

## German A: Literature

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 16	17 - 31	32 - 43	44 - 56	57 - 70	71 - 82	83 - 100

#### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 15	16 - 27	28 - 40	41 - 53	54 - 66	67 - 79	80 - 100

### Higher level internal assessment

#### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 30

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

In general, poets from various epochs were chosen, ranging from Eichendorff, Goethe, Heine, Rilke to Brecht, Kästner and Lasker-Schüler - to name only the most popular ones.

A number of schools submitted a range of poems with "Barocklyrik" appearing to be a particular favourite for part one (again). Moderators were wondering whether this was possibly due to the fact that great similarities in form and content enable candidates to "pre-learn" interpretations and especially lengthy introductions.

Most poems were appropriate in length and challenge, however, teachers should keep in mind that the length of a poem is crucial. If a poem is very short it might not offer an adequate number of stylistic features to comment on – this disadvantages weaker candidates in particular. If it is too long, candidates might struggle with structuring their commentary logically and staying within the time frame.

It is not necessary to read out the poem – unless it helps a nervous candidate to calm down.

The choice of works for the discussion part was always suitable and well chosen. As always, old-time favourites were taking the lead like Goethe's "Faust" and Fontane's "Effie Briest" as well as Kafka's "Verwandlung" and "Erzählungen", Dürrenmatt's "Besuch der alten Dame", Hesse's "Narziss und Goldmund", Frisch's "Tagebücher", works from Gottfried Keller, Jurek Becker and E.T.A. Hoffmann.

In regard to appropriate guiding questions, not all schools adhere to the number of guiding questions permitted (sometimes pretending that four questions are one), some give very detailed instructions and in some cases, questions are overly leading or are answerable by "yes" or "no".

A few schools submitted work not in accordance with the IB Language A Literature guide. Instead of selecting a range of poems by one author, they chose one or more epochs and several authors.

It seems that some teachers still struggle with part 2 of the oral. They either ask the same questions in the same sequence; have difficulties in formulating a question clearly and/or talking far too long instead of allowing the candidate to show his/her knowledge.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### A. Knowledge and understanding of the poem

Most candidates seemed to be well prepared for this task, displaying good knowledge of their poem(s) and delivered at least a reasonably well-structured commentary. Only in a few cases were introductions and conclusions missing and some candidates struggled at times with in-depth analysis.

Some teachers still appear to encourage their candidates to pre-learn introductions – which are not always relevant to the poem.

The author's biography or the time the poem was written in were at times too strongly emphasised without specific reference to the poem itself.

### B. Appreciation of the writer's choices

Poetry in general offers the possibility to appreciate writer's choices, so this is easy for candidates, provided they are well prepared. This was generally the case.

However, many moderators pointed out that too many candidates and teachers, too, seem to be struggling with the idea that commenting on language and style is important. All too many still use the wrong register (for example "Zeile" for "Vers" - with poetry as a major part of the IOC this should be avoided) and it is a concern to see that too many teachers appear to be unaware of the importance of syntax or many stylistic devices - which makes it difficult for their students to do well. This was particularly obvious (again) when subsequent questions focused on whether a "student" liked a person rather than on the analysis of stylistic devices.

### C. Organization and presentation of the commentary

This remains the weakest point in regard to this task. However, some improvement is clearly visible. Candidates seem to be better prepared. While some commentaries were structured very well, there are still many candidates who find this aspect difficult. In some centres candidates were obviously trained to structure their commentaries in a particular way (which may be too prescriptive) but in others students were "all over the poem".

### D. Knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion

This part varied a lot. While many candidates performed well and came up with a convincing personal response based on many aspects of the work in question, some struggled and did not much more than offering a summary of the events or expressing opinions not really relevant to the text.

### E. Response to the discussion questions

Some teachers obviously used the same catalogue of questions (eliciting very similar replies) in the same sequence, others struggled with questioning and did not really enable students to shine. Some teachers asked questions which were far too long.

For Criteria D and E performance is intertwined. Discussion questions should always lead to the candidate's reflection on the work in question rather than initiate a summary of the text. One moderator mentioned two types of questions of particular interest in this respect:

1. "Name two or three aspects that you liked about the work or that struck you as significant."

This allows the candidate – at least to some extent – to direct the discussion to his field of expertise and it alleviates some of the strain to get the discussion going.

2. "Try to transfer the characters of the work to our contemporary time, e.g. what boundaries would Faust cross today or how would Mephisto plot his pact on today's terms?"

This forces the candidate to reflect upon the timeliness of the work in question. Candidates that had to answer such questions came up with very interesting, original and convincing ideas.

### F. Language

The overall impression is that this year's candidates showed a very high command of their A language, both grammatically as well as stylistically. Sometimes it seemed that in cases of stronger dialect (Swiss / Austrian) – yet, with a high command of the language – teachers tried to downgrade students on grounds other than their dialect.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The programme of the IB Language A HL Part 2 of the syllabus must be followed. Teachers should remind students of the importance of not only mentioning a writer's choices. Instead, they should learn to offer a detailed appreciation of these choices. Students should also be made aware of the restriction of eight minutes for their commentaries.

- Students (and teachers!) need to be more careful in their use of register - as has been mentioned in every language A German report I have ever written...
- Students should ensure that they see a text as a product of its time.
- Even more care has to be taken to ensure that students understand how important it is to analyse in depth how language and stylistic devices shape meaning in a text.
- They should be encouraged to fully integrate the analysis of language and style into their commentary.
- In part 2 it is important to allow students to show detailed in-depth knowledge and understanding and questioning has to be aimed at that.
- It is important that everybody is aware of guidelines and adheres to them.

## Standard level internal assessment

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 30

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

The majority of schools continue to use familiar works and authors, although there were also some refreshingly new choices. Amongst the schools continuing to study year-in-year-out Goethe's Faust I and Schiller's Don Carlos, Büchner's Woyzeck, Fontane's Effi Briest, Hesse's Siddharta, Kafka's Der Prozeß and Die Verwandlung, Becker's Jakob der Lügner, Brecht's Mutter Courage and Galileo and Dürrenmatt's Die Physiker, Goethe and Brecht appear to have been the most popular and most extracts from their works were the standard choices.

The selection of poetry included Goethe, Eichendorff and Tucholsky. The schools' Advance Notice shows that there are very few indeed that do not list poetry in at least one part of the

syllabus. The non-fiction category was chosen by very few schools but those who did were interesting and convincing.

The excerpts selected for the commentaries were eminently suitable in challenge but varied considerably in length. Whilst most passages complied with the stipulated length, a number of them were much longer, some exceeding 60 lines. Likewise, a number of orals were too long, but there seemed to be no direct correlation between the length of the extract and the timing. The guiding questions were on the whole suitable, although some did contain specific terminology which should have come from the candidate unaided. Most teachers included one question on the author's choices. However, there were samples in which the candidate commented on the context and the overall theme of a work, but paid far too little attention to the actual passage. In one case, there was a further question on the second work at the expense of an in-depth analysis of the extract.

Only a few uploaded files were incomplete, usually missing the actual text extract. The quality of the audio files was very good on the whole.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A

There were some very well-constructed commentaries, succinct and focused, showing very good knowledge and understanding, whilst others, however, lacked a detailed analysis. Most showed the ability to place a passage precisely into context with an analysis of significant aspects (such as the literary epoch) and themes as apparent in the passage and then making links to the whole work. Weaker candidates need to be more aware of the need for analysis in order to show an understanding of the themes and not merely summarise the content.

### Criterion B

As pointed out in previous years, the difficulty appears to be the candidates' ability to combine meaningful observations on an author's choices and their effects on meaning. Some of the responses offered more than one interpretation of a given aspect. Most candidates had a good command of literary terminology, but there were also several inconsistencies with basic literary vocabulary, such as the confusion of 'Strophe' and 'Vers'. Commenting on the links between devices and themes appears to be particularly difficult, although stronger candidates were very successful in doing this.

Overall, more attention to this criterion was noticeable this year. However, candidates need to not only identify literary features/techniques but also explore the effect thus achieved.

### Criterion C

Many of the samples showed a purposeful structure with a sustained focus. Most started with a clear introduction, giving relevant details as to the historical and biographical context. The approach was varied, including thematic and line-by-line analyses. Good answers linked ideas and showed a progressive development in the course of the commentary, bringing the delivery to a clear conclusion. However, many candidates need to be more aware of the need

to illustrate their ideas with close references to the text - here line numbering of passages / poems would be helpful as suggested repeatedly.

Organisation and presentation was still the weakest area and could use some improvement. There was "some evidence of a planned structure" in most commentaries but few were able to "sustain focus".

### Criterion D

The majority of candidates were very aware of using language appropriate to the task, and only few incidences of unsuitable colloquialisms were noted. There seems to be a greater awareness of the need for a sustained suitable use of language.

Language and register was good, except for the non-native speakers, some of whom struggled to express themselves clearly and might not belong in this program.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers can help the candidate to focus on the actual passage with a question on the author's choices used in the excerpt and on the effects created (many teachers do this). Further questions should also be designed to help a candidate to explore the passage in more depth, if necessary.

Candidates should be referred to the marking criteria, which make clear that the focus of the commentary needs to be on the passage, not the whole work.

It is very important that the length of the extract is suitable for the purposes of the commentary.

Structure and presentation are areas that need to be improved.

A good range of stylistic terminology would be useful.

The Advance Notice of works chosen by a school is most helpful, and all schools should be encouraged to submit this at the time requested.

## Higher level written assignment

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

## The range and suitability of the work submitted

Virtually all Written Assignments were based on appropriate works of literature. There is a wide range of genres used, but usually, plays and novels are by far the most popular ones. Within these genres, the North American play writers (Miller, Williams), Scandinavian (Strindberg, Ibsen - a shift was noticeable from "Dolls' House" to "Hedda Gabler") and Chekhov are by far the most dominant, closely followed by Sophocles and Shakespeare. In novels, South American writers (Garcia Marquez, Allende) are still popular, so is Camus, but more and more African and Asian (Japanese) literature is emerging.

Most of the Written Assignments were suitable in content, structure and layout with the Reflective Statement being the weak spot of many essays. Also noticeable this year was the variety of topics within each school's submission of essays. There were far fewer more or less identical essays and more individual questions which is positive.

Overall, the impression was that the requirements and criteria are now mostly understood and applied. There was hardly any error made such as submitting the prompt instead of the reflective statement or comparing two works rather than focussing on one. However, Criterion C (see below) is still often not well treated. Therefore, candidates who decided to write on a literary topic (such as symbols, Leitmotiv etc.) fared better than those whose topic was merely content-driven.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### A Requirement of the reflective statement

Almost all candidates had their reflective statement attached to their essay, however, only few candidates were able to score the full three points. This is because a lot of students either merely summed up their academic knowledge or paraphrased in long passages the actual interactive oral activity and their classmates' presentations. As the focus should be on the cultural and contextual considerations, more attention needs to be paid on the actual writing to enable the students to obtain the highest scores. In some cases, the word limit of 300-400 was not observed.

### B Knowledge and Understanding

Usually, the topic of the essays and the performance was adequate. The right choice of topic is crucial to allow the candidates to demonstrate detailed knowledge of the work and perceptive insight into it. Some topics were so specific that it was difficult to recognize whether the candidate had grasped the broader meaning of the text. Likewise, some topics were too broad to allow a detailed analysis and perceptive commentary. Often essays with a theoretical question scored more highly than a content-based question (i.e. Hybris in Antigone could be better than American Dream in Death of a Salesman).

### C Appreciation of the writer's choice

The attainment of criterion C was variable but overall had the weakest results. Many candidates seem to have forgotten that they are being assessed on the appreciation of

literary features as well, as this constitutes 6 out of 24 possible marks. Considering the fact, that all the works are translated, a mere “hunt” for rhetorical devices (alliteration, anaphora etc.) is also not sufficient. The students need to be aware of some theoretical background of the genre in order to comment on the literary features used.

## D Organisation and Development

Most candidates achieved at least 3 marks, as they have mastered the basics of constructing a coherent essay. Unfortunately, formal aspects like integrating proper citations, working effectively with references and adding a bibliography were often not well observed. Generally, essays structured as one running text were of higher standard than those forced into a stringent structure with too many subheadings.

## E Language

Given the fact, that students have time to proof-read their work and run a spell-check at the end, some essays were very weak in language. Apart from spelling, too many candidates still experience difficulties with punctuation, indirect speech and the correct use of citations. Regarding the register, most candidates used appropriate language and only a few colloquialisms were to be seen. Most essays were written in the correct tense, some lapses were seen when referring to an earlier event within the work.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Overall, the steps leading to the final essay need to be clear and some thought should be given to the interactive oral as well as the reflective statement. It should be clear to the students, when the interactive oral is set to avoid a general summary of the entire unit taught previously.

Advise the candidates on a sensible choice of topic. Too wide or too general titles usually don't lead to success. A narrower focus and a focus on structure/motives/symbols etc. allow candidates to shine. It might be helpful (as seen in many examples this session) to formulate the topic in a question, similar to the research question of the EE or Personal Project. Teachers should refer to the word limit and the assessment criteria, especially the need to integrate observations relating to criterion C. An introduction to referencing, integration of quotes and paraphrasing would also be beneficial for many students. Despite the fact, that most essays are written within the first year of teaching, the correct use of literary terms is necessary (foreshadowing, narrator's point of view, speaking of character rather than person etc.). Some German specific topics include: separable verbs, capitalisation, two-part conjunction, and overall logic within a sentence.



## Standard level written assignment

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

A fairly good range of essays were submitted, with a high percentage in the upper two grades. A few were really excellent; some were hardly comprehensible due to language.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A

The Reflective Statement is quite problematic, as the pupils seem to not know the criteria. Especially the "development", gained during the Interactive Oral, was not explained. The context of the literary piece was not mentioned in the RS (but then most of the times in the main body, in the introduction!) Many students do not stay within the word count of 300-400 words. Mostly, students use the RS for an overall interpretation rather than stating culture, context and what they have learned in the Interactive Oral.

#### Criterion B

Most of the times, knowledge and understanding is adequately shown through the chosen topic. But some students stay at summarisation and miss the opportunity to exemplify their ideas with quotes from the literary text.

#### Criterion C

Students did not show enough appreciation of the writer's choices. Here is the biggest problem in writing the WA! Hardly any student looked into the structure of the literary piece or into the style, which shapes the meaning of the literary work. Students identified the problem, the author wants to bring across, but not, HOW he does it. If they refer to literary features, students miss to interpret them.

#### Criterion D

Generally, students have a good idea, but do not follow it strictly enough throughout the essay. They get distracted by "all they know", mention things which do not have any relevance for the chosen topic. Students find it difficult to develop an idea.

## Criterion E

Not all students write the title (and sometimes quotes) in German! However, more worrying is the language SL students use. It is often too colloquial and there are many mistakes in punctuation, spelling and expression (too informal).

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should inform students in greater detail, about what the Reflective Statement needs to consist of. Especially, what the pupil has learnt about the contextual elements during the Interactive Oral should be made clearer.

Teachers should make the students aware of Criterion C, and ask them to look into the style and structure of a literary piece.

Teachers should ask their students not to speculate about the literary piece; students like to think about "what if...", but this is not relevant to this piece of work. The focus should be on the author's intentions when choosing to write in the way, he/she wrote the literary piece.

Teachers should make students aware, that secondary literature is not needed for the WA, but a Bibliography is.

## Further comments

The main problem is writing the Written Assignment according the IB Criteria. It looks, as if not all students are aware of the Criteria and Criteria A and C especially are neglected. Secondary literature is not needed. Students should stay within the literary piece, no comparison with another work is requested.

## Higher 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 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

The two texts, prose and poem, were long and challenged the students quite a bit. Weaker students seem to struggle which question to take (as seen in notes/ drafts) and therefore ended up being under time constraints.

In general, the structure of the essays was appropriate and mostly followed the structure of the text(s). However, this led to weak essays for the poem as the essay was then often very repetitive. Better students handled the text with the full content in mind and were able to write convincing and concise pieces of work. Virtually all essays had an introduction and a conclusion, however, often one or the other or both were weak. The meaning of an introduction and different ways of approaching a (complex) text is crucial and needs to be practised. Assumptions as “The text was published in 2008 and therefore can’t deal with the Holocaust” don’t reflect well on the student’s critical thinking.

Too many students struggled with the connections between formal structure of the texts and the meaning. Most students observed a/the structure and described it well but failed to find any connection between form and content.

Referencing was a problem and often there were very few quotations or quotes that were merely used as “place holders” without any analysis.

Some students were quick in drawing conclusions for their interpretation that were rather far-fetched and not well supported. It needs to be clear to the candidates that an interpretation has to be based on a solid analysis of several aspects of the texts rather than jumping to conclusions from a quick skimming of the texts – at least it seemed that several interpretations have been done in this manner.

Surprisingly weak (shocking) was the use of language: Frequent spelling mistakes, incomplete sentence structure, wrong citations, colloquialism, wrong use of metaphors, wrong understanding of words – several students seem to have such a poor command of the German language; in some cases the choice of a German B class would have been more appropriate – especially as these students also struggled to merely understand the texts.

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

In general, most candidates are familiar with the assessment criteria for a Paper 1 commentary. The appreciation of the writer’s choice has to be demonstrated by adequate identification, naming and analysing the ways meaning is shaped. This was better and more convincing with stylistic devices rather than looking at broader aspects as point of view, atmosphere, register, setting, word choice, sentence structure to name a few. In general, the structure of the essays was adequate and most candidates seem to have a confident approach to their essay writing. Recognizing and naming stylistic devices was often good - but the interpretation of its use was not always recognisable. There was a sound knowledge of literary terminology used both for the text and the poem.

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

### Question 1 - Prose

The text was long but well structured and with only a few motifs that repeated themselves. The date of publishing was confusing to a surprisingly large number of candidate. While it was possible to find evidence for the historical background, this was not necessary to score high in A (Understanding). It was, however, necessary to see the isolated and desperate situation of the girl, contrasted by her memories - and the level of reflection she demonstrates. The role of the narrator and the point of view is shifting and only few candidates dared to mention this variation. Close reading was necessary to understand the characteristics of her prison. Almost all candidates managed well to point out the contrast in atmosphere in presence and memory and some made good connections for the family situation.

In general, the structure of several essays was weak, either clinging to the text and running out of time with a sentence-by-sentence approach or jumping around in the text without acknowledgement of the girl's development.

While the text was challenging, better students excelled and were able to score highly.

### Question 2 Poetry

The poem was long and - more importantly - ironic (sarkastisch). Once again, students don't seem to recognise humour in an exam situation despite the fact that humoristic texts are used fairly regularly. Only strong candidates recognised, analysed and obviously enjoyed this poem appropriately. Most candidates took the text literally and went through long and often tiring paraphrasing of each stanza, searching for meaning in the literary understanding and the appreciation of books through the "Lyrisches Ich". Most of these students were still able to identify the dialogue structure of the poem. However, several students started on the wrong foot from the beginning, such as: "Biblio is having a conversation with Phile". Or: "This is a well-known author, named Phile, talking about his many publications" As a consequence, many students were able to apparently find a "moral" in the poem, to appreciate books even in times of e-readers.

The recognition of some stylistic devices demonstrated, that the students had no other tools to approach this poem and often these attempts of analysing the poems were rather unconvincing. This is also true for the formal structure. Too often, there was one paragraph on stanzas, verses, rhyme - without any connection to the content. All students saw the length of the 9th stanza - but failed to analyse why that would be. While size does matter in some areas, in the case of this poem, most of the high scoring essays were short. The candidates combined the entire middle part of the poem and focused on the dialogue and the 9th stanza.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Practise writing, register, paraphrasing. Make the students aware of the importance of an introduction. Among other goals it sets the tone for the following and raises expectations - or

fails to do so. All HL candidates have already demonstrated competence of the analysis of poetry in their Oral Commentary. Refresh the knowledge and strengthen the confidence to vary the linear approach. For prose: even though the part 3 works might be drama, the students need to have enough terminology and tools to analyse a passage appropriately and to recognize how style, structure and language shape meaning. Avoid structures, which repeat themselves several times in introduction, body and conclusion.

## Standard 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 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20

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

There were few areas in which candidates struggled this session as it seemed that the texts were quite accessible, even though the poem did seem a little long and some candidates were unable to go into sufficient depth of analysis.

Students still seemed to find it difficult to interpret the function of a literary device. Mostly, literary features like the structure of the text or the rhyme were merely named, but not analysed in its meaning. This is also valid for quotations; only the strongest students made reference to, and looked into the meaning of, what they have quoted. Weaker students just use them instead of paraphrasing.

The structure of the commentary usually followed the structure of the poem or extract. Therefore, there was hardly any "development of an idea". The introduction often stays very weak by just stating author, title and year of the text but not a thesis, which the student wants to investigate. The conclusion is still most of the times a repetition of the main body; as there was no thesis in the introduction, the conclusion doesn't express critical thinking by transferring an idea into a wider context.

The language of the commentary remains a huge problem. Some of the SL students hardly manage to write ONE correct sentence. Some of them are ill advised to take German A as German is probably not their mother tongue (anymore). However, this year with a relatively easy poem and extract, they could understand the meaning of the text, but found it difficult to analyse the details in language. The vocabulary used was often too colloquial, punctuation non-existent and spelling wrong (or English).

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

It seems, that the students understood the texts well. Therefore, summarisation was kept to a minimum, which is a positive change to previous years. Also, more candidates managed to identify correctly at least some literary features (even though they didn't always interpret them). As the two texts were relatively easy to comprehend, there were not many abstruse interpretations, which again is a welcome progress. Students stayed mostly within the text, avoiding applying far fetched ideas.

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

Prose. The most common mistake made by students, was using the terms "author" and "narrator" interchangeably. Overall, the narrator and his function is neglected; instead, candidates like to refer to the author as soon as the text is written from the "I" perspective.

Almost all students managed to recognise the influence of music in the narrator's life, even though not in all aspects. The fact that upbringing, love and even the professional life of the narrator was determined by music, was pointed out clearly by only a few students. But most of all, the ambiguity of the role played by music was hardly observed. The metaphor of "Rattenfänger von Hameln" was not often investigated in regards to the negative aspect, the influence of music on the narrator's life. Only a few students questioned the fact that the narrator "catches" children the way she was caught by music. However, the positive impact of music was pointed out by everyone.

Poetry. The poem was long and therefore, many candidates found it challenging to investigate the whole poem in detail. The requirement of one of the leading questions: the way, in which music changed the life of poor people, was not investigated in depth. Many candidates referred to only one or two examples, thereby just stating that their lives were changed by the Leierkasten-music, but not exactly how.

Surprisingly positive was the description of the poor people's life, which most students recognised. However, some candidates answered these two leading questions separately, not building an essay with introduction and conclusion.

Only few candidates appreciated the frame of the poem, which is built by the "Professor". The contrast between the influence the Leierkasten-music plays on the poor peoples' lives and the rather academic (bourgeois) point of view on music by the professor, went often unnoticed. Only the most successful candidates pointed that out and usually scored highly.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teaching of Paper 1 should mainly focus on interpreting literary features. Just naming a literary device is not sufficient; an interpretation has to follow, why this specific device shapes meaning. This has to be regarding style, structure and language of the text. It is evident, that

knowledge of literary terms, such as “narrator” vs “author” and “metaphor” vs “symbol” are the basis of any analysis.

Furthermore, the presentation of the commentary has to be addressed. The importance of stating a thesis in the introduction and following it throughout the script, can not be stressed enough. This is the only way to ensure the development of an argument, fluidity and a response in the conclusion.

## Higher 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 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 25

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

Overall, the competence of language use appears to be weaker than in the previous year. Spelling and grammar mistakes, quality of language overall was often very poor and - like in other assignments, punctuation, colloquialism, lack of literary terminology, capitalisation of words, logical connection of sentences through appropriate conjunctions - the candidates need to be aware of the impact of their language capacity on the effectiveness of their argument.

Often, the students had a sound knowledge of the texts used for the essay but very often, there was little more than paraphrasing and summarizing of the plot. To demonstrate in-depth knowledge, more direct quotes and concrete details are necessary.

One problem that often occurs is the lack of comparison. Both works are often well analysed independently but rarely is there a comparison, let alone an effective one.

The questions might not fit the student’s previously acquired knowledge but it is necessary that the student keeps the question in focus. Too many students seem to have a concept in mind that they "bend" towards the question, however appropriate this might be. Therefore, the answers are often superficial or the students lose track of the question over the course of the essay. It is extremely important to read the question fully and to answer it fully, often, only "half" of the two-part question was approached.

While most candidates showed some knowledge of the literary conventions of the genre, a surprisingly large number of students did not use this knowledge effectively and/or with regards to the question.

Most students had an adequate structure to their essays but rarely highly effective. There is often more repetition rather than a proper development.

With regard to the genre, there were some slight mistakes in distinguishing and selecting the correct question for prose fiction and short prose (Roman versus Erzählung)

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

There was a sound knowledge of the works and often the plot was summarized successfully. Also, by far most essays had a recognisable structure with introduction - body - conclusion. Several students seemed to be aware of the assessment criteria and tried to apply them to their writing. Among others, this could be seen in the evaluation of the works in the conclusion. A minority of candidates showed excellent understanding of literary terminology and theoretical concepts and were well able to apply their knowledge to the question.

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

Q1. Spannende Momente - Gesellschaftsschichten: very popular question; some students successfully identified and tackled the question and incorporated the appropriate literary conventions. Weaker answers limited their essays to one aspect e.g. only wrote about social backgrounds OR interesting moments. Some plays were difficult to use, namely Dürrenmatt's Physiker.

Q2. Sprache zeitlos - aktuell: unpopular question, if taken, it was often misinterpreted as relevance of the play today and not the language used. Some weaker essays were caused because the terms "zeitlos" and "aktuell" were interpreted as interchangeable concepts.

Q3. Theater kann anklagen oder verteidigen - popular question, often with satisfying results. However, often the defence part of the question was ignored and only very strong candidates managed successfully to apply theoretical concepts and literary features.

Q4. Metaphern verweisen auf Probleme: Rarely chosen. The better candidates carefully explored several metaphors and how they support the reader in understanding specific problems, weaker answers just listed metaphors - or ignored the question altogether.

Q5. Außen- und Innenperspektive: The most popular question in the prose section, however, often not dealt with successfully. The students approached the topic only superficially without a true understanding, e.g. some only focused on the "image" of a character. Very good responses also linked the concepts to the point of view.

Q6. Gesellschaftliche Unterschiede durch Sprache: Only a couple of responses but these were often well done, dealing successfully with the texts, able to provide quotes and specific examples and/or to link the use of language to the author's intention. Weaker answers mistook the language of the author for the language used by the characters. Again: close



reading of the question is key! "Gesellschaftliche Unterschiede" were often interpreted in a very broad sense.

Q7. Dingsymbole: Only few successful responses. Some students who chose this question didn't know what a "Dingsymbol" is and therefore were not able to score highly.

Q9. Beziehung Dichter - Leser: generally for poetry: very few schools use poetry as genre. Most responses here only focused on two poems rather than on the work of two poets. There was the vague impression that the students were rather weak and tried to apply a pre-learned essay to whatever the question was.

None of the other questions were answered sufficiently frequently to warrant comment.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

With regard to the last paragraph here is an idea: move away from plays and dare to do other genres, especially prose non-fiction and poetry. If schools stay with plays, consider moving away from Physiker and Galileo. However, it needs to be mentioned that there is a definite shift towards Lessing, Büchner and Borchert at the moment.

Other than that, there are the obvious recommendations: make the students aware of the assessment criteria, train them to write in the appropriate register and to use accurate language, use theoretical concepts of the genre frequently including for "unexpected" questions, as well as modelling effective structures.

The students should read the question carefully and avoid pre-learning an essay, which they will tweak to any question (remember: there are 5 marks for "response to question")

The works are known by the examiner, no long summaries are necessary. Focus on the analysis and the question rather than summarizing the plot. Also, discuss and practise ways of comparing two works effectively with the candidates. .

## Standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 25

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

One of the biggest problems in Paper 2 is the lack of comparison of the two texts. Candidates really struggle to contrast the two works they have chosen. Many essays show a separation into two sections, dealing with each literary work individually, with little or no reference to any points of comparison.

The other biggest issue is focusing on the topic. Candidates seem to find it difficult to structure their essay according to points relevant to the question. Too many students write down what they know about the literary piece, regardless of whether this is suitable for answering the question. Therefore, often the essay does not develop an argument and is not coherent. Especially this year, where many questions had two parts to refer to (in addition to the usual HOW? and HOW EFFECTIVE?); candidates took one part but ignored the other. Hardly any SL student managed to answer to both aspects of the topic.

In general, candidates showed knowledge about the literary works they have studied. However, very often, they did not apply this knowledge in response to the question and/or the response was not very deep. Genre specific elements only found their way into the essay on rare occasions, again, not often answering the question. Some candidates were not even aware of the genre and chose the wrong question (Erzählung vs Roman especially).

Structuring an essay remains a difficult task. The introduction often includes irrelevant details such as the date and place of publication, without any reference to the question. Throughout the essay, there is hardly any development of an idea; the comparison – as mentioned before – is either completely neglected or limited to the opening sentence of writing about the second piece of literature. The conclusion often summarises the main body, but does not answer to any thesis (because there was none in the introduction), let alone sets the argument into a wider context.

SL candidates find it hard to include quotes. If they do, they hardly analyse them, but merely use them to paraphrase their own words.

Finally, the language – formal expression, punctuation, spelling – remains a big issue. It seems that for quite a high percentage of SL candidates, German is NOT their main language and therefore the essay is colloquial in its expression and this is reflected in casual punctuation and spelling, often more English than German. There are many candidates who score only 1 or 2 points in criterion E.

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

Overall, Candidates did not summarise texts as much as in previous years. This is a welcome progress.

As the results in SL Paper 2 show, only a small minority of candidates were able to answer to all parts of the question and therefore score highly. The text knowledge was mostly sufficient as well as a basic knowledge of literary terms.

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

Q1. Spannende Momente – Gesellschaftsschichten. This was the second most popular question (after Q 3), but unfortunately not the best choice for most candidates. Only few students could answer both aspects of the question, they did not understand the combination of one (Gesellschaftsschichten) causing the other aspect (spannende Momente). Many candidates showed difficulties in finding “verschiedene Gesellschaftsschichten” in their plays, not realising that the chosen literary pieces might not be suitable for answering this question. A definition of “Gesellschaftsschichten” was rarely given, let alone explicitly shown, which character belonged in which class in the play. Most of the students failed to define the “spannende Momente”, which of course led to superficial responses.

Q2. Sprache zeitlos – aktuell. This question was rarely chosen (ca 1 % of all responses). Those candidates who did choose this question found it difficult to find quotes which prove that the language is “zeitlos” or “aktuell”.

Q3. Theater kann anklagen oder verteidigen. This was the most answered question with some good results. Most candidates just referred to “anklagen” and pointed out the critic, the play writer expresses with his literary piece. The positive element of the question was mostly ignored, but didn't have to be answered. Only few students managed to refer to the concept of the play (Dramentheorie) and literary features, which are necessary to score highly.

Q4. Metaphern verweisen auf Probleme. Only few candidates chose this question. Those who did, often did not differentiate between "metaphor" and "symbol". How a metaphor indicates a problem, was often neglected; students just listed metaphors and explained their meaning according the overall understanding in the literary piece but not how they express a problem.

Q5. Außen- und Innenperspektive. This question was chosen very often, but not always with success. Candidates seemed to find it difficult to determine, what “Außen-“ and/ or “Innenperspektive” is and thus this was answered very badly. Again, this was a two-part question and only a handful of candidates managed to show, where a character is described with both perspectives. Many students did not realise, that their studied works did not apply for this question.

Q7. Dingsymbole. Only few candidates answered that question. Some seem to have difficulties in determine a “Dingsymbol” and therefore didn't score well.

No other questions were answered sufficiently frequently to make a commentary valid.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In genres "Roman" and "Erzählung", ensure pupils have been prepared on stylistic features like language, narrator, perspective, rather than only content.

In genre "Theater" focus on THE WAYS in which play writers express their intention. In Brecht the Verfremdungseffekt is well known and explained, but this is not done equally for others.