

GCE

Edexcel GCE

German (8230/9230)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication code: UA017969

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA017969

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

## Contents

Unit 1 Examiners' Report	1
Unit 2 Examiners' Report	5
Unit 3 Examiners' Report	11
Unit 4.1 Examiners' Report	15
Unit 4.2 Examiners' Report	19
Unit 5.1 Examiners' Report	23
Unit 5.2 Moderators' Report	29
Unit 6(a) Examiners' Report	37
Unit 6(b) Examiners' Report	39
Unit 6(c) Examiners' Report	43
Statistics	47



# AS Unit 1 (6481) - Listening and Writing

## Assessment Principles

This paper carries 50 marks. 26 marks are given for responding to a variety of German question-types; 14 for discrete items; 12 for answers in German. 8 marks are given to each of two personal responses in the target language. The final section, a guided summary in English, carries 8 marks.

Up to 26 marks are awarded positively for correct information successfully retrieved and conveyed in response to the German question-types on passages 1 - 5. The quality of German in the answers is only an assessment factor in so far as it impedes communication. Up to 16 marks are awarded for two personal responses based on the same text used for the German question and answer section: 8 each for Content and Quality of German, using the grids printed in the Specification. Up to 8 marks are awarded positively, according to a specific mark scheme, for the guided English summary.

## Candidates' Responses

Examiners felt that this was a fair paper which differentiated candidate performance. A good number of candidates showed good passive understanding of the language, and many had clearly benefited from training with past papers. Such practice enabled them develop key examination skills such as understanding the exact requirements of the tasks set and the significance of items of rubric set in bold type. Candidates who had failed to develop fully such skills performed less well. The standard of written German varied greatly, but most candidates managed to communicate enough to score something.

Q1-3 were in general well done. A number of candidates did not recognise 'Verschwinden', which was surprising. A number of weaker candidates often choose items to fill the gaps which are a grammatical impossibility. Teachers are advised to train candidates in analysing the language used in these question types so that such mistakes can be avoided.

Q4 was felt to differentiate well, with responses varying from candidates who were able to answer fully all components to others who were only able to cope with the most basic replies.

Q4(a): Most candidates were able to score the two marks available. Some candidates responded with two word answers, whilst others gave lengthy explanations of all the rooms. A very small number misunderstood the question and explained what a WG is. A disappointingly high number of candidates could not spell 'Küche' or 'Badezimmer' under examination conditions. A few candidates were sharing cakes ('Kuchen'), which could not be credited.

Q4(b): Many candidates failed to recognise that 'mit Verena' meant that she should be excluded from their calculations. Answers which gave 5 co-tenants could not be credited. Even otherwise high-scoring candidates failed to manipulate the information well.

Q4(c): Most candidates scored well on this question. The best produced pleasing answers such as 'es ist günstiger' or 'es ist nicht so teuer'. Many candidates failed to produce accurate comparative forms ('es ist billiger'), but this was forgiven as long as the meaning was clear.

Q4(d): Answers which merely listed household tasks were not credited, nor was the idea of 'sie arbeiten zusammen', which a number of candidates produced. Examiners expected the idea of sharing the housework. Many candidates did indeed convey this idea, although answers were not always grammatically correct.

Q4(e): Most candidates managed to convey the idea of the 'Brötchen' being gone when Verena wanted to eat breakfast. A number mentioned only 'Brot', which was not deemed to be precise enough in an AS paper, and some others mentioned the other tenants eating all the food without a mention of 'Brötchen', which sadly could not be credited.

Q4(f): This was answered both very well and very poorly, seemingly depending on whether the candidate knew the verb 'aufräumen'. A considerable number of candidates attempted to transcribe what they heard on the recording without fully understanding it, leading to nonsensical German ('wenn eine nie auf Freund' and 'wenn alles liegenlist').

Q4(g): Most candidates managed to score at least 1 point. A number of candidates were not able to spell 'früh' accurately, and others had difficulties with 'Prüfung', which became 'Profung'.

Q4(h): The majority of candidates managed to answer this well. Even otherwise weaker candidates scored something, or indeed, all 3 points available.

On the whole Q5 was well done, with most candidates understanding the task. The standard of the German varied enormously. It was often quite high with relatively few mistakes and some very nice idioms, turns of phrase and ambitious structures. Some candidates however did not understand how to conjugate verbs correctly and a small number failed to demonstrate progress beyond GCSE.

Some candidates still fail to understand the demands of the question, where a personal response to what is heard is required. Failure to address these requirements is self-penalising.

The number of words is still an issue, with some candidates exceeding the word limit.

Q5(a) was often well done, with candidates being able to give full and relevant answers. Some candidates misunderstood partly and explained what the advantages were without evaluating them themselves. A small number of candidates apparently did not recognise the word 'Vorteile'. Most, however, knew to give their opinion about specific advantages and there was a high incidence of 4/4 for content.

Q5(b) suffered from the same content problems as Q5(a), with some candidates misunderstanding 'Nachteile', or failing to give a personal response to the material. A number talked in general about the disadvantages of sharing a house without reference to what Verena says, and such material is not relevant to the question. A number seemed to be horrified at having to share a bathroom, which was credited, but leads one to think they will be disappointed when confronted with the realities of student accommodation! Candidates scored generally less well on the content mark than in 5a, because many only mentioned one disadvantage - often being kept awake by a party when they needed to rise early the next day. A number also failed to grasp that the party was in the flat, and mentioned people coming in late after a party and being loud. There were some witty opinions, such as 'university isn't all about exams and Verena should be less boring' and 'why can't she just go and buy some more bread rolls?' Some candidates were refreshingly honest about their own shortcomings ('ich bin faul und hasse aufräumen').

Q6 differentiated well, but a number of candidates are still exceeding the 60 word limit. This is rigidly enforced, and anything written after 60 words is not credited. Candidates whose responses are overlong do tend to self-penalise because of this. Answers in German cannot be credited and score 0.

Q6(a): Most gained the mark, with only a very small number putting she was the only female. Some went on unnecessarily about her going to university and studying and having a lot of work to do, thereby wasting some of their 60 words.

Q6(b): Most gained a mark for she writes songs, although a few put lyrics and lost the mark.

Q6(c): The vast majority of candidates scored on copying papers, but 'bestellen' caused very many difficulties although it is a GCSE word. Candidates clearly understood 'Bücher' and guessed from there, with Monika variously stacking, selling, arranging, tidying and even marking books.

Q6(d): Many candidates clearly did not understand 'Semester' or 'Hauptstudium' (which some had as Monika spending her time in a recording studio). Many got 1 mark for putting that she had to concentrate more on her studies. Others got 1 mark for saying that term had just started again, although some candidates got the timescales muddled up and put that term will end in three months. A few scored on both these points, or scored 1 mark by putting that she needed to write longer essays. There was some confusion on this point, with some candidates stating that Monika now needed to work longer hours. In general, few candidates scored both points available here.

Q6(e): This was successfully answered by most candidates.

#### Advice and Guidance

- Many candidates had clearly been well prepared to cope with the requirements of the paper. Teachers have clearly taken advice from previous examiners' reports and have trained candidates well. Practice with past papers is very helpful in enabling candidates to understand the rubrics and the demands of the paper.
- Candidates need to follow the rubrics and take notice of word limits given. In Q5a and Q5b, they must not use more than 40 words, and 60 words is the limit for the guided summary in Q6.
- Q5, which carries 32% of the marks, requires a personal response in writing to what is heard on the tape, and answers which do not show evidence of this are self-penalising. If the answer does not address the question, it is irrelevant and will not yield any marks for Content and therefore no marks for Language.
- Candidates who attempt simply to transcribe language (which they may not have fully understood) run the risk of failing to communicate enough to score. It is often better to attempt to give the response in the candidate's own German. This at least should convey the point the candidate is trying to make.



## AS Unit 2 (6482) - Reading and Writing

In this paper candidates are required to demonstrate their comprehension of four passages of German by means of a variety of exercises, one of which requires German questions to be answered in the target language, and one of which consists of questions in English to be answered in English. The final task is a directed writing exercise in which the candidates respond in German to a German stimulus with guidelines in German. Candidates may be assured that 'grammatical manipulation' test-types are not used in this module.

### Assessment Principles

A maximum of 40 marks is awarded positively for correct information successfully retrieved and conveyed in response to those target-language and English questions not requiring answers in continuous prose: the quality of the language is only an assessment factor insofar as it impedes communication. Full credit is given for answers in clear, unambiguous German or, where appropriate, English, provided they contain relevant material.

For the continuous target-language writing at the end of this module, content and quality of language are equally important. Up to 40 marks are awarded positively using the grid in the syllabus. Knowledge and skills to be rewarded include the ability to communicate clearly and intelligibly; to write accurately and in the appropriate register; to produce a range of lexis and structures; and to respond relevantly and effectively to the terms of the question.

### Mark Schemes

Where appropriate, at the Standardisation Meeting a few days after the examination the Examiners discuss a number of possible versions and variants which have emerged from their considering a large number of scripts prior to the meeting. A definitive mark scheme is agreed and signed at the end of the meeting by the Principal Examiner.

All tasks are marked positively, with varying marks available for each question according to the information required in the answer or the difficulty of the question. The number of marks available for each sub-section is clearly stated within the paper.

### Candidates' Responses

The Examiners were agreed that the paper as a whole represented a good test, that it was user-friendly and fair to all candidates, that the texts were interesting, that the questions were well thought out and that the paper as a whole differentiated well between the weaker candidates and the very able ones.

The vast majority of candidates obtained full marks on the exercise based on the first text. Clearly the task was a welcome introduction to the examination. Although the rubric requested candidates to give a letter designation (A, B, C etc.) as their answer, the Examiners also permitted the names of the islands instead.

On the first task set under the second text, the majority of candidates performed very well. The Examiners permitted candidates to offer initials (unless ambiguous), first names, surnames, full names or - despite the rubric - even ages as their answers!

In Q2B the Examiners were pleased that the majority of candidates scored 4 or 5 marks.

It was clear to the Examiners that candidates found Q3 to be a demanding task and a good differentiator between the able candidates and the weaker ones. The best candidates answered well by using their own words, as requested in the rubric, and the Examiners were pleased to note that there was less lifting of whole phrases than has sometimes been the case. Some candidates could not be fully rewarded, however, as they lifted their answers from the text without any manipulation, despite being requested in the rubric to answer in their own words. Candidates cannot be rewarded for lifting, or indeed for merely changing a possessive adjective or the tense or mood of a verb. Candidates should be aware that if two marks are on offer, as in Q3(f), they should be giving two items of information in the answer. A number of candidates failed to write an answer to any of the questions in this exercise. Moreover, the Examiners were concerned that some candidates elected to give their answers in English, and thus could not be rewarded at all. On the whole, however, the Examiners noted that the questions in this task were of differing levels of difficulty, thus enabling even weaker candidates to obtain some credit.

The attention of candidates and teachers is drawn throughout to the published detailed mark schemes agreed by the Examiners. Question specific points are as follows:

Q3(a) - the Examiners were unable to reward answers which suggested that the school had closed down altogether. *Zeichen für den Schulschluss* could not be rewarded unless accompanied by appropriate supporting, manipulated language.

Q3(b) - the better candidates noted that the question was targeting the textually explicit fact that Sabine's friends go home after school. The Examiners could not reward answers suggesting other activities surmised by the candidates but not implied by the text itself.

Q3(c) - the majority obtained the mark here, though a number could not be rewarded for suggesting that Sabine played the piano in the underground.

Q3(d) - Most candidates answered this correctly and the Examiners were flexible for this inference question. However, the not infrequent response *sie war Köchin* was not an acceptable answer to the question.

Q3(e) - very few candidates stated that Annemarie and Sabine greeted each other, and much reference was made to Annemarie's hip operation or her solving of crossword puzzles.

Q3(f) - most correctly gave two appropriate answers to this question. The Examiners were flexible as to what they would accept provided it was logical and relevant. Candidates quite often confused *schenken*, *schicken* and *Schinken*.

Q3(g) - Correct answers inferred that Annemarie's husband was dead. A number of candidates claimed that the text says nothing about him, or they surmised - rightly or wrongly - that he was the father of all of Annemarie's five children.

Q3(h) - this was mainly well done, though some simply lifted their answer from the text with no manipulation.

Q3(i) - the majority of these answers were incorrect, with most candidates willing Annemarie to remain in Frankfurt despite the clear point made in the text that she was anxious to leave the city. The Examiners could not reward any suggestion that Annemarie planned to live with her daughters - a trap which ensnared those candidates who failed to spot the meaning of *eine ihrer Töchter* in the text. Those candidates who decided to respond with a geographical location rather than state that Annemarie would probably live with or near one of her daughters were rewarded provided the answer was geographically reasonable. Thus Hamburg was acceptable, whereas Freiburg was not.

Candidates clearly appreciated the accessibility of Q4 and they produced a number of good answers. Indeed, many candidates obtained at least ten marks for this task. Nevertheless, candidates could not be rewarded for answers which were lacking in focus and detail. Only those candidates who paid careful attention to the text were able to obtain high marks in this task. Candidates should bear in mind that the Examiners are unable to reward answers which show an inaccurate and incomprehensible use of English. Candidates should be aware that if just one mark is on offer, as throughout this question, they should be giving only one item of information in the answer. The Examiners were concerned that some candidates chose to give their answers in German, and thus could not be rewarded at all. Although this kind of exercise is not one of translation, it is important for points to be rendered in English which truly reflects the meaning of the text.

Question specific points are as follows:

Q4(a) - generally this was well done, although a surprising number of candidates were misled by the photograph instead of reading the text carefully.

Q4(b) - most noted that the tie is a relic of the time when men held sway in the cockpit, though some candidates were less precise.

Q4(c) - The majority of answers were correct, though a number of candidates suggested that there was only one woman or that in 1988 the first two women flew an aircraft. *Lufthansa* was occasionally rendered as the name of a plane or of a destination.

Q4(d) - While many noted that Susanne's colleagues were used to working with women on equal terms, an equal number misread *gewöhnt* and claimed that Susanne had lived with her colleagues beforehand.

Q4(e) - The majority noted correctly that many passengers were surprised to hear a woman addressing them as one of the pilots.

Q4(f) - very few candidates understood *Segelflugzeug* and thus could not be rewarded.

Q4(g) - Mainly correct, though a number of candidates suggested that Susanne started working at 10,000 metres.

Q4(h) - Mainly correct, though the Examiners insisted on mention being made of Susanne having to stay overnight in Berlin, rather than merely when her schedule permits.

Q4(i), (j), (k) and (l) - Most candidates obtained three or four marks from the final four questions.

In Q5, there were some excellent responses in which candidates showed genuine interest, imagination and accuracy. Nevertheless, though most candidates attempted to include all of the content required, they often dealt with some points in one short sentence. The Examiners were surprised at the number of candidates who failed to refer to all the points which were required. Weaker candidates were of the view that the task was encouraging them to book a holiday rather than to write about a holiday which they had already taken. Thus they found much of the stimulus difficult to respond to.

A number of candidates failed to respond to the *warum* in the first and/or the second bullet point. If candidates wish to earn high marks for this question, it is vital that they address each point of the stimulus with the utmost care. Some candidates wrote an imbalanced answer, writing at great length about the problems they had encountered, to the detriment of other points. Another noticeable feature this year was the number of scripts where candidates listed in their plans all the grammatical structures which they had been told to include. Whereas good candidates were able to do this without too much distortion, weaker candidates thus included sentences in their letter which were totally irrelevant to the task, thus affecting the content mark, or they proved unable to handle complex structures and lost marks on the language component.

The better candidates were careful to ensure appropriate letter etiquette.

In the first stimulus point the Examiners were ideally looking for the candidates to state who they were and why they were writing the letter to the travel company.

In point two, candidates were asked to specify why they had specifically chosen the particular holiday on offer.

Point three was generally well done, with candidates making full use of the information provided in the stimulus. There was some creativity in many answers and the Examiners were pleased to note this.

Point four was done well on the whole, though many candidates gave just one (minor) difficulty despite the plural *Schwierigkeiten* in the stimulus. As a result, their work could not be fully rewarded.

Many candidates responded to the final point by simply asking for their money back. This is fine as a response to the stimulus, but it is an example of where candidates may wish to be more creative or to develop their answer further. Better answers asked the company not merely for a refund but requested an improvement in services or the offering in future of a better standard of hotel.

The strongest answers flowed through the bullet points. Reasons for choosing the holiday were given, which then linked in with what the candidates liked and the problems they experienced.

It should be remembered that this sort of exercise may require a certain amount of creativity, and those candidates whose answers were bland did not perform as well as those who produced something rather more scintillating, whether factual or not. The ability to be creative is part of the task. Candidates are not assessed for absolute truth in this question.

A few candidates wrote totally irrelevant essays which bore no relationship to the rubric at all and which therefore could not be rewarded in terms of content and thus in terms of language either.

A number of candidates wrote their answers in English, and thus could not be rewarded.

Some answers were too long (up to 700 words in length), which meant that the points were not covered within the prescribed word limit and candidates could therefore not be rewarded fully for their efforts. Likewise, a number of responses were too short, and thus could not convey all the points expected in the answer. In such cases the mark for language is reduced on a pro rata basis. Nevertheless, the Examiners were pleased to note that in this examination series the majority of candidates wrote within the prescribed word limit.

A fair number of candidates had obviously prepared a response in advance and endeavoured to reproduce their letter within the confines of the demands of the question. This did not always prove to be an easy or worthwhile task. Similarly some candidates padded out their answers with pre-learnt phrases which were not always apposite to the task at hand.

The Examiners were pleased with those candidates who paid careful attention to case, adjectival endings, word order and spelling, though they were disappointed by the failure of many candidates to use the correct register or to use polite rather than familiar forms in their email. Too often candidates failed to use the correct form of the verb. The level of language was often weak and candidates too often made very basic errors. A tendency towards anglicisms prevented quite a number of candidates from achieving marks in a higher band. Candidates should attempt to avoid anglicisms. Examples this time included *das Wasser war kalt und ich war blau*. There were many examples of candidates using an English word if stuck, and there were instances of carelessness resulting in phrases such as *sehr geehrte Daumen*, and *mit feindlichen Grüßen*. Too few candidates deployed a wide range of structures and lexis appropriate to the task. Good candidates were careful to use correct register and expression. Those candidates who performed best ensured that each aspect of the task was addressed appropriately and relevantly.

### Advice and Guidance

Superfluous information, information not contained in the printed target-language material, and self-contradictory combinations of correct and incorrect information earn no credit. Similarly, non-synonymous alternatives can be given no credit. Candidates are encouraged to cross through any alternative answer rather than leaving Examiners with a choice. Candidates should note that if two marks are available for a question, they should give two discrete points in their answer. Candidates should remember that in the final question the examination prescribes between 140 and 160 words in German. They must note that shorter answers cannot be rewarded in the same way as an answer of the required length, and they should likewise bear in mind that the Examiners will not mark more than 160 words. This means that the task should be completed within the prescribed word limit, otherwise full credit cannot be given.



## AS Unit 3 (6483) - Prepared Oral Topic

### Assessment Principles

The prepared oral topic carries 60 marks, 20 for each of the following categories, Quality of Language (10 for accuracy, 10 for range of lexis and constructions) Response, and Knowledge & Understanding. The test is assessed positively. All marking is carried out by Edexcel examiners.

### Candidates' Responses

There was a wide variety of subjects, ranging from towns, regions, famous people (Angela Merkel has appeared this year) and the inevitable Weltmeisterschaft. More unusual ones included die deutsche Kolonisation Namibias, Dr Josef Mengele and die Baader Meinhof Gruppe. A recent film caused an upsurge of interest in die weisse Rose and Sophie Scholl. The choice of topic is clearly vital and most candidates chose carefully in accordance with the specifications, which state that the topic must deal with an aspect of culture and/or society of the target language country. Many candidates had conducted detailed research from a variety of sources. However, native speakers, especially those from international centres, should bear in mind that it is not enough simply to give an account of their home town or region, without any evidence of research.

It must be stressed that candidates must not pre-learn and recite the entire oral test, nor must examiners permit this. Monotonous recitation where it is patently obvious that the candidate does not even understand what s/he is saying reveals nothing about their ability to speak German and does not fulfil the criteria laid down in the specifications, which emphasise spontaneous discourse.

The quality of presentations varied. The maximum time is 2 minutes but it need be only one minute. It should not be significantly less than this. The rationale of the presentation is that it should enable the candidate to get started and give them confidence. In some cases, candidates made all their points in the presentation and then had very little to add. The best strategy is to summarise the main points, using the bullet points on the oral topic form as a guideline, giving a framework to the ensuing conversation, which must last for another 8-10 minutes. The total time must under no circumstances exceed 12 minutes.

### Quality of Language

The 20 marks are allocated for accuracy and range of lexis and constructions. Pronunciation and intonation are also assessed here. Overseas candidates with a strong accent should perhaps be encouraged to speak more clearly and to curb their enthusiasm for fast flowing language.

Weaker candidates often tended to have the following difficulties: disagreement in number between subject and verb, gender errors, incorrect adjectival endings, and word order. Some students are still struggling with different tenses. Range of lexis was variable, depending on how much research the candidate had done. Candidates are expected to have learned the vocabulary relevant to the chosen topic, but should be able to employ this spontaneously. The range of structures is also sometimes very limited, with *weil* and *dass* still being the only subordinating conjunctions. Some candidates are still not confident with relative clauses, or modal verbs.

There are two difficulties with lexis. Firstly, if the candidate chooses a very restricted topic, there will not be a sufficient range of lexis to lift it above GCSE level. Secondly, if the topic is too ambitious, care should be taken that the relevant abstract and analytical vocabulary is known, which may be beyond most candidates' ability at this stage. For example, a weak candidate is not best served by choosing "Albert Einstein" as his/her topic. The danger then is that the examiner supplies the missing vocabulary or long and unproductive pauses develop while the candidate struggles to find the appropriate expression.

Pronunciation and intonation are inevitably affected if the candidate is permitted to regurgitate large amounts of pre-learned material. Recitations must be interrupted, as it is invariably detrimental to the overall performance and final mark, as it is not in the spirit of an oral test and contravenes the specifications.

Candidates who had recently visited a German-speaking country were usually able to capitalise on this experience, although they need to be careful that it is not merely personal narrative.

Candidates who were able to move away from the target language headings on the oral topic form and sustain a conversation in less predictable areas of their chosen topic, also scored more marks here.

## Response

Candidates' responses varied considerably and depended to a certain extent on the way in which the examination was conducted. Teacher-examiners must remember that they are facilitators, and should not say too much themselves.

At times, the moving away from the bullet points caused confusion and was inclined to lead to irrelevant personal anecdote. The "unpredictable" question must still relate to the chosen topic and may only be a request for further elucidation or explanation. Large quantities of pre-learned material should not be permitted: teacher-examiners should adroitly interrupt "the flow". Questioning should above all facilitate independent discourse; open-ended questions, a "Warum?" or "Könnten Sie das vielleicht näher erklären?" will often produce a good response. Some candidates are very nervous and sometimes a sympathetic "Ja und?" is enough to get them going again. They should not be encouraged to respond to a pre-arranged series of prompts. A degree of spontaneity is integral to the examining process. A rehearsed recited performance cannot gain high marks. Examiners must avoid asking personal questions which are not normally very productive and can lead to digression into personal anecdotes.

## Knowledge and Understanding

The choice of topic is critical. Centres must adhere to the specifications and candidates should choose a topic from the General Topic Area as outlined in the specifications. Very generalised topics such as "Vegetarianismus" or "Drogen" with "in Deutschland" as an afterthought, are not suitable, unless they are linked to particular research undertaken in the target language country.

Candidates who scored highly were those who could demonstrate detailed research from books, magazines, the internet or from visits to the target language country. It is advisable to start doing the research well in advance of the oral test. They must then be able to organise their material and present it logically and relevantly. Some candidates had an impressive amount of information and had clearly benefited from the process of acquiring it. Praise must also go to the teachers and language assistants who in many cases facilitated the research.

On occasion, candidates were overloaded with information, which they then struggled to organise and present. It must be self-evident that “Deutschland im zweiten Weltkrieg” is going to be a topic lasting for more than 12 minutes. A focus must be sought. Centres should note that comparisons with England or any other country are not an acceptable element of this unit, nor should examiners invite comparison. Please note that no additional material such as pictures, photos or music can be brought in to the examination.

The most popular topics were:

Berlin/die Mauer/die Wiedervereinigung

Cities- Dresden, Köln, Wien

Regions-Bayern, Schleswig-Holstein

Famous people: Jürgen Klinsmann, Michael Schumacher

Topics - die Weltmeisterschaft, FC Bayern-München

Candidates whose research was superficial lost marks here; there was also a danger that they became repetitive. It should also be borne in mind that understanding as well as knowledge should be demonstrated. It is all very well to have a wealth of factual information but the candidates must also be able to demonstrate some analytical skills. They should also be able to show that it is significant to the culture/society of the target-language country.

#### Advice and Guidance

1. **Topic:** Candidates should choose a topic which has the potential for evaluation. Entirely descriptive or narrative topics will not enable the candidate to access the higher mark range. Examples of appropriate topics can be found in the Oral Training Guide but these should by no means be regarded as prescriptive. If in doubt, centres should contact the assessment leader at Edexcel.

2. **Conduct:** Teacher examiners’ interventions should be minimal and productive. The candidates must be given ample opportunity to display their knowledge; however, regurgitated material must be interrupted. It is clearly totally unacceptable for the entire oral to be a dramatic performance, with the TE providing “cues” for the next recitation. Candidates should be encouraged to take the lead in the conversation. Teacher examiners should resist the temptation to correct, or to supply missing vocabulary. It is very important to keep to the correct timing: a presentation which exceeds 2 minutes must be interrupted. The overall timing is 10-12 minutes and must not over-run. Conversation after 12.5 minutes will not be assessed. Nor should it be less than 10 minutes. Short examinations will be marked pro rata. Timing for written papers is always rigorously observed. The same **MUST** apply for oral exams. Unfortunately, despite comments every session to this effect, there are some centres who still do not adhere to this and it disadvantages the candidates.

3. **Oral Topic Form:** Concise bullet points are best. Candidates do not necessarily have to write 10 points. A small essay which is then read out, is not permissible. Points should be brief and lend themselves to expansion, discussion, opinion and evaluation. Despite clear instructions on the form, the title is often not stated, and sometimes the bullet points are in English. Nothing other than the Oral Topic form can be taken into the examination. Centres should check that the most recently published Oral Topic form is used, with the mark boxes and comments to be ticked. Oral topic forms and cassettes are returned to centres and in addition, in certain cases, letters outlining particular difficulties, e.g. quality of recording, or timing.

4. **Recording:** Good sound quality is essential. Please use new cassettes. It does the candidates no service to be recorded over last year's French orals or music practice tapes. It is also important to have the right balance between the candidates' and examiners' voices. Neck microphones are ideal, but free-standing microphones should be angled towards the candidate, whose voice is normally quieter than the examiner's. All mobile phones must be switched off and there should be no background noise. Centres should check that every candidate has actually been recorded, that it is audible and at the correct speed. U3 and U4/1 tests must be recorded on separate cassettes, even if there is only one candidate. Please check the length of the cassette, whether it is C60 or C90 so that the tape does not run out in the middle of the test. It is helpful to label the cassette as well as the box. Please ensure that the cassette is rewound to the beginning before posting it off. Markers can lose an enormous amount of valuable time if they have to rewind many cassettes.

5. **Handbook of Instructions to Centres:** Teacher Examiners should be thoroughly acquainted with this publication, as observing correct procedures is vital. It is recommended that teacher examiners attend training sessions at Edexcel if at all possible. An Oral Training Guide with accompanying cassettes is also published by Edexcel, to help teachers to prepare for this examination. It is unfortunate that candidates are sometimes deprived of marks because the test has been incorrectly conducted. Teacher examiners have the responsibility to check the specifications and prepare adequately, in order to bring out the best from their candidates.

## Unit 4.1 (6484/01) - Oral Discussion of Issues

### Assessment Principles

The Oral discussion of issues carries 60 marks, 20 for each of the following categories: Quality of Language, Response, and Justification and Debate. The test is assessed positively. All marking is carried out by Edexcel examiners.

### Candidates' Responses

Candidates are reminded that they must take a stance to the chosen issue, and this must be clearly stated on the oral topic form. It is therefore advisable to choose a provocative issue, to which a stance can be taken. Timing is also crucial. Candidates have up to 1 minute to outline the issue, adopting a definite stance. They then have to defend and justify their opinions for 4 minutes. The examiner should present the opposing view and a debate should ensue. Subsequently the conversation will move on to at least two unpredictable areas. This part of the discussion should last for 10 minutes, making a total of 15 minutes.

Many candidates were well prepared and had clearly researched their chosen issue. Those who had given thought to the stance were able to debate and justify in detail. It is possible for candidates to gain high marks in the first part of the discussion, because they are on familiar ground. The unpredictable areas were more problematic. 10 minutes proved to be a long time for some candidates and a large number of topics can be covered in that time. Centres are reminded that these should be genuinely unforeseen topics; there must be no overlap with unit 5 or unit 3 topics; also rehearsed and regurgitated quantities of material cannot gain high marks. Examiners are advised to prepare a wide range of possible topics and to rotate them judiciously. It is not acceptable to merely use the other candidates' prepared topics as "unpredictable" elements, nor should there be a limited number of subjects which are recycled through the entire cohort of candidates.

This should be a spontaneous discussion, not merely a question and answer session, covering a wide variety of subjects. These do not have to be related to the target-language country, nor to the initial issue. Additional topics **MUST** be covered. In several cases the entire oral was devoted to the chosen issue and in this instance, candidates cannot access the highest marks. Teacher examiners must ensure that they have read the specifications carefully.

### Quality of Language

The 20 marks are awarded for accuracy, and range of lexis and constructions (10 + 10). Pronunciation and intonation are also assessed here.

Overseas candidates with a strong accent should perhaps be encouraged to speak more slowly and to curb their enthusiasm for fast flowing language.

Candidates should be able to demonstrate that they have moved on from AS level and are more confident with advanced grammatical structures such as the conditional and the subjunctive. They should know a wider range of subordinating conjunctions and be able to use the passive and reflexive verbs. They should have accurate possessives, adjectival agreements and correct personal pronouns. Similarly, they should be able to demonstrate a wider range of lexis. If they had done adequate research for the chosen issue, the range of lexis was broad and relevant. Some had also prepared the language of argument and debate, and were confident in using it to give and to elicit opinions.

The more testing element was the unpredictable areas, where some candidates revealed a lack of lexis, and hesitancy with certain grammatical constructions such as the conditional, or indirect speech. Centres should refer to the grammar list at the end of the Specifications for Modern Foreign Languages.

However, many candidates were able to speak spontaneously and accurately on a wide variety of subjects, with very interesting conversations developing.

## Response

Candidates' responses were variable, depending to a certain extent on the way in which the discussion was conducted. Some teacher examiners failed to engage their students in a debate and so they were unable to demonstrate their potential to argue and justify. Although it is quite legitimate to lead from the chosen issue to a similar topic, it is advisable to cover a range of subject areas. This should enable candidates to show that they are able to discuss a wide range of issues, and they are then not in danger of repeating similar lexis and concepts. The best candidates spoke spontaneously, with minimal prompting from the examiner. They were able to develop ideas without hesitation, and it was apparent that they had been well prepared in advance and were able to take the initiative. Candidates must not be permitted to recite large amounts of pre-learnt material. It should essentially be a spontaneous discussion on issues of general interest. This is not the forum for personal anecdote, future plans etc. Particularly with native speakers it is tempting for the discussion to fall into chit-chat. Teacher examiners must take care to choose stimulating and provocative topic areas which lend themselves to discussion and debate.

## Justification and Debate

Successful topics to which a stance could be taken, included;

Atomkraft  
Homosexuelle Ehen  
Gentechnik

Candidates are expected to show a thorough and detailed knowledge of the chosen issue, and some certainly revealed a considerable amount of in-depth research, either from books, magazines or increasingly, from German websites. Candidates must state on the oral topic form whether they are for or against the issue.

Weaker candidates found 10 minutes' discussion on unpredictable areas difficult to sustain. There was a tendency to jump from topic to topic in the hopes of finding a stimulating subject. Please note that the unpredictable areas do not need to relate to the target language country: they are topics of general interest and factual knowledge is not being tested. At this level, students should be able to give evidence of insight and independent judgment. They should be able to express opinions and justify them. The examiner should play devil's advocate if necessary, without being too aggressive. Some students need to acquire the relevant lexis for giving and justifying opinion: meiner Meinung/Ansicht nach, die Vor/Nachteile, einerseits, andererseits.

## Advice and Guidance

1. **Issue:** Candidates should choose an issue which has the potential for debate. It is difficult to defend Rauchen or Kannibalismus. A stance (für oder gegen) must be stated and maintained.
2. **Conduct:** When discussing the chosen issue, examiners must take the opposing viewpoint, to enable candidates to reveal their ability to justify and debate. The presentation must take no longer than 1 minute, and must be interrupted if it shows signs of continuing. The subsequent discussion of the issue should last no longer than 4 minutes. Under no circumstances can the whole oral test relate to the chosen issue, as this reveals nothing about the candidate's ability to discuss unpredictable areas. The second part of the oral should last 10 minutes. The whole oral test should last for 15 minutes. Keeping to these times is of the utmost importance. Failure to do so compromises the final mark.
3. **Oral Topic Forms;** Centres should ensure that they are using the most recent version of the form, which has mark boxes printed at the bottom. They should also ensure that every candidate has signed the declaration and has filled in all the relevant details, such as the Unit 3 and 5 topics. Overlap with these units is not permissible. Oral topic forms and cassettes will be returned to centres, and in addition, in certain cases, a letter outlining any particular difficulties e.g. timing, or quality of recording.
4. **Recording:** Good sound quality is essential. The microphone generally should be nearer to the candidate than the examiner. All mobile phones must be switched off (not just on silent, as there is otherwise electronic interference) and there should be no background noise or interruptions. U3 and U4.1 candidates must be recorded on separate cassettes. Please check that the tape is long enough: one candidate on each side of a C60, two on a C90. Please also check that every candidate has been recorded, that it is audible and at the correct speed. It is helpful to label the cassette as well as the box. Please ensure that every cassette is rewound to the beginning before posting them off. Markers can lose valuable time if they have to rewind a large number of cassettes.
5. **Handbook of Instructions to Centres:** Teacher-Examiners are referred to this publication as observing correct procedures is vital. It is recommended that teacher examiners should attend training sessions at Edexcel if at all possible. An updated Oral Training Guide with accompanying cassettes is also available from Edexcel Publications. Candidates are at a disadvantage and in danger of not being able to access the highest marks if the teacher examiner is inadequately prepared and/or is not familiar with the specifications.



## A2 Unit 4.2 (6484/02) - Interpreting

The Interpreting Test is assessed positively. There are three assessment categories:

- 1 Accuracy of Target Language (20 marks)
- 2 Appropriateness of Target Language (20 marks)
- 3 Transmission (20 marks)

### General Notes

The Interpreting Test is not a word for word translation exercise. Candidates are required to transmit the essential meaning given in each section and to render this in the appropriate language. Credit is therefore given for the process of transmitting information in the relevant language, the correctness of this information and detail according to the descriptors in the Transmission Grid. The range and appropriateness of individual lexical items and structures deployed in the rendition are assessed according to the criteria detailed in the Appropriateness of Target Language category. Here credit is given for the knowledge of individual words, phrases and idioms. Candidates should be instructed that they should always endeavour to produce an utterance for each section and not remain silent. They should think of the basic meaning of the phrase and give the most accurate version they can with the structures and vocabulary they have at their disposal.

It must be emphasised that this option does not suit everyone. Students should be carefully selected, and centres are strongly advised to start preparing candidates for this option well in advance of the examination and not assume that students are equipped with the wide-ranging and complex skills required for interpreting without sufficient practice. Intensive preparation is vital. In addition, students should familiarise themselves with the five topic areas (school/college, work, business, leisure, holidays) on which the Interpreting Tests are based, and the pertinent lexis associated with each topic.

### Conduct of the Tests

This was done well on the whole and colleagues are to be congratulated on the professional manner in which the tests were conducted. However interlocutors should bear the following points in mind: -

1. The syllabus states that candidates may request occasional clarification. The request for this must come from the candidates themselves audibly and clearly in the appropriate language so that it is recorded onto the tape. Equally, interlocutors should not explain lexical items or phrases unless specifically asked to do so by candidates.
2. Interlocutors are permitted to repeat a section once only, and, as above, only at the request of the candidate.
3. No test should exceed the time limit as stated in the specifications.
4. The text should be read at the normal speed.

### Candidate performance

In virtually all cases (with the exceptions of some native speakers) candidates fared very well on the German to English sections, with several candidates offering very fluent and effective transmissions.

Although the Interpreting test is not a translation exercise, candidates must convey the correct information as given in the English and German versions. In Test 3 for example where the English states 'about 200' this information must be conveyed accurately. Some candidates rendered this phrase as: 'Zweitausend - genau zweitausend.'

The main problem remains the inconsistency in grammatical accuracy and correct use of syntax and morphology by a certain number of candidates. Inevitably such candidates attained low scores in this assessment category. Verb agreement, case usage and adjectival agreements were very weak at times e.g. 'ich bleiben in dem Jugendhaus um das Ecke', 'ich arbeiteten in ein kleines Hotel'.

## Detailed comments on the individual tests

### Tests 1 & 2

'Suitcases' was unknown by a large number of students. Some candidates rendered this as 'Handtasche', 'Tasche', or even 'Handtüte'. The hotel situations in Tests 1 and 2 are very straightforward requiring lexical items common at GCSE Foundation Level in many cases. The plural of 'Nacht' was rarely known and at times 'single room' was rendered as 'einzig'. 'Verspätet, Verspätung' were generally used correctly although occasionally weaker candidates rendered this sections as 'mein Flug war spät'. It is gratifying to report that '3 Stunden' occurred in all cases and there was only infrequent misuse in this context of 'Uhren'. 'Airport' was given as 'Flugbahnhof' a couple of times. 'Arrived' was usually well known although 'when' was occasionally transmitted as 'wann' or 'wenn'. 'Einchecken' caused some problems with several students rendering the phrase as 'we should check you are here'. 'Toothbrush' and 'toothpaste' were not always known. In the case of "run out" candidates are required to render the central concept, e.g. 'ich habe keine Zahnpasta (mehr)'. One rendering was 'Ich bin ausgerannt von Zahnpastete'. 'Passport' was not always known but 'Handy' caused no problems. 'Hat Ihnen Ihre Fluggesellschaft gesagt...' was not well done with most candidates misunderstanding the force of the phrase, e.g. 'Have you told your airline when..?' thus contradicting the essence of the German. The common phrase 'that is very kind of you' was not always transmitted successfully, e.g. 'das ist sehr schön auf Ihnen'. 'Vegetarian' was usually well done but 'fruit', again a word in the GCSE Foundation Vocabulary List, was not a familiar item. 'Vorschlagen' was usually known although the relevant construction was not always secure: 'Was vorschlagen Sie, ich mache?' However there were some excellent renditions here: 'Was schlagen Sie vor, das ich morgen machen soll?' Predictably, the phrase 'I have been told' caused problems e.g. 'ich bin erzählt'. 'Möchten Sie zu einer bestimmten Zeit geweckt werden?' was generally well rendered although a few candidates stated: 'Would you like to ring at a specific time?' There were some ingenious transmissions of 'I'd rather sleep as long as possible': 'Ich möchte morgen ausschlafen - schlafen so lange wie möglich'. 'Alarm clock' caused problems with most candidates using somewhat convoluted phrases to render the concept: 'Eine Uhr mit einer Glocke: Ein Alarmuhr'.

## Tests 3&4

Somewhat surprisingly 'Nehmen Sie Platz' caused problems at times. Several candidates rendered this as 'Will you accept our placement'. However, the vocabulary relating to the work situation was overall well known with lexical items such as 'Lebenslauf, Arbeitserfahrung, Bewerber' clearly familiar. 'My French is fairly fluent' was usually well rendered, although at times the qualifiers were incorrectly applied e.g. 'mein Französisch ist leider fließend'. 'I can get by in Italian' varied from 'mein Italienisch ist OK' to renderings such as 'ich kann mich in Italienisch verständigen; ich kann mit Italienisch zurechtkommen'. Similarly 'Mein Spanisch ist nicht sehr gut' was by far the most common rendition of 'my Spanish is adequate'. 'Mention' was known by virtually all candidates as was 'I intend/it is my intention', yet there was at times a lack of precision when rendering 'an intensive German course'. Some candidates said simply 'ich werde Deutsch lernen' which only partially transmits the essence of the original. 'I welcomed.' caused few problems when 'begrüßen' was used but the construction with 'willkommen heißen' was rarely correct: 'Ich habe die Teilnehmer willkommen geheißen'. Most candidates rendered 'customs' correctly as 'Sitten' or 'Traditionen' yet 'responsibility' caused problems despite the fact that 'verantwortlich' occurred in the previous statement. 'Run my own hotel' produced many excellent versions, 'mein eigenes Hotel leiten/führen' with less able candidates using 'haben'. There was also a frequent confusion between 'morgen' and 'morgens'.

## Advice and Guidance

Candidates should ensure they transmit qualifiers in order to get across the correct thrust of the original, e.g. irgendwelche, ausgerechnet, besonders, bestimmt, gar nicht.

It is recommended that colleagues refer to the relevant section in the Teachers' Handbook where detailed guidance for this option is given. A short checklist is given below for colleagues who are considering entering their students for the Interpreting Test in future.

1. Candidates should be given frequent practice in responding spontaneously to set phrases in both languages as outlined in the introduction.
2. Candidates should not translate word for word. The essential meaning of each section should be transmitted. However, details of time/money etc. must be given correctly (see comments above).
3. Candidates should spend time familiarising themselves with the basic grammatical framework of German (genders, cases, verb forms and, in particular, possessive adjectives since they are essential for correct communication).
4. Candidates should be given practice in circumlocution.
5. Candidates should always attempt a version of each section by deploying the structures and lexis they already possess.
6. Candidates should revise GCSE vocabulary. Lexical items which are familiar at that level appeared unknown to several candidates.
7. Centres should start preparing their students for this Unit at least six months before the examination date.



## A2 Unit 5.1 (6485/01) - Topics and Texts

In this paper candidates are required to answer two questions on two different topics and/or texts. Candidates must remember they cannot be rewarded for writing two answers on the same topic or text. Teachers are reminded to check the list of prescribed topics and texts very carefully to ensure that the topic and/or texts they are teaching are in fact on the list. Teachers are also advised to ensure that their candidates have access to suitable books before they undertake the study of non-literary topics, particularly Topic 4 *Eine Region im Deutschsprachige Raum*. It is also essential that the parameters listed in the Specification for the non-literary topics are covered in the course of the teaching programme.

### Mark Scheme

The paper is marked positively, using the criteria and mark grids published in issue 4 of the Specification. Under this mark scheme there is a maximum of 45 marks for each question subdivided into 30 for Knowledge and Understanding, 9 for Organisation and Development and 6 for Language. A mark scheme is prepared when the paper is set, listing as many key points as appear likely to be made in the answers, but the candidates may well make points and express ideas which are not included. In such cases candidates are given due credit provided the material is accurate and relevant to the question, and has been substantiated, either by reference to the text or appropriate secondary sources.

### Candidates' responses

This year's entry for this paper revealed that the number of candidates opting for literary questions has increased further. The most popular text was again *Der Besuch der alten Dame* followed by *Ich fühl mich so fifty-fifty* and in third place *Der Vorleser*. Among the topics *Gastarbeiter*, *Aussiedler*, *Asylbewerber*, *Ausländische Mitbürger* and *Eine Region im deutschsprachigen Raum* were the most frequently chosen. The third most popular was *Deutschland im Zweiten Weltkrieg 1939 - 1945*. A small number of candidates answered question on *Die Bundesrepublik seit 1990*.

In general answers to topics were not done as well as those on literary texts although there were some exceptions to this, notably on *Gastarbeiter*, *Aussiedler*, *Asylbewerber*, *Ausländische Mitbürger*. As in previous years answers on *Eine Region im deutschsprachigen Raum* were somewhat disappointing and tended to show a lack of detailed knowledge and, in a few cases, almost no understanding. A few candidates simply regurgitated a pre-learned essay with little regard to the precise wording and angle of the question. There were some answers, mostly from overseas centres, that focused entirely on one town without any reference to the Bundesland where it was situated. In such cases no marks could be awarded. A number of native speakers concentrated on evaluative generalisations that were not substantiated by any specific evidence. This year there were far fewer answers on the set texts where students simply narrated the story. The amount of discussion and analysis increased further and was generally of a very good standard. Most candidates structured their answers in a logical coherent manner, but in a minority of cases answers were somewhat confused despite revealing an understanding of the essential nature of the question. The best answers addressed the requirements of the question relevantly, revealed detailed knowledge of the area under examination and analysed the specific evaluative aspects demanded by the question with skill and insight. Generally speaking the level of language has shown a steady improvement over the years. There are now very few scripts where communication breaks down markedly.

However a not insignificant number still write essays that despite communicating the essential linguistic message are characterized by frequent and often very basic errors of grammar syntax and morphology. Confusion of the possessive was again a weakness in several cases this year, e.g. *Frau Dehnert verstand sein Sohn*. In some cases confusion over vocabulary produced statements rather different in content from their intended meaning, e.g. *Sie hat ihre Servante Bobby; Sie hat alle die Fabriken in Gullen verkauft, sie hat alle die Züge stoppen; Wir erfahren diese fact weil Claire nimmt das Korp und der Sarg zurück mit ihr; Nach dieser Erfahrung, als sie 17 war, spuckte sie die Männer; Sie war früher mit Ill befreundet und bekam eine Kind auf ihm; Bayern ist mit 12 Universitäten bestattet; Deutschland hat keine Gastarbeiter mehr gebraut*.

Candidates are not permitted to take any texts, topic reference books or dictionaries into the examination room. A number of candidates had learnt quotations from their chosen texts and often used them to good effect, but in some cases the quotations suffered serious distortions. A number of topic essays contained a well chosen range of detailed evidence, but in a lot of cases candidates cited very few hard facts and treated the question in a generalized non-specific manner. This year there was a better balance in quality between the two questions chosen.

Q1(a) This question was fairly popular and most candidates who opted for it produced some excellent responses. Detailed knowledge of the initial campaigns was frequently very impressive and invariably accurate. The quality of analysis varied yet on balance it was of a laudable standard emphasizing the effect of the early strategic and military successes on the later course of the war.

Q1(b) This was less popular. A number of the responses to this question did not move beyond the obvious and knowledge seemed rather superficial in some cases. There was a lack of specific evidence and the second part of the question regarding the reaction of the population was largely ignored. Some ignored the word '*Kriegszustand*' in the question and wrote about the repercussions of Hitler's assumption of the chancellorship. The better answers to this question considered how conditions changed during the war years, rather than merely presenting their facts as static description.

Q2(a) Overall the responses to this question were eminently satisfactory. In the best answers the historical basis of *Gastarbeiter* was well documented and their contribution to German prosperity over the years well understood and discussed. The weaker answers revealed no depth of understanding of the different groups of *Gastarbeiter* and their effect on the economy.

Q2(b) The main problem here was that the candidates treated the question as a philosophical and abstract treatise on multiculturalism and included little or no hard fact. In several cases individual ethnic groups were not specified. Most candidates considered the position of the Turkish population in Germany, especially Kreuzberg in Berlin, but on the whole few facts on the initiatives to achieve integration were forthcoming. Little regard was also paid to the personal efforts made by different groups of foreign nationals to integrate themselves into German society. There were a few impressive answers that addressed all these aspects.

Q3(a) The few candidates who addressed this question performed very well indeed. They revealed a very good understanding of the role of the FDP within the coalition government during the Kohl era, and particularly in its contribution to foreign policy.

Q3(b) Not many candidates opted for this question, but it was invariably very well done, with the majority of the answers concentrating on unemployment and reunification. Occasionally answers were submitted which dealt with the topic in general terms with a lack of specific references.

Q4(a) Some candidates chose an area, usually a town, that was not listed in the specifications. Some answers on a region prescribed in the syllabus revealed a sketchy knowledge and insight into the demands of the question. Better candidates answered with plenty of relevant data and comment and avoided the list-effect of the travel brochure style.

Q4(b) Despite the specific nature of the question, asking for specific problems in the last 15 years, candidates provided material that was not focused on the question. In some cases the answers were largely irrelevant.

Q5(a) There were too few answers to this question to make any meaningful statement.

Q5(b) There were too few answers to this question to make any meaningful statement.

Q6(a) Some excellent responses were received to this question. Most candidates revealed accurate and detailed knowledge of Judith's circumstances, and her reaction to her predicament. The relationship with her mother was well documented, as were her home circumstances before leaving for Rerik. Some candidates found it more challenging to get to grips with the circumstances of her visit to Rerik and how some details were indicative of the Jewish fate in Nazi Germany more generally. The second element was usually done competently although there was a loss of focus at times.

Q6(b) This was the more popular question on this novel. Many answers were outstanding with excellent textual knowledge and understanding and the central role of Helander within the work analysed with skill and perception in several cases. It is gratifying to see how much good and average candidates can get out of this text, but even weaker candidates managed to score reasonable marks; they seem to understand and, perhaps surprisingly, appreciate the significance of the '*Schrift an der Wand*' as well as the significance of the *Lesende Klosterschüler*, and despite language difficulties they often manage to convey a heartfelt concern for Helander's fate.

Q7(a) Unfortunately a few candidates misunderstood the meaning of the word *wohlhabend* and took it to mean 'well meaning'. However the majority dealt with the question well and detailed affluent members of Sezuan linking this skillfully with Brecht's political ideology. The latter wholly escaped the attention of weaker candidates who also struggled when having to assess the way in which Brecht presents these characters.

Q7(b) The better candidates offered full descriptions of the gods, their function within the play and the probable significance for Brecht at the time of writing. A number of candidates however tended to resort to simple narration here and describe the scenes where the god featured. The function of the gods within the work was not always well understood and in several essays there was a marked lack of relevance.

Q8(a) This question was quite popular. In the case of the better candidates detailed and accurate knowledge was invariably forthcoming and in their analysis textual evidence on which opinions were based was usually relevant and apt. Many responses to this question failed to mention the distinction between the tabloid and serious press, and condemned the entire press as a result. They appreciated, however, the challenging portrayal and were able to discuss the questionable methods of the press at length. Only the better responses commented on the relationship between the police and the press. Occasionally candidates dealt with the second element of the question with little or no reference to the novel.

Q8(b) This question was rather less popular. The better responses showed a detailed knowledge of the circumstances of Katharina's arrest, the way they were portrayed in the tabloid press and subsequently followed up with the dubious findings of their investigative journalism as well as a clear understanding of the consequences of these events for Katharina personally. But some answers were not very convincing and seemed to lack sufficient knowledge to muster an argument. Such essays were restricted to basic narrative with significant omissions.

Q9(a) This question was extremely popular and produced answers of widely differing quality from quite outstanding to poor. The best answers gave a clear outline of the relationship between Claire and Ill when they were young emphasizing the importance of the resulting pregnancy, Ill's denial of his paternity and Claire's failure in the court-case due to Ill's successful bribery attempts and Claire's consequent departure from Gullen driven out by the derision of the town's citizens. They then established a clear link with the nature and actual steps of Claire's revenge. In the weaker answers this link was often not established and in some cases the fact of Claire's pregnancy was even omitted. There were also some examples of creative rewriting of the text, such as: *'Ill, hoffnungslos wie Claire ihn dazu gemacht hat, schafft es nicht, sie zu erschießen, als sich die Möglichkeit ergibt, auf Grund ihrer Macht mit den Menschen umzugehen bringt sie ihn dazu nicht zu schießen. Die Welt machte sie zu einer Hure, nun macht sie sie zu einem Bordell.'*

Q9(b) Although this was slightly less popular than Q9(a) many outstanding responses were received with however some very inadequate answers. It was somewhat surprising that a not insignificant minority of candidates failed to observe the change in character the teacher undergoes in the course of the play and not at all recognized his pivotal moral role within the play's development. Many candidates argued that the teacher's change of attitude, despite his initial battles within the community, corresponded to the inevitability of human nature. Again the maturity of some answers was often very impressive.

Q10(a) The few candidates who studied the text clearly enjoyed writing about it. The answers varied in quality, but the outcome was generally very good. The essential difference in Thiel's two marriages was clearly understood and in a few cases an effective link was made with the two different sides of his personality and resulting conflict and the consequent descent into insanity at the end of the novella.

Q10(b) This attracted only a few answers. They were generally well done with the responses not only including a discussion of Thiel and Lene, but also of the train. Points were particularly well illustrated from the text.

Q11(a) This was a very popular question and as with Dürrenmatt the whole spectrum of responses was represented. It was somewhat surprising that a not insignificant number of candidates confused the BRD with the DDR, and hence their answers were totally irrelevant. However by far the majority dealt with the essentials of the topic very well indeed basing their observations and opinions on a detailed textual knowledge and understanding. A few tended to lose focus at times and discuss the political ideologies of the two states with no reference to the text.

Q11(b) An equally popular question with a broad range of answers. The role of Mario as the first of the DDR characters to leave for the West was usually well recognized and discussed. The significance of his character within the novel was dealt with competently in most cases. Candidates invariably revealed an excellent understanding and knowledge of the work in this question.

Q12(a) This text is now very well established attracting candidates right across the ability range. Most answers reveal an individual and highly sensitive response to the novel and the question set. In response to this question there were some inspiring answers considering the effect of Michael's relationship with Hanna on the relationship with his family, as a son, brother and later as a father and husband. The pivotal effect of his early love for Hanna on all subsequent relationships as well as the distanced relationships of his childhood at home, especially regarding his father, came in for perceptive comment. Candidates generally argued their corner well.

Q12(b) There were some outstanding responses to this question with highly fluent discussions of the nature of '*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*'. Discussions included Hanna's suicide as proof of her own coming to terms with the past, and the question of illiteracy in her understanding of guilt. One very impressive answer discussed this questioning in relation to Kantian philosophy.

Q13(a) There were too few answers to this question to make any meaningful statement.

Q13(b) There were too few answers to this question to make any meaningful statement.

### Advice and Guidance

Candidates should always read the questions very carefully before writing their answers. They should ensure that they know the demands of each question and adapt their knowledge accordingly. All aspects of the question should be addressed. Each question should be structured with an introduction, development of theme and conclusion. It is often helpful for candidates to draw up a short plan before they start writing their responses. Relevance to the demands of the question is of prime importance and candidates should ensure that their answers are focused appropriately. When responding to literary questions candidates should avoid telling the story or presenting pre-learned material regardless of its relevance to the specific requirements of the question. The evaluative element should always be dealt with and candidates should ensure that the views they express are always substantiated with reference to appropriate evidence. Candidates should be selective in their use of quotations.

One excellent answer will not compensate for a poor answer, and candidates must ensure that they divide their time equally between the two questions. Candidates are reminded to write legibly.

All questions require candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the topics/texts they have studied and evaluate the specific aspects thereof as detailed in the question. An analytical approach is required to access higher marks on this paper. Candidates are reminded that totally irrelevant answers gain no credit, regardless of the quality of the language used and regardless of any accuracy of the information given.

Candidates writing on a region must ensure that their chosen area is prescribed in the specification.

Candidates should write a minimum of 250 words for each question. They may write more if they wish. Essays shorter than 250 words are assessed pro rata.

## A2 Unit 5.2 (6485/02) - Coursework

Candidates are required to write two pieces of Coursework in German, one of 450 - 500 words and one of 900 - 1,000 words, on two distinctive topics. The themes chosen must be firmly rooted in the culture, language and society of a German-speaking country or region. Topics based on German speaking regions in eastern Europe, Südtirol or former German colonies such as Namibia are also acceptable as long as the emphasis is on the German culture of that area, e.g. 'Inwiefern wird die deutsche Sprache im Elsass noch gefördert?'

General topics totally or barely related to a German speaking country or regions are not acceptable as a Coursework option. This was once prevalent this year and tended to occur as in 2005 with the topic of the Iraqi war as well as general topics such as the environment, smoking or other drugs and abortion. A number of candidates had to have their marks significantly lowered because of this error.

Reference should be made to Edexcel's official Instructions for Preparation and Assessment of Coursework available from Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG18 4LN (01623 467467) or online - for full details. The Coursework option should not be attempted without reference to this document. The administration instructions and necessary forms for photocopying can be found in this document.

The problem which occurred 3 years ago when a number of centres marked according to the old mark scheme featured yet again this year. It is vital that teachers keep up to date with changes in the syllabus to avoid such problems as it can significantly delay moderation and consequently the awarding of grades.

### Assessment Principles

Coursework is assessed positively by candidates' teachers and lecturers according to the published mark grids. Edexcel specifies the sample of candidates' work to be sent to the external moderator. An asterisk on the OPTEMS will indicate the candidates required in the sample. The sample should however include the work of candidates achieving the highest and lowest marks if these are not already in the sample specified. Marks are awarded with reference to the published grids: 30 marks for Knowledge and Understanding, 9 marks for Organisation and Development and 6 marks for Language. The maximum mark for each piece is therefore 45 although the mark for the longer piece is then doubled to give a mark out of 90. The total for the whole coursework option is therefore now 135. Any half marks should be rounded up. Noticeably a number of teachers failed to do this. No half marks should be entered on the mark sheets. Although the shorter piece is usually attempted first, it is still vital that this piece is entered on the Candidate's Record Sheet as Piece 1, otherwise the wrong piece may be doubled, as happened on a couple of occasions. Please be sure to use up to date Candidate Record Sheets when assessing. The new mark scheme for 2006 shows a greater emphasis on AO4 (the target language culture). It should therefore be made sure that the candidates are aware how important this aspect of the mark scheme has become. The accuracy of the language is not a major consideration in this option. This is tested more in Unit 6.

## Administration

Most of the administration of this year's coursework ran smoothly although some coursework did arrive rather late to Moderators. One or two centres failed to send in Coursework until a month after the final deadline. This ultimately causes problems for both moderators and candidates. It should be noted that the usual deadline by which Moderators should receive the sample of Coursework is May 15<sup>th</sup>. It is also important that centres make sure the Candidate Record Sheets have been signed by both the student and the tutor. These will otherwise have to be returned.

The top copy of the OPTEMS should be sent directly to Edexcel, the yellow copy to the Moderator and the green copy retained by the centre.

A title page, the Teacher Record Sheet and a checklist should also accompany each piece of coursework. It was noticeable that more centres failed to do this year. The title page should also show the number of words in the essay. An approximate number is not acceptable. A significant number of candidates submitted word counts of 500 and 1,000. This means moderators have to count the number of words and indeed essays significantly too short or too long will be penalised. The Record Sheets for those candidates not in the sample need not be included.

It is important to try to avoid mathematical errors when completing the Record Sheet and to round up any half marks. The piece to be doubled should always be the longer piece.

The Teacher Record Sheet, Candidate Record Sheet, Title Page and Checklist can all be found and photocopied from the Coursework guide, or can be downloaded.

The majority of work was received punctually and had been well organised for easy moderation.

## Candidates' Responses

The standard of essays submitted this year was again generally very high. It does appear however that there are continually fewer very weak candidates entering for the exam. The very best essays showed not only an excellent quality of language but also a very wide knowledge of the topic and an excellent ability to evaluate the material. The mark scheme shows that an essay which simply relates factual information can only be awarded a low mark for knowledge and understanding. There were a number of candidates who were disadvantaged from the outset as they had chosen a topic which was inappropriate or - more often - had a title which was not focused. A title such as '*Wurst in Deutschland*' or '*Bismarck*' is totally inappropriate. This does not allow any opportunity to focus on specific details and makes the whole thing far more difficult for the candidate. Titles formulated as a question are often a good idea.

Centres are once again reminded of the importance of focusing the coursework on an area which is clearly linked to the German language or culture. It is extremely easy to drift away from this focus if choosing too general an issue, such as a social issue like alcohol abuse or an issue such as the environment. Although these are areas, which can be chosen, they must be focused on German culture.

More candidates this year seemed to ignore the word count. It is made clear in the guidelines that the first piece should be 450 to 500 words and the second 900 to 1,000 words. These word counts do not include quotes. If an essay is too long or too short this will affect marks both for organisation and for knowledge and understanding. An estimate of 500 or 1,000 words, often offered, is not acceptable.

A plan and a bibliography must accompany all essays. Again this year too many candidates failed to do this. The former must be more than single words for each section but not almost as long as the essay itself! The bibliography should give full details of texts and websites. Bibliographies should include information on authors and publishers and websites should show the whole website address, not simply the name of a search engine or something like [www.tagesschau.de](http://www.tagesschau.de). Candidates are very strongly discouraged from using sites such as [hausaufgaben.de](http://hausaufgaben.de) which encourage plagiarism.

Bibliographies must contain at least three sources in German. These can be texts, websites, magazines, leaflets, films, television programmes or videos. It is acceptable to use one English source but no more and this may not replace one of the three minimum German sources. A bibliography may not consist of course books, nor may dictionaries or other similar reference books count. Candidates need to be clear in their heads that a piece of work cannot score highly for content unless it is obvious that a significant amount of research has been undertaken. An essay which shows minimal research and which has been written from general knowledge or a candidate's personal experiences will never gain a high mark. Entries such as '*Meine Erfahrungen in Berlin*' or '*Ein Gespräch mit meiner Mutter*' aren't appropriate.

A number of candidates used contacts in Germany, Austria or Switzerland to produce surveys and questionnaires. Some of these were very successful and can be used to produce interesting and original pieces of writing.

### Choice of Topics

There was again a fairly narrow range of topics this year. The most popular areas were Hitler and the Nazi period, the environment and energy issues, reunification of East and West Germany, politics including Angela Merkel, equality and the NPD, foreigners in Germany and neo-Nazism, and of course the World Cup. There were quite a lot of essays on literary topics. The most popular works were '*Der Besuch der alten Dame*' by Dürrenmatt, '*Der Vorleser*' by Schlink, '*Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*' by Böll and '*Ich fühle mich so fifty-fifty*' by König. One centre with a native German tutor had allowed the candidates to choose a different text each, unusual texts presumably chosen thanks to the knowledge of the tutor. It is worth noting that any literature to be found in German can be chosen as long as it was originally written in German and deals with themes which require further research. A number of essays also related to films, particularly '*Der Untergang*', '*Crazy*', '*Gegen die Wand*', '*Sophie Scholl*', '*Lola rennt*' and '*Goodbye Lenin*'. There were some essays based on music, both classical such as Wagner and Beethoven and popular, such as '*Die Prinzen*' and '*Rosenstolz*'. A number of students transferred knowledge from other subject areas to good effect: economics, history and environmental science for example. May I emphasise once more that it remains vital that all topics are firmly rooted in target language culture and if there is any doubt on this the Board can be consulted. Similarly a title must be chosen which gives scope for great evaluation.

Below is a list of some of the titles which were successful and may give a guide for future planning:

Some successful coursework titles:

- 1) *Was ist eine größere Herausforderung: eine weibliche Bundeskanzlerin zu sein oder einer großen Koalition vorzustehen?*
- 2) *Was war die Kampagne 'Du bist Deutschland' und wie erfolgreich war sie?*
- 3) *Sollte Wehrdienst abgeschafft werden?*
- 4) *Sollten ehemalige Konzentrationslager wie Auschwitz oder Sachsenhausen als Touristenattraktionen aufgemacht werden?*
- 5) *Wäre ein Verbot von allen rechtsradikalen Parteien in Deutschland sinnvoll?*
- 6) *Dinner for One - warum ist es ein Kult geworden und warum?*
- 7) *Inwiefern passt die zweite Generation der türkischen Gastarbeiter in die deutsche Gesellschaft?*
- 8) *Ostalgie - moralisch inkorrekt oder eine Weise, sich an die Vergangenheit zu erinnern?*
- 9) *Niedrige Geburtenraten und steigende Lebenserwartung, kann Deutschland überleben?*
- 10) *Inwiefern wird die Einführung von Bachelor- oder Masterkursen einige der Probleme auf den Unis lösen?*
- 11) *Ist das Berliner Judendenkmal ein Symbol des deutschen Schuldgefühls?*
- 12) *War die Wende für jeden Deutsche kein Erfolg?*
- 13) *Was sind die Gründe und die Ursachen der sinkenden Geburtenrate in Deutschland?*
- 14) *Ist der Ausstieg aus der Kernenergie wirklich gut für Deutschland?*
- 15) *Ist das Ende der deutschen Halbtagsschule in Sicht?*
- 16) *Am 11. November 2005 bildete sich eine große Koalition. Ist sie ein Segen oder ein Fluch?*
- 17) *Ist die Darstellung von Sophie Scholl im neuesten Film als jugendliche Heldin gerechtfertigt?*
- 18) *Das Wunder von Bern 1954 - inwiefern stellt dieser Film Deutschland in den Nachkriegsjahren dar?*
- 19) *Brief eines Atomgegners an Frau Merkel.*
- 20) *Ist die Botschaft in dem Stück 'Nathan der Weise' auch heute von Bedeutung?*

Below is a list of some of the various themes chosen this year and examples of titles on each of these themes:

#### Umwelt/Technologie

- *Ist alternative Energie unter Merkels Führung noch aktuell?*
- *Der Rhein - immer noch die größte Kloake Europas?*
- *Die deutsche Müllpolizei - ein Schritt zu weit?*
- *Sind die österreichischen Alpen in Gefahr?*
- *Trägt die deutsche Autoindustrie zur Umweltfreundlichkeit bei?*
- *Ist Genmanipulation in Deutschland erlaubt?*

#### Gesellschaft

- *Sollte Deutschland einen Einbürgerungstest für Ausländer einführen?*
- *Wie effektiv ist die Drogenaufklärung an deutschen Schulen?*
- *Babyklappen - eine gute Lösung für unerwünschte Kinder?*
- *Ist das deutsche Schulsystem im internationalen Vergleich "sitzengeblieben"?*
- *Verspricht die deutsche Bildungsreform ein Erfolg zu werden?*

## Wirtschaft

- *Die Bayer-AG - Geschäftemacher ohne Skrupel?*
- *Sind die Boykotte gegen die Schweizer Firma Nestlé gerechtfertigt?*
- *Hat sich Deutschland als Modeland etabliert?*
- *Waren die Hartz-Reformen bisher effektiv?*
- *Warum die Schweiz als Wirtschaftsland so erfolgreich?*

## Aktuelles

- *Wird die Fußball-WM 2006 Deutschlands Image aufwerten?*
- *Welche Chance hat das deutsche Projekt "Führerschein mit 17"?*
- *Stehen die Deutschen hinter ihrem neuen Papst?*
- *Einsicht in die Stasi-Akten - sollte das erlaubt sein?*
- *Besser-Wessi und Jammer-Ossi - Gelten diese Stereotypen immer noch?*
- *Ist die Große Koalition ein Erfolg für Deutschland?*
- *Gewalt an der Rütli-Schule in Berlin - Grund zur Besorgnis?*

## Geschichte

- *Warum ist das Rätsel um Kaspar Hauser immer noch aktuell?*
- *War Bismarck ein kluger Politiker?*
- *Warum war die Donaumonarchie zum Scheitern verurteilt?*
- *Kriegsweihnacht 1914 - ein Ansatz für den Frieden?*
- *Das Lebensborn-Projekt - nur ein Hirngespinnst der Nazis?*
- *Hat der "Rote Baron" seinen Ruf als deutsche Legende verdient?*
- *Das deutsche Wirtschaftswunder - ein Phänomen der Nachkriegszeit?*
- *War die DDR wirklich ein Arbeiter- und Bauernstaat?*

## Berühmte Personen

- *Ist Wilhelm Tell immer noch ein Schweizer Nationalheld?*
- *Freud oder Jung - wer war der bessere Psychologe?*
- *Ist David Irvings Gefängnisstrafe in Österreich gerechtfertigt?*
- *Schadet Jörg Haider dem Ansehen von Österreich?*
- *"Recht nicht Rache" - Wurde Nazijäger Simon Wiesenthal seinem Lebensmotto wirklich gerecht?*
- *Loriot - ein typisch deutscher Komiker?*
- *Alice Schwarzer - Deutschlands Männerschreck Nummer eins?*

## Literatur/Film/Kunst/Musik

- *Wie spiegelt sich die Beziehung zwischen Kafka und seinem Vater in der Erzählung "Die Verwandlung" wieder?*
- *Wie hat Paul Klees Leben sein Werk beeinflusst?*
- *Warum war die "Entartete Kunst" Hitler ein Dorn im Auge?*
- *Stellt der Film "Goodbye Lenin" eine Verherrlichung der DDR dar?*
- *"Sophie Scholl - Die letzten Tage" - Zeichnet der Film ein wirklichkeitsgetreues Porträt von Sophie Scholl?*
- *Wie erklärt sich der sensationelle Erfolg von Benjamin Leberts Roman "Crazy"?*
- *Welche Rolle spielte Leopold Mozart im Leben seines Sohnes?*

There were again fewer examples of creative coursework this year, continuing this downward trend, and often the greatest problem was a failure to evaluate and to show evidence of research. This needs to be carefully built in to the work, as probably more than with any type of coursework, it was the creative pieces which lacked evaluation.

Below are a few examples of two pieces of Coursework which could be combined as they show clearly distinguishable themes:

- 1) Inwiefern ist die geographische Lage Karlsruhes für seinen wirtschaftlichen Erfolg verantwortlich?  
Kam die Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands zu schnell?
- 2) Die Babyklappe - Briefe von einer Mutter an ihr Kind.  
Inwiefern war die Legende von Sisi von Habsburg der Realität nah?
- 3) Warum ist die Geburtenrate in Deutschland seit dem Mauerfall dramatisch gesunken?  
Ist der Machtwechsel in Deutschland gut für die Zukunft des Landes?
- 4) Windenergie in Deutschland -Fluch oder Segen.  
Wie erfolgreich war die Studentenwiderstandsgruppe 'Die weiße Rose' in ihren Zielen?
- 5) Wer war Martin Luther und warum war er so wichtig in der Geschichte der Kirche in Deutschland?  
Warum konnte sich Westdeutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg so schnell erholen?

Some poor coursework titles

*Die WM*  
*Leipzig*  
*Die Frauenkirche*  
*Tokio-Hotel*

### Planning

A good piece of coursework always begins with a good plan. It is not possible to produce a well organised piece of writing unless it has been properly planned. Once again this year an increased number of pieces of Coursework were presented with no plan at all or one which appeared to have been written after the main part of the Coursework had been written.

Plans vary according to the type and theme of the coursework but may possibly contain an introduction, an outline of the issue, one viewpoint, a differing viewpoint, the opinions of the writer and a summary.

The following is an example of a plan from this year's entries:

#### Plan One

*Title: Königsberg, Deutschland?*

#### *Plan:*

- 1) Warum ich dieses Thema gewählt habe.*
- 2) Königsberg*
- 3) Rußland*
- 4) Krieg*
- 5) Was ich denke - meine Oma*

This is actually a good topic to choose as it could well produce an interesting essay about to what extent the city of Königsberg in East Prussia remains a German city. However the plan is far too brief and will be of very little help to the candidate when writing the essay.

## Plan Two

*Title: Königsberg oder Kaliningrad? Inwiefern bleibt es eine deutsche Stadt?*

*Plan:*

- 1) *Eine kurze Geschichte der Stadt.*
- 2) *Sowjetisierung der Stadt nach dem Krieg - Massenvertreibung, Einzug der Russen*
- 3) *Die Zeit als geschlossene Stadt*
- 4) *Architektur, Kultur - deutscher Einfluss*
- 5) *Rückkehr von Deutschen nach Ostpreußen*
- 6) *Wird die Stadt wieder deutsch? Schlußfolgerungen*

This is a better title and plan. It is perfectly acceptable to choose to write about an area which is no longer part of a German speaking country as long as the emphasis remains very clearly on the German cultural contribution to the city or area. For this reason areas such as Alsace, Eupen-Malmedy in Belgium, South Tyrol, Silesia, Namibia, Germans in south or north America are all possible areas for coursework. This plan is not too long and is clearly accessible. The title is now clearly focused and the plan works through the ideas logically. The title is focused as a question which is so much better for the candidate who now knows in which direction to head.

## Candidate Performance

Generally the standards of work were again pleasing. Most candidates showed they had spent a considerable amount of time researching and reading around their topics. The best candidates chose appropriate topics, titles and resource materials, wrote a straightforward well focused essay with some opinion and comment commensurate with the 'advanced level' of the qualification.

Most candidates stuck to a German focus, although a few still write too general essays.

A few points for candidates to note:

Double space essays

Check for typing errors

Give an accurate word count

Give complete website addresses

Include plans and bibliographies

Use coversheets, checklists etc from the Coursework Guidelines

Very much in evidence again this year was the fact that too often essays didn't rise above the level of narration. This ultimately can greatly affect the mark awarded. It was indeed necessary this year to adjust some marks downwards quite considerably for this reason. The title chosen should be carefully considered to make sure there is room for evaluation.

Some candidates relied far too heavily on English sources which inevitably led to a distortion of the German. It should also be made clear that computer translation programmes should be avoided. Often these produce utter nonsense! Such translation sites caused both merriment and utter confusion amongst moderators this year. Teachers should actively discourage the use of such sites

All quotations should be acknowledged and preferably as footnotes on each page. Each page should be double spaced and only written on one side of the sheet.

Plagiarism remains somewhat of a problem. Candidates and teachers should be reminded that wholesale copying of material or direct translation from English is not allowed and if it is suspected, it will be further investigated by Edexcel. The style of such work often indicates to Moderators that it has been plagiarised. A number of candidates' work was considered plagiarised this year and this was immediately referred to the appropriate department. Such plagiarism is considered as cheating and candidates who ignore the warning can expect harsh penalties. It is becoming easier to identify plagiarised work from the Internet so there is now a greater chance of being caught out. Fortunately it should be noted that plagiarism was considerably less evident this year.

### Assessment

Generally the marking by centres was close to the marks awarded by moderators. Most differences in marking occurred in the assessment of criteria AO4 by being too generous in awarding marks for the '*ability to analyse in depth*' and '*very good independent judgement*'. In addition some centres seemed to have assessed the essay on its own rather than in relation to the title. Marks for quality of language often had to be marked upwards bucking the trend of the usually required adjustment downwards. Although candidates do have a lot more time to check work than in a written exam it is still not expected that an A level candidate will write 1,000 words without making some grammatical mistakes. It is also the case that communication is looked at first in this part of the mark scheme. However where adjustments were made they were usually downwards.

## A2 Unit 6(a) (6486/01) - Listening and Writing

This paper carries 35 marks. It consists of two passages, both based on the same topic. Part A requires responses in German to a range of target-language questions and carries a maximum of 15 marks. Part B is a structured summary in English with a maximum of 20 marks, 15 for the summary plus 5 marks for quality of language.

In Part A, up to 15 marks are awarded positively for information successfully retrieved and conveyed in response to German questions. It is assessed for Communication only according to a specific mark scheme. For the summary in English, up to 15 marks are awarded positively for communicating essential detail according to the mark scheme published in the Specification, plus a maximum of 5 marks for Quality of Language.

Examiners felt that most candidates could access the language and make reasonable responses to the tasks set. Candidates' responses in German were not always grammatically accurate, but most managed to convey enough to communicate.

### Part A

Q1(a) This was a very accessible question and most candidates managed to pick up 2 marks.

Q1(b) Most candidates managed to achieve at least one point here, but not all managed to score both points available. Most candidates were able to communicate the idea that they did not wish to do the same as their parents, but a number of candidates had difficulty expressing the notion that young people simply had no concept of the theatre. Some candidates talked about the young people bringing ideas to the theatre which was a misunderstanding of the text.

Q1(c) Most candidates managed this question well.

Q1(d) Most candidates found this question accessible, but some appeared to have difficulties with 'was für...'. Occasionally, candidates responded with the different branches of the theatre 'Schauspiel, Tanz und Oper' (sometimes even 'Schauspiel, Tanz und Opa'!) which could not be credited as these are not people.

Q1(e) This was the question least well answered. Candidates were required to infer Herr Grünewald's intentions from the recording. Many candidates were not able to home in on the idea of the young people getting to know the different parts of the theatre, nor on the idea that he wanted to stimulate the interest of young people in the theatre. Many answers were quite vague and not linked clearly enough to the idea of the theatre.

Q1(f) Most candidates managed to score 1 from the 2 marks available, but vagueness or imprecision in a number of responses prevented many from gaining 2. An inability to spell 'Schüler' led to some candidates not gaining one point because they wrote 'Schule', which would imply the schools were working in the classroom with Herr Grünewald.

Q1(g) Very many candidates performed well on this question, but a good number also wrote 'Tanzkörper' which could not be credited.

Q1(h) This question was quite lucrative for the majority of candidates, as there were 3 possible targets for marks and most were able to find 2 correct responses. Some candidates lost out again by being too vague in their answers, for example mentioning only that Herr Grünewald talked with the pupils, but not giving the idea that the talks were about the plays.

## Part B

This text was accessible, and most candidates were able to show understanding of its general meaning. Some candidates did waste some of the word count going into unnecessary detail of Herr Grünewald standing in front of a big hole (or even being in a 'big black hole') before mentioning the *essential detail* that he did not know what he would do next. As there is a word limit of 80 - 100 words, this is inadvisable. There were fewer exceedingly over-long summaries, but still a number which were sufficiently over-long to be penalised in the marks for summary. There were a very few sad cases of answers wholly in German, which is a rubric offence and therefore can receive no marks. Candidates should also be aware that there are 5 marks awarded for Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling in English for this summary. Although examiners reported that there were more 5/5 than in previous years, candidates are still failing to achieve their full potential by careless phrasings which convey the wrong meaning ('he was involved in lightning/lightening', 'he had responsibility for dressings', 'he had a big hole', 'he did many jobs such as actress') or by outright misspellings ('theater', 'roll' (for 'role'), 'whole' (for 'hole')).

## Advice and Guidance

### Part A

As mentioned in previous reports, candidates should try to use their own German in their responses rather than attempt to transcribe the text. If candidates write their response in the language they themselves would use, it is more likely to convey the meaning than an unsuccessful attempt at transcription. Candidates also need practice in identifying and responding to questions which require making inferences from the text, often signalled by 'wohl' or 'vielleicht' in the question.

### Part B

Candidates must adhere to the word count, as over-long responses are subject to penalty. Progress on this point seems to have been made since last year, but all candidates should be encouraged to read the rubric carefully. The bullet points are designed to guide the candidates through the summary, and it is advisable for candidates to follow these closely. In order to avoid over-long summaries, it may be helpful for candidates to bear in mind that they are not obliged to use the wording from the bullet points to introduce each section: it may be better to make an immediate start on giving the points without reference to the language of the bullets. Candidates need also to consider the fact that 5 out of 20 marks are awarded for the quality of English in the response: poor grammar, punctuation and spelling will result in a lesser mark.

## A2 Unit 6(b) (6486/02) - Reading and Writing

In this paper candidates are required to read authentic printed German material totalling approximately 200 words, and to retrieve and convey information by i) responding to a range of target-language questions in German and ii) carrying out a short translation exercise from English into German. The printed German material is drawn from the General Topic Areas and is related to contemporary society/culture of German-speaking countries or communities. Contemporary sources are used, such as magazines, newspapers, reports, books and other forms of extended writing. There is one stimulus passage with German questions and answers and the translation exercise consists of a passage in English of approximately 80 words. This passage is based on the content of the stimulus passage.

### Assessment Principles

Up to 8 marks are awarded positively, according to an agreed mark scheme, for correct information successfully retrieved and conveyed in response to target-language questions on the first stimulus passage. Superfluous information, information not contained in the printed material, and self-contradictory combinations of correct and incorrect information do not gain credit. Up to 7 marks are additionally awarded for the quality of language used in the first question. These are awarded on a sliding scale linked with the number of marks obtained for the comprehension task. For example, a candidate obtaining 3 marks out of the 8 on offer may obtain a maximum of 4 marks for quality of language.

Up to 10 marks are awarded positively for translation into German of an English passage (approximately 80 words) based on the content of the stimulus passage. Marks are awarded for the accuracy of translation.

### Mark Schemes

At the Standardisation Meeting the Examiners discuss a number of possible versions and variants. Both tasks are marked positively. The number of marks available for each subsection is clearly stated within the paper. This year there were eight questions in German, each of which was to be answered in German for one mark. The passage for translation was divided into 30 assessable elements and a mark was awarded for each entirely correct element, with the total divided by three to give a mark out of ten. Thirds of marks were rounded up or down accordingly. Thus a candidate obtaining 26 marks from the 30 on offer would be awarded  $8\frac{2}{3} = 9$ .

### Candidates' Responses

The Examiners were of the view that this paper provided a good test of different skills over the two questions. They felt that the paper was interesting and accessible to A2 candidates, with a variety of lexis and structure which tested different levels of achievement.

Many candidates performed equally on both questions, though a number misunderstood the questions in Q1 or merely lifted their answers direct from the text in contradiction of the rubric.

Q1(a) was generally well answered. However, the Examiners were surprised that very few candidates were able to respond to the inference question set as Q1(b), whereby any profession or work connected with the shipyard or harbour was rewarded (for example, *er war Fischer, er war Lotse, er hat Schiffe entladen* etc.). Indeed, many candidates betrayed their prejudices against *Gastarbeiter* by assigning to Recep any number of menial tasks which had no foundation in the text itself. A number of candidates noted in Q1(c) that some 10,000 people planned to move into the block of flats. This should have seemed unlikely even to those who failed to understand the passage fully. In Q1(d) the Examiners were unable to reward the lifting of *unter den türkischen Familien* and *bekannt wird* without successful manipulation, and the often claimed fact that many Turkish people were interested could not be allowed unless hope of a future interest was denoted. The thrust of Q1(e) was generally grasped, though some candidates were of the view that the Turks were simply too old to learn a new language. The Examiners were flexible as to what they might accept as a response to Q1(f) which showed an understanding of the inference of the text. Any appropriate response was permitted, no matter how creative. The Examiners were unable to reward the lifting of *mediterrane Atmosphäre* in Q1(g) unless it was accompanied by appropriate supporting language. Thus *um eine mediterrane Atmosphäre zu schaffen* was not accepted, whereas *um eine mediterrane Atmosphäre zu schaffen, wo die Leute sich wie zu Hause fühlen können* was permitted. Similarly, *aus Liebe zu den beiden Ländern* lacked sufficient manipulation as an answer to Q1(h), for which the Examiners also rejected answers which referred to the ideal of mutual understanding - for example, *um die beiden Länder zusammen zu bringen*.

There were some excellent responses to Q2, though there were some careless errors, especially by candidates failing to use words and expressions from the main stimulus passage upon which the English text was based. Candidates are encouraged to make use of such words and expressions, and they should bear in mind that, unlike the first question, there is no penalty in Q2 for candidates lifting phrases or words from the stimulus material, as they are translating from one language to another and not responding in German to a question in German. The Examiners were concerned at the number of candidates who transferred material from the first passage but who failed to copy the spelling accurately. Weaker candidates showed fundamental problems with word order involving the position of the verb, as well as with cases and adjectival endings. In a task such as this, where accuracy is vital, candidates must be careful to provide correct endings and spellings. Indeed, where Examiners were unable to ascertain whether a noun began with an upper case letter, they were unable in the first instance to reward the given element. Similarly a lower case erroneously given as upper case was not rewarded on the first occasion. Candidates should bear in mind that wrong use of Umlaut means that the mark for that element must be withheld each time as is the case with any other spelling error, unless it is a repeated error.

The majority of candidates were able to gain a few points by knowing words and phrases such as *Arbeit, zu bleiben, die Sprache, and in die benachbarte Wohnung*. *Dorf* was only rarely rendered as a neuter noun, though where candidates gave it as feminine, they could be rewarded consequentially with *in der sie wohnt* in the following relative clause. Common words such as *sechsendreißig* (and candidates merely putting '36' could not be rewarded, as this was not an accurate translation of 'thirty-six'), *Fabrik, Verwandte, Griechenland, and fließend* were too often unknown or incorrectly rendered. Element 12 required a past perfect, which most candidates missed. *Jetzt* was often provided with element 20 rather than element 21. Especially native speakers were on occasion disadvantaged by attempting to paraphrase the text into (fluent and accurate) German. Candidates must bear in mind that this is an exercise in accurate translation from English into German. Some candidates missed out whole phrases or even sentences.

## Advice and Guidance

In Q1, superfluous information, information not contained in the printed target-language material, and self-contradictory combinations of correct and incorrect information earn no credit. Candidates should look out for questions such as Q1(b) and (f) which demand an understanding of what is inferred within the passage. They should be careful to render their responses in their own words rather than merely lifting phrases from the text. In Q2, however, candidates are encouraged to look in the stimulus passage for words and phrases which will help them to translate the English passage into German. Indeed, a number of such words and phrases are intentionally targeted by the Examiners at the time of setting the paper. Candidates should ensure that they translate into German only what is conveyed by the English, rather than writing creatively. This is not an exercise in paraphrase, but a test of the candidates' ability to translate. In order to improve, candidates must ensure accuracy of rendition as well as of lexis, structure and grammar. Matters such as tenses, verb forms, cases, articles, adjective endings and word order are of paramount importance when it comes to the allocation of a mark for each assessable element in Q2. The attention of candidates and teachers is drawn to the detailed mark schemes of past examinations.



## A2 Unit 6(c) (6486/03) - Writing in Registers

Candidates are required to answer one question from one of three sections: Creative Writing, Discursive Essays or Task-based Assignments (TBAs). For the first two sections, the length of the answers must be 225-250 words. For the TBAs, candidates must write 200-225 words in response to a stimulus text.

### Assessment Principles

Relevance and quality of response (content) is marked out of 20, and quality of language is assessed under three categories: accuracy (5 marks), manipulation (5 marks) and lexical range (10 marks). All essays carry 40 marks, with equal emphasis given to content and quality of language.

### Candidate Performance

The paper produced a full range of ability and the marks awarded ranged from the maximum 40 to 0. The majority of candidates produced relevant answers and in terms of language demonstrated very real development from GCSE. Whilst the overall standard of written German was good, a number of scripts contained very basic errors that are unacceptable at A2 level e.g. *Ein Mädchen heißen Dora: wie Sie kann schön gedachten: die zwei Mädchen hatte eines Stritt mit jedes: Diese Probleme ist sehr seriösllich: ich bin schreibend zu du in Konnexion mit das Article*. At the top end (native speakers excluded), the range and appropriateness of the lexis and idiom employed, not to mention the high level of grammatical accuracy were very impressive indeed. Manipulation of syntax was also highly commendable, with candidates skillfully deploying an ambitious range of syntactic structures.

Candidates did not always pay attention to the specific wording of questions. As a result, some essays were only partially relevant, or, in a few cases, wholly irrelevant. Given that half the marks available are awarded for content, candidates must ensure that they choose the right question (see Advice to candidates) and address the elements within it. However, by far the majority of candidates produced well thought out and well structured work, expressed in clear, idiomatic and for the most part grammatically correct German. There were essays of distinction in all three categories.

The majority of candidates have been taught a good number of idiomatic phrases, but did not always produce them accurately, creating hybrids such as *es kann nicht zu leugnen: im Großen und Ganzen bin ich den Eindruck dass: meine Meinung nach ist dass: es liegt in die Hand...* Phrases for the discursive essay were plentiful, though candidates need to use them deftly to connect paragraphs and make the development of their argument logical and coherent.

## Creative Essays

### Q1

A relatively popular question that produced some interesting and imaginative answers. Some candidates failed to identify the relationship clearly between the two characters depicted and a minority did not give reasons for their argument. However the majority based their narrative on the situation and produced some laudable responses. In some essays little lexical range beyond GCSE featured and candidates limited themselves to a very predictable range of structures. Several candidates introduced direct speech into their narrative, most of which revealed a good knowledge and understanding of contemporary idiom. At the higher end of the ability range, candidates used an ambitious range of vocabulary and idiom. The quality of their grammar and syntax was very commendable.

### Q2

Comparatively few candidates attempted this question. The majority of responses were however very competent and some were highly imaginative. Most answers were well structured and offered convincing responses.

### Q3

This was the least popular question on the paper. The majority of answers were very imaginative and read like newspaper articles although a few candidates ignored the aspect of *Meisterdetektivin*. Good use was made of direct speech and quotations, and most candidates provided an effective balance between factual narrative and editorial comment.

## Discursive Essays

### Q4

This was a reasonably popular question, and in most essays '*Massenmedien*' were clearly defined by candidates. Examples cited by candidates ranged from the Internet to TV, films and the printed media and the influence they have on our daily lives. The extent and persistence of manipulation of the media in contemporary society was usually very well handled with excellent argumentation appropriately backed up with relevant justification. Conclusions varied from the media exerting considerable and too negative an influence on society, encouraging non-thinking, apolitical attitudes on the part of the consumer, particularly young people, yet the responsibility of the individual to resist such pressures was stressed. Less able candidates had problems in harnessing their ideas effectively and frequently digressed into pre-learned material based on the mass media in very general terms with little regard to the demands of the question.

### Q5

This question produced some of the most impressive essays this year with a high level of analysis and debate in the majority of cases. Most candidates defined *pazifistische Politik* clearly and proceeded to debate the pros and cons of such a policy in the contemporary world. Inevitably the Iraq war came in for some consideration, as did several of the peace movements in the UK and abroad. Terrorism was also mentioned by many candidates within the context of their argumentation. A few students lost sight of the contemporary emphasis of the question and looked at the issue from a broad historical perspective. The level of language in this question was invariably very high and sophisticated.

#### Q6

This question proved to be the most popular question on the paper and was chosen by approximately 40% of the candidature. Some candidates failed to address the responsibilities of all three agencies mentioned in the title relating to environmental issues, yet most referred to the government, business and private households in appropriate measure as required by the wording of the question. The wide-ranging and sophisticated level of lexis was impressive in many cases as was the cogent and well-structured argumentation. Most candidates felt that the government should do far more for the environment both in terms of education and information provision as well as in practical terms, although it was felt that on balance all three groups should and could do more. There was frequently a very balanced approach to the topic. A few candidates paid insufficient attention to the specific wording of the question and wrote in general terms about how the environment could be improved.

#### Q7

This was a reasonably popular question. Answers varied from a broad, sociological approach considering the problems teenagers experience nowadays to a very personalised view. Compared to the adult world being a teenager was regarded as preferable overall as the freedoms of youth were considerable and these must be weighed against the manifold responsibilities of adulthood. The level of language here varied greatly, as did the range of lexis and structures deployed.

#### Task-based Assignments

Students should ensure that all aspects of the bullet points are covered in their responses to Questions 8 and 9.

#### Q8

This TBA was tackled by students of all abilities. Less able candidates stuck very closely to the lexis and structures of the original stimulus and rarely moved beyond. More able students expanded widely and relevantly considering their own future career moves and personal benefits accruing from the offer outlined in the stimulus. The application for a "*Stipendium*" featured in most responses although a not insignificant minority ignored this point entirely. The more formal register demanded by such a communication was not always observed.

#### Q9

This was the less popular TBA, yet on balance answers tended to be more competent and more appropriate. Some excellent arguments were made for and against volunteer work abroad, and several students used the text very skilfully building in their own opinions and experience.

#### Advice to candidates

Given that 50% of the available marks are awarded for content, it is essential that candidates choose the right essay. They must ensure that they fully understand the title and all its implications. They must consider very carefully how they are going to approach the topic/task and are strongly advised to draw up a plan, outlining the salient points of their essay in a clear structure. Candidates should pay particular attention to the relevance of their answer and they should consider the wording of the question very carefully indeed. Wholly irrelevant essays score no marks at all.

In Section A (Creative Writing), candidates should ensure that they write imaginatively, but should avoid writing essays that are totally implausible or surreal. In order to score high marks, candidates must also employ a lexical range beyond GCSE. In Section B (Discursive Essays), answers should be balanced in their approach and reach a clear conclusion. The use of pre-learned essay phrases is certainly permitted, but should be used deftly. Essays that consist almost entirely of these phrases fail to address the question satisfactorily. For the task-based assignments, it is vital that candidates cover all aspects of the points outlined in the task, as well as demonstrating that they have assimilated the data/material of the stimulus text. They must also show an awareness of formal letter etiquette and - if appropriate to the task - an active knowledge of commercial language/phraseology. Candidates who have not practised task-based assignment questions in preparation for the examination are advised not to attempt Section C.

It is important that candidates adhere to the prescribed word limits. Answers that are too long will lose marks for content (defective structure/organisation); answers that are too short are self-penalising. It is important that candidates fill out the answer booklet correctly, remembering to indicate on the script the question they are attempting. Rough work should be crossed out neatly - a single line suffices - and as the work is now marked online it is essential candidates avoid using gel pen and correction fluid. It is also helpful if candidates write on alternate lines. Not only is it easier for the examiner to read the answer, but also allows corrections/amendments to be inserted clearly. The use of footnotes, arrows, asterisks and other symbols should be avoided where possible, as they can be difficult to decipher at times.

# Statistics

## Unit 1 Listening and Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	50	40	35	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 2 Reading and Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	80	59	53	47	41	36
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

## Unit 3 Prepared Oral Topic

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 4.1 Oral Discussion of Issues

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	41	36	31	26
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 4.2 Interpreting

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	34	29	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 5.1 Topics and Texts

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	60	53	46	40	34
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 5.2 Coursework

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	135	108	95	82	69	57
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

## Unit 6 Listening and Writing, Reading and Writing & Writing in Registers

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	100	73	65	57	50	43
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA 017969 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH