

A level German, Mocks Marking Training Commentaries, 17BAL05/17OAL20

All questions are from the sample assessment materials unless otherwise indicated.

Paper 1

Script Ref	Q	Mark	Commentary
A Specimen	4	0	In 4(b)(i) The use of 'suchen' in the first sentence is ambiguous and the mark was therefore withheld. The second sentence refers to the same bullet point and does not communicate the required information. In 4(b)(ii) the first sentence refers to its position but it is too vague. The following sentences are again just general phrases. It is important to understand that the order of element rules applies and only the first three elements are considered. Candidates are encouraged to write one summary sentence per bullet point in order to score highest.
B	4	2	For 4(b)(i) the first sentence was awarded a mark. The second clause refers to the same bullet point and is considered unnecessary. The sentence about health is not communicating the correct message and a mark can therefore not be awarded. The last summary sentence about children is not considered by the examiner, due to the order of elements rule. Please note that this is a summary task, and examiners are looking to award candidates who show an ability to select only the required information. In 4b)(ii) one mark was awarded for the summary of BP1. The second sentence has been lifted from the transcript and does not communicate the correct message. The last sentence does not refer to the improvement for passengers.
C	4	6	For 4(b)(i) all three marks have been awarded as the candidate clearly refers to each bullet point in order. Although the answers are short and not in complete sentences, the message is clear. For 4(b)(ii) again all three marks are awarded as each sentence communicates the essential message. The final pieces of information, after the "+" were not necessary, but the order of elements rule did not apply here, as they appeared after the 3 marks had been credited.

D	7	3	<p>7a) correct answer and mark awarded.</p> <p>7b) was not awarded a mark as 'Es ist wahrscheinlich' is incorrect, in relation to what is said in the text. For the second mark in the question, the repeated error was overlooked and gained one mark.</p> <p>7c) mark not awarded, as the answer is incorrect.</p> <p>7d) mark not awarded as the answer is incorrect.</p> <p>7e) mark awarded as first sentence is preamble, rather than an attempt to answer, so this does not count as an element.</p>
E	8	6	<p>8a) the information provided is correct and mark awarded.</p> <p>8b) the answer is incorrect.</p> <p>8c) mark awarded as answer is correct (candidates do not have to answer in complete sentences).</p> <p>8d) correct answer and mark given.</p> <p>8e) correct answer and mark given.</p> <p>8f) 'reaktiven Abfall' is ambiguous, and is not credited.</p> <p>8g) correct answer and mark awarded.</p> <p>8h) correct answer and mark awarded.</p>
F	9	4	<p>9a) mark awarded; correct answer.</p> <p>9b) mark awarded; correct answer.</p> <p>9c) no answer provided; zero mark.</p> <p>9d) answer incorrect; no mark given.</p> <p>9e) the answer does not describe a measure, so no mark awarded.</p> <p>9f) correct answer; one mark given.</p> <p>9g) acceptable answer as message is communicated even if comparative is wrong, mark awarded.</p> <p>9h) 'geschult' is not the same as 'ausgebildet/gut qualifiziert/ Facharbeiter' hence the mark was not awarded.</p>
G	7	3	<p>7a) no reference to writings/graffiti made; zero mark awarded.</p> <p>7b) one mark awarded as answer is correct.</p> <p>7c) mark withheld as answer is incorrect.</p> <p>7d) one mark awarded as first element is correct; however order of element rules applies and no further mark is given for the last correct information.</p> <p>7e) mark awarded as answer is correct.</p>
H	10	6	<p>Marks 1 -4 for sentence one were all given apart from 3 as 'Koalitionspartner' was not accurately translated. Mark 5 has been awarded but a mark has been withheld for adding people to the answer in 6 and describing sector as work areas has been considered ambiguous. Marks 8-11 have all been withheld as there are numerous mistakes in all parts such as not</p>

			<p>translating 'zudem', 'wird ...gesehen' and 'wirksam' and translating 'Armutsbekämpfung' incorrectly. Mark 12 was awarded but mark 13 was withheld as the adjective in its comparative form was not translated and 'heute' was left out. Mark 14 was given as the translation is acceptable and 15 has been awarded although certainly (mit Sicherheit) has been incorrectly translated and affected mark 16. As candidates cannot be penalised for the same mistake twice one mark was given. Mark 17 has been withheld as translation is incorrect. In the last sentence no marks have been awarded as 'beschweren', 'allerdings' and 'seine Einführung' were translated incorrectly.</p>
I	10	12	<p>The first sentence has been translated accurately and all four marks were awarded. For the beginning of next sentence the mark was awarded but the translation of 'gilt' has not been accepted. 'sämtliche Branchen' has not been translated accurately. In point 8 as 'zudem' was left out, which was a common mistake, the mark was not awarded. It is important that candidates ensure that every word is accounted for in their translation. For points 9-11 in the Mark Scheme only one mark was awarded for successfully translating <i>combatting poverty</i>. Mark 12 has been given although one capital letter was missing. Mark 13 was not awarded as 'großzügigeren' was translated incorrectly. For 14 and 15, the two marks were given. The last sentence was awarded two out of three marks as 'allerdings' was not included.</p>
J Specimen	10	14	<p>First three marks were awarded as the first three elements were correctly translated. However, in point 4, 'lastly' does not communicate 'the latter'. The next element was also translated ambiguously. In the next sentence (At that time...) three out of four marks were awarded as 'dunklen Wintermonaten' was translated with the use of comparative. In the next sentence two out of four marks were awarded. The translation of 'überschaubar' was rejected as well as 'grenzübergreifend...umfasst'. All four marks were awarded in the next sentence. For the last sentence three out of the four marks were awarded; a mark was not awarded for 'that simple arise'.</p>

Paper 2

NB There are two issues with the Point 1 in the mark scheme for Paper 2, Question 1. The translation in the 'Correct Answer' column is incorrect; 'wohnt/lebt' in the reject column would have been moved to the 'Accept' column in a standardisation meeting.

Script Ref	Q	Mark	Commentary
K	1	6	Marks awarded in sections: 1, 2, 5, 7, 13 and 16.
L	1	9	Marks awarded in sections 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 17, 19 and 20. There are some items of lexis which are too literally translated: wiederruft for recalls, nur for only. Three marks are awarded for the sentence in sections 7 to 9 but teachers should remind students about the importance of clarity when writing umlauts, as on würden in section 9. In section 13, the candidate has chosen the wrong word for different, and this affects the meaning. The candidate has thought about what an interrogation room might be, and come up with an attempt at 'questioning room' but this is not close enough – Verhörräume is a topic specific item of lexis. In Section 16 this is compounded by a too literal translation of 'when walking' as 'wenn gehend' – this needs to be rephrased, because the construction does not work in German. There is a spelling mistakes, which has been tolerated: Hilfe for Hilfe. However viel for fiel, has not. Note that, in section 12, the candidate's correction of the word order has been noted and accepted. The rephrasing in section 18, however, was felt to move too far away from the original. There is an important difference between viewing freedom as a threat and being (actually) threatened by freedom.
M	1	17	NB Please note introductory comment above re. Point 1 - therefore, the mark was awarded. Marks awarded for all sections apart from 4, 10 and 13. Overall, this is a very competent translation, with a good command of grammar and lexis. It has Konjunktiv I in reported speech. In section 4 there is a capitalised adjective, which counts as an error of capitalisation. However, in section 12 there is a noun which is not capitalised. This is regarded as

			the same mistake as in element 4, i.e. understanding that nouns should be capitalised and other parts of speech generally not, so it is awarded the mark. In section 10 there is an incorrect past participle and a word order problem. In section 13 there is a gender error.
N	22	5 10 5 =20	This is a response to the question: Untersuchen Sie die Idee, dass das Bild der DDR in diesem Film negativ ist. The essay is predominantly negative, and selects points for discussion which are not directly relevant. The points discussed are not always very significant. At times the focus of the essay is on comparing the portrayal of the two German states, which is not what the question is asking for. It might be a reasonable approach to show how the film technically portrays the DDR negatively, but the candidate needs to demonstrate the relevance – especially as the question asks specifically referenced ideas rather than techniques. At A Level, we would be looking for a much higher level of critical discussion, including examination, questioning, discussing, exploring and justifying. The language does contain some technical terminology, and demonstrates some variety, but it would benefit from more essay signposting, more of the language of analysis and evaluation, and a greater degree of complexity and variation. Some of the language is accurate, and mistakes generally do not impede comprehension.
O	22	12 14 6 =32	This is a response to the question: Analysieren Sie die Rolle von Lügen in diesem Film. The candidate has selected some relevant points to discuss, and there is evidence of (sometimes quite thorough) interpretation of these points. However, there is a need for more justification and perhaps quotation to support these interpretations. It would also improve the response if there were more overall attempt to direct each point towards answering the question. The candidate starts by talking about Christiane's lies, which are the foundational lies in the story, although they are the last to be revealed. It would have improved the level of critical discussion if the candidate had more thoroughly explored the foundational role of these lies. The candidate mentions that it is interesting that Alex also lies, but does not explore the role

			<p>this familial link might play in an interpretation of the significance of lies in this film. Unfortunately, the candidate then chooses a less significant point to mention – the Spreewaldgurken are of less significance than the overall lies about the fall of the wall. The candidate mentions the link between lies and Ostalgie, but does not fully explore this. The same is true of the symbolism of the lies. Overall, the candidate has interpreted, and has made some interesting points, but the essay could be improved by more fully focusing on the role of lies in the film, and by justifying interpretations more effectively. This could be achieved through argument and through quotation and more direct reference to scenes from the film. At present there is a little too much description. The language is varied on the whole, but there are repetitive areas. There is some good evidence of appropriate terminology for cinematic analysis in the first paragraph with the use of vocabulary such as "Hauptcharakter, Nebenfiguren, Handlung, Film, Kunstgriff", but further complexity and nuance would help to lift the language, as would more film-technical language and more essay signposting language. The language has accurate sections, although the word order can be problematic. Errors do not generally impede communication</p>
P	5	15 15 10 =40	<p>Overall, this is a reasonably competent essay, which does analyse the symbolism in the first part of Der Vorleser. The candidate has chosen appropriate symbols to discuss, and there is interpretation, which can be critical and well-justified, although there are moments when it is a little assertive. For instance, the claim that the house symbolises the Nazis needs more support, and is not fully convincing. To improve, the candidate could focus on providing arguments and other justification to support their interpretations. It would also help to use the introduction to set up a problematic relating to the analysis and interpretation of the symbolism. The essay might then resolve this problematic. The individual points of analysis need to be brought together. The essay is predominantly articulate with some range and complexity and some appropriate essay</p>

			<p>and technical language. However, in this script "Schlink wollte sagen" and "Im Buch" are two examples of terminology that are used quite repetitively. To attain the complexity and nuance necessary for the top band at A level the essay requires more consistent variation and a greater range of terminology appropriate for literary analysis. Despite the occasional error, this is very accurate language.</p>
--	--	--	--

Paper 3

Audio Sample 1

Task 1 – 27/30

AO4 – The ideas are relevant and perceptive. For example, analysing the questions “Was heißt eigentlich deutsche Kultur?” They are almost always consistently supported with examples in the justification of opinions. There was only one occasion when a question was not responded to with concrete examples from the target language culture. The analysis of society and culture reaches convincing conclusions. The mark given is 11/12, and would have been full marks if the answer to the questions about T.V. had been exemplified by the candidate rather than the teacher.

AO3 – There is a consistent variation in use of grammatical structures and vocabulary, including different types of complex structures and idiomatic language, which in this performance is used to great effect. Communication is fluent and articulate. The language is accurate and immediately understandable; any errors do not hinder clarity of the communication. The recurrent errors in the dative have just kept this performance from gaining full marks. 11/12

AO1 – The communication is spontaneous throughout this performance and the conversation is maintained with ease. To reach full marks, the candidate would need to show some evidence of directly addressing the teacher in an appropriate fashion. 5/6

Task 2, Part 1 – 3/12

AO2 – The candidate does make reference to sources, but they are not named. The references to the information in the sources does summarise information, but it is unclear, which of the sources gave which information. The personal response to the written sources in the presentation is very limited, and so, there is also very little evidence of justification. 3/12

Task 2, Part 2 – 24/30

AO4 – The ideas offered go beyond straight-forward and are quite perceptive. However, the reference to specific examples from the research means that the analysis is not as developed as it might have been. The performance could have been raised, if it were supported by pertinent examples and reference. Some of these were offered, when the technical terms of the Swiss school system were used. There was a degree of irrelevance, when the discussion moved on to the UK, and therefore some loss of focus on the target language culture. 6/12

AO3 – The linguistic performance remains very strong in section two, and since the issue with the formation of the dative case was much less prevalent, full marks can be awarded. 12/12.

AO1 – The interaction remains spontaneous. The conversation is maintained and there is a feeling that the candidate and the teacher feel equally comfortable as participants in the discussion. There is also evidence of the candidate directly addressing the teacher, so full marks for interaction can be awarded. 6/6

Total: 54/72

Audio Sample 2

Task 2, Part 1 - 8/12

AO2

The presentation clearly referenced two named sources. There was a slight lack of balance of information in the summary – slightly more information was offered for the second article. The candidate provided person response to both articles with justification. Whilst we were not marking the quality of the language, some of the details were difficult to understand, because of the pronunciation. If communication had not have been impaired by this the mark would have been higher. The presentation went a few seconds over the two-minute limit. 8/12

Audio Sample 3

Task 2, Part 1 - 3/12

AO2 – the presentation names one written source – Andorra, and the presumption is that this was not a set text. Otherwise, two written sources are evident, but they are not named, so it is ambiguous. The summary of each source amounts to one point each. There is a personal reaction to each of these points. The presentation is approximately 30 secs shorter than the maximum. 3/12.

Task 2, Part 2 - 19/30

AO3 – The accuracy was good, but the range could have been better, in terms of structure and idiomatic language. See grammar list in spec for further reference. 8/12.

AO4- There is a lot of knowledge about the topic, but the balance between analysis and knowledge is uneven. There are attempts at analysis, sometime well substantiated, but sometimes they are unsubstantiated. The knowledge shows evidence of top band, the analysis shows evidence of the middle band, so the best fit is 8/12.

AO1 – The candidate is a confident speaker, and isn't reliant on the teacher to maintain the conversation, but there are 3 occasions when the candidate hasn't listened to the teacher, and has given a response that either doesn't answer the question, or that only briefly addresses the question after a large amount of irrelevant material. There is no evidence of the candidate directly addressing the teacher. 3/6