



General Certificate of Secondary Education

German 4665

46652 Reading

Report on the Examination

2011 examination - January series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

Reading – January 2011

Foundation Tier

This paper was quite well done on the whole, with 86% of candidates scoring half marks or more. However, many candidates could have improved their mark either by knowing the requisite vocabulary (see the comments on individual questions below) or by reading in detail in the later questions, rather than basing their answers on individual words which they recognised.

Question 1

- a) 97% of candidates answered this question correctly.
- b) 64% of candidates correctly named two items from the sign. Candidates had difficulty expressing *Butterbrote* in English and a wide range of variants (e.g. buttered bread; bread and butter) was accepted. Many thought that *Eis* was the plural form of *Ei* and therefore wrote 'eggs'. *Kuchen* was often rendered as 'cookies', which could not be credited with a mark.

Question 2

- a) Examiners were surprised that only 28% of candidates knew the word *geöffnet*. Many candidates failed to gain the mark by offering additional information which was not in the text, e.g. 'open every day'. 14% of candidates did not attempt this question.
- b) This question was well done, with 82% of candidates giving a correct answer.

Question 3

- a) A wide range of answers was accepted for the two possible answers to this question (*fertig / lecker*) and 91% of candidates successfully gained the mark.
- b) Only 27% of candidates gave the correct directions to the restaurant. Many gave additional information which was not in the text (e.g. 'after the traffic lights') and many did not realise that *zur Post* was the name of the restaurant and said that you should turn left *after the post office*.

Question 4

58% of candidates gave the correct answer to this question. Almost 40% of candidates failed to read carefully enough and selected answer B.

Question 5

- a) 75% of candidates answered this question correctly. A significant number seemed to think that *Fahrrad* was a motor-bike.
- b) Most candidates had little difficulty with this question. 85% gave the correct answer, although some gave an unlikely length of time, such as three minutes.

Question 6

Candidates appeared to find all parts of this question difficult. Marks awarded were as follows: a) 29%, b) 38%, c) 2 marks: 26%; 1 mark: 55%, d) 2 marks: 27%; 1 mark: 53%. To score marks for this question, candidates simply needed to recognise the appropriate vocabulary item, but many of them were unable to do so. Teachers should note that in this new specification, there is a new vocabulary list (which is different from the previous specification) and that candidates need to be aware of the words which are contained in it.

Question 7

By contrast, all parts of this question were well answered. All parts were correctly answered by 90% of the candidates or more.

Question 8

While only 11% of candidates scored all six marks for this question, 85% scored three marks or more. Candidates often failed to read Susanne's statement carefully enough and said that she was going to stay in bed. The word *Bein* in Frank's statement did not appear to be known, and 'back' was a common incorrect answer. Some candidates overstated their answers and said that Frank had *broken* his leg.

Question 9

This question was well done on the whole. 43% of candidates identified the three correct people, while a further 49% identified two of them correctly.

Question 10

- a) Answers to this question were often based solely on the recognition of *Sommer* or *Sommerferien* and simply stated that it was summer. In these longer (Grade C) texts candidates should be made aware of the need to read for detail after the key word has been located. Some merely drew the conclusion that the weather was going to be good or hot on that day. Only 26% of candidates gained a mark for this question.
- b) This question was well done, 88% of candidates giving a correct answer. Most candidates recognised either drinks or sausages, although the spelling of the latter was not always accurate.
- c) With a facility of 58% this question was fairly well done. However 'salad' alone was not sufficient to gain a mark: candidates had to suggest that a salad be brought or prepared. There were a number of irrelevant answers, such as 'cooking', 'shopping' or 'serving', which seemed to be based on a barbecue scenario and bore no relation to the text.
- d) There were a large number of wrong answers to this question e.g. bring dessert; cutlery; chairs, help setting up. Only 33% of candidates gave the correct answer. A considerable number of candidates (15%) did not attempt an answer here.
- e) This question was reasonably well done (52% correct). Many interpretations of *einen schönen Abend* often went too far and suggested that it was going to be hot or sunny. Many candidates offered the answer 'hope to see you' – a traditional closing line to an invitation which was not there in this instance. There were also many references to either 'afternoon' or 'day'.

Higher Tier

In this paper, especially in the questions with longer texts there was evidence of candidates lacking the requisite reading skills at this level. There was a frequent failure to read for detail and answers were often based on single words or phrases recognised. Examples will be given in the comments on the individual questions which follow.

Question 1

As is to be expected, performance on this question was better than on the equivalent question at Foundation Tier. 31% of candidates gained all six marks and 95% of candidates gained three marks or more.

Question 2

Performance was better on this question also. 64% of candidates identified the three correct people. 97% gained two marks or more.

Question 3

- a) There were more correct answers to this question than at Foundation Tier (53%). But many candidates still appeared to have difficulty in understanding the clause *bevor wir alle in die Sommerferien wegfahren*.
- b) and c) Both these questions were very well done, with the correct answer being given by 97% and 80% of candidates respectively.
- c) Performance on this question was slightly better than at Foundation Tier, but the improvement was not as marked as one might have expected. 62% of candidates gave the correct answer. There were still a lot of wrong answers which were based on the scenario rather than the text.
- d) This question was well done (75% correct), with many acceptable renderings of one of the two possible answers.

Question 4

This question, targeted at C/D, produced a range of marks. 37% of candidates scored all four marks, while just over 60% gained three marks or more. In preparing candidates for this type of question, teachers should suggest that candidates decide what *type* of word (noun, verb etc) would complete the gap. This can often narrow down the range of possible options.

Question 5

Candidates performed well on most parts of this question. The percentage of correct answers ranged from 97% of candidates (Question a) to 62% (Question c).

Question 6

- a) Candidates answered this question well (73% correct). '*Kindergarten*' was accepted as a correct answer, as the word is used in English, as well as a number of acceptable variants: nursery, pre-school, playgroup. 'School', however, was felt to be too general. Other answers were not specific enough: e.g. help children; while other candidates thought that Maresa was going to work with disadvantaged children. Candidates should be advised not to offer options in their answers e.g. 'nursery / primary school' as an incorrect answer may well invalidate a correct one.
- b) Many laudable but incorrect aims were suggested for Maresa's visit to Peru and the question was not as well answered as the previous one, only 29% giving the correct answer. The concept of being an au-pair did not appear to be widely known and recognition of the word 'pair' led many to answer that she did not want to work with someone else or alone. There were many answers which suggested she wanted a well paid job, which the examiners found difficult to explain.
- c) This question had a low facility (24%). It was necessary to make reference to the *Abitur* examination in order to gain a mark, but there were many wrong answers which suggested that Maresa was already at university or that she had just graduated.

- d) This question produced very few correct answers. Many candidates simply recognised the word *einfach* and based their answer on that: e.g. It's easy to surf the internet. This clearly illustrates the necessity at this level of detailed reading of the text rather than the recognition of individual words. Other candidates did not appear to read the text at all and merely gave an advantage of the internet from their own experience.
- e) To gain a mark for this question it was necessary to make reference to the fact that Maresa had learned Spanish *for three years* or that she was at a grammar school. Teachers should inform candidates that at Higher Tier they are required to read for detail and supply that detail in their answers. The mere recognition of the virtual cognate *spanisch* is unlikely to be sufficient at this level to merit the award of a mark. When a key word has been used to locate an answer candidates need to read the sentence in which this word appears to see which additional relevant information is provided. Some candidates wrote that Maresa had learned Spanish in a gymnasium (sic), which gave an entirely different meaning to their answer and could not therefore be awarded a mark.
- f) This question was about Maresa's intention in going to Peru, not about what the job would qualify her to do, as many candidates suggested in their answers. There was a clear statement of this in the text: *Später möchte sie...* As a result the question had a fairly low facility (29%).
- g) To gain a mark for this question answers showing that Maresa regarded the year as beneficial were required. Many candidates thought that the final paragraph was written in retrospect (i.e. after her year in Peru), but these answers were allowed if they were correct. Generalisations such as 'it was good'; 'she enjoyed it' were not allowed as they did not show sufficient understanding of the text. Many candidates simply offered a translation of *ich gewinne*, which on its own does not mean very much.

Question 7

- a) There was a wide range of possible answers to this question, all of which were selected at some time. Some candidates tried to base their answer on the photograph accompanying the article, but this was not substantiated by the text. Many candidates gave the answer 'ride on the footpath', but this too was not stated in the text. Examiners were surprised at the number of candidates who appeared to have difficulty expressing *Fußgängerzone* in English.
- b) This question was quite well done, 53% giving the correct answer. Again there was a range of possible answers. The most popular of these were that going by car was more expensive or that parking places were hard to find. Other answers which were given were often not in the article: e.g. it's good for the environment or it gets you fitter.
- c) In order to gain a mark for this question it was necessary to suggest a building in which to leave bikes (*Fahrradparkhaus*). Many candidates just stated 'a place to park bikes' which was too vague, while others thought that the solution was just the provision of more parking places for bikes.
- d) This A* question was only answered correctly by 3% of candidates. Many recognised the word *Einbahnstraße*, but could not work out the context (available in both directions for bikes). The component part *Bahn* led to many references to trains and railway stations, such as taking your bike on the train.

- e) Some draconian measures, such as banning bikes or cars were suggested as the answer to this question. Only 26% of candidates correctly understood the subject under discussion. Many answers referred to children, which could only be explained by the appearance of the word 'child' in the *Nummernschildern*. This does suggest that such candidates do not have the requisite reading skills for this level of the examination.
- f) It was good to see that a substantial number of candidates (20%) gained one or more marks for this quite challenging (Grade A*) question. Insufficiently detailed reading led many candidates to simply state 'you can see cyclists quicker'. Again, this points to the need to read for sufficient detail at this level.

Question 8

- a) This question was quite well done, considering that it was targeted at A* candidates. 19% gave the correct answer. It was not sufficient to offer two contrasting adjectives (e.g. happy, but annoyed) as some explanation of the second part of the answer was required. Many candidates failed to gain the mark because they thought that *frei* referred to the cost of the passport.
- b) In their answer candidates had to suggest that Abbas was asked *lots* of questions, but the question was on the whole well answered, with 57% giving a correct answer
- c) Some candidates understood both parts of this question, some only one. 13% correctly answered part (i), while 24% correctly answered part (ii). Some answers, based on single words recognised, were well wide of the mark e.g. 'they went jogging together' (presumably based on *Laufe*) or 'he knew him from the mall (a misreading of *Mal*). It is important that candidates make clear in their answers who they are writing about. Answers such as 'he said he knew him' do not make it clear who the pronouns refer to.
- d) There were not a lot of correct answers to this question (29% correct). Answers were often based on phrases recognised without taking the context into account. Thus *an jeder Strassenecke* led to answers such as 'there are police on every street corner'. *Liste* (without reference to the context) led candidates to say that Abbas was on a list.

Answers such as 'stricter security' or 'more police' appeared to be based on some kind of scenario and could not be substantiated from the text.

- e) This question was quite well done, with 36% of candidates giving a correct response. Again, the necessary detail was required. 'That the police don't stop him' was insufficient and does not show detailed reading of the text. It was necessary to refer to the period of time (a month).
- f) This final question was well answered by the candidates (69% correct). However, once again, recognition of *diesen Monat* with no detailed reading led candidates to give an incorrect response: 'it will happen this month'.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.