

GERMAN

Paper 8683/01
Speaking

Key Messages

- The following points are already followed by the majority of Centres.
- Presentations (**Section 1**) should be firmly rooted within the contemporary society or cultural heritage of a country where German is spoken. Candidates who make no reference to such a country will have their marks for Content halved, or, if there is very little reference, reduced. Native speakers of German should not assume a listener realises that they are speaking about their homeland and should also give specific details and references. It is not acceptable to make a presentation about the country of domicile, unless this occurs as part of a comparison, where information about the German-speaking country should still predominate.
- Both in the Topic Conversation (**Section 2**) and in the General Conversation (**Section 3**) candidates must engage in a dialogue with the Examiner and ask him or her some questions. It is not acceptable to include these questions in the Presentation, except perhaps one at the very end to introduce the Topic Conversation, nor is it acceptable to ask a large number of questions at the very end of **section 3**, having previously asked none at all. If no questions are asked within either of the sections, no marks may be awarded for Seeking Information in that section. To obtain a mark of 4 out of 5 in a section at least two questions must be asked. The maximum mark is three if there is only one question.
- Please adhere to the timings specified for this examination and please do not exceed 20 minutes in total. Presentations should not be allowed to be too long. An Examiner should interrupt with a question after about four minutes, and three and a half minutes would be a more appropriate length. **Section 2** and **section 3** conversations should be of approximately equal length, say around eight minutes. It is difficult to achieve a high mark for Providing Information or Responsiveness if one section is cut too short.
- A quiet and perhaps relatively small room should be chosen for the speaking test. If there is loud traffic, or people talking in the background, or even an echo in a large space, candidates will not have optimum conditions. For preference record onto CD rather than tape, as sound quality is notably better, and please place the microphone or other equipment where both Examiner and candidate are audible to someone listening to the recording.

General Comments

There was a good range of candidates and nearly all were correctly entered at this level. Recording quality was generally very good, as the majority of Centres are now recording onto CD, and the labelling and general admin surrounding the recordings was also excellent. Most Centres included the correct paperwork, namely MS1, working mark-sheet and attendance register. The standard of marking was generally very good, though sometimes a little optimistic with regard to the mark-scheme. Specific examples of marking criteria will be mentioned in the final section of this report. Some Centres with native speakers of German were a little harsh on them with regard to their feel for the language, their accuracy and their ability to provide information. It should be remembered that the mark-scheme refers predominantly to non-native speakers, and that the majority of native speakers will, therefore, score nearly maximum marks on these criteria. However, this will not necessarily be the case at all with regard to Content in their presentations, nor to Seeking Information and Opinions, or even Responsiveness.

Specific Comments on the sections of the examination

Section 1 (Presentation)

- The manner of delivery of the presentation should be taken into account. Only award nine or ten marks for Content if the delivery is lively and confident rather than stilted and hesitant, in addition to including the ideas and opinions stated in the mark-scheme.
- Do not award nine or ten if the presentation is far too long, as it cannot be considered to be “well organised”.
- For a mark of five for Pronunciation a candidate does not have to be a native speaker. “Hesitation”, though mentioned in the mark-scheme, should not really figure highly when considering Pronunciation, but perhaps more so when considering delivery of the presentation or the Language mark.
- A well-prepared presentation by a correctly entered candidate should be able to access at least 4 marks for Language, as the criteria mention a “reasonable range” of structures and (topic-specific) vocabulary, delivered “fairly fluently”, and provided there is no ambiguity of meaning.
- There was an excellent range of interesting Presentation topics again, of which the following are just a selection:

Tierversuche; der neue Berliner Flughafen; Mobbing; Zivilcourage; Karl Lagerfeld; Einfluss der Technik auf Kinder; Atheismus; Krieg und Frieden; Obdachlosigkeit; Sonnenkollektoren; Scheidung; Generationskonflikt; deutsche Literatur; Chancengleichheit; ein Austauschbesuch in Deutschland.

Section 2 (Topic Conversation)

- The important issues concerning the marking criterion “Seeking Information”, the marking of native-speakers and non-native speakers, and timing of this section are mentioned above.
- If a candidate has memorized his material entirely or predominantly, a mark from the “Satisfactory” box should be awarded as a maximum, as it cannot really be claimed that he or she is responding to “unexpected questions”.
- Similarly a mark from this box should be awarded if the candidate can deal with basic situations and concepts, but not more complicated ones.
- The candidate should use varied questions when seeking information, not simply “*Was denken Sie?*”

Section 3 (General Conversation)

- This section should be clearly distinct from section two. There should be a clear announcement to introduce the section, for the benefit of the candidate and the recording. For example, the Examiner could say: “*Jetzt kommen wir zum dritten Teil der Prüfung*”, or something similar, and there should be a complete change of topic. If the candidate has, for example, been discussing a visit to Germany as a topic, starting section three with a general discussion of other countries visited would not necessarily be appropriate.
- Personal details such as the candidate’s future and his or her interests should feature briefly but should not necessarily form the main element of this discussion. It is better to move fairly swiftly on to more complex or wider issues to enable the candidate to access the higher marks for “Comprehension and Responsiveness” or “Providing Information and Opinions”.
- Open questions by the Examiner are more effective in drawing the required kind of response from a candidate than closed ones. Brief questions, such as *Warum?* or *Inwiefern?* are particularly useful in this regard. It should not be expected that the candidate will know any specific information on an unexpected topic chosen by the Examiner, perhaps a topic of current affairs, or even necessarily have an opinion about it. If this is the case, it would be better to switch quickly to a different topic.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/21
Reading and Writing

Key Messages

- For **Questions 3 and 4** it is very important that candidates use their own words in their responses, as this paper is designed to test Writing as well as Reading comprehension. The guidance ***ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben*** is highlighted in the instructions to **Questions 3 and 4**. Major lifting of textual material, including the mere re-arrangement of words in key phrases, cannot receive credit for comprehension. In particular, where imagery, idioms and key vocabulary are used to convey ideas in the texts, candidates are expected to show their understanding of these in their own words.
- The paragraph indicators given at the end of each sub-question, indicate where the answer material is to be sought, thus helping candidates to follow the progression of the text concerned. Candidates need therefore to demonstrate their understanding of the new question in context and how it relates to the new paragraph detail. This is all the more important where the same paragraph is indicated for successive questions.
- Some answers to **Question 5 (a)** were again too long, and candidates did not heed the word-limit stated. The response to parts **(a)** and **(b)** of this question should together not exceed 140 words. (See further guidance below). This is an exercise in summary skills, which demands some ability to select, interpret and relate main points. Time management for this paper should therefore take account of the need to organise and plan an answer to this final question. It should be noted that this question asks for a summary and personal opinion, not just a personal statement. Many candidates felt very strongly about the topic (lack of career women) that they either did not deliver a summary at all or just a very brief one before giving their personal opinion.

General comments

Both texts this year on the theme of lack of women in high positions in business in Germany were clearly accessible to the considerable majority of candidates. Whilst the range of marks achieved was again wide, a good number of papers showed excellent comprehension and were of a high standard linguistically.

Candidates should be advised to write clearly and legibly, and ideally to leave a line between answers within **Questions 3 and 4**, as well as some distinctive space between these Question sets. It is helpful if a candidate's answer sheets are properly fastened together; without using poly pockets.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 (Erster Teil)

Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)

Most candidates coped well with this exercise. In some cases, candidates were unable to find a substitute for *zunehmend* and did not find (*immer*) *mehr* in the text. Some candidates tried to guess synonyms that were not in the text; although the instructions clearly state that all words can be found between lines 1-6.

Question 2 (Grammatical manipulation)

Again, most candidates coped well with this exercise and managed to manipulate the sentences correctly. There is however a noticeable trend of not using the accusative, even with very strong candidates. (Die vielen Chefs finden *den* Frauenmangel peinlich).

The grammatical manipulation task requires a sound knowledge of German grammar and structures. In order to prepare candidates successfully; teaching should focus on subject/verb accord, passive and active voice, tenses, conjugation of verbs, separable verbs and sub-clauses with *dass*, *weil* etc.

Question 3

Many candidates were able to manipulate the language of the text effectively and successfully produced 'own language' answers. Others were reluctant to move away from key language items and text sequencing. As stated above, the simple reproduction of a section of the text by way of an answer does not confirm comprehension and hence cannot receive credit.

- (a) This was answered correctly by the majority of candidates; however some candidates lost marks by only including the statistics for one year (2015), but not mentioning the prognosis for 2020.
- (b) Some candidates lost marks because they did not understand that there should be at least 3 women on a team of 10 (not 10 **plus** 3).
- (c) The majority of candidates managed to answer this question correctly and scored 2 marks. However, some candidates were unsure how to answer **Questions (c) and (d)** and gave nearly identical answers to both questions.
- (d) See comment for (c)
- (e) Most candidates earned three marks for listing the three problems that women face in the workplace.
- (f) Most candidates were able to earn full marks available here. Again there was some over-reliance on the text.

Section 2 (Zweiter Teil)

Question 4

This question set, as should be expected, was a little more demanding. Some candidates coped equally well, and occasionally better, with it. Again there were some problems with over-reliance on the text. This was especially evident in **Question (b)**, where many candidates copied *mit Babys und Staubsauger* directly from the text without putting it in their own words or explaining the idea that according to the statement women are better at looking after children and the household.

Question 5

In their responses to this task candidates are required to summarise the main issues and arguments presented in the two texts in the form of continuous prose. A list of bullet points is not an appropriate format. It is clearly important to consider the question carefully for its direction. Both texts should be referred to, and candidates should expect to present an organised overview of the relevant elements, and how they relate to each other, extracting the main points from the detail. This year the question was asking who is to blame for Germany's lack of career women.

It should be made very clear to candidates in preparation for this Paper that the word limit of 140 encompasses both parts of the question, and that therefore the conciseness and effectiveness of their writing is likely to have a bearing on achievement. Some candidates wasted words initially by re-stating the outline of the task, without moving forward. Candidates who wrote at considerable length, without apparent regard for any word limit, invariably forfeited marks for the 'personal response' part of their answer, because they left this too late. The marking of this exercise must cease at the end of the sentence after 140 words, with an absolute limit set at 150 words, and teachers are advised to ensure that candidates are aware of this.

As a general point, candidates benefit considerably from advance practice in the skills of summary, which involve selection and analysis. It is recommended that candidates draft a plan before writing up their answer, which will help them to organise their delivery, and minimise the need for untidy crossings-out. It is good practice and helpful also to provide a word-count. This is checked, and is expected to be accurate.

There were a good number of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to earn some five or six of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question. Candidates should aim to

strike a good balance of selected textual points, drawn from the different approaches of the two texts for their overall relevance to the question. Some answers explored too much of the detail, some were too generalised or superficial and made little reference to textual points and some were personal opinion without any foundation in the texts.

Candidates' clearly preferred option is to address **Question 5** in two distinct parts, indicating **(a)** and **(b)** in their response. However, if they should choose to write a 'combination' essay, thus covering both parts of the question in the one sequence, it is essential that personal views and ideas be made completely clear as such, and distinguishable from points adduced from the texts.

Language:

The remaining five marks in **Question 5** are for the Quality of the Language, and for most candidates marks here were broadly comparable with those awarded for **Question sets 3 and 4**, as might reasonably be expected. Where responses fall significantly short of 140 words, the language mark must be restricted.

Persistent errors were seen in the non-distinction of *dass* and *das*, and also in gender and prepositional use. Overall, candidates experience the greatest difficulty with text language adaptation, which may then lead them to various sorts of error. At the same time, there were again a good many candidates who were able to write both fluently and impressively, and their responses frequently made excellent and interesting reading.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/22
Reading and Writing

Key Messages

- For **Questions 3 and 4** it is very important that candidates use their own words in their responses, as this paper is designed to test Writing as well as Reading comprehension. The guidance ***ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben*** is highlighted in the instructions to **Questions 3 and 4**. Major lifting of textual material, including the mere re-arrangement of words in key phrases, cannot receive credit for comprehension. In particular, where imagery, idioms and key vocabulary are used to convey ideas in the texts, candidates are expected to show their understanding of these in their own words.
- The paragraph indicators given at the end of each sub-question, indicate where the answer material is to be sought, thus helping candidates to follow the progression of the text concerned. Candidates need therefore to demonstrate their understanding of the new question in context and how it relates to the new paragraph detail. This is all the more important where the same paragraph is indicated for successive questions.
- Some answers to **Question 5 (a)** were again too long, and candidates did not heed the word-limit stated. The response to parts **(a)** and **(b)** of this question should together not exceed 140 words. (See further guidance below). This is an exercise in summary skills, which demands some ability to select, interpret and relate main points. Time management for this paper should therefore take account of the need to organise and plan an answer to this final question. It should be noted that this question asks for a summary and personal opinion, not just a personal statement. Many candidates felt very strongly about the topic (lack of career women) that they either did not deliver a summary at all or just a very brief one before giving their personal opinion.

General comments

Both texts this year on the theme of lack of women in high positions in business in Germany were clearly accessible to the considerable majority of candidates. Whilst the range of marks achieved was again wide, a good number of papers showed excellent comprehension and were of a high standard linguistically.

Candidates should be advised to write clearly and legibly, and ideally to leave a line between answers within **Questions 3 and 4**, as well some distinctive space between these Question sets. It is helpful if a candidate's answer sheets are properly fastened together; without using poly pockets.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 (Erster Teil)

Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)

Most candidates coped well with this exercise. In some cases, candidates were unable to find a substitute for *zunehmend* and did not find (*immer*) *mehr* in the text. Some candidates tried to guess synonyms that were not in the text; although the instructions clearly state that all words can be found between lines 1-6.

Question 2 (Grammatical manipulation)

Again, most candidates coped well with this exercise and managed to manipulate the sentences correctly. There is however a noticeable trend of not using the accusative, even with very strong candidates. (Die vielen Chefs finden *den* Frauenmangel peinlich).

The grammatical manipulation task requires a sound knowledge of German grammar and structures. In order to prepare candidates successfully; teaching should focus on subject/verb accord, passive and active voice, tenses, conjugation of verbs, separable verbs and sub-clauses with *dass*, *weil* etc.

Question 3

Many candidates were able to manipulate the language of the text effectively and successfully produced 'own language' answers. Others were reluctant to move away from key language items and text sequencing. As stated above, the simple reproduction of a section of the text by way of an answer does not confirm comprehension and hence cannot receive credit.

- (a) This was answered correctly by the majority of candidates; however some candidates lost marks by only including the statistics for one year (2015), but not mentioning the prognosis for 2020.
- (b) Some candidates lost marks because they did not understand that there should be at least 3 women on a team of 10 (not 10 **plus** 3).
- (c) The majority of candidates managed to answer this question correctly and scored 2 marks, However, some candidates were unsure how to answer **Questions (c) and (d)** and gave nearly identical answers to both questions.
- (d) See comment for (c)
- (e) Most candidates earned three marks for listing the three problems that women face in the workplace.
- (f) Most candidates were able to earn full marks available here. Again there was some over-reliance on the text.

Section 2 (Zweiter Teil)

Question 4

This question set, as should be expected, was a little more demanding. Some candidates coped equally well, and occasionally better, with it. Again there were some problems with over-reliance on the text. This was especially evident in **Question (b)**, where many candidates copied mit *Babys und Staubsauger* directly from the text without putting it in their own words or explaining the idea that according to the statement women are better at looking after children and the household.

Question 5

In their responses to this task candidates are required to summarise the main issues and arguments presented in the two texts in the form of continuous prose. A list of bullet points is not an appropriate format. It is clearly important to consider the question carefully for its direction. Both texts should be referred to, and candidates should expect to present an organised overview of the relevant elements, and how they relate to each other, extracting the main points from the detail. This year the question was asking who is to blame for Germany's lack of career women.

It should be made very clear to candidates in preparation for this Paper that the word limit of 140 encompasses both parts of the question, and that therefore the conciseness and effectiveness of their writing is likely to have a bearing on achievement. Some candidates wasted words initially by re-stating the outline of the task, without moving forward. Candidates who wrote at considerable length, without apparent regard for any word limit, invariably forfeited marks for the 'personal response' part of their answer, because they left this too late. The marking of this exercise must cease at the end of the sentence after 140 words, with an absolute limit set at 150 words, and teachers are advised to ensure that candidates are aware of this.

As a general point, candidates benefit considerably from advance practice in the skills of summary, which involve selection and analysis. It is recommended that candidates draft a plan before writing up their answer, which will help them to organise their delivery, and minimise the need for untidy crossings-out. It is good practice and helpful also to provide a word-count. This is checked, and is expected to be accurate.

There were a good number of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to earn some five or six of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question. Candidates should aim to

strike a good balance of selected textual points, drawn from the different approaches of the two texts for their overall relevance to the question. Some answers explored too much of the detail, some were too generalised or superficial and made little reference to textual points and some were personal opinion without any foundation in the texts.

Candidates' clearly preferred option is to address **Question 5** in two distinct parts, indicating **(a)** and **(b)** in their response. However, if they should choose to write a 'combination' essay, thus covering both parts of the question in the one sequence, it is essential that personal views and ideas be made completely clear as such, and distinguishable from points adduced from the texts.

Language:

The remaining five marks in **Question 5** are for the Quality of the Language, and for most candidates marks here were broadly comparable with those awarded for **Question sets 3 and 4**, as might reasonably be expected. Where responses fall significantly short of 140 words, the language mark must be restricted.

Persistent errors were seen in the non-distinction of *dass* and *das*, and also in gender and prepositional use. Overall, candidates experience the greatest difficulty with text language adaptation, which may then lead them to various sorts of error. At the same time, there were again a good many candidates who were able to write both fluently and impressively, and their responses frequently made excellent and interesting reading.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/23
Reading and Writing

Key Messages

- For **Questions 3 and 4** it is very important that candidates use their own words in their responses, as this paper is designed to test Writing as well as Reading comprehension. The guidance ***ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben*** is highlighted in the instructions to **Questions 3 and 4**. Major lifting of textual material, including the mere re-arrangement of words in key phrases, cannot receive credit for comprehension. In particular, where imagery, idioms and key vocabulary are used to convey ideas in the texts, candidates are expected to show their understanding of these in their own words.
- The paragraph indicators given at the end of each sub-question, indicate where the answer material is to be sought, thus helping candidates to follow the progression of the text concerned. Candidates need therefore to demonstrate their understanding of the new question in context and how it relates to the new paragraph detail. This is all the more important where the same paragraph is indicated for successive questions.
- Some answers to **Question 5 (a)** were again too long, and candidates did not heed the word-limit stated. The response to parts **(a)** and **(b)** of this question should together not exceed 140 words. (See further guidance below). This is an exercise in summary skills, which demands some ability to select, interpret and relate main points. Time management for this paper should therefore take account of the need to organise and plan an answer to this final question.

General comments

Both texts this year on the theme of car sharing were clearly accessible to the considerable majority of candidates. Whilst the range of marks achieved was again wide, a good number of papers showed excellent comprehension and were of a high standard linguistically.

There was some evidence that weaker candidates did not always understand the questions, tending to focus on particular words within questions and then moving directly to the paragraph indicated. Even though the textual paragraphs were short, some answers were then long in the attempt to include every detail.

Candidates should be advised to write clearly and legibly, and ideally to leave a line between answers within **Questions 3 and 4**, as well some distinctive space between these Question sets. It is helpful if a candidate's answer sheets are properly fastened together, without using poly pockets.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 (Erster Teil)

Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly. Very occasionally CO₂ was suggested.
- (b) This was usually answered correctly, but incorrect answers included *überreden*.
- (c) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (d) This was mostly answered correctly.

- (e) This was mostly answered correctly.

Question 2 (*Grammatical manipulation*)

This exercise was found more challenging by weaker candidates.

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly. However, the passive construction was not always known.
- (b) This was usually answered correctly. However, the comparative was not always correct.
- (c) This was usually answered correctly. A change of tense was not awarded.
- (d) This was usually answered correctly.
- (e) This was usually answered correctly. There was occasional difficulty with the gender of *Mitgliedschaft*.

Question 3

Many candidates were able to manipulate the language of the text effectively and successfully producing 'own language' answers. Others were reluctant to move away from key language items and text sequencing. As stated above, the simple reproduction of a section of the text by way of an answer does not confirm comprehension and hence cannot receive credit.

- (a) Most candidates were able to earn two marks here. However, the text statements on *Kilometergeld* and *Kosten pro Stunde* were quite often reproduced in their entirety.
- (b) There was some tendency to focus only on one point; either on only needing to fill up on petrol when the tank is empty or on getting the money back at the end of the month. Some candidates copied the entirety of the last two sentences of the paragraph.
- (c) Most candidates were able to earn at least two of the three marks available here. Again there was some over-reliance on the text.
- (d) Many candidates were not able to see the bigger picture here and did not understand the concept of loss of personal freedom. Even though the question was asking for disadvantages, candidates tended to list items that you **can** leave in your own car.
- (e) Most candidates earned three marks for listing three categories of people who would benefit from car sharing. Very occasionally, candidates misunderstood the concept of a car as a status symbol and said that people who hold their cars in high esteem would benefit from car sharing. Others relied rather too heavily and closely on the long text sequence *Für Leute, die täglich.....*
- (f) Most candidates were able to earn at least two of the three marks available here. Again there was some over-reliance on the text.

Section 2 (*Zweiter Teil*)

Question 4

This question set, as should be expected, was a little more demanding. Some candidates coped equally well, and occasionally better, with it. Again there were some problems with over-reliance on the text.

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify the problem of only one occupant per car, but did not make the connection to unnecessary trips in general.
- (b) Most candidates earned the full 3 marks here, explaining Daniela's difficulties with her first car sharing experience.
- (c) This 3 mark question was generally accessible, and a good number of candidates were able to earn at least 2 marks. Some candidates only mentioned one inconvenience, either the length of time or the inflexible dropping-off arrangements.

- (d) Weaker candidates experienced difficulty here in relating the question to the material in the paragraph, and simply copied the whole paragraph without any attempt at rephrasing. The mention of the spoilt weekend was superfluous, as it is only a consequence of the problems with the car. However, it did not invalidate candidates' answers.
- (e) Most candidates were able to earn at least two of the three marks available here.

Question 5

In their responses to this task candidates are required to summarise the main issues and arguments presented in the two texts in the form of continuous prose. A list of bullet points is not an appropriate format. It is clearly important to consider the question carefully for its direction. Both texts should be referred to, and candidates should expect to present an organised overview of the relevant elements, and how they relate to each other, extracting the main points from the detail. This year a summary, as presented in the texts, of the advantages and disadvantages of car sharing was required.

It should be made very clear to candidates in preparation for this Paper that the word limit of 140 encompasses both parts of the question, and that therefore the conciseness and effectiveness of their writing is likely to have a bearing on achievement. Some candidates wasted words initially by re-stating the outline of the task, without moving forward. Candidates who wrote at considerable length, without apparent regard for any word limit, invariably forfeited marks for the 'personal response' part of their answer, because they left this too late. The marking of this exercise must cease at the end of the sentence after 140 words, with an absolute limit set at 150 words, and teachers are advised to ensure that candidates are aware of this.

As a general point, candidates benefit considerably from advance practice in the skills of summary, which involve selection and analysis. It is recommended that candidates draft a plan before writing up their answer, which will help them to organise their delivery.

There were a good number of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to earn some six or seven of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question. Candidates should aim to strike a good balance of selected textual points, drawn from the different approaches of the two texts for their overall relevance to the question. Some answers explored too much of the detail and failed to see the bigger picture (stating that *car sharing cars are always dirty and always smell of tobacco*), some were too generalised or superficial and made little reference to textual points.

Candidates' clearly preferred option is to address **Question 5** in two distinct parts, indicating **(a)** and **(b)** in their response. However, if they should choose to write a 'combination' essay, thus covering both parts of the question in the one sequence, it is essential that personal views and ideas be made completely clear as such, and distinguishable from points adduced from the texts. In part **(b)** answers this year there were some original and interesting references to meeting new people while car sharing and reference to the situation in the candidate's home country or own experience. Other candidates restricted themselves to simple personal opinions of the textual content, and this often tended to limit their achievement here.

Language:

The remaining five marks in **Question 5** are for the Quality of the Language, and for most candidates marks here were broadly comparable with those awarded for **Question sets 3 and 4**, as might reasonably be expected. Where responses fall significantly short of 140 words, the language mark must be restricted.

Persistent errors were seen in the non-distinction of *dass* and *das*, and also in gender and prepositional use. Overall, candidates experience the greatest difficulty with text language adaptation, which may then lead them to various sorts of error. At the same time, there were again a good many candidates who were able to write both fluently and impressively, and their responses frequently made excellent reading.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/31
Essay

General Comments:

This series the essays were quite well distributed between the topics. There was a wide range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to those where the candidate struggled for ideas and wandered away from the title they were supposed to be addressing. It is important that candidates study the essay question carefully so that they are clear about what they are being asked to discuss.

Nearly all candidates attempt to provide an introduction and a conclusion and organise their points into paragraphs. There are still a number of candidates who write a general essay on the topic area and do not address the specific title. The content of these essays cannot be considered to be satisfactory. Many candidates head their essay with the topic title rather than the essay title which, although shorter, is no help to the candidate in keeping the essay on track. It is pleasing to note that many candidates take time to plan and organise their ideas before starting to write.

Some candidates have an excellent command of German and achieve marks for Language in the Very Good category. They have an impressive array of vocabulary at their disposal, both general and topic-specific and are ambitious in their use of structure. Some of these are semi-native speakers whose errors are generally of a phonetic nature. There are also candidates who have a wide ranging vocabulary but still have difficulties with rudimentary grammar and make basic errors. If possible, it is a good idea to leave some time at the end of the examination to check for careless language errors.

Common errors:

- interference from English tempts some candidates to use *Sie* instead of *man*
- confusion between *man / Mann* and *das, dass*
- confusion between *wenn, wann, als*
- confusion between *vorher, bevor, vor*
- confusion between *um* and *damit*
- word order after subordinating conjunctions
- nouns without articles

Question 1

Inwiefern sollte die Regierung beeinflussen, was wir essen und trinken, damit wir gesund bleiben?

This was quite a popular title producing a wide range of opinions from those advocating significant government intervention in our eating habits to those who considered it would be an infringement of human rights to do so. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the healthy eating side of the question at the expense of the government role.

Question 2

Wie sieht die Zukunft für Entwicklungsländer aus? Sind Sie optimistisch oder pessimistisch? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.

A minority of candidates chose this title but the responses were mostly thoughtful even though they reached quite different conclusions. Many appeared to have direct experience of the issues they raised in their essays.

Question 3

„Gruppenreisen sind keine gute Erfahrung. Nur wenn man allein reist, kann man ein fremdes Land wirklich kennenlernen.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?

This was a popular title, which was within the experience of all candidates and did not require extensive topic-specific vocabulary. The balance between those favouring group travel and those who prefer to travel solo was fairly even but some concentrated too much on this aspect of the title to the exclusion of the "getting to know a foreign country" element. It is important to keep referring to the title during the examination to check that what is being written is fully relevant.

Question 4

„Generationskonflikte gibt es in vielen Kulturen.“ Stimmt das Ihrer Meinung nach?

A number of candidates chose this title and were quite well versed in the problems that can occur between the generations but the references to other cultures were often limited.

Question 5

Haben arme Kinder die gleichen Chancen in der Schule wie Kinder aus reichen Familien? Was meinen Sie?

Many candidates chose this title and enthusiastically explored the difference in opportunities afforded to rich and poor children in school. Most concluded that there was little equality and that the situation varied in different parts of the world.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/32

Essay

General Comments:

This series the essays were quite well distributed between the topics. There was a wide range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to those where the candidate struggled for ideas and wandered away from the title they were supposed to be addressing. It is important that candidates study the essay question carefully so that they are clear about what they are being asked to discuss.

Nearly all candidates attempt to provide an introduction and a conclusion and organise their points into paragraphs. There are still a number of candidates who write a general essay on the topic area and do not address the specific title. The content of these essays cannot be considered to be satisfactory. Many candidates head their essay with the topic title rather than the essay title which, although shorter, is no help to the candidate in keeping the essay on track. It is pleasing to note that many candidates take time to plan and organise their ideas before starting to write.

Some candidates have an excellent command of German and achieve marks for Language in the Very Good category. They have an impressive array of vocabulary at their disposal, both general and topic-specific and are ambitious in their use of structure. Some of these are semi-native speakers whose errors are generally of a phonetic nature. There are also candidates who have a wide ranging vocabulary but still have difficulties with rudimentary grammar and make basic errors. If possible, it is a good idea to leave some time at the end of the examination to check for careless language errors.

Common errors:

- interference from English tempts some candidates to use *Sie* instead of *man*
- confusion between *man / Mann* and *das, dass*
- confusion between *wenn, wann, als*
- confusion between *vorher, bevor, vor*
- confusion between *um* and *damit*
- word order after subordinating conjunctions
- nouns without articles

Question 1

Inwiefern sollte die Regierung beeinflussen, was wir essen und trinken, damit wir gesund bleiben?

This was quite a popular title producing a wide range of opinions from those advocating significant government intervention in our eating habits to those who considered it would be an infringement of human rights to do so. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the healthy eating side of the question at the expense of the government role.

Question 2

Wie sieht die Zukunft für Entwicklungsländer aus? Sind Sie optimistisch oder pessimistisch? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.

A minority of candidates chose this title but the responses were mostly thoughtful even though they reached quite different conclusions. Many appeared to have direct experience of the issues they raised in their essays.

Question 3

„Gruppenreisen sind keine gute Erfahrung. Nur wenn man allein reist, kann man ein fremdes Land wirklich kennenlernen.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?

This was a popular title, which was within the experience of all candidates and did not require extensive topic-specific vocabulary. The balance between those favouring group travel and those who prefer to travel solo was fairly even but some concentrated too much on this aspect of the title to the exclusion of the "getting to know a foreign country" element. It is important to keep referring to the title during the examination to check that what is being written is fully relevant.

Question 4

„Generationskonflikte gibt es in vielen Kulturen.“ Stimmt das Ihrer Meinung nach?

A number of candidates chose this title and were quite well versed in the problems that can occur between the generations but the references to other cultures were often limited.

Question 5

Haben arme Kinder die gleichen Chancen in der Schule wie Kinder aus reichen Familien? Was meinen Sie?

Many candidates chose this title and enthusiastically explored the difference in opportunities afforded to rich and poor children in school. Most concluded that there was little equality and that the situation varied in different parts of the world.

GERMAN

Paper 8683/33

Essay

General Comments:

Few candidates tackled the essay on *The Developing World* but otherwise the essays were quite evenly distributed between the topics. As always there was the complete range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to those where the candidate struggled both for ideas and the means to express them.

Most candidates produced an essay of an appropriate length. Nearly all candidates are aware of the need to provide an introduction and a conclusion and to organise their material into paragraphs. Although it is only a small minority who write a general essay on the topic and ignore the title, there are very many candidates who start off with the title very much in mind and then wander off-course (possibly reproducing material from a practice essay) and draw a conclusion that has no relevance either to the title or to their own introduction. It would be helpful if the candidates copied out the question rather than the topic to remind them of the direction their essay should be taking. Judging by the number of candidates who write their essay more than once on the answer sheet, the time allotted for the topic essay should be sufficient to allow for some thought before writing and thorough checking after writing.

Some candidates have an excellent command of German and achieve marks for Language in the Very Good category. They have an impressive array of vocabulary at their disposal, both general and topic-specific and are ambitious in their use of structure. Some of these are semi-native speakers whose errors are generally of a phonetic nature. There are many candidates who have a wide ranging vocabulary but still have difficulties with rudimentary grammar and make basic errors.

Common errors:

- interference from English tempts some candidates to use *Sie* instead of *man*
- confusion between *man* / *Mann* and *das*, *dass*
- confusion between *ob* and *wenn*, *wann* and *als*
- confusion between *bevor*, *vorher* and *vor*
- confusion between *um* and *damit*
- plural forms of nouns, for example an extra *-n* added to *Kinder* and *Länder*
- nouns without articles
- agreement in number between verb and subject: singular subject with plural verb and vice versa

Question 1

„Wir essen alle zu viel Fleisch.“ Was halten Sie von diesem Standpunkt?

The health benefits and drawbacks of eating meat may be relevant but they are not the only issues to consider when responding to this title. The most successful essays also addressed the implications for the environment from the increasing consumption of meat. The word *alle* could also be explored and again the better candidates pointed out, not only that vegetarianism is quite widespread but that many people in the world have insufficient food and probably eat very little meat.

Question 2

Was könnten Ihrer Meinung nach die industrialisierten Länder von den Entwicklungsländern lernen?

Very few candidates attempted this title and the resulting essays were rarely successful, either because they misunderstood the question or because they wrote generally on the topic and failed to address the title.

Question 3

„Der Tourismus zerstört was die Touristen sehen wollen.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?

This title provided an opportunity to discuss the tensions between tourism and the environment and the effect of tourism on a country's cultural heritage. Many candidates rose to the challenge and produced relevant and well illustrated arguments which led them to different but equally valid conclusions. There were, however, a number of weaker candidates who lapsed into a descriptive account of tourism and failed to address the issues mentioned above.

Question 4

Die Kluft zwischen den Generationen ist am größten im Bereich der Kommunikationstechnologie. Was meinen Sie?

There were some thoughtful essays on this topic which referred to other generational differences as well as the attitude to modern technology. Some candidates concentrated almost exclusively on the communication technology aspect of the title and lost sight of the generation gap.

Question 5

Haben Frauen die gleichen Chancen in der Sportwelt wie Männer?

This title produced some interesting ideas on the position of women in sport and most candidates focused on the difference in physical strength between the sexes. Surprisingly the financial aspect was rarely explored and more use could have been made of specific examples to illustrate the points made.