

May 2013 subject reports

## German A: Language and Literature

Overall grade boundaries

### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 42	43 - 56	57 - 67	68 - 82	83 - 100

### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 11	12 - 27	28 - 42	43 - 56	57 - 67	68 - 82	83 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 30

Standard level internal assessment

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most teachers chose appropriate text extracts for the commentaries and asked good questions in the discussion. In some cases, the discussion failed to further the analysis as questions remained too general, too vague or on the work as a whole instead of the extract.

There was a wide range of extracts from novels, drama and poetry. Many centres used contemporary literary texts rather than ones dating from the 19th century or before.

Most of the extracts were of appropriate level of difficulty. However, the extract has to be on a work (or if it is a poem, on an author) studied in class and not on a text sharing only a similar content with one of the works discussed in class. Also, candidates should not be asked to compare two texts, but analyse one text only.

Texts were generally suitable in terms of length, but some texts were too long. Long texts usually led to less focused commentaries. It is also important that teachers do not edit the excerpts and provide continuous text. Candidates were on the whole very able and well prepared for this task

## Candidate performance against each criterion

**Criterion A:** There were several excellent commentaries. However, some candidates mainly paraphrased the content instead of analysing it. In some cases, candidates failed to analyse the whole excerpt and just focused on parts of it.

**Criterion B:** Most points were lost when it came to the analysis of literary features. Most candidates concentrated on the content of the excerpts and did not focus on literary features enough. In some cases, performance was very poor. Also, some candidates were able to name a number of literary features but did not demonstrate understanding of their effects.

**Criterion C:** Most of the candidates know how to introduce their commentary, but many candidates did not know how to structure the main body of their commentary and did not conclude it.

**Criterion D:** Language was often very good, but sometimes too informal (the very popular filler 'halt' or 'wahnsinnig' should be avoided). Instead of talking about 'the book' it would be better to indicate the genre (novel, short story etc.) The correct use of terminology was a problem for some candidates.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The 5 minute discussion should be primarily on the extract, and not on the work as a whole, allowing candidates to explain more in depth some passages, themes or stylistic devices and their effects or analyse passages they did not analyse at all during their commentary. Questions on the extract might help students gaining further points. A reference to the whole work makes sense only if it allows a better understanding of the extract.

Structure is one of the weak points in the commentary. There are different possibilities to structure a presentation. In the introduction it might be good, after having put the extract in its context, to outline how the talk will be structured. Students should discuss during the classes how an oral presentation, in particular its main body, might be organised. This would not only gain candidates points under criterion C, but also avoid repetitions, and help nervous candidates who after a few minutes do not know how to continue their commentary. On the

other hand, students not able to analyse the text extract in 10 minutes, but needing more time, show a weakness in structure. Teachers should help candidates by indicating to them when their time for the commentary is (nearly) over and encourage them to conclude it.

When discussing literary texts, the focus should be on literary features. Students should become familiar with terminology and also have opportunities to discuss the effects of certain literary features.

There were many very good and helpful guiding questions, encouraging candidates to focus their attention on the text extract. However, guiding questions should not be generic and not on the work as a whole, but specific to the text extract. There should be one question on content, theme or character and one on language or style. There should be no more than two questions and the questions should not be numbered.

For better clarity, it is preferable to have the text extract and the guiding questions on one page only. The text may also be too long for a 10 minute commentary if it does not fit on one page. Texts should not exceed 40 lines and should not be too short (poems).

The time limit, 10 minutes for the commentary and 5 minutes for the discussion, was respected most of the time. But sometimes candidates spoke for too long which left them not enough time to go into more depth during the discussion. Teachers should interrupt students after 10 minutes, ask them for a short conclusion and begin the discussion. On the other hand students should be allowed to have 10 minutes for their commentary without interruption, allowing them to follow the structure they prepared and to conclude.

## Higher level written Tasks

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 18	19 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 40

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

A wide range of Written Tasks 1 was submitted, but more non-fictional texts such as newspaper articles were chosen. But should a dialog without contextualisation be regarded as a suitable text type for Written Task 1?

A wide range of Written Tasks 2 was submitted, but merely from the first two areas. Most Written Tasks 2 were based on texts studied in part 3 and 4.

A wide range from very good to rather low Written Tasks was sent in but the Written Tasks 2 were mostly assessed lower. It was obvious that the level of preparation did differ from school to school.

Most schools did adhere to the guidelines: one Written Task was based on literature (part 3 and 4) and one Written Task was based on language (part 1 and 2). If it is chosen to base a task on language, it is important to understand that a topic explored in part 1 or 2 should be covered and not only a text type (a report, a message) discussed in class.

Some candidates put a lot of effort into their Written Task 1, including effective research of content, language quality, page layout and presentation: those students have tapped the potential of the creative writing task, but it is not clear whether the presentation of the text is needed to get full points in criterion B. This is especially important when assessing text types that can be found in the new media and where the text layout includes links – tags – advertisements etc.

As the Written Task 2 is a formal essay, prior research is necessary and the given facts have to be acknowledged by quotes and references. Too many candidates based their arguments on presumptions and/or presented stereotypes. Other candidates retold the plot from another perspective and did not elaborate the perspective based on research.

Last but not least too many candidates seemed to have difficulties in making adequate references to the text(s) and secondary sources and did not list their sources in a bibliography following standardized guidelines.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Written Task 1

**Criterion A:** Candidates should not write a summary of the Written Task 1, but explain the link between their Written Task 1 and the course in detail. More information about the text type with examples from the own task is needed as well as more reflection on writing purpose, audience and context. The rationale was often not structured (e.g. from general to more specific information). Many candidates did not utilize the word count of 300 and some were even below 200 words. The linguistic quality of the rationale was in many cases very low. Therefore most candidates did not get the two points for their rationale.

**Criterion B:** Text type, audience and context should be reflected more in the language and structure of the text, the Written Task has to address more the target group related.

**Criterion C:** The Written Task 1 was generally well organized and coherent, but in some cases it was apparent that pre-planning had not been done and therefore the tasks were not focused enough.

**Criterion D:** Language and style were generally good, but still too many typos or spelling and/or sentence construction mistakes were apparent. The candidates have to proof-read their work more carefully.

### Written Task 2

**Criterion A:** It seems that many students have not been informed enough about the information in the guide (p. 43) of what the outline needs to include. Therefore some

candidates did not write 3-4 key points, but instead a re-narration/sometimes a summary of their paragraphs in the Written Task 2.

**Criterion B:** It is expected that a candidate demonstrates knowledge, strong focus on the task and analytical skills. Statements have to be supported with examples from the text and/or secondary literature. Candidates need to know how to work with references (direct/indirect quotations etc.) The „openness“ of the questions together with a superficial understanding of both task and basis text(s) often lead to speculative essays. It seems that a lot of candidates had enormous difficulties in writing a formal academic essay.

**Criterion C:** The lack of a logical progression tended in many cases to ruin the structure and coherence of the Written Task. Many candidates underestimated the importance of an introduction as well as a conclusion. It was again apparent that pre-planning had not been done or not been done effectively enough.

**Criterion D:** Many candidates had difficulties in expressing themselves more formally, some because they tried too much to echo what they think academic language sounds like.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

In general: Avoid “class topics” i.e. most of your students writing nearly the same task about the same piece of literature or topic; instead students should chose their topic and text type freely, and get only some guidance from their subject teacher.

As the prescribed questions will remain the same from session to session (guide, p. 43), it is advisable for the subject teachers to vary their IB-course programme regularly.

Teaching (academic) writing:

- The two different types of writing must be clearly explained to the students.
- Candidates need more support and guidance for being able to write their Written Task 2. They should be informed by their teachers about the expectations, there should be some class time spent on reflecting on the implications of every prescribed question and so the candidates could get the feeling of how deep their analysis should go. Secondly the candidates need some guidance on how to research and gather data and how to present their sources in a bibliography.
- A good way of learning to write a good Written Task 2 could be writing a model Written Task 2 in class time and plan/discuss every step of the writing process. Only after having completed this “writing course” successfully should the candidates start to write their own Written Task 2.
- Encourage the candidates to plan their writing effectively; the writing process for both Written Tasks should start with the writing of a proposal that could be openly discussed in class.

- Candidates choosing a graphic source as their basis text for the Written Task 2, should take into account, that there should be enough written text on it for the analysis/interpretation/contextualisation.

#### Language and Presentation:

- The candidates need more linguistic support, so that they are able to perceive the typical characteristics of formal writing in German. Therefore they should be offered stylistic exercises/studies to improve the expressiveness of their written work throughout the IB-course.
- The candidates should put a bit more emphasis on the layout and presentation of the Written Task to show their understanding of the chosen text type more effectively.
- Candidates should concentrate on the composition of an introduction, a main body and an appropriate conclusion in which a candidate reflects on his argument. Within the main body there should not be a number of different arguments but rather an overall logical structure.
- The candidates should be informed that they have to submit their Written Tasks in the chosen language, the “Umlaute ü-ö-ä” and the “ß” (in the German Swiss “ss”) are typical letters of the German alphabet and need to be used.

## Standard level written Task

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

The work submitted included tasks linked to part 1 & 2 and part 3 & 4 of the course. The text type chosen were all suitable, such as speech, interview, article, opinion column, psychological report, and diary, added chapter to a literary work, dialogue, monologue, TV report, and film review.

Most of the tasks submitted were suitable; a few were not, because the task was not linked to any part of the course and could therefore not explore any particular aspect of the course.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

**Criterion A:** There were some very clear and for the marking helpful rationales: candidates not only quoted the work or text studied on which their written task was based, but explained the relevant aspect studied in class and how they intended to explore this particular aspect of

the course. They explained their choice of text type, its content, form and language (conventions of the chosen text), their purpose, the context and the audience.

Several candidates gave only partial information. They did not establish a link to the part of the course to which it was related (maybe thinking it was obvious) or did not explain why a particular text type had been chosen and which of its conventions (form, language, style) were therefore to be expected. Very often there was too much information on content and not enough on conventions of text type, purpose, and audience.

**Criterion B:** There were some original works, showing clearly how well the candidates had understood and engaged with the topic or text on which they had based their written tasks and how familiar they were with the conventions of the chosen text type. A frequent problem with the creative tasks was that it was an overall summary of the work studied instead of explaining for instance a specific character more in depth as stated in the rationale.

A frequent difficulty with text types such as articles, opinion columns, reviews and reports was that candidates did not know the conventions of the text types or at least did not know how to put them into practice. Instead of articles or opinion columns the written tasks were mainly essays.

Sometimes the works or texts studied were not well enough understood. For instance, some candidates wanted to give a clearer idea of the opinion one of the characters had on a specific topic, but instead candidate would give their own opinion. Some candidates had made no (credible) links to the works or topics studied in parts 1, 2, 3 or 4 and could therefore not score high under the marking criteria B.

**Criteria C:** Most of the tasks were structured, some of them very well, so that the text could be read very smoothly. One main difficulty in structuring the tasks was that the transition from one idea to the next was often quite abrupt, or there were repetitions, starting with the first idea, continuing with the second idea, going back to the first idea, and so on, or the logical progression from one idea to the next was not clear for the reader.

**Criteria D:** There were some very well written tasks, candidates clearly understood what register and style to choose for their specific text type, context or characters. In some written tasks grammar and spelling was often inaccurate and the register did not correspond to the text type chosen: most of the time register was too colloquial or switched from formal to colloquial, or too complex or not credible for the type of character chosen.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Please make sure that students are aware that 1 point will be deducted under A if the rationale is longer than 300 words and 2 points will be deducted under C if the written task is longer than 1000 words. Sometimes the word count was above 1000 words, even though on the form it said that it was below 1000 words. The text written after the word limit will not be read.

Please make sure that students know and understand (from the very first written task on) the

marking criteria, for instance that the link to the work or text studied in Part 1, 2, 3 or 4 has to be very clear, that the conventions of the chosen text type have to be known.

A clear rationale (guide, p. 31) is important and affects not only criterion A, but particularly the marking of criterion B, and to some extent criterion C. Candidates should not write a summary of their Written Task. Rationales with a word count below 200 are not likely to clearly explain the link to the work or text studied, how a certain aspect discussed in class will be explored further, the reason for the choice of a specific text type, its conventions including language, the audience, its purpose and context. Writing a proposal for the Written Tasks that could be openly discussed in class might be a good start to improve the quality of student's Written Tasks.

The topic for the Written Task should not be prescribed by teachers. Students should choose their topic and discuss with their teacher if their choice is appropriate.

Students should always quote their sources, in particular when their written task is based on a speech or a specific text in Part 1 or 2. Many students do this already very accurately. It is also important that students quote their sources when citing numbers or when making assertions as facts. Students should also know which websites to use; please remind them that the use of xenophobic, racist or sexist websites will weaken the point they want to make instead of strengthen it as intended.

## Further comments

Not all schools seem to have the analysis of pictures on their programme. However, candidates will be expected for other exams to know how to analyse a picture. Students seem to be aware of conventions for literary texts, but not always for non-fiction. Analyses of conventions for text types such as newspaper articles, reports, opinion columns should be enhanced.

For Part 1 and 2 the texts chosen should be originally written in German.

## Higher level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20



## The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

There were too many summaries and not enough analysis. Many candidates could only explain the effects of stylistic devices in a very general manner, but without adapting them to the specific texts.

For some candidates it was difficult to integrate examples from the text and to put the example in its context. Students should not simply quote the number of the line, but quote the concrete example from the text.

## The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates generally knew how to introduce and how to compare the texts. Most of them wrote about audience and purpose. The best results were obtained by students with an analytical approach, who based their arguments on quotes from the text, and explained the effects of the stylistic devices for the specific text.

## The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

The majority of students compared the two non-fiction texts on vegetarianism versus meat-eaters. A minority compared the fiction and non-fiction texts on idyllic (in appearance or full of clichés) family holidays. There were excellent papers for both questions and most of the students had no problems understanding the texts. However, only some students were able to go in depth and to pick up nuances.

The two non-fiction texts provoked some very passionate responses, with candidates writing about their own passionately felt food preferences. Consequently, they did not write in a more neutral, observational and analytical style but sided with one text or the other (which ever matched their own ideas) and then read their own ideas into the text.

There was a tendency to summarize the texts instead of analysing them. Most of the candidates wrote about audience and purpose, and some explained the ideological positions of the authors from the two non-literary texts, but many did not consider enough the (social, cultural, temporal) context and the conventions of the text type in their analysis. There were some excellent analyses of structure, in particular for those who compared the structure of the novel with the non-fiction text, explaining in a very insightful manner why the novel had only one paragraph. But the overwhelming majority, rather than analysing the structure, as they proposed to do, gave lengthy summaries of each paragraph without references to the text and without analyses.

Candidates generally wrote about stylistic devices and their effects. They seemed to be more at ease to analyse literary texts than non-literary texts. The difficulty lies particularly in analysing the effects of stylistic devices. Many students did not write about the effects or did so only in a very general manner (such as: 'this should make the reader think'), without linking

them to the specific text. Some candidates explained that because it was a non-literary text it had no or only few literary devices which was not the case. Some students analysed the non-literary text as if it were a literary text, using the terminology (character, first person narrator, etc.) which should be used only for literary texts. Concerning the literary text, students often did not make a difference between the author of the novel and its first person narrator, whereas some did not understand that there was a first person narrator. There was a tendency to write what was not in the text (for instance explaining that the novel had no title or that there were no alliterations). Students should focus instead on what is in the text and also avoid speculation.

Most of the papers were structured, but the arguments were not always developed and the overall logic of the structure, the passage from one paragraph to the next, was not always clear. Often, the structure was quite convincing during the first half of the essay, but turned into an enumeration and repetitions to the end of the essay, particularly when the literary devices were discussed. Generally students who compared both texts from the very beginning did better than students who compared each text individually and left the comparison for the end.

Typical language errors were spelling: capital letters were not used correctly, forgetting to capitalize nouns, or capitalize the adjective instead of the noun; the difference between 'dass' and 'das' (conjunction and relative pronoun), 'in 2011' instead of 2011, 'Paragraphen' instead of Absätze, 'Author' instead of Autor, use of first names ('Iris und Eberhard') instead of last names, incorrect spelling of names of the authors, book titles underlined instead of quotation marks, English quotation marks instead of German quotation marks; the terminology for stylistic devices was not always correctly used.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Please be aware that in the exam papers there will be at most one literary text and then three non-literary texts (Language A: Language and Literature Guide, pp. 39-40, includes examples for non-literary texts). Candidates are generally well prepared to analyse literary texts, but many find it difficult to analyse non-literary texts. Non-literary texts should be analysed in class, particularly their stylistic devices and effects.

Please remind students not to summarize a text, but to analyse it. Also, students need to quote from the text to strengthen their argument and should know how to integrate the examples. When analysing the structure, students should avoid giving a summary for each paragraph.

## Further comments

Some candidates end their paper with their personal opinion. As this did not in most of the cases add anything to the analyses, it might be better to leave it out and replace it by a conclusion.

## Standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

### The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

The main difficulty was that the texts were not analysed, but often mainly paraphrased. The conventions of the text type were not taken into account in the analyses. The meaning of context (social, historical, cultural or temporal) did not seem to be clear for many candidates.

### The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates often wrote a good introduction and had a good understanding of the audience (article on Lena) and the purpose (article on Lena and letter from Freud) of the text.

### The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Most candidates chose the article on German singer Lena, probably because the topic and language were more familiar than the historical context and language in which Freud's letter had been written to his daughter.

Some candidates analysed very well the position of the journalist and how he managed to present even Lena's weaknesses as strengths; they also had a clear understanding of the contrasts of Lena's personality (her simplicity in contrast to her image as 'superstar', her success as singer in contrast to the fact that she did not even do her *Abitur* in music, because she does not play an instrument and does not know how to read music). But some aspects of the texts had not been understood by all, sometimes only part of the text had been discussed and the main weakness was: too much summary and not enough analysis.

The candidates who chose the letter from Freud often had a more analytical approach which was positive, but had more difficulty in understanding the text and only few candidates understood correctly Freud's allusions in his letter (such as the requirement of the society of his generation for a woman to remain a virgin until marriage).

Concerning both texts, candidates made sometimes assumptions instead of basing their arguments on examples quoted from the text. There was also a tendency to speculate which should be avoided.

Some candidates had no difficulty identifying stylistic devices and explaining their effects, but generally this part remains difficult for many candidates. The focus should also be on stylistic devices in the text instead of mentioning which stylistic devices the text has not. There were some good interpretation of Lena's photo, but most of the candidates gave only a superficial description or only mentioned it.

Concerning the structure, there was generally a difficulty to relate one paragraph with the next and therefore the logic of the argument was not always clear, but the main weakness was that ideas were just mentioned without developing them.

The language used was sometimes too colloquial (such as 'Klamotten' or 'rüberkommen lassen'); there were spelling mistakes and the vocabulary used was not always appropriate such as 'Author' instead of 'Autor', 'Paragraphen' instead of 'Absatz', English instead of German quotation marks, spelling mistakes in the names of the authors, incorrect use of capital or small initial letters.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates need to learn how to pass from a summary to the analysis of a text and how to analyse a specific text type (article, letter, etc.). The focus should also be more on how to analyse the effects of stylistic devices in non-literary texts. Discussions in class should focus more on how to define the context for non-literary texts.

## Further comments

It would be better to abstain from personal opinions or at least formulate them in a more general manner, because most of them did not add anything to the understanding and analysis of the text. It is important that candidates know and understand the marking criteria. As images might be part of the exam, candidates should be able to analyse them. The best results were obtained by candidates choosing an analytical approach based on examples quoted from the text.

## Higher level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 25

## The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

The principal challenge for a large number of candidates remains the literary features (Criterion C). There are only few candidates that score a 3 or 4 in this area. Another big challenge remains the question itself and answering it in a dialectic way, i.e. looking at the question from various angles and then arriving at a logical conclusion. There are still quite a lot of essays that give more or less a summary of the studied works without keeping their focus on the question.

## The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Many students displayed a good knowledge and understanding of the works studied. A majority also showed convincingly how the social and historic context of a literary work has an impact on the choices made by the author. Criterion E (language) was overall good as well, so linguistic abilities seem to be in line with a group 1 course.

## The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

**Question 1:** This question was not chosen by so many candidates, but those who chose it did very well. It seems that the candidates who were prepared to talk about the style and language of a literary work, felt confident in looking at literary features and using their analytical skills. This had a positive impact on the quality of the essays.

**Question 2:** This was a very popular question. Many candidates apparently were led to believe that this was an easy question where some statements about the characters' childhood were sufficient. There were not so many candidates who managed to get to an analytical level and not just offered pure summary.

**Question 3:** This was also a very popular question. There was a good number of essays that showed well how authors use reality ("life") as a source of inspiration and then transform this reality into a piece of art in order to make the reader think and widen his horizon. The other (weaker) group of essays did not manage to do this and just summarized the content of a work and argued that this content reflects real life.

**Question 4:** This question was the least popular. It seems that students could not relate to the term "engagierte Literature" and therefore did not choose this question.

**Question 5:** This question was fairly popular. Similar to question 2 many candidates focused too much on content and retold a difficult love story from the works they had studied in class. Only few candidates used the question as a starting point for literary analysis.

**Question 6:** A majority of candidates dealt well with this question and analyzed male and female gender roles in different periods and societies while keeping literary analysis in mind.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It remains one of the main challenges to teach candidates the necessary analytical skills that are needed to deal with literature effectively (criterion C). Candidates need to be aware that knowing and repeating the content of a given literary work is not sufficient. Rather, candidates need to be able to look at literature as an art that conveys bigger concepts of human experience, and is crafted by the author in a unique way in order to bring these concepts across. Students should also be well trained in the formal aspects of essay writing (i.e. introduction, main part with dialectic argument, conclusion).

### Further comments

The choice of works for part 3 was varied; however Eurocentric tendencies are visible with most authors coming from Europe. Schools/teachers are encouraged to choose authors with different backgrounds/contexts (Asian, African etc.) for part 3 as this is a good opportunity to bring new and different cultural perspectives into the classroom. Some teachers did this already but they were the minority.

## Standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 25

## The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Fulfilling all five criteria at the same time was difficult for many candidates, especially to consider the context of the works and the stylistic features. Another main weakness was to consider all parts of the chosen question. A number of candidates chose a question and then offered more or less a summary of the works without any comments or discussion. Another missing part was a formal introduction to the essay question. Many candidates were not familiar with basic rules of the language like spelling, sentence construction, the use of common expressions and literary terms.

## The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates showed good knowledge of the works of Part 3. There was an interesting choice of works, a wide range of well know German and translated works and some unusual ones. The choice of works gave the candidates good opportunities to answer the questions. A good

number of students organized and developed their essay pretty well and wrote in a mostly balanced way about the two works.

Some candidates were aware of the context of the works including the circumstances of the production, the setting and their effects, and candidates demonstrated their understanding of stylistic features of the works and their effects.

## The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

**Question 1:** The majority of candidates, who chose this question, managed well by giving examples of the stylistic features and analyzing them, but many candidates missed the inclusion of the aspect of quality and specific elements for the literary works.

**Question 2:** This was a very popular question, but candidates did not fully realize the opportunity to show different aspects of how childhood influences life. They rather simply confirmed that there is such an influence and demonstrated this by narrative references to the works.

**Question 3:** This question was also very popular, but candidates did not always recognize it as a question, which was open and could be negated. One group of candidates just confirmed the statement and took the opportunity to show their knowledge of the works. Another group of candidates at least changed their minds at the end and named some other purposes of literature. Good essays offered alternative purposes and analyzed these throughout their works.

**Question 4:** It was the least popular question. The term “engagiert” seemed to be unclear for candidates.

**Question 5:** This question was not always fully read or understood. Most candidates focused on a love conflict or different expectations in a love relationship. Like in question 2, they used this as a possibility to narrate the content of their works, instead of discussing why love can be painful but nevertheless necessary in their particular works.

**Question 6:** This question invited some candidates to focus on gender roles to a certain time and place. Many times, they described the different roles the characters have in their works and did not concentrate on the gender roles.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates need to read the instructions and the whole question very carefully and need to make a good essay plan for writing a meaningful and coherent analysis. This needs to be practised throughout the course.
- Teachers need to go over all five assessment criteria very carefully to make the candidates aware of the expectations.

- Teaching of the Part 3 works, need to include the context of these works. It is very important that candidates are familiar with stylistic features including their effects of the works they study in class.
- An effective introduction of an essay, which introduces the essay question, needs to be practiced much more.
- The two works in Part 3 should be chosen very carefully, if they are to offer the candidates a good number of choices for writing the Paper 2.
- Candidates, who are in the A Language and Literature course, need to be able to write an essay without basic language mistakes. Writing skills (basic spelling, sentence constructions, appropriate phraseology, analytical language, synonyms, literary terms, colloquial speech versus formal language etc.) need to be integrated in the course on a regular basis.

## Further comments

It is important to place candidates in the appropriate programme of the IB: A or B. Sometimes, candidates seem to be not ready for the A programme.