GCE

German

Advanced GCE F713

Unit 3: Speaking

Teacher Support Booklet

Exemplar Responses with Commentaries

Contents

The recordings of these examinations can be downloaded free of charge from Interchange. They can be found by following the link : Resources & Materials/exam resources/past papers and mark schemes. Select AS/A Level GCE, select German, click on folders named : "F713 German – Exemplar Speaking Responses 1, 2 and 3".

Text C: *Spirale der Gewalt* **(June 2010)**

Understanding of Text   Grid K

The candidate covered the first paragraph of the text reasonably thoroughly, without giving the impresion, however, that she always understood what she was saying, especially when reading out the word *Tatverdächtigen* inappropriately and inaccurately. She also failed to mention the school survey. In the second paragraph a few main points were picked out but no detail given, notably when she failed to mention the specific example of school violence. The remainder of the text was covered, but in a brief manner and with errors, such as *Gesamtschüler* for *Gesamtschullehrer.* Her discussion of the general issues raised by the examiner was far more impressive and she was able to develop ideas on all the questions except one, where her response was *Keine Ahnung.* As there were clear difficulties with the complex language of the text, however, and limited ability to infer meaning, she could only be awarded **3/10**

Response to Examiner Grid L

This was a satisfactory performance.The candidate produced some appropriate replies, even though it was not always clear in the discussion of the text that she quite understood the vocabulary she was using. She showed a degree of imagination in her reponses on the general issues raised and kept going well for the most part, with little hesitation and some initiative. There were some quite detailed responses, especially to the questions *Warum gibt es so viel Gewalt?* and *Was kann man dagegen unternehmen?* To the more unexpected follow-up question as to what else one could do no valid response was given. **5/10**

Quality of Language (Accuracy) Grid C1

In this criterion the performance was below the average standard expected at this level. Her first response, beginning *das erste Absatz steht,* gives a flavour of the general standard, as does the reponse to the question regarding the headmaster's views, where she attempted to read out part of the text but neglected to insert a verb, (*es gibt),* which would have been required to be manipulated into final position. This was an example of quite an elementary error, caused by the candidate's tendency simply to read out the text with little evidence of grammatical awareness. The main verbs were not always in second place or were incorrect in a very basic way, for example *ein Lehrer habe finden.* There was little evidence of case awareness at times, for example *für er,* nor of real awarenes of singular and plural. Possessives were generallly weak, for example *sein* to translate *their.* **2/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

The candidate tended to use a very restricted range of vocabulary and structure, often relying, as already mentioned, on the vocabulary offered in the text. Unless there is an attempt to extend the range, which implies using one's own words at times, a mark of 3 out of 5 cannot be achieved on this grid. There was some attempt to use more complex language, especially in some of the opinions and justifications offered, but it was not always successful, for example when final verbs were missing or not in the correct position. There were some gaps in basic vocabulary, for example the number 16 in an attempt to say „sixteen year-old". **2/5**

Topic Conversation: Designer-Babys

Development of Ideas, Grid M

The candidate had researched some of the specific vocabulary and the general issues around her topic well enough. However, there was very little information about the situation in Germany, and the cap on marks – from the 3-4 box on the grid - which is imposed if a conversation is considered to be too general and not specific enough to the target country, was triggered in this case. When pressed by the examiner, the candidate stated that there were no examples from Germany or „Ich konnte keine finden". This is not really the case, but if it were, this topic would have been an unsuitable choice. There was also evidence of a limited ability to express ideas and in some cases the examiner's help was required. There were opinions, but as they were not often factually based they could not all be rewarded. There was a distinct lack of evidence offered and some generalisation, such as in the discussion of *eine perfekte Rasse* and in the assertion that "the older generation are more religious". **3/10**

Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E2

This was a pleasantly natural and unrehearsed conversation. The candidate maintained a good pace for the most part and responded promptly to the examiner as, despite the weaknesses of detail already mentioned, she knew her material well. Examiner intervention proved she was responding genuinely and spontaneously at all times. There was no evidence at all of her fluency being confined to pre-learnt material, which can lead to a reduced mark. There was not much initiative though, and the examiner rather than the candidate kept the momentum going. She could not respond to all questions, for example the one on the reasons for couples opting for artificial insemination. **3/5**

Quality of Language (Accuracy) Grid C1

The candidate was not really able to improve upon her mark for the text discussion in this criterion. There were many errors, a flavour of which is provided by the following list: *viele Leute glaubt, es will in andere Landen erlaubt wird, für mich das ist, eine Kind mit rote Haare, der letzte Chance für eine Kinder haben.* **2/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

There was some good topic-specific vocabulary that had been prepared to cover the scientific and mechanical processes surrounding the issue, such as the equivalent of „blocked fallopian tubes" and the like. There was also an attempt to use complex structures with some degree of success. Often there were sentences made up of several clauses, even if the word order was not always correct. **3/5**

Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G

There were some difficulties with v and Umlaut sounds, and a few isolated words were mispronounced, but pronunciation and intonation were acceptable and communication was scarcely, if ever, impeded. **3/5**

A candidate showing sufficient communicative ability to deserve a pass mark at this level.

Total   26/60

Text B: *Drogenprävention in der Schule* (June 2010)

Understanding of Text   Grid K

The candidate began with a lively and full response to the opening question about the content of the first paragraph. This response was sufficiently detailed to sum up all the main points, and the examiner, therefore, did not feel the need for any follow-up question. It should be noted that follow-up questions are often required, in order to pick up any key points missed, but when a candidate shows this degree of initiative they will become unnecessary. The candidate can be rewarded for this initiative under Grid L. In the second paragraph the important but easily missed point about the difficulty of getting a driving licence, if a young person has *previously* been involved with drugs, was not mentioned. A perhaps avoidable mistake was made in the fourth paragraph in assuming that Mareike Klaaßen, the student mentioned, was a boy. This was to ignore the obvious grammmatical clue to be found in the phrase „*die* 17-jährige". The candidate was able to pick up points, however, by exemplifying his response following the examiner's „*zum Beispiel*?" and by his full justification after the *Warum?* question. The responses to the questions on general issues were all quite detailed and showed quite well developed ideas except for the response to the question *Gibt es ein Problem in England?* which did not contain much depth or detail.
This was a good performance overall withh good understanding evident. **7/10**

Response to Examiner Grid L

As already mentioned, the candidate showed plenty of evidence that he was able to take the initiative, with the ability to develop the majority of topics raised. As he was in conversation with a visiting examiner he had only just met, it is safe to assume that many of the elements of the discussion were unpredictable. The candidate was able to deal with unexpected questions very successfully and to give prompt and fluent responses. When asked to elaborate on or justify his points he was able to do so confidently. Some of his responses were very detailed. **8/10**

Quality of Language (Accuracy) Grid C1

The candidate showed a fair understanding of grammatical usage and the ability to use complex structures but there was a degree of inconsistency evident. For example, not all verbs were correct as to number: *Leute sitzt* for example, genders were not secure: *die Problem* being an example, and there were also some problems with word order and case endings. It was not quite true to say that his language was "generally accurate" and therefore he was awarded **3/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

This was a positive attempt to introduce variety by intelligent use of the candidate's own words throughout. There was no attempt simply to re-use vocabulary from the text when responding to it and indeed all responses were totally natural and frequently complex, in that sub-ordinate clauses were often to be heard, usually with the verb in the correct position. Even if the usage is not totally correct, a good performance on this grid is based on an attempt to extend the range of vocabulary beyond the obvious, text-based material. This candidate was rarely, if ever, unable to respond owing to gaps in his range. **4/5**

Topic Conversation: The film *Goodbye Lenin*

Development of Ideas Grid M

The candidate showed obvious pleasure in the topic he had chosen to prepare and was able to transmit his infectious enthusiasm to the examiner and also to the casual listener. It was clear also that he "knew his stuff", having seen the film several times and having considered his views thoughtfully and thoroughly. All the information he offered was relevant and he was able to justify his ideas with little difficulty. His response to question about the positive and negative consequences of *die Wende* was particularly detailed and confident and contained full justifications for his ideas. He was able to base his ideas on correct factual information and never lapsed into repetition. It was a charming performance rather than, perhaps, a profound one and fully worth **8/10**

Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E2

The whole conversation was totally spontaneous, as the candidate had no idea of the exact direction in which the visiting examiner would wish to take the discussion, even though the general factual information and ideas required had of course been so well planned. Furthermore, despite the examiner giving some leads, it was the candidate who provided all the momentum, fluently leading the conversation and providing some detailed, natural and at times amusing responses. This performance was fully deserving of the mark of **5/5**

Quality of Language (Accuracy) Grid C1

The candidate continued to display the degree of inconsistency in grammatical accuracy evident in the first part of the examination, and perhaps to a slightly more marked extent. Even in some quite straightforward utterances there were errors, such as his assertion at the outset that this was *eine fantastisches Film*, and later *eine gutes* Film, illustrating a certain lack of awareness of gender or of possible patterns of adjective ending. *In die Schule* when he meant *in der* and *sechs Monate vor* when he meant *vor sechs Monaten* are further examples of his tendency to get some of the simpler things wrong, whilst at the same time attempting a wide range of complex and sophisticated language mostly correctly. **3/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

Again there was an excellent attempt to introduce variety, both of vocabulary and structure, with many complex sentences and a more than adequate range of vocabulary to deal with the candidate's chosen topic. Some of the responses offered were remarkably detailed. As correct usage was not always maintained, however, the mark awarded was rightly judged to be **4/5**

Pronunciation and Intonation   Grid G

 The candidate offered generally accurate intonation and pronunciation. Not only did he speak naturally, as already mentioned, but reasonably authentically too. There were few actual errors, apart from some Umlaut sounds, but there were some slightly strange aberrations such as his mispronunciation several times of the key idea of the „DDR". **4/5**

A communicative candidate with sufficient ability to be considered for the award of Grade A

Total 46/60

Text A: *Freiwilliges soziales Jahr im Ausland* **(June 2010)**

Understanding of Text   Grid K

The candidate's response to the general introductory question *Worum geht es hier?* and to the specific question on the first paragraph revealed sound understanding. She was careful to offer all the apparently minor details, having been taught no doubt that these are also worth marks for „understanding". The second paragraph was dealt with similarly but the third and fourth paragraphs were covered slightly more superficially, though nothing appeared to be misunderstood. There were plenty of ideas on offer when it came to the discussion of the general issues arising from the text, and the candidate was generally able to develop these ideas quite well and to justify her points. A sound performance **7/10**

Response to Examiner Grid L

The candidate responded readily to the initial question requiring a brief summary of the text content and this was of the expected length: neither too brief nor too long. She continued in this vein throughout and was never lost for a prompt reply. The examiner rarely had to probe or to put follow-up questions. Although the responses were not always accurate grammatically, they were always fluent and spontaneous. She was well able to deal with unpredictable elements and indeed the whole conversation sounded natural, with confident contributions from the candidate helping to keep the excellent momentum going. **8/10**

Quality of Language (Accuracy) Grid C1

From the outset a certain degree of inconsistency in the application of grammar became evident, for example when the candidate referred to *eine Programme, der ..,*
but to her credit she was able to switch immediately to „*es*" on hearing the examiner correctly say *„dieses Programm".* It was a pity some of the grammatical evidence of the text was not picked up on, as for example *haben gearbeitet* was unnecessarily changed to *haben arbeitet.*There were mistakes in singular/ plural verbs: *sie findet* for *sie finden,* and case endings were not always sound, for example *in viele verschiedene Programme.* Word order rules were not always adhered to. However, a reasonably sound general understanding of grammatical principles was evident. **3/5**

Quality of Language (Range)   Grid F1

The candidate made a good attempt to use her own words and not always to rely on the vocabulary of the text, even if, as in the example above, it was sometimes at the expense of accuracy. She very rarely lacked the vocabulary to attempt the response she wanted, and would attempt a complex response even if unable to maintain correct usage, for example in the senetence including „*sie haben mehr Schätzen..."*
Her range of structures and vocabulary was generally appropriate to the task. **4/5**

Topic Conversation: Arbeitslosigkeit

Development of Ideas Grid M

The candidate made clear from the outset that her topic title was indeed *Arbeitslosigkeit IN DEUTSCHLAND* and there were some facts and statistics to back this up. However, rather a lot of the information could in fact have applied to almost any country. For example in the section on the health issues faced by unemployed people and their tendency to drink more or turn to drugs: no specifically 'german' details were offered here. The candidate had occasionally to be reminded by the examiner that she was actually referring to Germany. She had plenty of ideas but these were not always based on sufficiently clear facts. She had clearly done her research and was interested in her topic but there was a certain lack of depth in this conversation. Further evidence for this was in the length of the discussion: only nine minutes, as compared to the expected twelve. As there was comparatively little on the target country the mark on this grid was reduced slightly to **6/10**

Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E2

There was a lively performance on this criterion and the candidate clearly kept the momentum going. She responded readily to all questions and was able to answer fluently and reasonably spontaneously. She was unable to disguise the fact that she wished to cover her prepared material,however, as evidenced by the change in her intonation, but this was not considered sufficiently serious as to trigger a 'cap' on this grid. If fluency is often confined to pre-learnt material, or if spontaneity is only evident 'at times', marks can be lost, but this candidate was awarded **4/5**

Quality of Language   (Accuracy) Grid C1

The candidate was able greatly to improve her level of grammatical accuracy during this part of the test as compared with the first part, as she was on more familiar territory. There were still mistakes of a similar kind to those already mentioned but they were fewer and she showed a sound grasp of A2 strucures in general. **4/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

On this grid 'appropriate to the task' can be taken to mean 'sufficient to cover the chosen topic effectively' and this was certainly the case here. The candidate was never lost for the required vocabulary and there was a good range of appropriate structures, even if correct usage was not always maintained and despite the slight lack of depth already mentioned. **4/5**

Pronunciation and Intonation   Grid G

Although the candidate's pronunciation was good and there were few problems with individual sounds, it was a pity that she employed rather anglicized rising intonation at times during the topic conversation. This had not occured during the text discussion, where pronunciation is not considered, and was clearly a result of her eagerness to put across her prepared points. This is a danger when discussing well-prepared material and should be avoided if at all possible. Despite this, she was awarded **4/5**

A lively candidate of a good standard, not far from the border between grade B and A.

Total 44/60

Text A *Freiwilliges soziales Jahr im Ausland* (June 2010)

Understanding of Text   Grid A

The candidate summed up the main content of the text quite effectively in response to the question *Worum geht's?* and then picked out all the key points from the first paragraph after a little probing by the examiner. In the second paragraph, however, he did not cover the main reasons for the two students' participation in the scheme: to get involved in a social project and gain experience in a foreign context. There was also a slight misunderstanding in the fourth paragraph regarding the *Flasche* mentioned, but this was insignificant. He was able to express his points of view effectively enough and to give valid justifications. Sound understanding was shown throughout and the performance was worth **8/10**

Response to Examiner   Grid L

There was a prompt response form the outset, and it was especially impressive how well the candidate was able to define *Wohnhilfe* when required to. It is good technique for the examiner not necessarily to accept lexical items from the text in a response without probing as to their meaning. This also introduces an *unpredictable element,* as mentioned in the criteria for a higher mark on this grid. When asked a double question including the tag question *warum?* it was probably understandable that he failed to pick up on the latter. It would be better for the question to be split in two for ease of response. To most questions the candidate replied fluently and promptly and was able to take the initiative. The whole performance was good in terms of responsiveness and was worth **8/10**

Quality of Language   (Accuracy)   Grid C1

It was clear from the outset that the candidate's language was generally accurate and that he had a fair grasp of the main structures, though a verb at the end of the clause after *dass,* and *geflogen* instead of *gefliegen,* would have been preferable.
His use of the pronouns *ihm* and *es* instead of *ihr/sie* in the third paragraph made it unclear whether he thought he was referrring to a boy or a girl. *Vor* used for *bevor* was quite a serious error. As a result of slight inconsistency in his application of grammar the mark awarded here was **3/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

There was a good attempt by the candidate at using his own words and carefully explaining his points without simply relying on the text vocabulary. He used a range of complex structures, without however always being able to maintain correct usage.
As a result of his positive attempt to introduce variety he was able to achieve a mark of **4/5** on this grid.

Topic Conversation: Deutschland – Exportweltmeister?

Development of Ideas   Grid M

In response to the two opening questions the candidate was able to offer an excellent summary of his reasons for choosing this particular topic, in a succinct yet detailed form, and also a very clear overview of the individual research he had undertaken in order to prepare it. It is good practice for an examiner to open with these questions or to ask them at some stage of the conversation. The factual basis of his performance was excellent, both detailed and up-to-date, and it was clearly a topic in which he was extremely interested and on which he had clear views, which he was always able to justify. His enthusiam was infectious, on a topic that would not necessarily appeal to the majority of students but which he had clearly made his own. His command of at times complex detail was outstanding. This was a performance as good as one could possibly expect at this level **10/10**

Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness Grid E2

This was an extremely well prepared topic and as such might have run the risk of sounding 'over-prepared' or even pre-learned. This was never the case, however. Even the well-planned answers to the opening questions and the candidate's technique of asking the examiner *Waren sie bei einer Fachmesse?* worked well, and sounded quite natural. The candidate was always able to respond fluently and to take the initiative, keeping the momentum going really well. As the performance was perhaps not totally spontaneous throughout, as specified in this grid, and as some of the language sounded more like written German than one might expect in a conversation, he was not awarded maximum marks but a creditable **4/5**

Quality of Language   (Accuracy) Grid C1

The occasional inconsistency of the first part of the test was no longer to be heard in the topic conversation. A sound grasp of A2 structures was evident and tenses and agreements were good. Some complex structures were employed, including passives. As he tired towards the end of this twelve minute conversation, slightly more errors began to creep in, as in the utterance *weil Deutschland ein zunehmender Wirtschaft haben* but the standard overall was still sound and worth **4/5**

Quality of Language (Range) Grid F1

The range of vocabulary was excellent, especially for an unusually complex and esoteric topic. The candidate was confident throughout in his use of idiom and topic-specific vocabulary and offered a variety of complex sentence structures. This performance was considered to be among the best that one could expect at this level and was worth **5/5**

Pronunciation and Intonation Grid G

This was good pronunciation and intonation with only the occasional error. **4/5**

A candidate with grade A characteristics who is especially strong on his topic.

Total 50/60