



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **German 5661** *Specification*

**GR02      Aspects of Society**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2008 examination - June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**Unit 2**

	<b>% of AS</b>	<b>Marks for each AO</b>
AO2 Response to written language	10	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	30	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	30	54

**Annotation of Scripts**

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

- C written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from the Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
- © written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from a source other than the current Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
- T written in the margin to indicate information generally relevant to the topic.
- Rep written in the margin to indicate repetition of information relevant to AO4 or AO2.
- R written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 when no justification is given.
- ® written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 where this includes reason/justification of opinion.
- irr vertical line in the margin = irrelevant/inappropriate material.

The mark for AO4, AO2 and AO3 respectively to be written at the foot of the answer accompanied, where the examiner deems it necessary, by a word or phrase quoted from the criteria for assessment as published in the specification.

**Question 1(a)**

**Haben verschiedene Massenmedien den gleichen Wert als Informationsquelle für die Deutschen? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate considers more than one medium and discusses the ways in which each presents information (whether specifically news or more general information) and to which target German audience. There is a clear 'yes or no' answer to the question.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate clearly deals with information but in less detail and also with other aspects of the medium under discussion. There is less evaluation of the relative worth of the media dealt with.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate deals superficially with the question of information and writes at great(er) length on irrelevant aspects. Little clear German dimension.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	There are some random and unevaluated facts about various media. No reference to Germany.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><i>All of the following content points should, as much as possible, <b>be linked to their value to the Germans</b> and not simply be listed as what is available.</i></p> <p><b>C</b> for the material in the Preliminary Material relating to websites which give 'information' (much of it trivial)</p> <p>© for examples of other websites used by Germans to gather similar information or for examples of sites which give more serious information/news</p> <p>© for details of 'non-internet' computer programs which impart knowledge/information</p> <p>© for details of news programmes on television and who watches them</p> <p>© for details of other television programmes which give factual information (eg popular science programmes, documentaries or educational programmes for the young)</p> <p>© for similar details about radio</p> <p>© for details about/comparisons between different newspapers and how they present news</p> <p>© for details about the information/education content of magazines aimed at different age groups</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 1(b)**

***'Es gibt so viele Sender in Deutschland, dass jeder Zuschauer / jede Zuschauerin immer etwas Interessantes im Fernsehen findet.'* Nehmen Sie Stellung zu dieser Aussage.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate considers the differences between a range of broadcasters in Germany, both public and private, shows their types of programme and evaluates why these programmes would appeal to different audiences. Agrees (or not) with the title.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	There is some information about the differences between broadcasters in terms of their output, but there is also information about the 'legal' differences, which does not directly relate to the question. Less evaluation about audience taste.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate has given generalised facts about television (not necessarily German television) with little or no detail about programmes or audiences.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for the use of material from the Preliminary Material relating to programmes aimed specifically at young people.</p> <p>© for any information which illustrates differences between: ARD/ZDF; das Dritte; private 'freeview' channels; private subscription/pay-per-view channels; cable channels (but see AO2 band 3)</p> <p>© for specific examples of programmes on any channel and how/why they appeal to a particular audience</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 2(a)**

***In welchem Bereich des Umweltschutzes haben die Deutschen Ihrer Meinung nach den größten Erfolg gehabt? Wo haben sie weniger Erfolg gehabt? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.***

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate writes in great detail about two areas (the best and a less successful ) or about several in less detail but nevertheless explains a most successful and a less/east successful one. There should be some indication of progress from problem to solution OR of how a potential problem has (not) been averted.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Initiatives are described in some detail but there is less attempt to evaluate or explain the success or lack of success. There is too much emphasis on the problems rather than the solutions.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	There are brief descriptions of several problems/initiatives, but no evaluation. Little or no focus on Germany.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>As the question is open to different approaches (see AO2) examiners need to use discretion as to how much detail/width of knowledge is necessary or acceptable for content to be put in a high band. There is the likelihood that there will be many points made which can be rewarded with © and it is unlikely that there will be much call for <b>T</b> or <b>Irr</b>.</p> <p><b>C</b> for information about recycling from the Preliminary Material, and © for further information about recycling such as oil, paint and battery disposal, <i>Sperrmüll</i> or <i>Pfandflaschen</i></p> <p><b>C</b> for information about transport issues from the Preliminary Material (but note that some of this text is about what is possible rather than what is being/ has been done to reduce car usage) and © for other information about how this problem is being dealt with, such as the encouragement to use bicycles, favourable rail pricing and urban car restrictions</p> <p>© for other transport-related material, such as the polluting effects of flying or the environmental problems caused by heavy goods transport</p> <p>© for information about initiatives to reduce water pollution</p> <p>© for information about energy policy, such as the role of atomic energy, fossil fuels and large-scale renewables, as well as the use of small-scale photovoltaic systems</p> <p>© for information about initiatives to reduce energy consumption or improve energy efficiency, whether domestically or on a larger scale</p> <p>© for information about policies relating to smoking in public (air pollution)</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 2(b)**

***Das Auto ist der größte Umweltverschmutzer, den es überhaupt gibt.' Glauben Sie, dass dies in Deutschland wirklich der Fall ist? Warum (nicht)?***

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate explains why the car is or is not a big polluter, and also makes a comparison with other possible sources of pollution. The answer may consider ways in which car pollution is being combated and reduced. Should have a yes or a no (at the end).
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The polluting effects of cars are dealt with but there is less attempt to evaluate these and compare them with other possible sources of pollution or there is little information about how they are being reduced.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate writes more generally about transport, but does not deal properly with the issues of pollution.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for the use of relevant statistics (eg C02 emissions) from the Preliminary Material and © if these are augmented by other non-Preliminary Material statistics, such as total car ownership</p> <p>© for information about motorway traffic and long-distance heavy goods transport</p> <p>© for information about attempts to develop cars with cleaner fuel or using electric power; catalytic converters</p> <p>© for information about the polluting effects of air transport or water transport</p> <p>© for information about the polluting effects of power stations, chemical works etc</p> <p>© for information about the extent to which household waste is a major polluter</p> <p><b>T</b> for information about public transport/cycling, as this does not address the issue of whether a car is a polluter, but does show that the problem is being acknowledged</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 3(a)**

**Welche Wirkungen haben Ausländer auf die deutsche Gesellschaft gehabt? Inwiefern sind diese positiv?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate considers the relationship between foreigners and German society and shows ways in which the presence of foreigners cannot be seen as something happening "in a vacuum", but as something with consequences and effects. There needs to be an evaluation of how positive the effect is.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate describes in some detail aspects of the life of (different) groups of foreigners, but does not fully evaluate the wider effect on other parts of society.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The answer is less detailed on the life of foreigners. There is little or no evaluation of their effect on wider society.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for the information from the Preliminary Material about the need for highly qualified non-Germans in ICT and other hi-tech work; © for further information about how successfully or otherwise this initiative has been carried through and with what effect on the economy.</p> <p>© for information about the effects on the economy of the first waves of <i>Gastarbeiter</i></p> <p>© for information about second generation foreigners who are now employers</p> <p>© for information about the impact on the workforce of the more recent wave of (particularly) Eastern European tradesmen and unskilled workers</p> <p>© for information about the need to set up language classes and other courses to help integration and © for information about the impact of foreigners on the school system generally</p> <p>© for information about the effects of foreign cuisine on German eating habits</p> <p>© for information about the need to adapt broadcasting schedules to attract non-German viewers, and the increase in numbers of foreign TV presenters</p> <p>© for information about the divisive effects of foreigners, leading to racism and racial attacks, as well as peace vigils</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 3(b)**

**Was für Probleme erleben Ausländer in Deutschland? Mit welchem Erfolg kämpfen die Ausländer und die Deutsche dagegen?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
= irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate explains why certain situations are a cause of problems for (which groups of) foreigners, and clearly shows the extent to which these problems still exist or have been removed.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate writes about situations but does not fully explain in what way these cause problems. The candidate does not fully evaluate the success of attempts to deal with the problems.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate writes very generally and superficially about foreigners in Germany.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>The question asks about the problems faced by foreigners therefore any information about the positive aspects of life as a foreigner – unless it is shown to be the result of overcoming a problem – should be given <b>T</b>. Similarly, information about problems faced by asylum seekers <i>in their country of origin</i> should be given <b>T</b>.</p> <p>© for information about language problems and about language classes</p> <p>© for information about schooling and qualifications and about citizenship issues</p> <p>© for information about delays in the processing of asylum applications and consequent public attitudes about “drains on finance”</p> <p>© for information about a range of racist attitudes</p> <p>© for information about employment and attitudes in the workplace</p> <p>© for information about housing</p> <p>© for information about attitudes towards religion</p> <p>© for information about family/cultural issues</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	



**Question 4(a)****Kann man Ihrer Meinung nach die Deutschen als ‚gute Europäer‘ bezeichnen? Warum (nicht)?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate explains what he/she understands by a good European (eg contributions towards the development of the EU as a whole, attitudes towards fellow member states, individual attitudes towards the EU) and explains why Germany does or does not match this description.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate writes in reasonable detail about Germany's contribution to the EU but does not fully explain why this does or does not make the Germans good Europeans.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	There are random facts about Germany and the EU; there is minimal evaluation.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for information from the Preliminary Material about the German government's attempts to drive particular developments within the EU and © for other examples of similar attempts (eg the 'constitution')</p> <p>© for information about Germany's role in trade developments during the growth of the EU</p> <p>© for information about Germany's role in the introduction of the Euro and about subsequent developments</p> <p>© for information about Germany's positive participation in educational initiatives such as Erasmus</p> <p>© for information about Germany's attitude towards the constant expansion of the EU (<b>C</b> if it focuses on the worries about Poland, taken from the Preliminary Material)</p> <p>© for comments about the German wish to rebuild Europe after the devastation of WWII.</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 4(b)**

**Welche Nachteile oder Probleme gibt es für Deutschland als Mitglied der EU? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate clearly explains why the aspects of EU membership he/she has chosen can be considered as disadvantageous to Germany, for example financially or politically.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	The candidate describes aspects of Germany's membership which may be disadvantageous but does not fully explain why. The answer deals with positive aspects of membership (not asked for).
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The candidate writes about various aspects of the EU with little or no attempt to evaluate how these impinge on Germany.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for information from Preliminary Material about the influx of non-German workers and © for further information on this problem, if taken from other sources, such as the imposition of restrictions</p> <p>© for information about German companies who relocate within the EU, and consequent German unemployment</p> <p>© for comments on the Euro as a problem for Germans</p> <p>© for information about cross-border crime within the EU</p> <p>© for information about the effects of increased HGV traffic since the EU expanded</p> <p>© for information about ‘suspicions’ on the part of other member states about Germany’s role in the EU</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 5(a)**

**Inwiefern kann man den deutschsprachigen Raum als eine Einheit bezeichnen? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort und geben Sie Beispiele.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
= irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b> For “German –speaking area”, Germany alone is acceptable.
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate considers range of ways in which different parts of the German-speaking area are alike and in which they differ; there is no need for a ‘blanket’ yes or no conclusion, but the comparisons between different parts are clear.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	There is relevant information about the GSW, but there is less evaluation. Facts are superficial or anecdotal.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	There is some information but it focuses on only one area or aspect of the GSW. No evaluation.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p>The Preliminary Material offers various possible starting points for <b>C</b>, such as reference to differing dialects, differing local 'stereotypes' and different geography. All of these aspects could be developed for © with more detailed material from other sources.</p> <p>© for information about types of industry peculiar to a region or town</p> <p>© for comments about politics or about political attitudes prevalent in different areas</p> <p>© for information about the role and the importance of local media</p> <p>© for information about regional differences in religious affairs and attitudes</p> <p>The process of <i>Wiedervereinigung</i> is not acceptable content, but the consequences could be relevant eg states in the former East Germany and West Germany</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	

**Question 5(b)**

**'Es hat für Ausländer keinen Sinn mehr, Deutsch zu lernen.' Nehmen Sie Stellung zu dieser kontroversen Aussage.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=irr	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> (These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)	<b>Amplification</b>
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	The candidate considers the importance of Germany and/or other German-speaking states within Europe and the world economy as a whole, showing why this importance (or otherwise) justifies the need to learn the language. The candidate considers the importance of German culture in a wider context.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	As above, with most points detailed enough for ®, but also possibly some R.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	There is some description of what is going on in modern Germany or some reference to its past but this is not well evaluated in terms of Germany's importance in the world as a whole.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	The reasons for or against learning German are largely anecdotal or personal.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> (These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic, including good use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are very good.	<p><b>C</b> for information in the Preliminary Material about numbers of German speakers in the world and the numbers of German books translated</p> <p>© for information about German industry and exports</p> <p>© for information about Germany's role in modern developments in science and technology</p> <p>© for comments on the advantages of being able to communicate in their own language with European political allies</p> <p>© for comments on Germany's place in world sport</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material and makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are good.	
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material and to use some topic-specific vocabulary. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are sufficient.	
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. The quality of evidence and understanding of the topic are limited.	
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. The quality of the evidence and understanding of the topic are poor.	
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	