

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2006 question paper

9717 and 8683 GERMAN

9717/03 and 8683/03 Paper 3 (Essay), maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

The grade thresholds for various grades are published in the report on the examination for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2006 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL - OCT/NOV 2006	9717/8683	03

Language (out of 24)	Content (out of 16)
21-24 Very good Confident use of complex sentence patterns, generally accurate, extensive vocabulary, good sense of idiom.	14-16 Very good Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated; coherently argued and structured.
16-20 Good Generally sound grasp of grammar in spite of quite a few lapses; reads reasonably; some attempt at varied vocabulary.	11-13 Good Sound knowledge and generally relevant; some ability to develop argument and draw conclusions.
10-15 Adequate A tendency to be simple, clumsy or laboured; some degree of accuracy; inappropriate use of idiom.	7-10 Adequate Some knowledge, but not always relevant; a more limited capacity to argue.
5-9 Poor Consistently simple or pedestrian sentence patterns with persistent errors; limited vocabulary.	3-6 Poor Some attempt at argument, tends to be sketchy or unspecific; little attempt to structure an argument; major misunderstanding of question.
1-4 Very poor Only the simplest sentence patterns, little evidence of grammatical awareness, very limited vocabulary.	1-2 Very poor Vague and general, ideas presented at random.