

OCR Report to Centres

June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

© OCR 2012

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE German (H476)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE German (H076)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
F711 Speaking	1
F712 German Listening, Reading and Writing 1	4
F713 German Speaking	6
F714 Listening, Reading and Writing 2	10

F711 Speaking

General Comments

Many teacher/examiners established a friendly atmosphere conducive to good performance and conducted the speaking test well. In most cases timings of both role-play and topic discussion were of the recommended length. More centres than previously used the Repository to upload recordings and documentation.

Role-Play

All of the role-plays proved to be equally effective with none any more or less difficult than the others.

Role-plays were most effective when:

- teacher/examiners had prepared the Examiner's Sheet and the Candidate's Sheet well.
- teacher/examiners encouraged candidates to supply details from the stimulus material by using open questions.
- teacher/examiners did not supply the information which candidates were intended to supply.
- teacher/examiners listened carefully and elicited further information, if they recognised that candidates had omitted parts of the stimulus material.
- teacher/examiners listened attentively, reacted to candidate responses and suggested further stimuli designed to extract more information.
- teacher/examiners used the correct form of address.
- teacher/examiners followed up the final two bullet point questions with *warum*, giving candidates the opportunity to be inventive and imaginative.
- Candidates changed the word order and/or verb ending in the initial two questions.
- candidates conveyed the stimulus material systematically and chronologically.
- candidates took the initiative and used their imagination.

Comments on Individual Questions

Role-play A: Library Volunteers

The two initial questions were frequently done successfully. Successful candidates understood that they were supposed to be thinking about applying for the job rather than already having it or recommending it to the examiner. Those who supplied the details scored highly on Grid A, which is marked according to the 15 Key Points.

Successful candidates were able to convey information from the text such as: customers / busy times / offer full days / on a regular basis / work involves contact with the public / lively / soon part of the team. The final two bullet points were accessible and most candidates were able to respond to questions asking why this might be a good job for them and the advantages and disadvantages of voluntary work.

Role-play B: Cambridge

Candidates responded well to a familiar scenario and asked the initial two questions successfully. Candidates who performed well provided details such as: has existed for over 2000 years / famous buildings / beautiful architecture / fabulous shopping opportunities / ideal place to buy a bargain / boat trip on river / regular bus services / hire a bike. The final two extension bullet points were dealt with well.

Role-play C: Stubai Ski

Candidates often did well when they

- understood that the English family was considering a winter ski holiday, not that they did this last year or every year. It is important that both candidates and teacher/examiners understand their roles.
- provided details such as: new to skiing / bring the whole family / Austria's favourite winter holiday destination / lots of fun / learn a new winter sport like snowboarding / heated outdoor pool / fantastic way to relax / ice-skating under the stars / transfer to and from accommodation / hire of anything needed.

The first final bullet point asked candidates to suggest the best way of getting from England to Austria. Many coped well and offered sensible suggestions. The second final bullet point asked whether winter or summer holidays were better. This question elicited a broad spread of responses.

Role-play D: National Express Coaches

Most candidates understood the situation inviting them to recommend National Express coaches. The two initial questions posed few difficulties. Well-performing candidates supplied details such as: trouble-free journey / in the UK / public transport / to all airports 24/7 / airport entrance / problems of carrying heavy luggage / the earlier you book / the greater choice of where to sit / network map / timetables / student discounts. The final bullet points, asking candidates which parts of England they would recommend and how to improve public transport provoked a mixture of responses.

Topic Discussion

Candidates offered a variety of topics, and some topic discussions were very impressive. Most candidates prepared themselves well for this part of the examination, and many successful conversations took place, containing spontaneous interchanges of ideas between teacher/examiner and candidate. The language quality in this series was reasonably high. Candidates should be encouraged to select a topic which is relevant to a German-speaking country, which interests them, and which they can research in depth. The headings on the Oral Topic Form should be different aspects relating to the same topic and interconnected.

Grid D (Ideas, Opinions, Relevance) has a maximum of ten marks to be awarded for the ability to convey ideas and opinions, supported by factual information referring to Germany / Austria / Switzerland. Successful discussions in this series were based on information relating to the AS topics/sub-topics and also to a German-speaking country.

Grid E1 (Fluency, Spontaneity, Responsiveness) awards a maximum of ten marks for the ability to use German naturally, fluently and genuinely spontaneously. Candidates who are in charge of the conversation and can "keep the momentum going" are likely to achieve a mark of at least 7–8. The headings outlined on the Oral Topic Form should be followed in chronological order. Candidates are not penalised if a heading is omitted, as long as the conversation has been successful. Discussions should last nine to ten minutes. Centres should be aware that overlong discussions do not bring candidates any advantages, as assessment ceases after ten minutes.

Spontaneity is of critical importance. One crucial role of teacher/examiners is to react to statements made by candidates and to challenge statements or ask for further clarification. Those candidates who can respond spontaneously and fluently to such interventions score highly on this grid. Successful performances were elicited by teacher/examiners who encouraged genuine and spontaneous interchanges. This happens in a natural way when discussions have not been over-rehearsed.

Grid C1 (Quality of language) awards up to 5 marks for a combination of accuracy and range. Candidates who mostly offer accurate basics but little ambitious language are restricted to 2/5. Those offering a good range of ambitious structures in accurate German are rewarded with higher marks.

Grid G (Pronunciation and intonation) (5 marks). Candidates with good German pronunciation and intonation are rewarded with high marks.

Recordings can be submitted in various formats, the preferred one being mp3, which is often excellent in terms of quality of audibility.

F712 German Listening, Reading and Writing 1

Unit 2 Listening, Reading and Writing

General Comments

Whilst appearing to be accessible to the vast majority of candidates, the paper produced a full range of responses and a wide distribution of marks. The format of the examination is now familiar and most candidates have been well-prepared, so there were few instances of candidates misinterpreting the rubric or failing to attempt questions. There was little evidence that candidates had had insufficient time to complete the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A – Listening and Writing

Task 1 This task about reality television involved choosing the correct ending, out of a choice of three, to ten sentences. Although the subject matter was main stream the text needed to be listened to carefully to capture the detail. Relatively few candidates achieved full marks and the task proved to be an effective predictor of performance in the paper as a whole.

Task 2 Although truancy was perhaps a less familiar topic many candidates achieved a better mark identifying the ten correct statements than they had in the first task.

Task 3 Answering questions in English is generally well done and most candidates scored high marks on this text about a house exchange scheme. The situation was sufficiently within their experience to allow them to use their common sense where their grasp of the detail was insufficient. They were not always successful in this, but as a linguist it is a useful skill to develop. In (b) *waren wir keine richtige Touristen* was sometimes interpreted as there being no tourists and *einladen* seemed unfamiliar to many. In (f) the concept of *noch nie* was frequently omitted. The last question was designed to provide a straightforward end to the task but *Vereinigten Staaten* was not recognised by a significant number of candidates.

Task 4 Most candidates were capable of communicating the content of this letter, although some lost marks unnecessarily through omitting elements of a message. Much difficulty was caused by a lack of general vocabulary, such as *Easter, edge, border, scenery, practical*. Many candidates found a way round the difficulties by resorting to *in der Nähe*. *Renovated* was more challenging but for those who did not use the correct verb *renovieren*, there was always the option of using *verbessern* or even *besser*. It is essential, however, to include all the content and those who left out *recently* in (f) and *practical* in (j) were not awarded the marks for communication.

Word order and tenses were quite sound but candidates need to revise the rules concerning prepositions, cases and pronouns.

Section B – Reading and Writing

Task 5 This task discriminated effectively between candidates. (a) was the gap most frequently filled incorrectly while (g),(i) and (j) were for the most part correct.

Task 6 Most candidates got the gist of the text and were able to attempt an answer to all the questions. One unanticipated difficulty seemed to be identifying the gender of Birgit: either gender was accepted as long as the pronouns and possessives matched. Where there was confusion (*sie wohnt bei seinen Eltern*) candidates were penalised only once for communication.

Most candidates are now aware that the questions are designed to prevent them from lifting answers directly from the text and that they are required to manipulate the language of the text rather than to use entirely different vocabulary. Those who make too much effort to be original sometimes penalise themselves: candidates who replaced *Zuhause* with *Hause* in (b) created a sentence with quite a different meaning. There were, however, some very successful answers to (g) from the many candidates who simplified the construction *es kümmert niemanden* to: *er darf (kein Gemüse essen)*, (*Er kommt nach Hause*), *wenn er will*.

The Quality of Language was generally sufficient to convey the meaning but manipulating from first to third person often caused difficulties with verb endings, pronouns and possessives. Tense was frequently overlooked by candidates but this was tolerated in the marking.

Task 7

(a) This text about young drivers needed careful reading to understand that in Germany you need to be 18 to get a driving licence but that you can drive at 17 accompanied by an experienced driver. Nevertheless the points about the dangers of cars were generally well understood and most got point 4 in the Mark Scheme. Some candidates mistakenly used *Straßenverkehr* to mean road accident which meant they failed to get point 5 but most identified *stirbt* and gained point 6. Most candidates managed to communicate at least half the points successfully.

(b) Candidates had strong views about whether driving is too dangerous for young people. Although many were quite harsh about the driving skills of their peers, they had criticisms of older people behind the wheel too. Most eventually found in favour of young people, the majority of whom they consider to be responsible. They seemed to come up with a good number of arguments for which they had adequate vocabulary and good use was made of *Erfahrung* which appeared in the text. It is possible that more might have been written on the topic of insurance but very few could recall the word. A few candidates went off the point by spending too much time on their own driving experiences, expanding on the dangers of drink and drugs and going into the impact of the car on the environment, but for the most part their ideas were relevant. Planning avoids the repetition of points which will then gain no credit. It was pleasing to see the number of candidates who gained a high mark in this section, even if their language skills were limited, because they had plenty of ideas and had sufficient confidence to find a way of expressing them.

Many candidates express themselves quite fluently and have an extensive vocabulary, but their work often loses marks for Accuracy because there are errors in agreements, commonly used verbs, word order, plural forms and spelling.

The Accuracy and Range grids in the Mark Scheme are identical for AS and A2 but the expectations of "complex language" are not the same. An ability to express opinions is clearly important but *Meiner Meinung nach*, *ich finde* and *dass* are perfectly adequate ways of doing this. Occasionally substituting *da* or *denn* for *weil* provides variety in justifications and the confident use of subordinating conjunctions like *obwohl*, *damit* and *wenn* can be considered as complex language at this level.

F713 German Speaking

General Comments

The majority of candidates were correctly entered at this level and a high standard was evident. Most recordings were of good quality, both on the Repository and on CD. It is important to complete a Working Mark Sheet for each candidate, and these should be sent by post with the attendance register or uploaded onto the Repository.

The subject matter for the texts can be drawn from either the AS or A2 topic areas. The AS topic areas are not intrinsically any less demanding, and texts chosen from such areas, such as Text C on this occasion, can be quite challenging. All three texts this year produced interesting discussions. Text A, because of its topic-specific vocabulary might initially have appeared more difficult than the others, but was often very well covered.

On this unit, there is no randomisation sheet and any text can be used for any candidate. Some centres indicated they were reluctant to use Text A, as the majority of their candidates were talking about a topic dealing with the environment, but this need not have been the case. Provided that the topic in question was dealing with a different aspect to that in the text, namely problems associated with transport (planes), the text could have been used to complement the information in the topic conversation.

The timing of the tests was good this year, with fewer too short or excessively long. The optimum timings are six minutes on the text and twelve on the topic, though it should be borne in mind that the text discussion represents half the total marks and, therefore, should not be cut short in any way. The suggested questions for the teacher/examiner to use are only suggestions. They can be phrased in any way, and it is nearly always essential to probe for information or view points by formulating additional follow-up questions. This makes the discussion sound far more natural and spontaneous, and it ensures that no important information is omitted.

Evaluative questions to challenge the higher achieving candidates are suggested for all texts, though as with all the suggested questions, they do not have to be used and can be replaced by something similarly, less, or more demanding, according to the candidate's ability. An example of such a question was *Ist Integration möglich?* Some extremely interesting answers resulted, and candidates can take their responses wherever they wish.

A further positive feature this year was the continued reduction in the number of candidates relying on pre-prepared and memorised material for their topic conversation. The interchange between candidate and teacher/examiner should sound like a conversation. If fluency is obviously confined to pre-learned material that sounds more like written German than natural spoken language, a high mark for Spontaneity on grid E2 is unlikely. Often pronunciation and intonation are affected also.

Comments on Individual Texts:

Text A *Eine positive Protestaktion gegen Flugzeugabgase*

It was not necessary fully to understand or explain in detail the scientific facts presented in this text to get high marks on grid K (Understanding of and Response to Text), though many candidates clearly did, and nearly all were able to give an excellent summary. Many were able to identify with Katja Schiller and supported what she and her class-mates had done to preserve the peace and quiet of their school.

In the first paragraph the point of detail about the runway at the airport being lengthened was not insisted upon, though the fairly important idea behind *auszubauen* was often not quite grasped. In the second paragraph what was actually the most important point about noise pollution was sometimes overlooked in candidates' eagerness to talk about air pollution through various chemicals. The third paragraph was sometimes slightly misinterpreted, partly because *stattdessen* was overlooked or not known. The *Protestaktion* that had been mooted was in fact aborted. This protest was not actually the one mentioned in the title, but the link should have been clear enough as a result of the addition of *positiver*. The vocabulary item *umwandeln* was possibly not well known in this paragraph, though many candidates were able to find excellent equivalents in their own words for other items, such as *sinnlos* for *keinen Zweck* or *verringern* for *reduzieren*. As a general point of information, only occasional synonyms are necessary for a high mark for Range on grid F1. It is not expected that the vocabulary of the text is avoided, only that it is not relied upon exclusively. A good synonym offered when discussing the last paragraph was *erweitert* for *vergrößert*. The ability to infer meaning is required for the higher marks on grid K, and an example of this in the final paragraph was the assumption that the airport owners would have been able to pay for the trees to be planted as they would have a bigger airport and thus make more money. Many candidates also realised that Katja's comment about them having to pay was in fact meant humorously.

There were some excellent discussions about the rights and wrongs of active protest and the pros and cons of flying. Some excellent additional general questions were used by teacher/examiners. Among them were:

- Gibt es einen Grund, Gewalt zu benutzen, wenn man protestiert?
- Ist Bäume pflanzen eine gute Idee?
- Ist die Reaktion der Schüler typisch für Jugendliche?
- Haben Jugendliche die Chance, die Entwicklung ihres Landes zu beeinflussen?

Text B *Ein ungewöhnlicher Fußballstar*

It was not necessary to know anything about football to talk successfully about this text, as very many candidates proved. Nor was it important to have heard of Mesut Özil or to pronounce his name as in Turkish. The text was about successful integration and there were some excellent and well-informed discussions about this.

Many candidates used their background knowledge about *Gastarbeiter* to enhance the discussion of the first paragraph. It is a good idea to practise the reading out of unfamiliar names of towns or people that may be encountered in texts, such as *Gelsenkirchen* in this text. It was rather unexpected that *mit zwei Jahren* was sometimes taken to mean *für zwei Jahre*. Not many problems appeared to be encountered in paragraph two apart from the pronunciation of *entschieden / Entscheidung*. In the third paragraph *selten* was often interpreted as *nicht* as far as Mesut's alcohol consumption was concerned. Some candidates muddled up the German characteristics with the Turkish ones. The idea behind *spreche in mich hinein* was often missed, though this was not considered vital. An understanding of the subjunctive sentence at the start of the last paragraph was not strictly required, though it was encouraging how well this was generally interpreted. *Es gibt nicht genug gute Vorbilder wie Mesut* was one good interpretation, or *Wenn er nicht existierte, wäre es nötig, jemand wie Mesut zu haben*. It is worth checking whether people mentioned are men or women during the preparation time, and it was a *Professorin* on this occasion. In this paragraph *trotz* was sometimes misinterpreted as *wegen*. It seemed to be difficult to find the necessary synonym for *bescheiden* but good efforts were *nicht arrogant* and *normal*. A good probing question from a teacher/examiner was *Ist Geld für ihn wichtig?*, which produced the necessary information.

Some interesting questions for the general discussion included:

- Haben Sie ein Vorbild?
- Was für Vorbilder sollten junge Menschen haben?
- Glauben Sie, dass die Olympischen Spiele kulturelle Integration fördern?
- Würden Sie sich leicht integrieren können, in eine andere Kultur?

Many candidates had interesting views as to whether immigrants should adopt the culture of their new homeland, and as was expected, this discussion was often widened to include the situation in this country. The difficult question as to whether integration is in fact feasible was sometimes brilliantly discussed.

Text C *Wie man in Form bleiben kann*

This text was based on an AS topic area, and produced some lively discussions.

It was interesting in the first paragraph that some candidates put a positive gloss on the statistics, and made sure they were using their own words, by emphasizing how many people were *not* overweight, rather than just reading the numbers from the text. Candidates should note that *halb* is not a good synonym for *die Hälfte*. Not everyone noticed it was *Milliarden Euro*, rather than just millions, that these illnesses cost the economy. A better pronunciation of *Diabetes* might have been expected, and the pronunciation of German words that look identical but are pronounced differently might be a profitable area to practise, similarly the correct use of *übergewichtig*.

The second paragraph offered several difficulties: *Gesundheitssystem* was not necessarily known or understood, especially when linked with *sich leisten*. The idea behind *auch wenn* was usually missed: namely, if the chronically ill died young it would actually reduce the costs for the government. Many candidates made a good link, however, between the relatively cheap cost of the *In Form* initiative and the enormous yearly costs brought about by the illnesses mentioned. *Kampagne* proved difficult for many to pronounce, though some employed their own words well to cover the details of the campaign. For example: *für Sportler, Kinder, Fabrikarbeiter und Rentner*.

The word *unbewusst* in paragraph three was sometimes misunderstood; in this context it meant “without their realising”, and not “unaware”. Many candidates could not use *Verbote* correctly, or, more frequently, the verb *verbieten*. As mentioned in the General Comments, the second part of this paragraph was sometimes omitted. This was considered significant information to be rewarded under grid K. The fourth paragraph was usually well understood and expanded upon, with some interesting views expressed, for example that “lack of time” was really only the parents’ excuse for not actually caring what their children ate. Another unusual comment was that the economy relies on fast food firms so they are beneficial. In the discussions on this text it was noted that there is still confusion between *gesund* and *Gesundheit*, and *Krankheit* is incorrectly given instead of *Krankheit*.

Some good additional general questions that were noted included:

- Wäre es nicht besser, wenn die Regierung mehr Geld für Sportinitiativen ausgeben würde?
- Sollte man Werbung für Fast Food verbieten?
- Ist die Olympiade nicht eine Motivation, gesünder zu leben?

Topic conversation

As already mentioned, the most important feature of this part of the test is that it should be spontaneous and not rehearsed to too great an extent, nor pre-learned or presented as mini-monologues in essentially “written German”. The conversation should have some pace, but the candidate can certainly pause for reflection and even say *das ist eine schwierige / interessante Frage* before offering some thoughts. Natural interaction between the two participants in the conversation is the main thing. Some of the conversations heard this year were again extremely informative and interesting.

The most popular topics seemed to be:

Jugendkriminalität

Arbeitslosigkeit

Integration (also covered by Text B)

Various aspects of *Umwelt* (also in text A)

Some new and successful titles included:

Geschichte des deutschen Kinos

Das Berliner Märkische Viertel

Schutz der Wölfe in Deutschland

Ausgewählte Werke Franz Kafkas

Schutz von Meerestieren in der Ostsee

Neutralität der Schweiz

Deutschlands Rolle in der Euro-Krise

Die Rote Armee Fraktion

Legalisierung der Prostitution

Die Zwickauer Terrorzelle

Robotertechnologie and

Inwiefern können Promis in Deutschland ein Privatleben haben?

F714 Listening, Reading and Writing 2

Unit 4 Listening, Reading and Writing

General Comments

The majority of candidates were appropriately entered and had no difficulties in managing their time to complete all sections of the paper. Almost all candidates clearly had enough time to plan and write their essays, some of which were well over the suggested maximum length of 400 words. The preparation they had undertaken across the topic areas meant that the majority were able to cope well with the vocabulary of the listening and reading passages.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Listening and Writing

Task 1 The Benefits of Technology

The gist of the text was understood well and many candidates gained high marks. The main error in (a) was reference to the 'top ten' sights (sometimes 'sites') in Germany, due, perhaps to a lack of familiarity with the word *Sehenswürdigkeiten*, the first element of which they misheard as *zehn*. Question (b) tested knowledge of *weder ... noch*. Despite the fact that 'Cologne cathedral' is mentioned in question (a), there were a number of answers that referred to the 'dome' and consequently lost marks. The mark was occasionally lost for (g) because details were missing (eg on Monday), although the use of the word 'specific' in the question was intended to elicit a full answer.

Task 2 Radiobericht über Diskriminierung

There was evidence of good understanding of the meaning of the passage, although candidates clearly found it more challenging than the first text. The first question highlighted several issues:

- '*stammen aus*' is not widely known and candidates would benefit from a better geographical knowledge of Germany, eg knowing the names of key towns and also the Bundesländer (and which ones are in the former DDR). In this task this would have assisted understanding of the location of Nordrhein-Westfalen and Dresden.

- it is important to try to establish the gender of the person at the outset. Renate (and in Text 4 Rotraut) are perhaps unfamiliar names and could easily be assumed to be male. There are, however, many other clues that candidates can use, such as the word *Frau* and the feminine *-in* ending (here *DDR-Bürgerin*, and in Text 4 *Polizistin*). Thus, a candidate answer beginning *Er...* is an error, particularly when, as here, there is a female actor playing the part.

In the other questions successful candidates understood the question *Was für...?* and the words *Umschlag* and *Nachricht*, but there were many answers that seemed to be guesses and did not gain the mark. Some candidates simply transcribed something they had heard. Others were able to answer questions directly, not necessarily in full sentence answers but in a way that clearly expressed comprehension. The best answers to (h), (k), (m) and (n) were very brief, but the answer to (l) required an answer beginning a verb, such as (*weil*) *sie dachte...*, to be awarded marks.

Section B: Reading and Writing

Text 1 In Nordfriesland regt man sich auf

Task 3

This was a non-verbal task. Many scored full marks. The mark that was most commonly lost was due to mistaking *aufgebraucht* for *aufgebracht*.

Task 4

This task, requiring answers in German, discriminated well. It was encouraging that many candidates were able to gain the second mark in (c), which was intended as a stretch and challenge question.

Task 5

For marks to be gained, candidates needed to read the text carefully and manipulate the language to make the sentences read correctly. The majority of candidates approached this task with some success and had understood the sense of the passage. They have clearly been taught well to try to make grammatical sense of the passage, and it was encouraging to find that most candidates saw that they needed an infinitive for (c) or the adjective / past participle from *Überraschung* for (g). The point most commonly lost was for (e), which was intended to be more of a challenge.

Text 2 Freiheit durch Fahrrad fahren

Task 6

Here there were a few vocabulary items that caused difficulty. The main problems (in this order) were *eifrig*, *selten* (often confused with *seltsam*), *Anblick*, *Kopftuch* (translated as helmet, head towel, head cloth, headdress), *am Rand*, *während* (meaning while), *Fahrrad* (translated by some as motorbike). Other problems were the recognition that the ending of *Migrantinnen* is important as is the construction with *seit*. Working on this first paragraph in detail perhaps helped candidates to be able to access the rest of the text.

Task 7

As always with this type of task, direct answers to the questions are required, which will very often not be in complete sentences. For (b) the best answer was one beginning with *mit*, ie simply *mit Haus und Familie*, and for (f) simply *seit 17 Jahren*. The question *Warum?* elicited either *um ... zu* or *weil* from the best candidates. For example, (g) *Um mit ihrem Mann zu leben*; (h) *Weil sie nie die Gelegenheit hatte und...*. Difficulties in this task were due to misunderstanding *familiär* in (b) and not being able to express the answer clearly, not understanding *beibringen* in (d) and in not being able to say *für sie* in (h).

Task 8

Explaining words and expressions from the text is becoming a familiar task. Most of the words were understood although not all candidates were able to find the words to express the meaning. The improvement in candidates' ability to use relative clauses is continuing, however.

Task 9

This task discriminated well. Most candidates gained some marks but only some candidates gained marks for (a) and (d). Some lost marks for confusing *sein* and *ihr* and for not having the feminine singular form of friend.

Section C: Writing

The most popular title was 12, followed by 10 and 11. Many candidates found time to plan their work, which was clearly beneficial, and there were many competent essays that really did attempt to address the question set. There was impressive evidence that candidates had covered the topics and the issues surrounding them thoroughly in class. There were still a few candidates who wrote an essay that was not a response to the title but rather on the general topic area. This meant that content marks could not be other than very low.

Many candidates wrote essays in good German, demonstrating advanced topic-specific vocabulary and the ability to express complex ideas.

Question 10

A few candidates chose this question despite not having studied the topic, or this aspect of it, in class and their essays were very general. Better essays were those in which candidates showed knowledge of current crime figures in Germany and the fact that there has been a slight drop in youth crime, where rates were very high. Some mentioned particular campaigns that had been introduced to raise awareness among young people. Others cleverly introduced facts about the crime rate amongst the immigrant population and discussed measures to improve language skills and make immigrants less marginalised in society.

Question 11

Most candidates read the question carefully and wrote an appeal to their fellow citizens to join the demonstration. Less successful essays stated that unemployment in Germany is high (sometimes inventing figures, such as there being 8 million unemployed, to support their case). More successful essays were those where candidates introduced factual information to illustrate their arguments and perhaps referred to a particular area of Germany where unemployment was particularly high (eg Brandenburg) or a particular group such as the Turkish community.

Question 12

This was a very popular title, and it was impressive that most candidates were able to fit what they had learnt to the demands of the question, although some candidates found it difficult to go beyond listing different types of renewable energy. The best essays addressed Germany's decision to close down all their nuclear power stations, including details such as the fact that over 20% of Germany's electricity comes from renewable sources, that there are financial incentives to increase the amount of renewable energy with the goal of being almost entirely dependent on renewables by 2050. These candidates knew about off-shore wind farms, solar panels in Freiburg, passive houses, etc, and were able to construct a relevant and focussed essay around what they knew.

Question 13

This title did not generate much interest. Some essays fell down on Grid N because they were entirely imaginary, and the requirement for 'relevant information' was not met. Nevertheless, there were a few more successful attempts, such as a sea-life conservation project at a Baltic Sea resort, a tree-planting project in South Germany and one on the Frankfurter Waldsiedlung.

Question 14

This was not a popular choice and those who wrote on it appeared not to have researched the German aspects of the topic. Most wrote about computers, mobile phones, MP3 players etc. There was generally a good attempt to address the benefit to young people. One wrote about a Mercedes technical innovation of LEDs for automatic variable control LED headlights which would help young people learning to drive.

Question 15

There were surprisingly few essays on this, considering the number of innovations there have been in the car industry, including the invention of the diesel engine and the first motor car.

Question 16

Towns chosen were Munich, Vienna, Cologne and, most popular of all, Berlin. Essays were variable in quality. The best were excellent, with candidates selecting examples well and focussing on the influence of past events or architecture on aspects of present day life.

Question 17

Again there was a range of performance for this essay. Some were not relevant, in that they were not written in the first person or did not examine the motives but others were extremely insightful. Among works chosen were: *Andorra*, *Der Besuch der Alten Dame*, *Sansibar und der letzte Grund*, *GoodBye Lenin*, *Das Leben der Anderen*, *Der Vorleser*.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

