
GERMAN LANGUAGE

8683/22

Paper 2 Reading and Writing

October/November 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, 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, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

1 Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

2 General Marking Principles

2.1 Please note that it is not possible to list all acceptable alternatives in the Detailed Mark Scheme provided on the following pages. You will need to consider all alternative answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts, make a decision on whether they communicate the required elements, in consultation with the Principal Examiner if necessary, and award marks accordingly.

2.2 Crossing out:

- (a) If a candidate changes his/her mind over an answer and crosses out an attempt, award a mark if the final attempt is correct.
- (b) If a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question but makes no second attempt at it, mark the crossed out work.

2.3 Annotation used in marking:

- (a) BOD = Benefit of the Doubt and is used to indicate material considered by the Examiner and judged to be more correct than incorrect: the benefit of the doubt is given to the candidate and the mark is awarded.
- (b) NBOD = No Benefit of the Doubt and is used to indicate material considered by the Examiner and judged to be more incorrect than correct: the benefit of the doubt is **not** given to the candidate and the mark is **not** awarded.
- (c) caret = to indicate where something which is key to the response is missing.

2.4 No response and '0' marks

There is a NR (No Response) option in **scoris**.

Award NR (No Response):

- If there is nothing written at all in the answer space or
- If there is only a comment which does not in any way relate to the question being asked (e.g. 'can't do' or 'don't know') or
- If there is only a mark which isn't an attempt at the question (e.g. a dash, a question mark).

Award 0:

- If there is any attempt that earns no credit. This could, for example, include the candidate copying all or some of the question, or any working that does not earn any marks, whether crossed out or not.

3 Detailed Mark Scheme**Section 1**

Question	Answer	Marks	Not Allowed Responses
1	Accept only answers which fit directly into the 'footprint' left by the original word – i.e. no additions, no deletions. Do not allow misspellings.		
1(a)	Deutschland	1	
1(b)	garantieren	1	
1(c)	vielen	1	
1(d)	internationalen	1	
1(e)	ungefähr	1	

Question	Answer	Marks	Not Allowed Responses
2	Allow one minor spelling mistake which doesn't alter meaning.		
2(a)	---es viele Probleme gibt/gebe/gäbe	1	
2(b)	---gefordert	1	gefördert
2(c)	---zu unterrichten/Unterricht zu geben	1	um zu unterrichten/zu Unterrichten
2(d)	---kaum eine Schule barrierefrei ist/wenige Schulen barrierefrei sind	1	keine/kaum Schulen
2(e)	---das Schulamt	1	

Question	Answer	Marks	Not Allowed Responses
3	Reject direct lifts from the text.		
3(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nicht sehr erfolgreich • meist keinen Abschluss • kaum Berufsperspektiven 	3	
3(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sie sind für die Reform • Aber sie scheitern an praktischer Umsetzung/überfordert 	2	
3(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unzufrieden mit Bedingungen • Sie können einigen Kindern nicht helfen • Es gibt nicht genug Lehrer/keine Doppelbesetzung • Unterricht ist nicht immer möglich (any 3 of 4)	3	
3(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sollten spezieller sein • Sollten kostenlos für Lehrer sein 	2	
3(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schulen sind nicht rollstuhlgerecht • Lehrer sind nicht ausgebildet in Blindenschrift/Gehörlosensprache 	2	
3(f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gehörlos • Sie braucht Dolmetscher • zu teuer für das Schulamt 	3	

Quality of Language – Accuracy (Questions 3, 4 and 5)

5 Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4 Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3 Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2 Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1 Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.

Additional marking guidance for Quality of language – questions 3 and 4

The five marks available for Quality of Language are awarded **globally** for the whole performance on each set of answers.

A concise answer, containing all mark-bearing components for Content is scored on the full range of marks for language, i.e. length does not determine the Quality of Language mark.

Answers scoring 0 for Content cannot contribute to the overall Quality of Language mark.

Identify the answer(s) scoring 0 for Content in the whole set of answers. Then add together the number of Content marks available for each of these questions and reduce the Quality of Language mark according to the following table:

Total Content marks available on questions where a candidate scores 0	Reduce Quality of Language mark by:
2–3	1
4–5	2
6–7	3
8–14	4
15	5

Note: A minimum of one mark for Quality of Language should be awarded if there are any Content marks at all (i.e. 0 Quality of Language marks only if 0 Content marks).

Question	Answer	Marks	Not Allowed Responses
4	Mark as Question 3		
4(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warteliste • Internat • existiert schon seit 20 Jahren (any 2 of 3)	2	
4(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sozial-emotionale Entwicklung • besserer Teamgeist 	2	
4(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viel für ihr tägliches Leben • Findet Zusammensein mit Behinderten natürlich • Suchen nach Lösungen • Umgang mit anderen Menschen (any 3 of 4)	3	
4(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sie fühlt sich nicht/weniger behindert • Nicht ihre Behinderung ist wichtig, sondern ihr Charakter 	2	
4(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Einige Schüler stören • Einige Dinge dauern länger bei Gruppenarbeit 	2	
4(f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • keiner wird ausgeschlossen • Behinderte werden nicht bevorzugt • Es gibt immer 2 Lehrer in der Klasse • Schüler werden nicht als Behinderte gesehen, sondern als Personen • Klassenklima besser (any 4 of 5)	4	

Quality of Language – Accuracy (Questions 3, 4 and 5)

5 Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4 Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3 Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2 Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1 Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.

Additional marking guidance for Quality of language – questions 3 and 4

The five marks available for Quality of Language are awarded **globally** for the whole performance on each set of answers.

A concise answer, containing all mark-bearing components for Content is scored on the full range of marks for language, i.e. length does not determine the Quality of Language mark.

Answers scoring 0 for Content cannot contribute to the overall Quality of Language mark.

Identify the answer(s) scoring 0 for Content in the whole set of answers. Then add together the number of Content marks available for each of these questions and reduce the Quality of Language mark according to the following table:

Total Content marks available on questions where a candidate scores 0	Reduce Quality of Language mark by:
2–3	1
4–5	2
6–7	3
8–14	4
15	5

Note: A minimum of one mark for Quality of Language should be awarded if there are any Content marks at all (i.e. 0 Quality of Language marks only if 0 Content marks).

Question 5**Length of 5(a) + 5(b) (Summary and Personal Response)**

Writing within the maximum length is part of the task, and candidates who remain within the limit (140 words in total) deserve credit.

Content marks: Summary

[10]

The summary could include the following points (award 1 mark for each point covered up to a maximum of 10 points):

<u>Gründe</u>
Bessere Berufsperspektiven/bessere Leistungen
Gut für die Entwicklung der Schüler (emotional/akademisch)
Gut für den Alltag/Umgang mit Menschen
Behinderte fühlen sich weniger behindert/mehr Selbstständigkeit
Keiner wird ausgeschlossen
Alle werden gleich behandelt/keine Bevorzugung
Lehrer finden Konzept gut
<u>Hindernisse</u>
Schlechte Unterrichtsbedingungen
Es ist teuer
Lehrer überfordert
Kein gutes Fortbildungsangebot für Lehrer/Mangel an Fachkräften
Viele praktische Hindernisse/barrierefrei
Unterricht wird gestört
Gruppenarbeit dauert länger

Content marks: Response to the Text/ Persönlicher Standpunkt

Marked like a mini-essay according to the variety and interest of the opinions and views expressed, the response to the original text stimulus and the ability to express a personal point of view.

5 Very good Varied and interesting ideas, showing an element of flair and imagination, a capacity to express a personal point of view.
4 Good Not the flair and imagination of the best candidates, but work still shows an ability to express a range of ideas, maintain interest and respond to the issues raised.
3 Sound A fair level of interest and ideas. May concentrate on a single issue, but there is still a response to ideas in the text.
2 Below average Limited range of ideas; rather humdrum. May disregard the element of response to the text, and write a largely unrelated free-composition.
0–1 Poor Few ideas to offer on the theme. Banal and pedestrian. No element of personal response to the text. Repeated error.

Quality of Language – Accuracy (Questions 3, 4 and 5)

5 Very good Consistently accurate. Only very few errors of minor significance. Accurate use of more complex structures (verb forms, tenses, prepositions, word order).
4 Good Higher incidence of error than above, but clearly has a sound grasp of the grammatical elements in spite of lapses. Some capacity to use accurately more complex structures.
3 Sound Fair level of accuracy. Common tenses and regular verbs mostly correctly formed. Some problems in forming correct agreement of adjectives. Difficulty with irregular verbs, use of prepositions.
2 Below average Persistent errors in tense and verb forms. Prepositions frequently incorrect. Recurrent errors in agreement of adjectives.
0–1 Poor Little or no evidence of grammatical awareness. Most constructions incomplete or incorrect. Consistent and repeated error.