

German A: Language and Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

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

Standard level

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

Higher level written tasks

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

Some interesting WT1 and 2 were submitted. The Written Tasks 2 were assessed lower. The schools adhered 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). 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, always getting back to the research question. Candidates seemed to have difficulties in making adequate references to the text(s) and secondary sources and did not always 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 their own task is needed, as well as more reflection on writing purpose, audience and context. The rationale was sometimes not structured (e.g. from general to more specific information). Many students did not utilize the word count of 300. The linguistic quality of the rationale was generally lower than in the WT itself. 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 the target group related more.

Criterion C – the Written Tasks 1 were generally well organized and coherent.

Criterion D – Language and style were generally good.

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 base text(s) lead to rather speculative essays. It seems that a lot of candidates had enormous difficulties in writing a formal academic essay. The students understood the question adequately, and the ideas were generally relevant and some references were made, but, for example, the “two readers” were drafted too superficially, the ideas repeated and sometimes the essay did not focus enough on the question.

Criterion C – Spacing tended to ruin the structure and coherence of the Written Task. The conclusion was often not used as a possibility to address the question again.

Criterion D – Language and style were generally good.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In general: Avoid “class topics” (several students wrote nearly the same task about the same piece of literature or topic); instead students should choose 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 by 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 (good sources are e.g. materials for the German “Abiturvorbereitung”) 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 and plan/discuss every step of procedure. Only after having done this “writing course” successfully the candidates could start to write their own Written Task 2. To encourage the candidates to plan their writing effectively, the writing process for both Written Tasks should start with the writing of a writing proposal that could be openly discussed in class.

Presentation: Candidates should avoid spacing and 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 not a number of different arguments should be presented, but an overall logical structure should be apparent.

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

A wide range of Written Tasks was submitted, demonstrating a good mix of fictional and non-fictional texts. The candidates had a lot of creative writing ideas: leaflets, blog-entries, diary entries, interviews, newspaper articles etc.

Some candidates put a lot of effort into their Written Task, including research and presentation.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A – Candidates should not write a summary of the Written Task, but explain the link between their Written Task and the course in detail. This link was not always clear. 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 students did not utilize the word count of 300, some were even under 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; that especially means that the genre has to be chosen very carefully as well as the realisation: For example it is not very authentic that one diary entry covers the period of two years, several entries within the 2 years would be better; or that a monologue is merely a dramatic scene with elements of a dialogue. The Written Task has to address more the target group related, content-wise as well as language-wise. In some cases the link to the German-speaking countries was not worked out or the understanding of a special historical context was not apparent. There was some repetition.

Criterion C – the Written Tasks were 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. All in all, form, layout and structure were good. In some cases a bibliography was missing – if needed.

Criterion D – there was a clear difference between the WT of different schools. But generally speaking the register of the WT was in most cases appropriate whereas sometimes too many language mistakes were apparent. The candidates have to proof-read their work more carefully and apply their linguistic knowledge.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In general: Avoid “class topics” (several students are 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.

Teaching (academic) writing: To encourage the candidates to plan their writing effectively, the writing process should start with the writing of a writing proposal that could be openly discussed in class.

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 avoid spacing and structure their text more effectively.

Higher level and 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

There was a variety of authors from the 18th to the 21st century (Goethe, Heine, Kafka, Schnitzler, Hesse, Brecht, Borchert, Bauersima) and of genres (novel, short story, drama, poems). The majority of the works were from the first part of the 20th century. The authors were from Germany, Austria and Switzerland. There were no women writers. All extracts submitted were suitable and offered enough opportunities for candidates to comment on them. Several extracts were however too long; even if they had less than 40 lines, the lines were so long that the candidates could not go in depth and the analysis was therefore often too superficial or missed important parts of the extracts. Sometimes there were three guiding questions instead of two (one should be on content, one on stylistic devices), some guiding questions were too generic (the questions should be specifically on the chosen extract), some guiding questions were on the work as a whole (the guiding questions should be on the extract only) and sometimes the extract was not complete (passages were cut in the middle of the text which should be avoided for the IA oral exam).

Candidate performance against each criterion

A: Some analyses were very good; candidates clearly showed that they had understood the extract and their commentaries were based on references from the text. Some analyses were quite weak; the main weaknesses consisted of mainly paraphrasing the extract instead of analysing it, or the explanations were very short and did not go into depth (one example followed by one sentence as explanation), or only a part of the extract was analysed, leaving out other important parts and without giving an overview of what the whole extract was about. Sometimes the commentary was not based on enough examples from the text.

B: The analyses of literary features and their effects were generally weaker than the analysis of the content. Many candidates did not go into depth to explain the effects on the reader.

C: The structure was often quite weak. This weakness sometimes affected criteria A and B as well. Some commentaries were much too short. (The commentary should last for approximately 10 minutes), some were too long, after 10 minutes some candidates had only analysed the first half of the extract. There was often no real introduction: only the name of the author and the work were mentioned, but without contextualising the extract and without mentioning the main topic of the extract in order to allow the 'public' to gain an overview of it. Most of the candidates did not announce in the introduction their structure for the main part which would be even helpful for them. Many candidates stopped their commentary without any conclusion. But the main weakness is the main part of the commentary. If this part has a logical structure and development of ideas, it would certainly affect also criteria A and/or B in a positive manner.

D: Most candidates, but not all, were able to express their ideas in a clear manner and to use the correct terminology for stylistic devices. There were some basic errors in the choice of vocabulary (such as 'Linien' instead of 'Zeilen' for lines or 'Paragraf' instead of 'Absatz' for paragraph), some errors in grammar (mostly articles and cases) and the register was sometimes too colloquial. A few candidates had so many unfinished sentences or interrupted their sentences so often to restart again that it became difficult to understand what was being said.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should discuss and practise more on how commentaries can be structured. To get used to commenting on an extract for approximately 10 minutes they should time themselves during the school year.

The lines of the extracts should always have numbers (5, 10, 15...this is often the case, but not always) and students should be encouraged to quote not only the example, but also the line which makes it easier for the internal and external examiner to follow the commentary and to know which part of the extracts were analysed.

During the 5 minute discussion teachers should mainly focus on the extract - its content, stylistic devices and their effects - particularly on parts the candidate did not analyse (enough) during the commentary. This can allow candidates to gain further points.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	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

In general, candidates did not understand and analyse (enough) the differences between the types of text. Concerning part A, their understanding of the conventions of a novel (fiction) was often good, but less so for the non-fiction text (preface to a history book). Concerning part B, their understanding of the cartoons was often at least adequate, but the text type 'opinion column' was not always understood.

Sometimes, not enough examples were given to illustrate the argument (it is not enough to refer only to the line).

It was often counter-productive when candidates tried to show how the text was structured. Instead of analysing why the author had structured the text in a certain manner, it was a lengthy and not very concrete summary of each paragraph that did not help the reader to gain an overview.

Candidates knew that they were expected to analyse the effect of the use of stylistic devices, but sometimes they did this only (partly) for the first of the two texts and not (enough) for the second text.

Most of the comparisons were adequately structured, but ideas were often not developed sufficiently, sometimes it was mostly an enumeration and the transitions from one argument to the next were abrupt.

Language was often quite weak, many errors in grammar and expression, sometimes the register was not adequate.

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

Most of the candidates were well prepared for the exam in the sense that they knew what was expected from them. They knew how to compare two texts (content and stylistic devices) and most of the candidates took context, audience and purpose into consideration. Candidates knew generally how to structure their comparison.

Some analyses were very convincing, the arguments were well developed and based on appropriate examples, the context, intention and audience well explained and the connection between form and content excellent.

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

Two thirds of the candidates chose part A (comparison: literary text and non-fiction), one third of the candidates chose part B (comparison: cartoons and opinion column). The average of the end result was comparable, but for part A the results were mainly in the mid-range scale, whereas for part B the results were more spread from lower to high-range scale.

Concerning part A, there was often an excellent understanding of the context (particularly time, sometimes also place), a good understanding of the texts and its stylistic devices (such as the narrative perspective). However, sometimes there was too much summary and not enough analysis, the differences between fiction (text 1) and reality (text 2) had not been understood, or examples were missing. Nuances were not always understood, such as the humour in text 1. Generally, there was a better understanding of text 1 than text 2 and the analysis for text 1 went into more depth than for text 2.

Concerning part B, there was partly a good understanding of the texts and contexts, specifically for the cartoons (text 3). Some candidates did not understand the irony used as the main stylistic device in the opinion column (text 4) and therefore did not understand the purpose of the text. Those candidates, who did understand the irony, offered a very convincing analysis of the text. There was an excellent analysis of the cartoons, but most of the candidates did not go into depth in describing and explaining the images and the typical language used for cartoons.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Discuss in greater depth the conventions of each type of text (what is typical for fiction and non-fiction such as blogs, opinion columns, newspaper articles, cartoons, publicity etc.) to enhance a better understanding of the specific text.

Candidates should comment and analyse content, but they should avoid giving a summary of each paragraph. The reader should gain an overview of what these texts are about and should be able to follow the structure and the development of the argument and examples given even if the reader would not know the texts on which the comparison is based.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	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

In general, candidates found it difficult to analyse the texts in appropriate depth. Often texts were retold or paraphrased, without any particular critical engagement.

Images were only superficially analysed without considering them in their wider context.

There was also a distinct and noticeable difficulty in producing accurate and appropriate language. A large number of candidates experienced difficulties with lexis and syntax.

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).

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

A large number of candidates opted for the interview with the Austrian author Christine Nöstlinger. Most candidates commented correctly on the journalist's interview strategy and the way in which he elicited the author's lengthy responses. Candidates analysed well the context, target group and intention. What was missing to some degree was a thorough analysis of how Nöstlinger's development since childhood had affected her writing.

While candidates identified a number of stylistic devices, many of these were either not analysed or their effects were misinterpreted. Most candidates succeeded in identifying the informal, colloquial language register used by the author and contrasted this with the register adopted by the journalist. Some of the passages were misunderstood (why Nöstlinger started to write, why she didn't have access to children's books etc.) and only very few candidates commented on the use and meaning of the title in the context of the interview.

Fewer candidates selected Text 2, the BILD article, and those that did often misunderstood the context or overlooked subtle nuances (i.e. reporting on reaction of readers to a website advertising campaign). Candidates struggled on the one hand with the complexity of the context, and on the other hand experienced difficulty in extracting sufficient analysis from this relatively short text. It also appeared that candidates had difficulties with analysing the image and integrating it into the overall analysis of the article.

It also seemed that candidates were unfamiliar with the features of a “Boulevardzeitung” and therefore missed many devices so particular for a paper such as BILD.

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 also positive to see that candidates were aware of the importance of structure, in particular in the importance of construction strong introductions. As already mentioned, the main part of the essay lacked coherence at times and candidates should have concentrated more on the logical coherence of their essays.

Those candidates with well-structured essays had usually spent time on drawing up well-thought out plans before embarking on the writing task proper.

A number of candidates presented their own views and opinions on the texts or issues discussed. Candidates should be made aware that there is no requirement to do so, and may benefit more from merely focusing on text analysis.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Based on observations made during marking and grading, recommendations for the teaching of future candidates are thus:

- To encourage candidates to plan their essays
- To train candidates in essay structure, in particular in constructing transitions for introducing new ideas, using appropriate stylistic devices, to achieve overall logical coherence
- To train candidates in the analysis of a range of non-literary texts and their characteristic features
- To train candidates firstly to identify stylistic devices in non-literary texts and secondly to analyse the use and effect of these devices
- To instruct candidates in the use of topic-specific vocabulary for text analysis, to proofread for spelling and grammatical mistakes (especially word order).
- To train candidates in the analysis of text and image and the discussion of the relationship between the two

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	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

Candidates concentrated too much on the content of the literary works, instead of analyzing the works related to the chosen question. In connection with the chosen question, some essays did not consider the second part of the question. Some candidates missed considerations of the context and stylistic features. The structure of the essays was acceptable, but sometimes, the focus did not support the development of the question. Although the majority of essays showed a good language level, there are still weaknesses in correct expressions, sentence construction, spelling, and missing terminology.

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

Candidates were well prepared with a choice of appropriate literary works, which offered good opportunities to answer the questions. A good number of candidates showed good knowledge of the works and some acknowledged the context. In general, the language level was acceptable or good.

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

Question 1: One third of the candidates chose this interesting question, but concentrated too much on the content of the works instead of analyzing and discussing the whole question.

Question 2: Another third of the candidates wrote about this question and used the possibilities of the studied literary works appropriately. This Question was perhaps not as complex as the others and offered the candidates good chances for a well structured essay.

Question 3: Was not chosen.

Question 4: Was not chosen.

Question 5: Was not chosen.

Question 6: Another third of the candidates chose this question, which created some problems by determining social classes and the question about possible conflicts. The studied works would have given them excellent examples (e.g. "Woyzeck"; "Die Räuber"), but the majority was not aware about details.

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. Candidates, who are in the A Language and Literature HL course, need to be able writing an essay without basic language mistakes. Writing skills need to be integrated into the course regularly.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	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

Candidates found it difficult to take into consideration all aspects of the question and not only paraphrasing the content. In addition, it was difficult to consider the context and stylistic features of the works of literature. Sometimes, candidates digressed from the question, and some candidates were not familiar with the works of literature. Besides all the difficulties related to the content of the essay, many candidates had problems in expressing their ideas in clear sentences. Sometimes, it was difficult to understand the meaning of the sentences. Too many candidates were not able to write correct sentences. Many candidates showed weaknesses in basic spelling, basic grammar, sentence constructions, adequate phrases, analytical language. Concerning the structure of the essays, sometimes the comparison of the two works, in relation to the question, was neglected.

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

The choice of literary works was good and gave candidates good opportunities to choose a question. A number of essays showed good results with good knowledge of the works, well organized ideas and on an acceptable language level.

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

Question 1: The majority of candidates chose this question. Unfortunately, many essays concentrated on the content of the single works and did not compare. Sometimes, the studied works did not match with the question, which related to love and death.

Question 2: A few candidates chose the question about history, but did not always go beyond the description of the content of the literary works.

Question 3: The few candidates, who chose this question, were able to use the opportunities of the studied works of literature well and showed good results with focused analysis of the question.

Question 4: Was not chosen.

Question 5: Few candidates chose this demanding question, which created many problems and did not convince with analyzing aspects of the studied works of literature in relation to this complex question.

Question 6: Very few candidates chose this question. Candidates found it difficult to identify social classes in the studied works of literature including possible conflicts.

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. Candidates, who are in the A Language and Literature SL course, need to be able writing an essay without basic language mistakes. Writing skills (basic spelling, grammar, sentence constructions, adequate phrases, analytical language, synonyms, literary terms, etc.) need to be integrated in the course on a regular basis.