German A: Language and Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 26	27 - 41	42 - 55	56 - 69	70 - 84	85 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 25	26 - 39	40 - 53	54 - 66	67 - 80	81 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The work submitted ranged from classic texts to more recent publications. The majority of teachers used texts from the post-war era, often by Frisch and Duerrenmatt. The most commonly used text was Schlink's "Der Vorleser". There was a good mixture of genres,

covering narrative texts, drama and some poetry. A few teachers chose very similar texts for part 4 of the course and did not vary genres and literary periods; it is more beneficial if students get to read a number of genres and the part 4 texts come from different literary periods.

Most texts provided enough challenge for the candidates. Just a few poems were rather short and in isolated instances quite simple. Teachers should not be discouraged from using lyrical texts, but they must ensure that there is enough of a challenge.

Some teachers used text excerpts that were considerably longer than 40 lines. Longer texts do not lead to better commentaries as the students do not have enough time to analyse their excerpts in depth.

The follow-up discussions varied in quality. Some teachers asked excellent questions that enabled their candidates to expand on their commentaries. However, a good number of teachers asked quite vague questions or questions that focused on the text as whole or even other texts and not on the excerpt at hand. In these discussions, the teachers should aim to further the candidates' analyses of the text extracts. Questions such as "Would you recommend this text?" or "Did you enjoy reading the text?" hardly ever lead to more analysis. Also, teachers should ask precise questions about literary features and their effects.

Candidate performance against each criterion.

A: Overall, the students showed good knowledge and understanding of the extracts, discussed their meaning well, and, if necessary, made references to the whole work. In some cases, students focused too much on the whole work rather than focusing on the text extract. Some commentaries went straight into the analysis of the extract without mentioning sufficient information about the larger context. In a few cases, the candidates talked at length about the author's life. It is not desirable to give summaries of the whole work or the author's life, but the text excerpts must be placed in their contexts before the analysis begins.

B: This is the most difficult criterion and many pupils lose points here. Some students managed to analyse the language and its effects on the reader well and used the correct terminology to do so. However, there was a good number of candidates who struggled with the analysis of literary features. Some failed to discuss them completely, while others were able to name literary features, but did not elaborate on their effects. Some comments such as "this metaphor supports the reader's imagination" simply remained too vague. Concrete interpretation of literary features is paramount for a good score. Candidates must be taught correct literary terminology as part of their Language A course.

C: Many students succeeded in organising their commentaries very well when they gave a short outline of their presentation or even a thesis statement, which they illustrated throughout their commentary. The most effectively organised commentaries contained an introduction (author, title, genre, year of publication, themes, thesis statement on the excerpt), the analysis of the excerpt (including literary features) and a short summary.

For some students, it was challenging to organise their commentaries and they used the

guiding questions to organise their thoughts or they simply went chronologically through the work. A chronological structure usually fails to be effective and students ought to be discouraged from analysing a text from line to line.

D: The majority of students spoke fluently and clearly. The language used was mostly suitable with a high degree of accuracy in grammar and sentence construction and appropriate register and style. However, a number of students used inappropriately colloquial speech such as "rueberbringen", "klar kommen", "der Schiller", "kriegen" and "sich einschleimen". Interferences from English such as "paragraph", "fokussieren auf", "der Text adressiert den Leser" and "basiert sich auf" were also common.

Most candidates were native speakers or excellent bilingual speakers. A few candidates seemed to be non-native speakers who generally coped well with the (considerable) demands of this exam.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

Teachers should focus on the analysis of literary features and their effects in their teaching. This is the most demanding part of this exam and many candidates lose out when it comes to criterion B. Students need to be aware that simply naming a feature is not enough. Also, terminology with regard to narrator and perspective was in some cases incorrect and literary analysis should play a big part when discussing part 4 texts.

Teachers should also talk to their students about effective structures. Students should introduce their extract and provide a clear focus, they should then go on to focus on the main aspects of the excerpt (linking content and language) before summarising their key points.

The link between content and language is the most important aspect to this exam. Linking content and language does not come naturally to most pupils, so they need plenty of practice in their lessons.

For the exams: Teachers should prepare subsequent questions carefully, ensuring that they really focus on the excerpts and not the whole texts or other texts studied in the course. Candidates must be made aware that their commentaries should last around 10 minutes.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted:

The IA upload system functions well and centres seemed to have no problems in using it.

The extracts chosen for this examination were mostly appropriate, though in a few instances the texts were slightly too long. The schools internal assessment was generally appropriate and teachers' commentaries on their own marking were usually sufficiently detailed. Some of the guiding questions were perhaps not specific enough, but teachers' questions towards the end of the examinations were usually very good.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: In general this part of the examination went really well. Better students managed to integrate the given text into the literary work as a whole and even into the period from which the text was chosen. Weaker candidates failed to do this and gave largely a descriptive, factual account of the text itself.

Criterion B: This is the most difficult part of the examination and some texts challenge students' more than others. a good number of candidates struggled with the analysis of literary features or kept references to a bare minimum. One would expect a bit more imagination, e.g. a reference to specific metaphors, to the text's register, to specific styles and these observations should be related to the theme of the extract. A clear distinction between sections A and B should be expected.

Criterion C: Students should organise their presentation in such a manner that a clear distinction between an introduction (the text and its work and author, maybe even literary epoch), a main part (the topic discussed, its relevance for the work in general) and a clear conclusion which relates individual aspects to one another and also gives the student's own opinion. Repetition may sometimes be necessary, but should be kept to a minimum and stated as such. Students should be advised to speak slowly and should emphasise certain aspects rather than give a boring monologue.

Criterion D: Since one expects near native-speaker performance, candidates need to excel in this section and not simply render a delivery that is reasonably correct. Examiners expect a sufficiently elevated language, some specific register and proof that candidates are able to discuss the subject-matter in hand easily and at a reasonably intellectual level.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Centres might wish to train students in accordance with the points mentioned under A-D. Examiners wish to see that the candidate has not only understood the text but can also appreciate its literary merit and can deliver a presentation that goes beyond mere facts while, at the same time referring to examples taken from the text. Too much repetition and undue hesitation suggests lack of understanding or insufficient preparation. Teachers and students should bear in mind that section B does not simply demand stylistic features such as alliteration, but a more specific reference to a variety of styles and in addition a brief explanation as to the effect of specific stylistic features.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Higher level written task

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

There were some excellent written tasks 1 and 2 and a wide range of text types and prescribed questions were submitted. The main weakness for the first written task was that the conventions of the chosen text type were not respected, there were too many essays. For the written task 2, the main difficulty was for candidates to structure their essay around the prescribed questions. Candidates who based their analysis on existing texts generally did better than those who based their analysis on hypothetical texts. Their argumentation was often not credible, based on presumptions and unproven claims. Most schools adhered to the guidelines that one written task should be based on part 1 or 2 of the course and the other written task on part 3 or 4. Generally, the creative written tasks were better than the formal essays.

Candidate performance against each criterion.

A (WT 1): Candidates should make sure that they address all requirements: how the content of the task is linked to and intends to explore a particular part of the course, the conventions of the text type including the appropriate language, and information about audience, purpose and context. The rationale should not be a summary of the written task, but make clear the purpose of the task.

B (WT 1): The link between the choice of the topic and what has been discussed in class is not always clear. The layout is sometimes very elaborate, and fits perfectly well the text type.

A (WT 2): The outline is often too vague. The question is not always addressed in a concrete manner. For prescribed questions divided in two parts often only the first part is addressed: 'how' but not 'why'.

B (WT 2): There were some excellent written tasks offering a profound and convincing analysis. These written tasks made continuous reference to the prescribed question and the analysis was always based on suitable quotes from the text. However, quite often the reference to the prescribed question was not continuously established. Candidates proposed an analysis, but without or with only a few references to the prescribed question. There were not always enough quotes from the text.

C: Some written tasks were well structured making it easy and smooth to follow the development of ideas, but others were lacking coherence, the logic behind the structure was not clear and it was therefore difficult to follow the reasoning.

D: Some written tasks were well written, but sometimes the register or terminology was not accurate and there were errors in grammar and spelling. Typical errors were literal translations from English into German (such a 'realisieren' for realise or 'fokussieren' for focus on), or the use of English instead of German punctuation (comma) and quotation marks.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

Candidates should make sure that they address the prescribed question throughout their written task. Candidates analysing a text without addressing the prescribed question will not score highly under criterion B.

Further comments

It would be helpful if teachers could translate the prescribed questions into German to avoid translations from candidates which were not always accurate.

Standard level written task

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most of the tasks submitted were suitable and showed a variety of text types and approaches. Chosen text types included articles, speeches, interviews, brochures, opinion columns, blogs, letters, diaries, additional chapters, and inner monologues. Amongst the language topics, many chose political correctness, language development, gender, and influence through language. The majority of literary tasks were based on literature from the 20th century.

Candidate performance against each criterion.

A: Candidates should take into consideration all aspects for the rationale: how the content of the task is linked and intends to explore a particular part of the course, the nature of the task chosen (text type), and information about audience, purpose and context. The rationale should include knowledge about the conventions of the text type (see also p. 31, Language A: language and literature guide). The rationale plays an important role and allows the examiner to understand the purpose of the task set by the candidate and mark it accordingly. It is not enough to state that the written task is taken from part 1, 2, 3 or 4; candidates should explain how it is linked to the course and what part of it will be explored more in depth. Candidates

often omit to comment on the conventions of the chosen text type and on the chosen language and stylistic devices. It is not enough to say e. g. that the language of the author was reproduced in the written task; candidates should explain what is typical for the language of the author. The purpose of the written task is often not explained: candidates should explain the aim of their task, what they want to achieve with it. A few candidates exceeded the word limit.

B: The rationale is very important to mark criterion B. Candidates who explained the purpose of their task well, the conventions of the text type and the language chosen, did often also well under criterion B (and vice versa). There was often a good understanding of the topic or text, but the content was not always appropriate or credible for the chosen text type. Several written tasks were not credible, because candidates only used what they learnt in class by forcing it onto a specific text type. This means that students might have understood the topic, but not the text type. Even if a candidate calls his or her written task an article, interview or a letter for example, it is too often an essay, which is not an acceptable text type for written tasks. Many candidates chose, for example, the topic power and language and proposed some implausible interviews with a politician without taking into consideration real discourses from the chosen politicians. Quite often, candidates did not understand the text type 'letter to the editor'. This should not be an analysis of the newspaper and its layout, but a critic on a given topic published in this newspaper. Sometimes the content was quite superficial, because candidates did not have the required language level to discuss quite complex topics. Some layouts were excellent, corresponding very well to the chosen text type.

C: Most students knew how to structure their written tasks, but there were some inconsistencies such as repetition or jumping between arguments. A few candidates exceeded the word limit.

D: Some candidates wanted to reproduce the style of an author, but failed to achieve this. The choice of the style should be explained in more depth in the rationale. The register was not always adapted to the specific text type, person or situation. Some written tasks were very well written; others had errors in expression, syntax, grammar, punctuation or spelling. Some written tasks were well written, but there were many errors in the rationale. Candidates should avoid submitting written tasks for external marking using vulgar language or adding errors, explaining that this corresponds to the character.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

Candidates should analyse different text types (such as letter, diary, interview, blog, newspaper article, pastiche etc.) in order to be able to understand the conventions of each text type and adapt this knowledge to their own writing.

They should also be aware that the rationale is very important. The rationale does not only affect criterion A, but also criterion B. A rationale should not be a summary of the written task, but explain the purpose of the chosen task and explain the conventions of the text type and the language.

Candidates should be reminded that they will lose points if their rationale is longer than 300

words (1 point deducted) or if the written tasks exceed 1000 words (2 points deducted).

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20

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

A: Most candidates defined the main topic well, but without giving an overview of the content. It was therefore not possible to get an idea on what both texts were about. On the other hand, some paraphrased the texts instead of analysing them. Some candidates did not fully understand the texts; others had some preconceived ideas on the topics and instead of analysing the texts discussed their own ideas on the topic. The analysis was sometimes too general, too superficial or partly not correct. Some affirmations were not based on (appropriate) examples and were not convincing. Quotes from the text should be integrated in the analysis; it is not enough to quote only the lines from each text and it is not correct to quote from the text without adding quotation marks. Candidates often mentioned context, intention, audience and text types, but the analysis was not always correct.

B: Most candidates mentioned stylistic devices and their effects. The main weakness was that the analysis of the effects of the stylistic devices was too short or too general (not specific to the chosen text). Some candidates mentioned only a few stylistic devices, or only from one of the texts. Some candidates mentioned many stylistic devices, but failed to analyse the effects in more depth or to give concrete examples. Candidates analysing the structure should avoid paraphrasing the content or commenting the length of each paragraph if the paragraph does not correspond to its original length (which is always indicated by '[…]' in the text and 'extract' at the end of the text).

C: The analyses were often structured (introduction, main part, and conclusion), but a few introductions or conclusions were quite abrupt. However, the main difficulty consisted in structuring the main part. The passage from one idea to the next was often difficult to follow, ideas were not linked but only listed, or there were many repetitions, going back and forth which made it difficult to follow the development of the ideas.

D: Some candidates struggled with basic German grammar (articles, endings, tenses) and word order. In most cases, the language was clear, but the style was a bit clumsy or the choice of words not always right. The use of literary terminology was not always correct.

Many candidates had difficulties with spelling (capitalization) or punctuation (comma).

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

Candidates were well prepared for a comparative textual analysis; most of them were familiar with the expectations. Most candidates commented on context, intention, audience, and text types, defined the main topics, knew how to compare two texts, explaining their similarities and differences, mentioned stylistic devices and their effects, structured their analysis (introduction, main part, and conclusion). The comparative analysis was often balanced.

Some candidates showed an excellent understanding of the texts by offering an in-depth analysis based on quotes from the texts, and a convincing comparison. The best comparative analyses were often those based on an analytical approach, creating a continuous link between form and content.

Some candidates offered a very clear structure, integrating the examples very well in the analysis and allowing a logical and smooth transition from one idea to the next which made it easy to follow the development of ideas. The style was very good, sometimes personal, humorous and elegant with a wide variety of vocabulary and a well-used terminology.

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

There were some excellent analyses for both pairs of texts.

Candidates who chose question 1, texts A and B often understood the blog on 'scientists against journalists' better than the extract of the novel on the sociologist Ethan Rosen. There were some very good analyses of the text type blog, well applied to this specific blog. Most candidates described the emotions of the main character of the novel quite well, they also often correctly mentioned the fact that he was both, scientist and journalist, but failed to explain the contrast between Rosen as a scientist and a journalist and its reason. It is not enough to say that the purpose of a novel is to entertain and candidates should avoid giving a specific age for the audience. If the intended audience are clearly adults, it might be better to explain what might attract potential readers such as style, language, atmosphere or the tone of the novel. Some candidates wrote what they thought about the role of scientists and/or journalists instead of keeping close to the text and some speculated if the novel was autobiographic or not, which was not relevant for the analysis.

Candidates who had chosen question 2, texts C and D often understood the film review 'The Educators' and its context better than the epilogue in form of a letter from Manès Sperber. Many candidates seemed not to be aware of the historical context in Germany in 1930, did not understand or misunderstood the significance that the author was a dedicated communist (in 1930) and did not take into account that the author was nearly the same age (25) as the audience (e.g. university students) he addressed. The overall positive attitude of the film critic on the youth and Sperber's critical approach were not always understood. Some candidates did not analyse the photo.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

Candidates need to learn how to give an overview of the content of texts, but without going into too much detail or paraphrasing. A reader should be able to follow the development of ideas even if s/he had not read the texts. Candidates should avoid giving simple assertions or their own opinion instead of analysing what is really said in the texts. Speculation or enumerating what is not said in the texts should also be avoided. Instead, candidates should keep near to the texts basing their statements on concrete examples (quotes) from the texts. Candidates should avoid statements such as 'there are not many literary devices in this text' and analyse instead the devices that are in the text, based on examples, avoiding being too general and explaining the effects specifically for the chosen text. Candidates need to learn how to structure the main part of their analyses. It might also be useful to revise the German spelling (capitalization) and the rules for comma usage in German.

Please explain to candidates the use of '[…]' in examination papers, to avoid comments on the length of each paragraph when it is only an extract, and that the footnotes are not part of the texts, but are added by the examiner in order to help candidates understanding the context or specific expressions.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

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

While it appeared that the majority had understood the two texts, many candidates found it difficult to analyse the texts in appropriate depth and structure a convincing argument.

In Text 2, candidates struggled with the complexity of analysis of both the column and reader contributions as a whole. This often resulted in neglecting or omitting one part of the text (usually readers' opinions). There was also a general trend towards paraphrasing rather than engaging in deep analysis. In many cases where the analysis was correct and appropriate, textual evidence was missing to support the argumentation. This is a general trend – many candidates make assertions but provide no evidence, thus weakening their argument.

Text 1 proved to be less popular but those candidates who tackled the text usually coped well. But here, too, some candidates opted for chronological re-telling of the main points, rather than engaging in analysis.

The performance in Criterion D was patchy – a large proportion of candidates showed considerable weaknesses in spelling and punctuation. While this is not unduly penalized, it is important that candidates understand the need for punctuation to communicate clearly (in particular the use of the comma and the effect of the omission thereof). Some candidates did not appear to be aware of the conventions for capitalisation in German, of the spelling of the conjunction "dass" and of the meaning of, and difference between, "Paragraph", "Abschnitt" und "Absatz". Some scripts lacked clarity; in other cases, candidates' register was too informal for the task.

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

Candidates appeared to understand the importance of essay structure. Most essays started with sound introductions and generally showed logical sequencing of ideas, albeit with room for improvement (especially in terms of transitions from paragraph to paragraph and composing an adequate ending).

Most candidates made a good attempt at constructing clear introductions, in which the structure of their work is outlined. The majority of candidates concluded their essays with sound closing paragraphs, in which the main points were summarised.

In general, candidates should also concentrate on the logical cohesion of the main part of their essay. In some cases, there was no apparent structure or candidates simply analysed the text paragraph by paragraph.

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

A large number of candidates opted for the Text 2, possibly because of the fact that it was a more recent text and in a format most candidates would probably be familiar with. In general, candidates had no particular problems in identifying target group and context, although there was some misinterpretation of the author's intention and some lack of understanding of the text genre and its features.

In general, candidates recognised many of the particular stylistic features of the commentary, i.e. first half of the text. In general, though, the analysis could have gone further and often, candidates did not consider the intended effect of the devices.

Candidates recognised that this was a more informal piece of writing but there was some confusion of the difference between "Umgangssprache" and "Dialekt".

While some candidates analysed the second section of the text, i.e. readers' responses, accurately and in sufficient depth, others simply broadly paraphrased or ignored this part, without attempting any deeper analysis.

Fewer candidates chose Text 1 and although some of the better pieces of work were based on this text, there were also some candidates who struggled to analyse this text sufficiently.

Some candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with the text type and searched for more literary features such as rhyme or alliteration, rather than looking at the text form itself or examining how cohesion and the overall intention is realised.

It was encouraging to see, however, that in both cases due consideration was given over to a discussion of target audience, text intention and context.

It was positive to note that the majority of candidates worked hard on constructing clear introductions and making a good effort at discussing intention, target group and context.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

- To continue to train candidates in the importance of structure, in particular focusing on how to introduce new ideas or themes

- To introduce candidates to a broad range of contemporary and more traditional text genres

- To emphasise to candidates the importance of not only recognising literary features but also examining their effects on the target group

- To instruct candidates in the use of punctuation (comma) and the importance of "Großschreibung" in German

- To emphasise to candidates the importance of providing textual evidence (by using the conventions of quoting in German) to strengthen argumentation

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 22	23 - 25

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

Stylistic features remained a challenge for many candidates during this exam session. Many candidates can list stylistic features but do not manage to link them in a meaningful way to their argument. Having said this, also developing a structured argument in regards to the chosen question does not seem to be easy for many candidates. They write about their works and do not keep in mind that their writing has to be focused on the question. The tendency to

offer too much summary and too little analysis could also be observed in many essays.

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

Most candidates scored highly under Criterion E (language). They wrote fluent and correct German and were able to use a rich vocabulary appropriate to literary analysis. In comparison to the last exam session more candidates were aware of the social context of their chosen works and the requirement to write about this context in a relevant way. Therefore a large number of candidates got high marks under Criterion A.

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

Question 1: This was clearly the most popular question by far. There were many good essays. The weaker essays failed to understand that it was not sufficient to offer a summary of how a literary character becomes a victim, but that literary features also had to be considered.

Question 2: This question was very popular as well. However, just like in question 1 many candidates indulged in detailed descriptions about destruction and violence in their works and neglected literary features.

Question 3: This question was quite popular and candidates who chose it generally showed a very good understanding of how authors use literature to educate and influence the reader. They also used the social context to enhance their argument which led to good results.

Question 4: This question was only answered by a small number of candidates. Many answers were not very strong as candidates did not manage to go beyond very general statements like "People today have a different view of this or that...".

Question 5: This was a very technical question only chosen by few candidates. But most of these candidates did well as they showed a good understanding of narrative perspective in their texts and how authors use it to create certain effects.

Question 6: The quality of essays for this question varied greatly. Some candidates lost track of the actual question and wrote very general essays with a lot of summary. The better essays showed in a convincing way how authors create effects through humour and tension.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

- Candidates need to be trained to write essay plans throughout the course.

- Teachers need to make candidates aware of the expectations for each criterion. Especially criterion C remains difficult for many students.

- Context seems to have been taught well as most candidates showed a good knowledge

of this aspect. Teachers need to make sure that students are fully aware of how society and literature reflect each other.

- The works for part 3 should be chosen carefully. Different genres should be included and the programme should not be the same every year. The Literature in Translation list offers a wide range of choices and teachers should try to also read literature from a non-European context.

- The Language and Literature course requires mother tongue level language skills. Students who choose this course should be able to write grammatically correct and idiomatic German.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 25

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

For some candidates, it seemed to be difficult to write a comprehensive introduction, not only combining the authors and the titles of the literary works and the essay question in one sentence.

In connection with the introduction, it was important to read and understand the question better, including all parts of the question.

Criterion C always seems to be the most difficult part for the candidates. It is necessary to integrate the analysis and explanation of stylistic features in relation to the question. This needs to be better implemented into the courses.

Part of writing a German essay is following some basic rules, e.g. not underlining a title, but using quotation marks.

Many candidates lose points by making very basic mistakes. The variety of language mistakes is large: spelling, sentence construction and expressions. The main spelling mistakes are based on ignoring capital and small letters. Examples of other spelling mistakes are: Wieder-wider, wärend-während, warscheinlich- wahrscheinlich, das-dass, dastellen-

darstellen, persöhnlich-persönlich, nähmlich-nämlich, Reflektion-Reflexion, Komik-Comic, Motif-Motiv, representieren-repräsentieren, Author-Autor, den-denn, in dem-indem. Using the right expression is another weakness. Some examples are: Charakter, Buch, strikt, überhören, auf der anderen Hand, Nachricht, Botschaft, Audienz. It seems to be difficult to develop a good style, using appropriate terms and terminology, building comprehensible sentences with the right congruence, with the right conjunctions etc.

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

It was good to see that the majority of candidates started with an outline. This improved the quality of their essays, especially the structure and development.

Many candidates showed a good understanding of the context of the literary works. Most candidates had a good understanding of the literary works and some details. In addition, they were able to quote. There was an interesting choice of works, a wide range of well known German and translated works and some unusual ones.

Although, candidates made many basic spelling and expression mistakes, there were less grammar mistakes.

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

Question 1: This was the most popular question with 50 % and it opened the door for good essays. Good essays differentiated between victims and perpetrators, guilty and innocent victims, individuals and societies. In addition, good essays written in a meaningful way about victims, followed by explaining the conditions and then elucidated by a discussion about the literary works and their context. Many essays just described various characters as victims without taking the chance of a discussion about what victims are.

Question 2: This question was less popular with only 10 % and many candidates tended to retell the content of the literary work by focusing on death and violence. Of course, this is not enough and good essays distinguished between physical and emotional violence, or used violence in a metaphoric way.

Question 3: Nearly 20 % of the candidates chose this question. The term "erzieherische Funktion" was often used as a synonym for "message of the text" or how the author wanted to provide an opportunity for their readers to "think" or "reflect". Often, candidates used the term "Botschaft" or "Nachricht", which is not an appropriate term in connection with this topic. The quality of this "message" or thought often remained vague. Good essays correctly discussed aspects of literary works and how they provide opportunities for readers to learn.

Question 4: This question – only chosen by 5 % - was not very successful, because candidates did not know much about the reception of their literary works. Only few candidates were able to write sufficient essays.

Question 5: This question was only chosen by 5 % of the candidates. If it fit with the literary works (novels, novellas, short stories), some results were very good, but some candidates tried to use this question for plays as well, which was less successful.

Question 6: This question, chosen by 10 % of the candidates, seemed to be very difficult, because candidates were not sure, what "unterhaltsam" means. The majority saw it more or less as "interessant" and did not analyze the term "Unterhaltung". Candidates did not find profound aspects to write about the question.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates.

- Encourage the students to read the questions and the exam instructions carefully, and plan before writing. This needs to be practised throughout the course.

- It is very important to concentrate on the question and not only paraphrase the content of the literary works.

- Students need to be aware of all five assessment criteria and the expectations, especially criterion C.

- Practise writing effective introductions.

- Students in the A Language and Literature course should be able to write an essay without basic language mistakes. Writing skills like spelling, sentence constructions, appropriate phraseology, literary terms, formal language expressions should be part of the course and need to be practised under exam conditions.