occur. Refer any problems of this kind to the Team Leader or Principal Examiner.
- 8.6 Allow 'lifting' of up to 5 words (from the original stimulus or from the cloze test). Put brackets round lifted sections. Discount lifted sections when assessing grid 3A.
- 8.7 Quality of vocabulary should be rewarded under structure.

- 8.8 Responses which are totally irrelevant to the task and/or text should not be assessed for language.
- 8.9 Comprehension (grid 3B).
For 'Adequate', the candidate should refer to c.40% of the content points.
For 'Good', the candidate should refer to 50%+ of the content points.
- 8.10 Content points can be precise, factual points **or** allusions. This will depend on the text. Points do not need to come from the entire passage - they can come from only a section of the text.
- 8.11 Response (grid 3C).
'Insight' and 'originality' refer to anything which was not in the original text.

Modern Languages at Advanced Subsidiary**UNIT 2 and UNIT 3****(June 2005)**

Please use the following symbols on all scripts to indicate marks awarded and any deductions.

- 1 Tick each point for which a whole mark is awarded. Write ½ for a half-mark.
 - 2 Draw a single line **under** any incorrect answer for which no marks are awarded (or, as appropriate, mark it with a cross). Write a zero to indicate no marks.
 - 3 Draw a single line under any language errors [in parts of the examination where language is to be marked].
 - 4 Indicate omitted information by a caret sign.
 - 5 Indicate superfluous information or clumsiness in language by a wavy line.
 - 6 In translation exercises, indicate the end of each sub-section by the symbol // .
 - 7 Where candidates give alternative answers, only the first one written, or the one on the line should be marked.
 - 8 For each question or section, write the mark awarded in the righthand* margin. At the end of the exercise write the total marks, **and ring this figure**. Allow any half-marks to stand.
- * Left-handed markers may use the lefthand margin.
- 9 In Unit 3, section B, Writing, show the mark for Grid 3A (Quality of Language) first and then the mark for 3B (Comprehension), then the mark for 3C (Response) eg

$$4 + 3 + 3 = 10$$

Individual content points made should be numbered consecutively and ringed, either in the body of the text or in the right-hand margin. Any personal or imaginative additions by the candidate should be ticked in the left-hand margin.

- 10 At the end of each exercise total the marks awarded, **and ring this figure**. Allow anyhalf marks to stand.

Arriving at the final mark

Transfer the ringed totals for each exercise to the boxes on the front cover. Total these marks, rounding up any remaining half mark, and write the final total in the box on the front cover. On the OMR marksheet enter **the final total only**.

**AS GERMAN
UNIT 2663, June 2005**

Mark Scheme

Section A: Reading (max 15)

1 One mark for each correct answer (max 7)

a e f i j l n

2 One mark for each correct answer (max 8)

Beispiel: a)	bestellen	b) begonnen
c)	stammt	d) trainieren
e)	wird	f) arbeitet
g)	gibt	h) mithalten
i)	umgehen	

Section B: Writing (max 30)

10 marks for Quality of Language (Grid 3A)

10 marks for Comprehension (Grid 3B)

10 marks for Response (Grid 3C)

Possible comprehension points :

- 1 Actionserien haben viele Fans
- 2 Actionserien haben viele Kritiker / werden von den seriösen Zeitungen kritisiert
- 3 Actionserien haben (zu) viele Effekte / Explosionen / Explosionsmanie / Sensationen
- 4 Hermann Joha / Chef von Actionfilm-Produktionsfirma achtet nicht auf die Kritiker
- 5 Actionfilme haben (regelmäßig) (mehr als)7 Mio / viele Millionen Zuschauer
- 6 (Sogar) Wiederholungen haben 6 Mio Zuschauer / sind sehr beliebt
- 7 Actionserien haben mehr Zuschauer als Hollywoodfilme (im Gegenprogramm)
- 8 Man kann Actionserien mit einer Achterbahnfahrt vergleichen / Action ist zeitlos /
Man kann die selbe Sendung mehrmals sehen
- 9 Die Reaktion ist physisch aufregend
- 10 (Inzwischen) haben andere Kanäle Actionserien
- 11 Die Plots sind schwach/ Die Struktur der Handlung wird von der Action
bestimmt
- 12 (Vier) Autoren schreiben eine Folge in sechs Wochen
- 13 *Eine Mischung aus Sensation / Action und Emotion macht ein erfolgreiches Rezept*
- 14 Frauen und Männer gucken Actionserien / mehr als die Hälfte der Zuschauer sind
Frauen /53 Prozent der Zuschauer sind Frauen

Grid 3A: Quality of Language

10 marks

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders. Only simplest sentence patterns, and those mainly incorrect.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty. Some attempt at use of subordinate clauses and more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language and shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of AS and/or A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. The overall impression is one of competence. Confident and correct use of a varied range of structures.

+ vocabulary.

Grids 3B and 3C**20 marks**

These two grids should be applied jointly to the assessment of the candidate's work. For example, a candidate might omit any significant reference to the passage and yet provide an imaginative response to the theme of the text. The best candidates score highly on each grid.

Grid 3B: Comprehension**10 marks**

This grid is intended to assess the candidate's comprehension of the contents of the text. This grid should be read in conjunction with the setter's mark scheme for the paper, which indicates the list of points considered as forming the essential content indicating comprehension of the passage.

0		Work undeserving of any marks (e.g. blank, irrelevant).
1-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Includes only one or two points from the original passage.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Merely transcribes sections from the original passage.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Includes a reasonable number of points from the original passage.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Includes a good number of points from the original passage.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Provides a comprehensive summary of the original passage.

Grid 3C: Response**10 marks**

0		No attempt to provide a personal response.
1-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Only briefly indicates a personal opinion.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Two or three personal opinions indicate the beginnings of a response.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	A number of personal views expressed, but little flair or imagination.

7-8	<i>Good</i>	A range of personal views, with a certain originality and imagination.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Responds with a wide range of views which show insight and imagination.

Section C: Cloze Test

One mark for each correct answer (max 15)

- 1 i) Zuschauern ii) werden
- 2 Chef
- 3 ihm
- 4 i) mögen ii) mehrere
- 5 i) wenn ii) schalten über sechs Millionen Zuschauer ein
- 6 i) Wegen ii) ihre
- 7 i) die ii) kann man nichts Raffiniertes erwarten
- 8 vorbereiten
- 9 zu unterhalten
- 10 den

**Mark Scheme 2664
June 2005**

Components 01 and 03: Speaking and Reading**Total: 60 marks**

Section A Discussion of Article

Response to and understanding of article	10 marks (A02)	(Grid 4A)
Comprehension of and response to examiner	10 marks (A01)	(Grid 4B)

Section B General conversation

Spontaneity, comprehension, responsiveness, fluency	15 marks (A01)	(Grid 4C)
Pronunciation and intonation	5 marks (A01)	(Grid 1F)
Quality of language	10 marks (A03)	(Grid 4D)
Factual knowledge, ideas and opinions	10 marks (A04)	(Grid 4E)

Section A: Discussion of article: Grids 4A and 4B

20 marks

Grid 4A: Response to and understanding of article**10 marks**

0-2	<i>Very poor</i>	Minimal understanding shown of article. Ideas largely superficial.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Limited knowledge shown of article. Considerable gaps in understanding.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	A reasonable level of understanding. Needs encouragement to develop ideas.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Article generally well understood, but ideas rather limited.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Excellent understanding of all aspects of the article.

Grid 4B: Comprehension of and response to Examiner**10 marks**

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Severe problems of comprehension. Very marked hesitation. Limited responsiveness.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Has general difficulty in understanding. Limited response to the majority of topics raised.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Understands questions on basic concepts but has difficulty with more complicated ideas. Some delay in response.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Few problems of comprehension. Responds readily and without undue hesitation. Quite forthcoming.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	No problems of comprehension. Prompt response to questions. Takes initiative in developing themes.

Section B: General conversation: Grids 4C, 1F, 4D and 4E

40 marks

Grid 4C: Spontaneity, comprehension, responsiveness, fluency marks

15

0-3	<i>Very poor</i>	Severe problems of comprehension, Very marked hesitation. Limited responsiveness. No fluency or feel for the language.
4-6	<i>Poor</i>	Has general difficulty in understanding. Limited response to questions on majority of topics raised. Little fluency or feel for the language. Translates literally from the mother tongue.
7-10	<i>Adequate</i>	Understands questions on basic situations and concepts but has difficulty with more complicated ideas. Some delay in response. Needs encouragement to develop topics. Reasonable fluency and feel for the language with occasional use of relevant idiom. Limited expression of ideas.
11-13	<i>Good</i>	Few problems of comprehension. Responds readily and without undue hesitation. Reasonably forthcoming but tends to follow examiner's lead. Good fluency and feel for the language. Shows competent use of relevant idiom.
14-15	<i>Very Good</i>	No problems of comprehension. Prompt response to examiner's questions. Very forthcoming in developing topics. Able to guide the discussion and lead the examiner, offering and seeking opinions as appropriate. Very good feel for the language and is able to express concepts fluently and in the appropriate idiom.

Grid IF: Pronunciation and intonation

5 marks

0-1	<i>Poor</i>	Only comprehensible with difficulty. Heavily influenced by mother tongue. Many sounds mispronounced.
2-3	<i>Adequate</i>	A number of errors, with particular problems with more difficult sounds. Otherwise intonation and pronunciation mostly acceptable.
4	<i>Good</i>	Pronunciation and intonation mostly correct, although there may be occasional mispronunciation with more difficult sounds.
5	<i>Very Good</i>	Only occasional errors of pronunciation and intonation. Sounds authentic most of the time.

Grid 4D: Quality of language

10 marks

There is a mark out of 5 for grammatical accuracy and another mark out of 5 for range, variety and appropriateness.

Grammatical accuracy

0-1	<i>Very poor</i>	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language, but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
4	<i>Good</i>	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas.
5	<i>Very good</i>	High and consistent level of accuracy. Mainly minor errors. Confident and correct use of the full range of structures contained within the specification.

Range, variety and appropriateness

0-1	<i>Very poor</i>	Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms. Very limited range of structures. Only simplest sentence patterns.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Narrow range of vocabulary. Frequent repetition of common words. Some attempt at more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Some attempt to extend range of vocabulary but still rather repetitive. Shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task.
4	<i>Good</i>	Good range of vocabulary with little repetition. A positive attempt to introduce variety. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns but not always able to maintain correct usage.
5	<i>Very good</i>	Apt use of a wide range of vocabulary. Able to use idiom appropriately. Confident use of a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures.

Grid 4E: Factual knowledge, ideas and opinions**10 marks**

Note that it is not possible to be specific in the following grid because of the diversity of topics presented. The examiner should adapt the general statements below to the specific topics being addressed by the candidate. Grid 4E focuses on (i) knowledge and factual information; (ii) evidence of reading and preparation; (iii) ideas and opinions. Note that response to the examiner is assessed as AO1 in Grid 4C. The concern here is with knowledge and opinions.

0-2	<i>Very Poor</i>	Conveys very little information about the topics. Material very thin and vague. Much waffle or superficiality. Gives the appearance of not having studied the subject seriously. Insubstantial and hesitant delivery. No, or very few, ideas or opinions expressed.
3-4	<i>Poor</i>	Little information beyond the obvious or commonplace. Material thin, rambling, repetitious. Some evidence of preparation, but delivery is pedestrian, as are the one or two ideas expressed.
5-6	<i>Adequate</i>	Solid base of information with evidence of preparation. Material is factually sound, but with no evidence of wider reading. Material may not always be relevant. Exposition of topics is serious but somewhat stilted. Has begun to think about the issues and express ideas.
7-8	<i>Good</i>	Detailed exposition of the topics. Well-informed with a range of relevant factual information. Well prepared material. Interesting ideas and observations.
9-10	<i>Very Good</i>	Shows well-informed and consistently well-illustrated factual knowledge of the subject. Knowledge is allied to a clear grasp of the subject and understanding of the context and wider issues, and is expressed in a range of opinions and observations. Detailed preparation evident and topic presented with style and flair.

Note: In cases where candidates fail to offer some factual knowledge, ideas and opinions related to the country where the language is spoken, a maximum of 4 marks (Poor) will be available on Grid 4E.

Mark Scheme 2665
June 2005

2665 German Listening, Reading and Writing 2

June 2005

Marking scheme and Tapescript

Please indicate marks awarded as follows.

14. Tick each relevant point for which a whole mark is awarded. Indicate in margin by 1 or 0.
15. Draw a single line under any language errors [in parts of the examination where language is to be marked].
16. Indicate omitted information by a caret sign.
17. Indicate superfluous information by brackets.
18. Use a wavy line to indicate clumsy expression.
19. Use an arrow to indicate an error in word order.
20. Where a correct answer is invalidated by later incorrect information, indicate with 1 – 1.
21. For each question or section, write the mark awarded in the right-hand margin*. At the end of the exercise write the total marks, **and ring this figure**. [*Left-handers may use the left-hand margin.]
22. At the end of Sections A and B, write the mark awarded for Quality of Language as 5A or 5B and ring this mark.
23. In the extended writing exercise in Section C, show the mark for Grammatical Accuracy (G) and then the mark for Range, Variety and Appropriateness (R). Ring their total.
24. For the Range mark in cases where answers are irrelevant or there are gaps:

On questions (i) to (iv) tick each content point from markscheme in left-hand margin.

On question (v) place one tick only, if a personal opinion is attempted.

Then

- if all answers have at least one tick against them – assess Range on full range of 5 marks
- if only 4 of the answers have at least one tick against them – assess as normal, then deduct one mark.
- if only 3 of the answers have at least one tick against them – assess as normal, then deduct two marks.
- if only 2 of the answers have at least one tick against them – assess as normal, then deduct three marks.
- if only 1 of the answers has at least one tick against it – assess as normal, then deduct four marks
- and, finally, give 0 for Range if none of the five questions gains a tick.

If there is no answer at all to (v) or it is totally irrelevant, give 0 for Range.

- 11 Transfer the totals for each task to the front cover, insert the Quality of Language mark after the appropriate question. On the OMR marksheet, enter the final total only.

Teil A: Hörtexte. Answers must be expressed in German.**Hörtext 1: Aufgabe 1 – E-Mails zum Pisa-Schock**

- (a) keiner hat ihr die (Ergebnisse der) Pisa-Studie erklärt [1]
- (b) sie verdummen immer mehr [1]
- (c) (i) den Lehrern [1]
(ii) neue / andere / interessante Lehrmethoden [1]
- (d) (i) sie haben den falschen Beruf gewählt / sie sind im menschlichen Umgang unbegabt [1]
(ii) sie schaden sich selbst [1]
(iii) sie sind zu alt / sie haben keine Lust mehr, (richtig) mit ihnen zu arbeiten [1]
- (e) Unterrichtsmaterialien / Bücher und Computer [1]
- (f) 2 of 3:
viel Geld wird zum Fenster hinausgeschmissen [1]
Sachen werden gekauft, die bald veraltet [1] oder nicht nötig sind [1]

Total 10 marks**Hörtext 2: Aufgabe 2 – „Die Zukunft der Bundeswehr“**

- (a) die Bundeswehr ist stolz darauf / stolz auf sie [1]
- (b) (i) (ihre Rolle) in Afghanistan [1]
(ii) (ihre Rolle) bei den Flutkatastrophen [1] [*interchangeable*]
- (c) gar nicht groß / es gibt keine Schwierigkeiten [1]
- (d) 2 of 3:
mehr Zeitsoldaten [1]
mehr Berufssoldaten [1]
viele dienen freiwillig länger [1]
- (e) keinen / sie ist keineswegs gefährdet [1]
- (f) Berufsarmee ist teurer / Wehrpflichtarmee ist billiger [1]
- (g) Junge Leute aus einer begonnenen Berufsausbildung [1]
- (h) Sie hat dem Land und dem Volk vortrefflich gedient [1]

Total for Teil A: 20 + 5 Quality of Language (using Grid 5A) = 25

Teil B: Lesen - 1. Freiwilliges Ökologische Jahr

Aufgabe 3. One mark for each answer in German demonstrating comprehension.

- (a) Sie haben die Qual der Wahl (idea of difficulty of choice) [1];
einige wissen nicht, was sie machen wollen (idea of not knowing what to do) [1]
- (b) sie können die Umwelt schützen [1]
mit der Natur arbeiten [1] ;
- (c) 2 of 3
1987 in Niedersachsen [1] als Modellversuch [1] bald großes Interesse [1]
- (d) 2000 Jugendliche machen das FÖJ jährlich [1]
- (e) es kommt auf ihre Neigung an [1]
- (f) es gibt theoretische Begleitprogramme [1]
wo sie mehr über ökologische Zusammenhänge lernen [1]
Teamarbeit kennen lernen [1]
eigene Projektideen entwickeln [1]
- (g) zwischen 16 und 27 [1]
- (h) any three of: sie erwerben praktische und theoretische Kenntnisse [1]
sie sammeln Erfahrungen [1]
sie werden selbstständig [1]
sie lernen andere Menschen und deren Lebensbereiche kennen [1]
sie bekommen Denkanstöße [1]
sie bekommen einen Blick über den Tellerrand [1]

Total 16 marks

Aufgabe 4 Marks as follows for communicating comprehension:

- (a) *deutschlandweit*: überall in Deutschland [1]
- (b) *azubi*: Auszubildender / junger Mensch, der eine Ausbildung bekommt [1]
- (c) *beruflich nutzbar*: gut für die (spätere) Arbeit [1]
- (d) *der Blick über den Tellerrand*: einen neuen Horizont sehen / Neues erleben [1]

Total 4 marks

plus 5 marks for Quality of Language, assessed using grid 5B.

Teil B: Lesen - 2. „Das Leben in der Stadt“

Exercise 5. One mark for comprehension as per below. (Ignore all answers in German)

- (a) do not wish to live in a city [1]
wish to move to the country in 20 years [1]
- (b) a little house / cottage by the sea [1]
far from (city) traffic [1]
and busy streets [1]
- (c) town planners [1]
traffic planners / experts [1]
- (d) people who flee / have fled the city [1]
- (e) nice public areas [1]
(creation of) more green areas and parks [1]
- (f) shopping malls / arcades [1]
public transport [1]
housing [1]
- (g) The money invested [1]
in modern town and traffic planning [1]
since the fall of the Wall / since reunification [1]
has been worth it / has paid off [1]
- (h) the culture on offer [1]
- (i) balance between housing [1] and industrial/commercial use [1]

Total 20 marks

**Total for Teil B: 20 + 5 Quality of Language (using Grid 5B to assess Aufgabe 3) + 20
= 45**

Teil C: Schriftliche Arbeit – ‘Viennese strike on a novel reading idea’

Aufgabe 6. A global mark out of 10 (using Grid 5C), taking into consideration the quality of the candidate’s German and the communication of some or all of the following points in (i) to (iv):

- (i) (100,000 copies of) book being given away;
- (ii) authorities think Viennese not reading enough
wish to encourage people to visit bookshops and/or libraries;
to discover the joy of reading;
to take a look Vienna’s history
- (iii) the story of Berek Spiegelglas;
Jewish blacksmith;
from late 19th century till annexation of Austria
- (iv) born in Vienna in 1924
as Fritz Mandelbaum
fled to London 1939
moved to America 1940;
- (v) Personal Response : reward pertinent expression

Total for Teil C: maximum of 10 marks

Total for whole paper: [80 marks]

Tapescripts: Teil A

Hörtext 1: E-Mails zum Pisa-Schock

Frauenstimme: Wir fragten: Wer ist am schlechten Ergebnis für Deutschland bei der Pisa-Studie schuld? Die Schulen oder die Schüler? Hier einige E-Mails zum Thema.

Männerstimme: Angelika schreibt: Uns hat wirklich keiner erklärt, wie das im Einzelnen abgelaufen ist und was die Ergebnisse dieser Studie waren. Es hieß immer nur, die Pisa-Studie lässt uns Schüler in schlechtem Licht stehen.

Frauenstimme: Hier Steffi: Unsere Lehrer meinten, dass wir immer mehr verdummen würden und dass wir im Prinzip selber dran schuld seien. Wir Schüler würden immer weniger Interesse an der Schule zeigen und hätten nicht mehr so die Intelligenz wie die Schüler aus früheren Zeiten.

Männerstimme: Bianca schreibt: Unsere Lehrer sind stinklangweilig. Es müssen sich vor allem die Lehrmethoden ändern, um die Interessen der Schüler mehr zu wecken und sie zu motivieren.

Frauenstimme: Kirsten geht weiter: Ich glaube, dass es Lehrer gibt, die den falschen Beruf gewählt haben. Sie können zwar teilweise den Stoff überbringen, sind aber im menschlichen Umgang ganz unbegabt. Bei solchen Lehrern will man einfach nichts lernen, obwohl einem das letzten Endes selbst schadet. Es ist auch das Alter der Lehrer. Bei uns an der Schule ist das Durchschnittsalter 50; sie haben keine Lust mehr, richtig mit uns zu arbeiten.

Männerstimme: Jan meint Folgendes: Der Mangel an Geld liegt dahinter. Unterrichtsmaterialien fehlen oft völlig. Wir haben nie genug Bücher, müssen sogar Fotokopien teilen oder selber machen. Wie kann man heutzutage lernen, wenn die Schule fast keine Computer hat? Kein Wunder, dass wir an zwanzigster Stelle oder so was im internationalen Ranking sitzen.

Frauenstimme: Marvin drückt das anders aus. Er schreibt: Viel Geld wird zum Fenster rausgeschmissen. Es werden Sachen angeschafft, die bald wieder veraltet sind, oder sie sind nicht das, was man eigentlich braucht.

Hörtext 2: 'Die Zukunft der Bundeswehr'

Frauenstimme: Wir reden heute mit einem Sprecher des Bundesverteidigungsministeriums, Herrn Steiner. Herr Steiner, wie ist zur Zeit die Stimmung bei der Bundeswehr?

Männerstimme: Die Bundeswehr ist stolz auf ihre Leistungen. Und das ist recht so, denn die Soldaten leisten bei den Auslandseinsätzen hervorragende Arbeit. Denken Sie zum Beispiel an ihre Führungsrolle bei der Schutztruppe in Afghanistan. Und was die Bundeswehr bei den verschiedenen Flutkatastrophen geleistet hat, verdient auch höchste Anerkennung.

Frauenstimme: Trotzdem gibt es Probleme, bei der Rekrutierung, zum Beispiel.

Männerstimme: Nein, dort gibt es keine Schwierigkeiten. Das belegen alle Statistiken, die mir vorgelegt werden. Der Trend ist zu mehr Zeit- und Berufssoldaten; außerdem gibt es viele, die freiwillig länger dienen.

Frauenstimme: Wie kommt die Reform der Bundeswehr voran?

Männerstimme: Langsam, denn das Geld reicht nicht aus, um uns alles zu leisten, was wir gerne machen möchten. Aber die Einsatzbereitschaft der Bundeswehr ist dadurch keineswegs gefährdet.

Frauenstimme: Wird es demnächst so etwas wie eine berufliche Interventionsarmee in Deutschland geben?

Männerstimme: Nein, das ist nicht die Absicht der Bundesregierung. Wir bleiben grundsätzlich bei einer Wehrpflichtarmee. Eine freiwillige Berufsarmee ist übrigens beträchtlich teurer als eine Wehrpflichtarmee.

Frauenstimme: Wie sieht es denn aus mit der Zukunft der Wehrpflicht?

Männerstimme: Wir kämpfen dafür, dass wir an die allgemeine Wehrpflicht festhalten. Allerdings berücksichtigen wir die Lage auf dem Arbeitsmarkt und holen deshalb möglichst niemand aus einer begonnenen Berufsausbildung. Andere Parteien, vor allem die Grünen, denken anders als wir. Unser Standpunkt ist, dass die Bundeswehr 50 Jahre lang dem Land und dem Volk vortrefflich gedient hat; daran wollen wir nichts ändern.

Mark Scheme 2666
June 2005

The following general principles apply to the marking of the Culture and Society paper in all languages.

- 1 **Assessment criteria:** All scripts are to be marked in accordance with the assessment criteria below (Grids 6A and 6B).
- 2 **Marking:** Examiners are asked:
 - (a) to single underline all language errors
 - (b) to indicate omissions by a caret sign
 - (c) to indicate superfluous or unclear material by a wavy line.
- 3 **Comments:** Examiners are asked to write **no comments** at all on the scripts. However, in certain cases it may be helpful to attach comments on a separate sheet when an explanation of the allocation of marks may be deemed necessary.
- 4 **Length:** There is no limit on the number of words to be written per essay, no penalties, therefore, are to be imposed.

Essays which are too short should be assessed as normal; the shortness will usually be self-penalising.

- 5 **Rubric infringements:**

Where candidates write their essays based on the same text or topic, only the better of the two should be marked.

In such cases the action taken by the examiner must be clearly shown at the foot of the essay, and the words **RUBRIC INFRINGEMENT** written on the front cover. There is no need to mark such scripts for the attention of the Team Leader.

Any other cases of rubric infringements should be drawn to the attention of the Team Leader.

- 6 **Reference to the country:** Both the Aims and the Assessment Objectives of the specification indicate that essays in Section C must relate to **"a country where the language studied is spoken"**. It is acknowledged that some of the topic titles have international application, but each title in the specification specifically refers to the country/countries in question. There is, therefore, no excuse for essays which do not refer to the country/countries studied. It should be noted in this respect that, with the exception of those topic areas asterisked in the specification, **any** country where the language is spoken is acceptable for the purposes of this paper (eg Francophone Africa, Austria, Latin America).

Essays which make no or little reference to the country/countries in question may be awarded no more than 7 marks for grid 6A.

- 7 **Indication of marks:** At the end of each essay, the examiner must show the mark awarded under each separate grid, and the resulting total, which should be ringed.

e.g.

6A1	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	36
6A2	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6B	5 + 3	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Add the two totals out of 60 together to get an overall mark out of 120. Divide this by two (rounding up any $\frac{1}{2}$ marks) to get a final total out of 60. Indicate this on the front cover of the answer script.

e.g.

$$36 + 38 = 74 = \textcircled{37}$$

Grid 6A (1): Information about topics, texts, relevance and appropriateness of response

20 marks

0-3	Very Poor	Extremely brief and/or very inadequate answer. Little or no knowledge of the text/topic. Frequent irrelevance. A very superficial treatment of the task.
4-7	Poor	The candidate has a limited grasp of the text/topic. Some material but little attempt to organise it or answer the question. There are omissions and some irrelevancy in completing the task.
8-11	Adequate	Evidence that the candidate has understood the text/topic presented. The essay has a preponderance of content but there is evidence of ability to recognise the central issues. Rather dull treatment of the task.
12-15	Good	Evidence of thought and preparation showing a sound knowledge of the text/topic, supported by factual knowledge. Mainly relevant to the task and demonstrating some imagination and/or originality (where appropriate).
16-18	Very Good	The text/topic is used and pointed to the question, the general issues pertinent to the text/topic have been taken into account in response to the question. There is evidence of an ability to produce an imaginative and/or original response to the task (where appropriate).
19-20	Excellent	Intelligent use of factual information, clarity, sense of control. Clear evidence of thoughtful evaluation of texts/topics. A precise and thorough response to the task showing insight into the text/topic.

Grid 6A (2): Understanding of topics, texts and issues, structure and development of ideas.

20 marks

0-3	Very Poor	May have great difficulty communicating at this level in the foreign language. Ideas presented at random. Sequence illogical with no development of an argument and no ability to draw conclusions.
4-7	Poor	Little attempt to structure the work. Some sequence in facts presented, but a weakness in paragraphing and no real build-up of an argument to a conclusion. Rambling and disjointed.
8-11	Adequate	Ideas generally organised in a structured way and some ability to organise into paragraphs and sequence the argument, although somewhat superficial.
12-15	Good	Some ability to develop ideas and opinions even if without much sophistication. Clear line of thought with competent development of argument. Ideas mostly well-linked and some ability to draw conclusions.
16-18	Very Good	The essay has an argument and develops a case but there may be some limitations in scope. There is a clear line of thought and/or evidence of an ability to draw conclusions.
19-20	Excellent	Well-balanced and coherent piece with an excellent introduction and good organisation with clarity and a sense of control. Ideas clearly linked and well-developed. Thoughtful work.

Grid 6B: Quality of language

20 marks

Grammatical accuracy

1-2	Very Poor	Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Persistent serious and elementary errors in endings, tenses, genders.
3-4	Poor	Evidence of gaps in basic grammar. Frequent errors of an elementary kind, e.g. irregular verbs frequently not known; adjectival agreements and common genders faulty.
5-6	Adequate	Shows evidence of fair understanding of grammatical usage but performance is likely to be patchy and inconsistent. Attempts more complex language but work is characterised by being inconsistent and with variable accuracy. Expression rather forced and problems with correct word order.
7-8	Good	Accuracy generally consistent. Shows sound grasp of A2 structures list. Tenses and agreements sound although there may be some inconsistency and errors in more complex areas.
9-10	Very Good	High and quite consistent level of accuracy. Confident and correct use of the full range of structures contained within the specification. Only minor errors of spelling which do not affect the morphology.

Range, variety and appropriateness

1-2	Very Poor	Very limited vocabulary. Frequent anglicisms. Very limited range of structures. Only simplest sentence patterns.
3-4	Poor	Narrow range of vocabulary. Frequent repetition of common words. Some attempt at more complex sentence patterns, but errors still even in common structures.
5-6	Adequate	Some attempt to extend range of vocabulary, but still rather repetitive. Shows some ability to produce syntax and structures appropriate to the task.
7-8	Good	Good range of vocabulary, with little repetition. A positive attempt to introduce variety. Ambitious in use of a variety of complex sentence patterns, but not always able to maintain correct usage.
9-10	Very Good	Apt use of a wide range of vocabulary. Able to use idiom appropriately. Confident use of a wide range of complex sentence patterns and structures.

Report on the Units

June 2005

Examiner's Report June 2005

2661 German Speaking

General Comments

Markers and Moderators reported the full range of performance from the exceptionally good to the very poor. Most candidates seemed well-prepared and aware of the requirements of the AS speaking examination.

Role-play

Almost all Teacher/Examiners adhered correctly to the Randomisation Sheet sequence printed on page 2 of the Examiner's Booklet, which meant that role-plays A and C were the most frequently used. Markers and moderators reported no real discernable differences between the four role-plays set for this session. Many of the role-plays heard were successful and entertaining, some less so. One feature still causing some concern, despite the many role-plays set since 2001 for this specification, is the inability of many candidates to word the initial two questions correctly. For example (*Zuerst müssen Sie Informationen herausfinden:*) *was er/sie in der Zeit vor Weihnachten macht* (role-play A) was often simply repeated as a question making little sense: *was er/sie in der Zeit vor Weihnachten macht?* Centres should also be aware that criterion 1A assesses response to the stimulus material. Many candidates conveyed enough information to score 3/5, but the higher marks can only be awarded if all or virtually all details are provided. More than a mere summary is required. Similarly, a good range of structures and vocabulary enables access to the higher marks on 1C, as long as the basics are also sound. Sadly, serious errors involving basic verb forms and subject/verb agreement still persist. Candidates should be discouraged by centres from writing full sentence translations on the Candidate Sheet during the preparation time.

The importance of good preparation by the Teacher/Examiner has been emphasised at numerous Inset meetings and in previous 2661 Examiner Reports. It cannot be stressed enough that the Teacher/Examiner's role is **not** just to read out questions from the Examiner's Booklet, ignoring what the candidate is saying. A good Teacher/Examiner listens carefully, reacts to the candidate's statements and suggests further stimuli designed to elicit more information if necessary, without providing the vocabulary. Teacher/Examiners should not expect their candidates to deliver a monologue on the stimulus material before intervening. A successful role-play is one where there is interaction, especially where the Teacher/Examiner recognises that points have been omitted. Good Teacher/Examiner knowledge of the stimulus material and the Candidate's Sheet is therefore vital. Where candidates fail to express satisfactorily what is in the stimulus material, the role of the Teacher/Examiner is to encourage them to supply further details without providing the answer. Closed questions (e.g. *Gibt es einen Andenkenladen, wo man Souvenirs kaufen kann?*) only help candidates to practise *Ja* or *Nein* and do little to help them gain marks.

Many Teacher/Examiners prepared very well this session. Many (but not all!) have learnt the art of eliciting information in a skilled way, giving candidates the opportunity to gain better marks, especially on criterion 1A. Few Teacher/Examiners and few candidates made reference to the photographs and visuals supplied with each role-play to add flavour and make it more interesting. A minority of Teacher/Examiners failed to ask about the final bullet point, perhaps because it is now printed on the second page of the Examiner's Sheet. Timing of the role-play was good from many centres this session. Assessment of the role-play ceased after five minutes, in line with QCA requirements.

Comments on Individual Questions

Role-play A: Advent in Salzburg

Most candidates were given this role-play, the first in the Randomisation sequence. Most candidates made some attempts at conveying the details contained in the stimulus material. The two initial questions were not done well by all. Some enquired about the time von Weihnachten rather than vor in question 1. The response to the second question should act as a cue to the introduction of the stimulus text. A considerable number of candidates failed to recognise this: when asked what they were going to be doing in the Advent period, they answered with variations on "I'll be working in a restaurant" (followed by a pregnant pause) rather than "I'll be visiting Salzburg". Many virtually ignored the opening sentence about the timing of Advent and reduced it to the equivalent of warum nicht Salzburg besuchen? Surprisingly, not all knew Austria and Salzburg appeared to be in several countries including Germany and Australia. The second paragraph was the densest, and candidates often offered some but not all of the information. The words brightly coloured/wooden/figures were ignored by many (wooden often rendered by variations on Wald), and the sentence containing Mozartkugeln proved a barrier to many. The expression Salzburg's most famous son was not conveyed well (Salzburgs wichtig Junge/ berühmte Sonne etc).

Narrow streets often elicited schlanke Straßen, and the word Weihnachtslieder was often mispronounced. Some thought that the Austrian airport was called Stansted-Salzburg and there was much confusion over one way plus taxes, many offering the price mit Gebühren. It was unhelpful to candidates if Teacher/Examiners used Steuern, where Gebühren was given in the Hilfsvokabeln. Again, the importance of good teacher preparation is vital. Numbers are invariably a hurdle, and both £29.99 and 120 Euros were not always successfully conveyed. Ein Doppelzimmer von 1200 Euro pro Nacht does seem rather excessive. Not all English learners of German knew B&B. The final bullet point was done adequately, but often with a good deal of Examiner help. Few candidates mentioned the snow in the photographs adding to the Christmas atmosphere.

There were, of course, many good responses and the majority of candidates were able to convey details with at least moderate success. With judicious Examiner questioning, some of those candidates scoring 3/5 on 1A may have scored a little higher.

Role-play B: London Eye

The initial questions were done well by many, the most frequent mistakes being failing to change er/sie to Sie, and möchte to möchten in question 1. To some candidates it is not yet obvious that they should use the polite form of address when the Candidate's Sheet states that the candidate is talking to the father/mother.

Many candidates made good attempts at conveying the stimulus text. Astonishingly, the pronunciation of the Hilfsvokabeln word Riesenrad was poor, many offering Reisenrad. The word high was not always known and many ignored 'become a symbol for 21st century Britain' completely. Most could not use sich drehen correctly. The final section, the easiest, was done better, although problems with numbers occurred. £12.50 was sometimes £12.15/ £12.40/ zwölfundfünfzig Pfund (sometimes pronounced Perfund) and Kinder sind Halbp reis. Many did express 09.30 correctly but 20.00 was variously rendered as zehn in der Nachmittag/ 8 Uhr nachmittags/ zwanzig hundert Uhr. The zero of the telephone number was poorly done, as was the w for the website. Centres are encouraged to practise numbers and the alphabet at all levels.

The final bullet point was done satisfactorily by many but not all. Some Teacher/Examiners were urged to travel mit dem (Unterstraßen)Bahnhof and die U-Bahn fährt 3 Zeit ein Tag

(sic) in order to see *die Häuser der Reagierung (die englische Reichstag)* or *Großes Ben*. This year's Weitsicht prize goes to the London Eye, which *war in 3000 geöffnet*. Teacher/Examiners who prepare well do not step out of role. It can only be confusing to candidates who have read *der Vater/die Mutter (der Prüfer/die Prüferin) war noch nie in England* to hear *Ja, diese Gegend kenne ich*.

Role-play C: Honister Slate Mine

Most candidates working with this role-play also made a good attempt at expressing in German the details in the stimulus material on what there is to see and do at this visitor attraction. The text itself had a mixture of items ranging from the easy to the more difficult. The initial questions were not always well done and some left the words unchanged, adding only a question mark (Wo er/sie übernachten wird?). As with role-play B, many candidates incorrectly used the du form of address.

Many candidates misread Schiefergrube and pronounced it as *Scheifergrube/ Schiefergrub/ Stiefergrube/ Schliefergrube/ Schniefergrube/ Schiefergruße*. Honister State Mine was heard, near Kenswick. Often, candidates ignored whole sections, such as the second sentence in paragraph one and the second half of the first sentence in paragraph two. Centres are reminded that 1A tests response to the written text. If candidates ignore sections of the stimulus material, it is the task of the Teacher/Examiner to elicit further details. The latter half of the third paragraph was not done particularly well. If you're lucky was often rendered (if at all) by *wenn du glücklich bist* and watch the experts as they cut the massive blocks of slate was virtually ignored. The final (easier) section was more successful on the whole, although few coped well with suggestions as to what one might buy in the shop. Some imprecision occurred: the Lake District is *in der Nähe von Schottland/ Exmoor*, at the Slate Mine *man kann kostenlos Tee und Kaffee kaufen/ man kann selbst Schiefer machen* and *man kann einen Schutzhelm kaufen. Eine Tour kostet 5 Mark 20*, apparently.

Criterion 1A assesses how well the stimulus material is conveyed. Statements such as *man kann eine Schutzhelm geben/ man kann Hose wehren/ schwierige Kleidung/ man hat die Schiefergrube abgebaut/ Honister ist jetzt eine Touristenseite* cannot be construed as successful. Again, a (thankfully tiny) minority of Teacher/Examiners stepped out of role, one even stating *du wohnst nicht in Keswick, du wohnst in London, nicht?* Such misleading statements cannot help any candidate already in a nervous state. Many candidates were refreshingly honest in their assessment of Lake District weather, but their suggestions as to clothing were not always suitable (*Jeans/ T-Shirt usw.*)

Role-play D: German Audiomagazines

The initial questions caused some confusion over tense and pronoun (Wie lange hat er/sie schon Italienisch gelernt? was common, as was Was für einen Standard hat er/sie erreicht?). Most candidates did at least understand that German Audiomagazines offered some reading as well as some listening. The stimulus text itself had many details, some of which were ignored by candidates. For example, the third sentence of the stimulus material contained four examples of when German Audiomagazines could be used. Many candidates seemed satisfied with suggesting one or two (or even inventing a different one such as in Bett). Good Teacher/Examiners recognised that not all four had been conveyed and requested further examples.

Unknown words were portable/ well-known/ writers/ journalists/ business people/ rave about/ (money) back. Candidates tend to ignore what they find difficult. It is good examining technique to offer candidates at least the chance to express what they have omitted. The languages on offer were often an approximation rather than totally accurate (*Italienisch/ Italien/ Spanianisch/ Spanien*). The *Hilfsvokabeln* word *fließend* was often pronounced

fleißend. Numbers and prices again caused concern (e.g. £109 was sometimes *neunundhundert Pfund/ £131 einunddreißighundert Pfund/ £75 fünfundsiebzehn Pfund*).

Most candidates did attempt to convey at least parts of the text adequately. The final bullet point (the opinion of the friend in England learning German) was a little disappointing, with many candidates simply saying (*sehr*) *gut*, rather than extolling the virtues of the course.

The role-play remains a good test of what candidates can do and differentiates well. It offers the weaker candidate the chance to express some basics and challenges the stronger candidate to use initiative and imagination. The variety in the level of language heard was as in previous sessions. Weak candidates are restricted to simple sentence patterns/ *es gibt*/ forms of the verb *sein*, and have difficulties with even basic verb forms and word order. 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 and subjunctives.

Topic

The vast majority of candidates are well prepared for this part of the examination. Some are over-prepared. Most presentations were well timed at between two and three minutes, and fewer this session were overlong. Teacher/Examiners are reminded that in such cases they must intervene after three minutes (but preferably not mid-sentence!) The topic discussion should last 7-8 minutes and proceed along the lines of the headings on the Oral Topic Form/AS, starting with the first heading. Oral Topic Forms should be sent to Markers and Moderators with the Working Mark Sheets (WMS). Discussions should encourage spontaneity and Teacher/Examiners should challenge and explore statements made by candidates. The best discussions are those where a great deal of genuine interchange takes place. This occurs naturally when discussions have not been over-rehearsed. A minority of centres still allows pre-rehearsed mini-monologues to take place where there is anything but spontaneity. Such candidates penalise themselves on 1E, often severely. It is pleasing to report that this session, almost all topics related to a German-speaking country (example of exception – *mein Gitarre*) and the full range of marks on 1D was possible. Headings on Oral Topic Form/AS were better presented. They should be headings, not sentences, and limited to a few words. Their function is to remind candidate and Examiner what the candidate would like to focus on in the discussion. Assessment of the topic ceased after ten minutes, in line with QCA requirements.

Topics chosen by candidates ranged, as usual, from some well worn ones, such as *Essen und Trinken/ das deutsche Schulsystem/ Bayern München/ das Oktoberfest/ Michael Schumacher* etc. to individual and unusual ones such as *die deutsche Anti-Kriegseinstellung/ das Pflichtdienstjahr in Deutschland/ das Schulwesen in der Schweiz/* etc. All topic discussions are measured against the same criteria and if every candidate did those mentioned above, then they would no longer be unusual! It is refreshing, however, to hear discussions where the candidate has obviously done some private research and is able to converse on a topic which is not commonplace. Markers and Moderators are grateful to those centres encouraging different topics by different candidates. A centre where all candidates are offering, for instance, *das deutsche Schulsystem*, is not greeted with enthusiasm by the Marker/Moderator. Candidates are encouraged to research in depth some aspect with a German perspective and become an expert in that field for the purposes of the oral examination. It is insufficient just to have a mild interest in a topic but to have done little research. Comparisons such as *Vergleich zwischen Franka Potente und Keira Knightley* are only partly based on a German context and marks for 1D are restricted.

Mispronunciations (*Wirtschaftswachturm/ Waschtürme/ Außenputzel [fairytale figure]/ Schreibhauseffekt/ Leberkuchen/ Empfängnisverhärtung und Abreibung/ Brot mit Aufschnitt und Kaiser*) count for most of the odd features encountered in this part of the examination. Sometimes the wrong word is chosen by mistake: *Katharina Blum hat ein ziemlich einfache Leber/ Mozart hat Opfer geschrieben/ Rinderwahrsein/ Leopold war gegen die Ehre (Mozart)/ der Rhein ist 1320 Quadratkilometer lang*. Accuracy remains a problem with some. Subject/verb agreement is still a major difficulty with weaker candidates, as are verb second idea and word order in subordinate clauses.

Such examples refer, of course to individual lapses and can be minor compared with the many well-phrased statements. It is extremely rewarding to hear successful interchanges of ideas and opinions and many topic discussions are exactly that. The best are always spontaneous, lively, full of factual information on the chosen topic and accurate. Candidates can, and often do, research a particular topic well, either through reading or the internet. The internet and written sources often provide excellent information. However, this information is in a written format and sounds stilted and unnatural if simply learnt by heart and regurgitated. It is the candidates' role to manipulate 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 fascinates them and which they can explain with enthusiasm. Topic discussions this session ranged from the extremely impressive to the seemingly unprepared.

2662: German Listening, Reading and Writing 1

General Comments

The candidature consisted of the usual mix of those taking the paper for the first time at the end of their first year in the Sixth Form, those re-sitting for the first or even a second time, a selection of mature students and some native speakers. The marks scored went across the whole range from 80 to the teens. As always many scripts showed considerable care and thought, and there was plenty of evidence of excellent teaching based upon the study of past papers. Sadly there continue to be a surprising number of scripts which are scruffy in the extreme, not just full of amendments and scribbled afterthoughts but written in a scrawl from the very first page. Such scripts can be difficult to decipher; it is not in the interests of students to present carelessly written answers.

Specific Comments

Candidates generally found little difficulty with the first Listening exercise, *Autosport; Siegfür Porsche*. They are familiar with numbers and the German alphabet and scored highly on questions 1(a)-1(c). A small number of candidates rightly reckoned that Porsche had previously won the race 19 times and gave this as the answer (which was accepted) to question 1(d).

The second exercise demanded more reading to select the appropriate 9 answers to tick. The information in the text about *Kein Erfolg für Deutschlands Handballspieler* was very factual, containing dates, numbers, names, scores. Most candidates scored well, though by no means perfectly.

The same applied to the third listening task, which centred on a national music competition called „*Jugend musiziert*“. A relatively small number of candidates were uncertain whether the competition was open to both sexes (q.3(iii)) and a similarly small percentage were not sure about the attitude of the Minister to the record entry for the competition (q. 3(iv)). As is always the case candidates get off to a good start on these short listening passages assessed through the medium of largely non-verbal tests.

The Reading exercise required candidates to complete sentences which were based on a passage about two new figures to be introduced into the children's television show *Sesamstraße*. The words needed to fill the gaps were given below the exercise with a number of distracters. Candidates need to study the text carefully and think logically about what fits appropriately into the blank spaces, a verb, an adjective, an adverb, etc.. Few candidates made wild choices, though the occasional decision made for mildly comic reading. The most common error was to insert *höchsten* instead of *besseren* in the last sentence; otherwise the full gamut of mistakes was run.

Major difficulties start with the World of Work Listening exercise. This paper was no exception. It is good to see how many candidates clearly do understand what they hear and are able to transcribe words and even whole phrases accurately. For every such candidate there is, however, another who writes down a good deal of nonsense which bears some relation to what he or she hears but would leave a reader coming fresh to their answers completely baffled as to what was meant. Examiners are always surprised by what the candidates appear not to know or not to recognise: this time it was *Kunden, Verkauf, Waren, Exportmarkt* and *Abteilung*, all words that reoccur in this exercise from session to session, as well as *lachen, stark, warnen* and *zufrieden*, which are hardly

difficult words. A very large number of candidates were unable to write *elfhundert* as a word, and plenty wrote 11,000 or 11,00 as their answer. One perennial problem in reporting the content of such answerphone messages is the problem of getting the perspective right: often it was not clear, for example, whether Frau Busch wanted to speak to Mr Hawkins' design department herself or wanted him to speak to them. Marks on this exercise always vary radically, and they did so here too.

The passage to be converted into a memo for a non-German-speaking boss was a summary of the results of a survey carried out among German customers; it concerned the goods marketed by Old Yorkshire Kitchen Products. Much of the German vocabulary was routine or familiar from previous passages: *Umfrage*, *Ergebnisse*, *Verbraucher*, *Preis*, *Verpackung*, *Kunden*, *Mangel*, for example; yet many candidates made little sense of them. As is always the case the quality of English written by candidates varied from near-faultless to dreadful. What candidates thought they were saying by writing 'manly customers' (*bei den männlichen Kunden*), 'old-modern packaging' (*die Verpackung altmodisch*) or 'people interviewed almost without a name' ('fast ohne Ausnahme die Befragten') must have been a mystery to them. Lots of candidates said the text was 'an overview of the responses' or even an 'over view'; dozens said that the pies were 'price-worthier' than the puddings, that customers were 'unsatisfied', that young customers showed 'disinterest'. Often there was as much confusion among candidates as to what or where 'Yorkshire' is as there was among the German consumers. Spelling of *questionnaire*, *German/Germany*, *dissatisfaction*, *vegetarian*, *negative* and *attractive* were predictably poor. The use of *zuschreiben* in the final paragraph floored many a candidate, who often suggested that someone was going to write a negative reaction on a piece of packing or packaging!

Unusually the final exercise required candidates to respond in writing to the answerphone message and say thank you for it and the survey. Many candidates failed to notice this and began their letter by thanking Frau Busch for her 'letter' (with all the usual errors). The fact that the word *Nachricht* is given in the rubric of question 5 escaped countless candidates. This particular exercise was, generally, not done well. Far too many letters contained grossly inaccurate German heavily influenced by the English memo: *Ich bin sprechen* for *I am discussing*, for example, and repeated instances of *Ich bin nicht Glück mit die Idee*. *In the future* was another major source of difficulty. And a disappointingly large section of the candidature did not seem to know the word for *today*. This remains an area of the paper where first-time candidates often do very poorly; it is a consolation to see that apparent second-time takers do manage it better eventually.

German: 2663 Reading and Writing: Summer 2005

General Comments

This year's paper appeared to be accessible to almost all the candidates whilst still discriminating well. The format is familiar by now to most candidates but there are still those who lose marks unnecessarily by leaving gaps or not reading the rubric carefully enough. However, the performance of many is impressive: they are able to rework the original text into a coherent summary and express their ideas effectively. There were no particular problem areas this session and several Examiners were of the opinion that the level of performance was improving. There was little evidence that time had been an issue with candidates: those papers that were incomplete were usually from very weak candidates who, in this gruelling schedule of two consecutive examinations, seemed to have given up.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 This review of a film about teenage love seems to have posed no particular problems for candidates. Most identified 4 or 5 of the 7 sentences which described the film, although only the strongest candidates gained full marks. The distracters most frequently chosen were (c) and (h), often at the expense of (e) and (l).
- 2 Candidates seem to find gap-filling a more challenging task since the scores here were lower, although the text about women's football seems, if anything, more accessible. Some of the vocabulary was quite testing but it was generally (b) and (c) which pose problems. Here a careful reading of the text was the key, as the vocabulary was not obscure. There was some miscopying, especially of *trainieren* (the most frequently correctly identified word) but this was not penalized. If the candidate tried to adapt *kommen* to *kommt* to complete (c), however, this was not accepted.

- 3 Most candidates got the gist of the text even if some of the finer points escaped them. However, with a possible 14 points to pick up on and only 10 being necessary for full marks, this was not generally a problem and very few candidates were below the "Adequate" category for the comprehension marks (Grid 3B). Some candidates failed to grasp the comparison with the roller coaster ride and many more were confused as to whether the plots were weak or not since they had managed to identify *clevere*, *sinnvolle* and *intellektuelle* but had failed to pick up on the negatives. Nearly all candidates gained marks for mentioning the critics, the millions of fans and the fact that more than half of these were women. The notion of repeats was picked up on less than anticipated. It was not necessary to render the statistics precisely: *viele Millionen* was acceptable for the viewer figures, but where the numbers given were incorrect the point was not awarded. It is pleasing to note that the vast majority of candidates make every effort to summarize the text in their own words, as in fact the rubric requires them to. Some transcribed Joha's opinions in quotation marks but still managed to get into a muddle with *auf meiner Seite*, which appeared with almost every possible possessive adjective.

The second part of the question, marked according to Grid 3C: Response, widened out, as usual, to a more general discussion of an aspect of the text. This time candidates were asked to consider the issue of "dumbing down", which many of them did quite articulately. Reality TV and the soaps came in for a bit of a drubbing but some of the best essays came from those who defended what television has to offer. Some got diverted from the task in hand and started listing their favourite programmes and why they liked them: some indication of preference was clearly relevant but could only be credited once. However there were many candidates who failed to read the question properly and either limited themselves to talking about *Actionserien* or wrote about the advantages and disadvantages of television, including health issues (an essay, one suspected, they had already rehearsed). Some talked exclusively about the cinema. Answers which were not relevant to the question were not credited.

Since the number of words is no longer mandatory and this examination allows candidates ample time to complete the tasks, it seems fairer to try and reward the quality of the essay. Although a point is scored for simply answering the question posed in the title, candidates are given more credit for developing their ideas than just making a list of points. They would be well advised to stop and think what they are going to write and make a few notes. This should go some way to avoiding irrelevance and repetition. Candidates should also be reminded that an equal number of marks are awarded for parts (i) and (ii) and that writing a page and a half for (i) is not going to compensate for a four or five line answer to (ii).

There was again a huge range of competence in the production of German: from the elegant to the incomprehensible. Again the level of "unforced errors" was very high. Many words that could have been checked in the text were misspelt or had incorrect genders and the matching of subject and verb in number remains poor. Word order is inevitably going to cause problems, especially when candidates are trying to express their own ideas and end up tying themselves in knots. Some have learnt sophisticated phrases that they are unable to tie into a meaningful sentence. Despite the demand for "complex sentence patterns" in the *Good* band of the Quality of Language grid, it seems more realistic at this stage to aim for the confident use of basic language, a limited number of subordinating clauses and expressions like *um ...zu*.

3 cont. Since candidates are always asked to express an opinion, it is quite surprising that so many are incapable of using any of the various constructions with *Meinung* correctly. Vocabulary is also taken into consideration at this point and those with a good active vocabulary clearly had the advantage. Considering that the media figures highly in the AS topic list and is also covered at GCSE there should have been no problems here. As with every examination specific difficulties arose:

- The word family *Fernsehen, Fernseher, Fernsehapparat* and, above all, the verb *fernsehen* were generally not handled well.
- Plurals and singulars were used indiscriminately: *Serie/Serien* and *Sendung/Sendungen, Film/Filme, Kritiker/Kritik*. And presumably extrapolating from *Explosionsmanie* many wrote *Explosions* as the plural form. There was, in fact, quite a high incidence of plurals formed with *s*: *Films, Series, Kritiks*.
- Some confused *schauen* (or even *schauern*) with *zeigen*.
- Many candidates still have difficulty using *Spaß*

4 In the opinion of the Examiners this task produced higher marks than in previous sessions. It is still, however, only the very best candidates who score 13 or more here. The second part of 1 and 4 and 6 seemed to create the most problems for candidates. With the extra clue of the dative ending on *Zuschauern*, many managed to identify *den* as the correct response in 10 and most were successful in spotting the difference between a modal and non-modal construction in 8 and 9.

Very few candidates appeared to use the Cloze Test to help with their summaries this time, although it would seem to be a good idea to read the sentences in conjunction with the text before attempting the Writing task. At this stage candidates could do the task in pencil, note any vocabulary which might be of use to them and then make their final choices in ink at the end of the examination. This procedure might also help the examiners who have to grapple with a page full of crossings out, circles and zigzag lines to try and decipher what the candidate's final choice actually was.

2664: German Speaking and Reading

General Comments

It was again encouraging, as in the previous sessions, to find that this examination is posing few problems to Centres and that some really good performances are being given. There were relatively fewer examples of the problems that were experienced in the "earlier days", such as inappropriate topics, regurgitation of pre-learned material, monologues, failure to spend sufficient time on discussing the text or superficial preparation of a topic. There are still a few Centres that do not seem to have the appropriate paperwork or who do not submit it with the tapes. Please fill out a Working Mark Sheet for each Candidate. It is also helpful to the markers to have full details of the topics chosen. These should be entered on the form provided. A one word entry such as "Umwelt" is clearly insufficient. It is perhaps helpful to imagine that you might have been taken ill and a visiting Examiner has had to take your place. Would he/she be able to conduct the examination to bring the best out of your candidates on the basis of the details available on the forms? In other words, have the candidates' areas of knowledge been indicated in sufficient (but not excessive) detail? Some recordings are still of a poor quality, with the microphone obviously having been placed nearer the Examiner making the candidate scarcely audible, or with various buzzing sounds on the tape, which can be even worse. It can only be a disadvantage for the candidate if he or she is not able to be heard at times. Some Centres still fail to label both the tape and the tape box and one or two do not even announce the name of the Examiner or the candidate or Centre number on the tape. But they are very much in the minority and these are essentially minor quibbles. The overall impression is very positive and the standard of performance, which is obviously the main thing, is as high as ever, if not even higher as far as the "average candidate" is concerned. There were some very interesting discussions and, with some exceptions, of course, the experience of listening to and marking the tapes was in the main a pleasant and encouraging one for our regular team of Examiners.

"Points to watch" (with apologies for some repetition from previous Reports)

- please place the microphone nearer the candidate than the examiner
- please fill out a Working Mark Sheet for each candidate
- choose the text to suit the candidate (candidate doesn't choose!)
- candidates should specify which **3 different topics** they have prepared (**not** which 3 aspects of the same topic as it appears to say on the form)
- please discuss only **one** or **two** of them on the day, giving full details on the form of the general areas to be covered
- check that the topic is **not** purely "historical". In other words it must relate to the present day or, as it says in the Specification, "the last seven years" or so. It must also be related to the target language country
- please do not exceed the maximum **18 minutes** for the exam. (Markers listen to a maximum of 18 minutes.)
- within the 18 minutes allow **two thirds** of the time for the topic discussion
- within the six minutes for the text discussion please ensure that the **text itself** is discussed in detail for the majority of the time
- please always ask a "Worum geht's?" question (or similar) to start the text discussion even though this will no longer be on the Examiner's sheet
- there are only four suggested questions on the sheet, but please note that these are not sufficient to cover the text in sufficient detail, unless the candidate shows a lot of initiative. Supplement the suggested questions with some of your own.
- try to stop monologues from developing – interrupt with a probing question, especially during the topic discussion
- please do not spend any time on "general chat", as this generally lowers the

standard, takes up time that should be devoted to the text or the topic, and anyway attracts no marks

- **never** follow a "script", whether it be from the Examiner's sheet or, perhaps even more importantly, questions specified by the candidate on form ML/T/CAND/A.
- please label both the tape and the tape box, in case they get separated

Comments on the application of the Mark-scheme

- many candidates get quite good marks for "responsiveness" (grid 4B) but do less well on 4A (understanding of text), sometimes because the text has been covered too superficially (too few questions/too much on "issues arising")
- many candidates can get very high marks on grid 4C (spontaneity/responsiveness in the topic discussion) even if their grammar/range of vocabulary is not outstanding
- to get "very good" in this category candidates must "guide the discussion and lead the examiner"
- some candidates are heavily marked down on 4C, because they appear to be reciting learned notes or regurgitating a prepared answer
- if "understandable throughout" candidates are awarded the "standard" mark three for pronunciation; to obtain 4 or 5 they must sound reasonably or very "authentic"
- "consistently poor" grammar is awarded two marks; if there are "simple sentences" only i.e. no subordinate clauses, the maximum mark is three; if there are complex structures and consistency at least 4 marks are possible.
- the "range" grid refers mainly to vocabulary, as structure is covered by the grammar grid; to obtain at least 4 marks "well-prepared, topic-specific" vocabulary must be evident; if vocabulary is inadequate for the topic two is a likely mark.
- if the target country is not mentioned at all the maximum mark on the "factual knowledge" grid (4E) will be four out of ten
- some "personal involvement" in the topic will be good evidence of "research" (for example a project or visit participated in) and will gain higher marks than a theoretical discussion, provided it is not just a "chat"
- please try and ask the question "Where did you get your information for this topic and why did you choose it?"
- "style and flair" should be present for a "very good" mark
- marks are higher when students choose their own topics, with a personal angle, rather than doing an imposed one
- all candidates at a Centre offering the same two or three "standard" topics is not a good idea, leading to poor marks in 2005, as in previous years

Comments on Individual Questions

Text Discussion

A Neonazis als Nachbarn unerwünscht

Only the better candidates could bring out much of the detail of the text, especially the first and last paragraphs, but even the weaker ones could conduct a reasonable general discussion of the topic, as most Centres seemed to have covered it as part of the Specification. There was, as ever, difficulty with the various numbers, especially 1953, which some people took to be a date, and the various percentages. It was disappointing to hear “zero Punkt acht” or similar for “0,8%”. There were some interesting opinions: virtually everyone said “yes” when asked if neo-Nazis were “dangerous”; some people commented on the irony of them not being accepted by society, when they themselves are not exactly noted for their tolerance; some commented on how unfair the “anti-single-parent” view was, even though apparently held by only 5.1% of Germans; when asked whether this was a purely German phenomenon, many showed an encouraging wider awareness, mentioning the BNP, le front national, and even similar parties in Spain and Italy: most of the information was very up-to-date; the question about which neighbours one would like brought some lively responses: “viele Mädchen” or “eine hübsche junge Frau ohne Kinder” (from boys, needless to say), “ältere Leute, weil sie netter sind” or “weit weg von allen Nachbarn wäre besser”, perhaps from girls. Vocabulary items that caused difficulty included: wachsam, Szene (pronunciation), Prostitution (pronunciation), sich vorstellen, im Freundeskreis, whilst in the last sentence there was misunderstanding of the link between “andere gewaltbereite Organisationen “ and “Hinweise auf terroristische Aktivitäten”. “Viele Leute halten internationale Terroristen für noch schlimmer als Neonazis” was one good response to the question as to why we needed to be “wachsam”.

B Auch der Fernseher kann süchtig machen

The text proved to be a good test, even for the stronger candidates, as it was rather harder than it seemed at first sight. The first question about why the children were interested in Gerd Manzke’s presentation caused quite a few difficulties, as some candidates ignored the age of the children and the interesting new angle on this topic he would have brought home to them. Some made the interesting point, however, that he would have got his point over much better to these younger children, as for older teenagers it would have been too late. “Die Kinder haben jetzt eine bessere Idee von Sucht als ihre Eltern” was another perceptive response. There were some excellent definitions of „Sucht“, and many candidates coped extremely well with the – rather complicated – distinction between „Drogen“ and „Stoffe“. The main difficulty was in the last paragraph, in which weaker candidates tended either to misunderstand important concepts or be unable to work out any detail, for example exactly who or what was “uncool” (on the surface an easy word to understand.) It was of course the teenagers who found it “uncool” to have to do without alcohol at parties. There were few problems with issues arising, as again this topic would have been covered as part of the course. There were some good additional questions thought up by teacher examiners, however: was this the right age (10) to discuss such problems; what advice would you give a child; should teenagers/adults have to set an example or shouldn’t we be allowed to live our lives as we like; should it be the responsibility of the school, as here, or of the parents; what are “Jugendschutzbeauftragte” and do we need them? Some of the difficult vocabulary included: ablenken, Nasch-Sache and “süchtig machen”.

C Gegen die sprachliche Monokultur

As expected, this text produced some excellent discussions, though it was disappointing how pessimistic many (German) students seemed to be about the future of German in England and its right to be “Fremdsprache Nummer eins” or to compete with its main “rival”, Spanish! Not many picked up on the (admittedly rather obscure) link between the position of English in Germany (“always number one”) and the similar one of the football team Bayern München. It was surprising to hear the difficulties many had with all the numbers, however, and with working out which languages were learned by the most students. Some people couldn’t work out the reference to Birthe Petersen, but the rest of the text was generally well understood. There were some good additional questions besides all the obvious ones on a topic not surprisingly close to many teacher-examiners’ hearts: did you notice the same “stagnation” as Birthe in the first language you learned? (Reply: yes, in French!); why was so much money invested in finding out how many children learn how many languages; why isn’t there a “Monokultur” in England?

There were also some good responses to the various bullets:

Why is Professor Meißner against the “Monokultur?”:

“Er vertritt seine eigene Lobby”, “Er ist ein bisschen voreingenommen”, “Er ist Französischlehrer!”

Explain „Monokultur“: „die Dominanz von einer Sprache“; „es gibt einen großen Markt für Englisch, die ganze Welt spricht Englisch und das ist eine Schande, weil es so viele andere Sprachen gibt.“

Why is German unpopular? “Deutschland ist nicht cool genug für junge Engländer.” “Deutsch ist männlich und Spanisch weiblich!” (sic)

Topic Discussion

Far fewer centres than usual had all their candidates prepare the same topic and there also seemed to be less pre-learned material: both very good developments. 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. Most information was up-to-date and the new “seven year” rule in the specification was mostly adhered to. Some non-native speakers were able to achieve maximum marks (60) because they had mastered the language remarkably well and had prepared impressively. All in all, a positive experience was enjoyed by the markers and fortunately also by many of the teacher examiners and, possibly, also by the Candidates!

2665: German Listening, Reading and Writing 2

General Comments

As usual, there were candidates of all abilities taking this paper, mostly for the first time, at the end of their time in the Sixth Form. The standard varied from excellent (by no means native speakers only) to very poor indeed.

The two Listening exercises produced a wide range of performances, but the general standard was high, particularly on the first passage, *E-Mails zum Pisa-Schock*. Presumably most candidates knew something at least of the *Pisa-Studie*, perhaps more than Angelika in Q. 1 (a) who complained that nobody had explained the results to her. Some candidates had difficulty of expressing the teacher's view that pupils had grown more stupid in recent times; most had no difficulty in recognising whom Bianca blamed and what she demanded. Kirsten's complaints were also clear to most candidates, though there were difficulties with the notion of *sich selbst schaden*. The vast majority of candidates understood Jan's request for more teaching materials, though *Unterrichtsmaterialien* was not often spelt correctly, and when they went on to give details it was often *Buche und Computers* or even *Komputers* that Jan was demanding. There was considerable confusion about Marvin's claim that money "*wird zum Fenster rausgeschmissen*". It was not usual to read that windows were being repainted.

The candidates' powers of transcription were severely tested by the second passage, about the *Bundeswehr*. There was much misunderstanding and/or misrendering of *Auslandseinsätzen*, *Führungsrolle*, *Schutztruppe* and *Flutkatastrophen* in the early questions. Predictably there was much misspelling of *Schwierigkeiten*, *Zeitsoldaten*, *Berufssoldaten* and *gefährdet* in the middle section. The incidental spellings of *übrigens* had to be seen to be believed, and huge numbers of candidates did not recognise the word *Volk*. Nevertheless many candidates get off to a very solid start on the Listening Section.

In the second section of the paper, Reading, candidates were required to answer, in German, a number of questions on a text about the *Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr*. The environment is a familiar and well worn topic: candidates can be expected to do well on any text connected with it. This was no exception. However, there were areas where candidates lost marks. In question (a) most realised that many school leavers do not know what to do but many candidates missed the notion of *Qual der Wahl* and failed to convey the idea of difficulty of choice. Most could explain the attractiveness of the FÖJ in question (b) but often did not give details about the beginnings of the scheme required in question (c). *Niedersachsen* made one of its not infrequent appearances in an A-level paper but still cannot be certain of being spelt correctly; indeed sometimes it undergoes conversion into *Nordsachsen* or worse. Plenty of candidates missed the fact that 2000 youngsters now take part in the scheme each year, and only a minority clearly understood that the criterion for allocation to one of the many areas of the scheme was *Neigung*, the individual inclination of the participants. Questions f-h were generally answered well as they required relatively factual answers.

Aufgabe 4 was the near-traditional exercise asking candidates to explain some individual words from the text. *Deutschlandweit* and *azubi* almost come into the category of 'old favourites', but by no means all candidates were able to explain *deutschlandweit* effectively and hosts of candidates obviously do not recognise the word *azubi* even now. *Beruflich nutzbar* was seldom a problem, but *der Blick über den Tellerrand* defeated an unexpectedly large number of candidates; indeed, it was often the only question left blank on the whole paper.

The second part of the Reading section involved answering in English questions on a text about people's attitudes to cities, *Das Leben in der Stadt*. Sadly, a huge amount of mediocre English was written in response to the questions and many marks were lost because the examiner was not convinced that understanding has been demonstrated by the answer. An example might be "city refugee" as an answer to "What is meant by *Stadtflüchtlinge*?" Is that a refugee who lives in a city or a refugee from the city? Or just what did the candidate mean when he/she wrote: "They don't want to know about the city"? Ambiguous answers or ones written in incoherent English cannot gain credit. The result is that candidates often score less well on this section than on the previous exercise where they are answering in German.

The final section, Writing, centred on a passage about an initiative on the part of the authorities in Vienna to encourage reading: 100,000 copies of a novel about the city's history were given out free. Teachers will not be surprised to know that countless candidates wrote sentences such as "*Die Autoritäten in Wien haben ein Hundert tausend Buche ausgegeben.*" or "*Die Viennese Burger lessen nicht genug.*" The lack of knowledge of the plural of *Buch* was almost universal, and "Vienna/Viennese" floored far too many candidates. That said, the majority did well, as usual, on explaining the factual content of the passage in response to questions (i) – (iv), even if the German was often heavily anglicised – it was a rare treat, for example, to find a script that managed to express "Frederic Morton was born in Vienna in 1924" using the correct tense, the appropriate word order and either *1924* or *im Jahre 1924* to convey the date. The final part involves a personal response of about 80 words to the question What do you think of the scheme? All sorts of views were expressed, almost always with good sense and reasoned argument pro and contra. Many candidates, though, write too much: rather than filling the page (and sometimes the margins too), they would do well to spend time planning a concise and accurate reply. There are also too many scripts where the response is scrawled and heavily amended, as if the candidate is making it up as he/she goes. One thing was very clear: many Centres are spending a lot of time on preparing their candidates for this mini-essay, inculcating pertinent phrases and appropriate verbal expressions, particularly modal verbs. Inevitably these sometimes are rather forced (not everything is *ein umstrittenes Thema!*) but it is good to see real improvement in the general approach to this exercise.

2666 German Culture & Society

General Comments

The German Culture and Society examination produced a wide range of essays covering nearly all of the texts and topics on the paper. The candidates' essays spanned a similarly wide range of achievement, as regards both knowledge and understanding and linguistic competence. Nearly half the candidates wrote on at least one literary text and just over half answered two questions on the non-literary topics. All questions were accessible to candidates. The only two candidates who lost marks through rubric infringements seem to have made their own decision, unlike the other candidates in their Centres, to ignore the clear instructions: one wrote two very competent essays on the same text from Section A and the other wrote eleven brief or extremely brief answers to all questions in Section A and three in Section C, showing little or no knowledge of the texts and topics. At the top end of the range were essays, which were a pleasure to read and which demonstrated excellent knowledge and an impressive ability to address the question, to analyse and draw valid, well-supported conclusions from the evidence. The command of varied, complex and accurate German was also impressive. The language used by the best candidates was comparable in fluency and idiom to that written by the best of those who were native speakers. At the bottom end of the linguistic scale of competence were essays in which candidates showed little knowledge of basic grammar and in which there were errors in the form and tense of verbs, in subject/verb agreement, in case endings, in prepositions and their cases and in word order. Punctuation was often lacking: here some of the worst offenders were native speakers. Some native speakers still gain less than satisfactory marks on this paper, because they have merely a general, cursory knowledge of the text or topic they choose. Specific, detailed knowledge is required of all candidates to gain marks for content. Its lack was particularly noticeable in the case of the large number of the essays written on the most popular question on a non-literary topic (*Gesundheit/Alkohol/Q.3a*), where often little or no knowledge of Germany was shown and where the generalisations about alcohol and its dangers could just have easily applied to any country.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

Q.A1 a/b It was surprising that candidates were not able to analyse the significance of Knudsen's Verdun-Bein in the context given. The bonds between Knudsen and Helander were less well understood than their differences. The question of the appropriateness of the title of the novel was sometimes dealt with superficially, but one candidate succeeded in making the search for Sansibar convincingly applicable to all the candidates, as well as to the Junge.

Q.A2 a The significant moment of Walter's realization was not recognized, but candidates were able to show knowledge of post-war society and Walter's attitude to it.

Q.A4 a/b More candidates tackled (a). In general, the question of Shen Te's reaction was dealt with well. There was disappointingly little quotation or close reference to the text in the analyses offered of Sun's character and motives, so an accurate but very incomplete picture was given. The candidates choosing (b) were able to make valid points about Brecht's views on Epic theatre and the *Verfremdungseffekt*, but did not have sufficient detailed knowledge of the *Lieder* and *Zwischenspiele*.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

Q.A5 a/b This was the most popular literary text and (a) was rather more popular than (b). Almost all candidates could offer some good relevant explanations for the irony of *Zeitungslesen*. The comparison of Biedermann's treatment of Knechtling and Schmitz was often disappointingly limited and failed to refer widely to the play to illustrate and prove points. There was a wide range of competence shown in the responses to (b); sometimes knowledge of the details of the Chor's intervention and understanding of its significance were insufficient to answer the question.

Q.A6 a/b Candidates showed a good knowledge and understanding of the text in general, but did not always point their knowledge sufficiently to the question. Candidates did not always try to justify their view of Eva's importance by quotation or close reference to the text.

Q.A7 a/b Both questions were answered competently. Candidates were able to use their knowledge to show insight into Gregor's state of mind and the family's predicament.

Section B

B1 Candidates chose to write on young people with reference to a variety of texts: *Sansibar*, *Das Brot der frühen Jahre*, *Der gute Mensch*, *Jugend ohne Gott*, *Andorra* and *Die Wolke*. In some cases candidates ended up telling the story. *Die Wolke*, in particular, often lends itself more to description than analysis. All the texts chosen provided good material for examining the influence of society on the young person and most candidates were able to write relevantly at their level.

B3 Excellent analyses were produced on *Mutter Courage* and *Im Westen Nichts Neues*. Although *Das Brot der frühen Jahre* is a text which would lend itself to an examination of the effects of war, candidates found it easy to stray from the point and failed to choose examples appropriately. There was one entirely inappropriate response using *Sansibar*, where the candidate had no idea of the date of the action of the novel and placed it during the war, distorting the characters' motives and misinterpreting their actions.

B4 A wide range of texts proved suitable for candidates to tackle this question, which the majority did very ably. There were several particularly good analyses of Galileo with reference to Brecht's views on science and society. *Der gute Mensch* was also used, as well as *Andorra* and *Der Besuch der alten Dame*. *Ich fühle mich so fifty-fifty* is a novel which is potentially very fruitful for an examination of society and the individual, but candidates need to be careful to avoid narration of the plot.

B5 The temptation when examining the question of love and fate is to tell the story. The ability to pinpoint relevant facts was shown in an excellent analysis of *Immensee*. Other candidates succumbed to description.

B6 Very good interpretations of the effect of the environment on the happiness of the characters were given with reference to *Der Schimmelreiter* and *Sansibar*. In all cases excellent knowledge of the text was used relevantly and pointed to the question.

Section C

Q.C1 a/b Candidates attempting this topic had usually studied the historical period and most knew it well. Not all made their knowledge relevant to the question and there was a tendency for weaker candidates to write generally about the period. In the case of Q.1a some candidates appeared to be reproducing an answer to the January 2005 question and inevitably lost marks for relevance.

Q.C2 a/b Answers varied enormously as to the quality of the television criticism offered. Few candidates made a real attempt to contrast the second programme of which they approved with the unsatisfactory first, but just left the comments side by side. Few attempted to write on the role of the local and regional press and those who did had little knowledge on which to base their assertions.

Q.C3 a/b Q.3a was the question attempted by the most candidates. There were some well-informed and relevant answers, but far more had very few precise and pertinent data. Many gave a few statistics, with no reference as to where or how they were obtained and little or no analysis of them, and then proceeded to make general observations about the dangers of alcohol which could be applied to any country and which gave no information about Germany. For Q.3b candidates rarely knew much about care and treatment of Aids in Germany and gave information instead about campaigns.

Q.C4 a/b Most candidates chose to write about the success of a German film star and there were some excellent analyses of why a role in one film was more successful than one in another. Some candidates, however, had recourse to narrating the plot. Despite this, Q.4a was tackled more relevantly than 4b, where candidates did not write about the international influence of the German cinema, but tended to describe films, which had had international success.

Q. C5a/b A few of the essays dealing with the organisation of sport showed real knowledge of the system and were able to give details of changes and improvements. Not all candidates were able to inject any element of evaluation into their description. Although there are always one or two competent answers, most of the essays about a famous sports person failed to rise above the mundane. There was no attempt to address the question and the details given of any successes were without structure other than chronological. There was one very good essay on Steffi Graf, which was a model of what can be achieved when thorough knowledge is allied to insight and enthusiasm and applied to the question.

Q.6 a/b This topic has the second and third most popular questions. In general, the essays on *Müll* were more relevant and well-informed than those on the *Treibhauseffekt*. Candidates did not always know the essential dates and provisions of the regulations for waste disposal, but most were well-informed about their purpose and implementation. For Q.6a some candidates still spend time unnecessarily detailing the general chemical processes of global warming and are less able to give details about floods, temperature rises and pollution in Germany, which are a more appropriate response to the question.

Q.7 a/b Those candidates choosing to write about employment and transport were usually well-informed and had lived in or spent time in the town. Some were able to make obvious links between the two sets of problems in their evaluation of the situation. There were some excellent analyses, in which the relevant details were selected, as well as some pedestrian descriptions, of the enduring influence of history on a town. Particularly successful were several essays on Berlin.

The majority of candidates this year again chose, or were advised, to write one essay rather than two shorter ones, which certainly gave the more able candidates scope to present and develop an argument fully.

There was a wide range of topics, with "Wiedervereinigung", in one form or another proving the most popular. Moderators noted here that, regardless of the title, candidates often considered it necessary to devote a large amount of space to telling the story of the division of Germany, which often detracted from what should have been the focus of the essay. "Die Umwelt" again proved popular, as did the integration of foreigners, and also drug and alcohol abuse. These topics can, of course, lead to excellent essays, but not all candidates had sufficient knowledge of current issues and angles to make their work interesting to read. Other popular topics this year were, naturally enough in the year of the 60th anniversary, the

Hitler period and its legacy, women in society, schools, PISA, obesity and genetic engineering.

There were a number of essays on films (particularly “Goodbye Lenin” and “Lola rennt”) and also on various literary texts, the most popular being “Ich fühle mich so 50/50” “Der Vorleser”, “Andorra”, “Im Westen nichts Neues” “Die Physiker”, “Der Besuch” and “Sansibar”. In some of these cases, particularly where all candidates wrote on the same film, there was insufficient differentiation between titles or content and several candidates from the same Centre ended up writing a similar essay. However, at other Centres candidates wrote on completely different aspects of the same work, and many of those essays, in the individuality of approach, showed the intellectual and cultural benefits candidates derive from the study of literature.

In general titles were much better this year. There were still a few mere labels, e.g.: “Ausländer in Deutschland”, “Physiker aus der deutschsprechenden Welt”, “Der Zustand vom deutschen Fußball”, “Multilinguale Schweiz”, where the essays lacked focus and content marks suffered badly. The majority of Centres had encouraged candidates to phrase their title as a question, e.g. “Inwiefern kann man sagen, dass die Wiedervereinigung ein Erfolg war?” or “Inwiefern ist der Euro vorteilhaft für Deutschland?”

There was also evidence of a high standard of research, with much intelligent use of the Internet. Moreover, there seemed to be fewer cases of candidates simply copying material from a website, perhaps because Centres are now more alert to the possibility of this happening. The best essays contained a great deal of well-selected, relevant, up-to-date information. Those candidates who relied on class notes and textbooks did not do so well. Again, a few Centres clearly prepared the majority of their candidates in class on the same topic, and it was rather dispiriting to find the same arguments and examples appearing in one essay after another. On the other hand, there were many candidates who impressed moderators by their personal involvement in their subject. It was always enjoyable to read essays where candidates appeared to have picked a topic which genuinely interested them.

2667 Coursework

Assessment of the work by Centres was variable, errors in judgement most commonly resulting from an overvaluing of content. Many candidates did not know how to develop and link their ideas to construct a convincing argument and reach a valid conclusion, qualities which are needed for high content marks. Moderators had the impression that there are a few Centres that are still not completely familiar with the "Teacher Support: Coursework Guidance" document, which gives teachers helpful advice on all aspects of the organisation and assessment of Coursework, e.g. on titles, planning and length. There were still a number of essays that were too short and that teachers had subsequently not assessed correctly.

Moderators were often impressed by the quality of the language, particularly by the attempts to use complex, flowing German. However the dictionary remains a problem and wrong words were often chosen. It is suspected that on-line translators were the source of some of the extremely peculiar German that weaker candidates occasionally produced. In general, however, it was encouraging that even candidates who clearly had a limited grasp of the complexities of German grammar were often able to demonstrate enjoyment, knowledge and understanding of their chosen aspect of German culture, thus validating the importance of coursework.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE German 3862
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		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	68	60	52	45	38	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2663	Raw	60	48	42	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Specification Aggregation Results

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

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3862	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3862	23.7	43.0	62.8	79.8	93.3	100.0	1505

**Advanced GCE German 7862
June 2005 Assessment Session**

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	66	59	52	46	40	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

Specification Aggregation Results

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

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7862	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
7862	33.9	59.7	80.2	92.2	98.0	100.0	1050

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@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

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

