



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2022**

**GCE German 9GN0 02**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2022

Publications Code 9GN0\_02\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

Congratulations to candidates and centres for preparing so effectively for this paper despite the challenging circumstances of the last two years. It is a significant achievement in any year to prepare for a translation into German and to read, think about and respond critically in German to two works of literature and film. This year all the more so.

There were some very impressive performances from candidates who effectively communicated the message of the translation with strong control of grammar and in particular good control of verbs and word order. These candidates produced a high level of critical response in articulate language – by no means error free, but in control.

Most candidates were able to make a reasonable attempt at the translation, and to address the questions posed in Sections B and C at least to some extent. For some candidates this was a successful use of well selected evidence and critical commentary with real thought to how this could be used to answer the question. For others this was an attempt to adapt a related essay with greater or lesser success. Lower down the range, candidates tended to narrate or describe, and to assert unpersuasive claims.

Overall, it was a delight to be marking again, and to see what candidates were able to achieve.

## Question 1

The translation was generally well attempted and the full range of marks from 0 – 20 was accessed. The mean mark was very slightly under 10.

Examiners recognise that German is a grammatically complex language, particularly the case system, and take this into account when marking the translation, in order to be fair to candidates and to achieve comparability with other languages. For instance, it is felt that, while cases should be assessed, a candidate with strong lexis, verb construction and word order but a wobbly grasp of cases should be able to gain marks for what they do well rather than losing a mark in every box because of case troubles. For this reason, examiners expect an acceptable version of communication, verbs and word order to be present in every box, and additional grammatical features such as cases, adjective endings, prepositions and other structures are specifically targetted in about half the boxes.

For instance, "her job" was isolated in box 2, and the masculine accusative case ending in "ihren Job" was targetted. Where candidates selected a feminine noun such as Arbeit, this was accepted as long as the candidate wrote, "ihre Arbeit". In box 8, "with unemployed people" was isolated and the dative plural required. In box 5 by contrast, examiners looked for verbs, word order and communication, and did not require a correct ending on "erfolgreich".

In box 16, "since her childhood in the GDR", it became clear in the preparatory stages that "seit ihrer Kindheit" did not discriminate, in that almost everyone got the case after "seit" wrong. Rather than take a mark away from everyone, it was decided to look for communication and word order, and to target, "in the GDR". This did discriminate – a significant minority of candidates wrote "in die DDR" and a few wrote "in die GDR". "Childhood" also offered opportunities for discrimination. Many candidates did not know "Kindheit". However, examiners accepted reasonable attempts to form a German compound noun which communicated. So "Kindzeit" and "Kinderheit" were accepted, but "Kinderschaft" was not, because it communicated the idea of a large group of children, along the lines of "Mannschaft".

The emphasis in the decision making process is on fairness to candidates, discrimination across the whole mark range, and comparability. This is not to say that the case system is the only difficulty one might encounter. Chinese, for example, has almost no case system – the words for I and me are the same, for example, but it is definitely not an easy language. However, it is impossible to write sentences without the case system, so the Senior Team has made the best effort to deal with the realities in the marking.

Communication on the whole was fairly strong. Even where candidates had grammatical difficulties, they did know many or most of the key words they needed to communicate the message of the translation. Examiners took a fairly generous approach to what communicated. For example, in box 8, "with unemployed people", "mit Arbeitslosen" was a beautiful answer, as was "mit arbeitslosen Leuten". Examiners also accepted less beautiful communication, such as, "mit Leuten, die keinen Job hatten" or "mit Leuten ohne Arbeit". In box 5, examiners accepted "Fragen stellen", "befragen", and even, "verhören", on the basis that it is a form of interview which is stricter than but related to journalistic interviews, and about half the cohort was familiar with this item of lexis from the film "Das Leben der Anderen". "Vorstellungsgespräch", on the other hand, whilst also a form of interview, gave completely the wrong mental image, and did not communicate.

At the top of the range, verb formation and agreements were well done. The main mistake towards this end of the range was using the wrong tense. Boxes 14 and 18, for example, were often written in the present tense, even in responses that were otherwise competent. Boxes 7, 10 and 11 were designed to challenge candidates towards the top end of the range. A pleasing number of candidates were able to cope with the challenge. Towards the lower end of the range, agreements were wobbly and basic tense formation was patchy. In box 4, examiners saw "magte" frequently.

On the whole, candidates coped well with German's complex word order, mainly getting the inversion in box 7 and the warum clause in box 19, for example. At the very bottom of the range, word order tended to follow the English.

In addition to boxes 2, 8 and 16 which targeted cases, box 3 targeted an adjective without ending, box 9 targeted a relative clause, box 13 targeted an "um ... zu..." clause, box 15 targeted a preposition (although 'makes sense' was the criterion rather than absolute idiomatic accuracy), box 17 targeted consistency of adjective endings and an opinion phrase, and box 20 targeted the use of "alles".

K

find ihre Arbeit bei einer

Anna found her job at a Berlin newspaper interesting. The tasks were varied. She liked asking politicians about their initiatives. Anna often interviewed successful immigrants and was always optimistic afterwards. However, she had also talked with unemployed people who hoped that the AfD would help them. They would be disappointed, Anna thought.

Geschichte?  
Gefühl?  
Energie?

This afternoon, Anna wanted to meet a Turkish actress, to discuss her social project. While she walked, Anna reflected on the changes in Berlin since her childhood in the GDR. The new cultural energy was, in Anna's opinion, positive, but she understood why some people felt threatened. Everything was different now.

Anna fand ihre Arbeit bei einer Berliner Zeitung interessant.

Die Aufgaben waren verschieden. Sie mochte Politiker fragen über

ihren Initiativen zu stellen. Anna befragte oft erfolgreiche

Immigranten und war immer danach Optimistisch. Dennoch, ~~noch~~ hat

sie auch mit Arbeitslosen geredet die hofften, dass die AfD

ihnen helfen würden. Anna dachte, dass sie enttäuscht sein würden.

Diesen Nachmittag, wollte Anna eine Türkische Schauspielerin treffen,

um ihr soziales Projekt zu ~~besprechen~~ besprechen. Während sie

gegangen ist, reflektierte Anna auf den Unterschieden in Berlin seit

ihrer Kindheit in der DDR. Die neue kulturelle Energie

war, Anna's Meinung nach, positiv, aber sie verstand warum manche

Leute sich bedroht fühlten. Alles war jetzt anders.



This is a strong candidate, despite some errors. Boxes 7 and 15 were not awarded. Box 7 was the wrong tense, it should have been "hatte". Examiners felt that "auf" in box 15 did not communicate. Box 4 was marginal, as it should have been either "mochte es .. zu + infinitive" or "mochte ... infinitive", but examiners decided that getting "mochte" rather than, for example "magte", was enough.

It was accepted that a candidate might think that "die AFD" was a plural noun.

Errors such as "über ihren Initiativen" instead of "ihre" were tolerated.

This response scored 18 marks.

## **Question 2 (a)**

A small cohort of candidates addressed this question, and were spread across the whole mark range. On the whole, candidates were well prepared to talk about the social and historical context of "Andorra", with reference to both Frisch's intentions to create a model and the numerous reflections of post-War Europe in the play. The strongest candidates offered some insightful interpretation and commentary using well selected evidence to support their views, whereas weaker candidates told parts of the story and asserted that they were relevant.

## **Question 2 (b)**

A small cohort addressed this question, with responses covering a very wide range of marks. On the whole, candidates were well prepared to talk about the "Lehrer" and the "Soldat". Stronger candidates focused on their importance for the work, with links to how they represented key themes and concepts. Lower down the range, candidates focused on their importance in terms of moving the plot on. At the lowest end of the range, candidates described what these characters did.



### Question 3 (a)

Candidates were roughly evenly split between Q03(a) and Q03(b), and the whole range of marks was accessed. Candidates were well able to talk about Ill and most candidates were able to discuss whether Ill was the victim or Claire. Some stronger candidates were able to consider that Ill and Claire were each others' victims, and a few were able to consider the extent to which the townspeople were victims (even though they eventually capitulated to the love of money and Claire's offer). Other strong candidates considered what might make someone a victim, and whether it was possible to be a victim if your own actions had set the train of events in motion. The strongest candidates selected evidence carefully, and made thoughtful, carefully controlled arguments which fully linked together.

Some candidates focused on whether Ill was a victim or a perpetrator, with insufficient adaptation to the requirements of the question. At the lower end of the range, candidates were able to talk more generally about Ill or about the work.

In dem Theater 'Der Besuch der Alten Dame' geschrieben von Friedrich Dürrenmatt wird der geliebte von der Clara Wäscher als Opfer bemahlt, da ~~er~~ <sup>ILL</sup> ~~am~~, durch die Hier ~~seiner Kollegen~~ <sup>der Bürger</sup> Güllen ermodet wird.

Der Charakter Clara Wäscher überzeugt die Bürger Güllens für eine Milliarde einen unmoralischen Deal anzunehmen. Die Bürger Güllens sehen diese Bitte als unvorstellbar doch durch ihre Wirtschaftliche zurück ~~ge~~ Gebbliebenheit wird diese Bitte doch nach einigem Überlegen in Wahrheit genommen. Da ILL die damalige Jugendtreibe geschwängert hatte, aber dann die Vatersehaft beschriftet hatte, indem er zwei Männer bezahlt hatte ~~die~~ ~~zugriffen~~ sie hätten sie geschwängert. Die Wörter 'Schwarzer Panther' beschreibe ILL in seiner Jugend welche ihn als selbst relevant beschriebte und wenig Interesse für Moral.

Da, Clara Wäscher nachdem der Angebllichen Lüge aus Güllen rausgeschmissen würde, wollte sie Rache. Dürrenmatt benützt Wäschers aufgebauten Reichtum als Lähre, indem er die Meinung unterstützt, das Geld einen Menschen nicht Ändern kann um moralisch Korrekt zu werden. Man sieht ILL's verzweiflung, indem er unruhiger wird als die Bürger um ihn plötzlich anfangen sich schöne Materriale

Sachen zu kaufen, obwohl das Örtchen Gullen keine positive wirtschaftliche Vermögung hatte. Dürrenmatt benützt die Wörter 'Ich bin verloren' als Anzeige von Ills ~~versch~~ Verzweiflung 'er fiel auf die Knie ~~und~~ und senkte sein Kopf auf den Boden'. Die geplante Rache gegenüber Ill war aggressive und unmoralisch doch keiner der Bürger verstand ihn, weil ihre Gier zum Belt immer weiter wächste. Dies macht Ill als Opfer da, er wird für was bestraft was er in seiner Jugend gemacht hatte, obwohl er seinen Fehler einsteht, ist die Rache für Clara wichtiger, wahrscheinlich weil sie will ihn zeigen wie er sich fühlt ausgegränzt zu werden und keine vertraute Person zu haben weil alle gegen einen sind.

Der Title 'Der Besuch der alten Dame' könnte darauf hinweisen das Clara Wäseher in der Vergangenheit zurück-geblieben sei. Da Dürrenmatt das Wort 'alten' benützt spiegelt es sich mit ihrer moralischen Meinung und wie sie die Bürger behandelt. Ill ist ein Opfer durch die unmoralische Ermordung aber auch durch seine abnerzung vom Bürgermeister, weil er sein Angebot ablehnte sich als Opfer zur Ermordung aufzugeben. Es zeigt das Ill ein Mann mit Moral ist und seinen Fehler einsteht obwohl er mit der Rache nicht einverstanden ist. Die Zuschauer bekommen das Ende der Wäseher mit 'versteht' da sie ihr sogenanntes 'N Karma' bekommt.

Zum Schluss, Dürrenmatt stellt Ill als Opfer da auch wenn er in seiner Vergangenheit einen Fehler begangen ist. Es ist eine Tragödie das Theater da Ill am Ende stirbt.



The response tells the story, includes a paragraph in the middle of the second page which asserts that Ill is a victim, moves on to consideration of the word "alten" indicating that Claire has remained in the past, then expresses another couple of opinions about Ill with insufficient evidence, exploration or argument. There is some misunderstanding, and new information is included. The critical response is simplistic where it is present.

There is a wide range of structures and the lexis is fairly varied, but there is a lack of essay signposting language and language appropriate to literary discussion. The language is accurate.

Critical and analytical response: 7 marks

Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary: 17 marks

Accuracy of language: 10 marks



Avoid narration.

Omit material which is irrelevant to the question.

A simple structure would significantly improve the response, perhaps along the lines of: reasons why Ill is the victim, reasons why Ill isn't the victim, weighing up, conclusion.

### Question 3 (b)

Candidates accessed the full range of marks. Candidates were generally able to explain the elements of tragedy in the work, although they predominantly focused on the idea of tragicomedy, rather than responding to the idea in the quotation about the arousal of strong feelings being necessary for tragedy.

A few very strong candidates were able to link the idea of alienation to the lack of strong emotions in the audience. These candidates were able to consider that, to the extent that alienation succeeded in keeping the audience rational, and if strong audience emotions were necessary to call the work a tragedy, the work could not be considered a tragedy. However, they also questioned whether alienation was fully successful, and argued that the audience did feel emotions – a couple mentioned fear and pity, or the sense of overwhelming impending doom.

Some strong candidates were able to point out moments in the play when the audience must feel emotions, whether for Ill, Claire, Ill's family or the townspeople, and to link this to the idea of tragedy.

A number of candidates were able to list elements of Greek tragedy which the playwright used, and so say that it was a tragedy, although most of these did not mention the role of emotions in tragedy. Many did comment that the playwright thought that modern life was too complex for pure tragedy, but this was rarely linked effectively to the question, and more often used to segue into a discussion of the comedic aspects of the play. Alienation was most often used in reference to the comedy in the play. There was a tendency for candidates in the middle of the range to say that the grotesque elements of the play were funny, without questioning whether they were actually still funny in the twenty-first century, or how they might link to the question.

At the lower end of the range, candidates were able to make some statements about the work.

## Question 5 (a)

Candidates accessed the full range of marks on this question.

The strongest responses considered issues of memory, partial perspective and bias, as well as how Michael's stories change, and the lack of clarity which we have about Michael's objectives, which might make Michael an unreliable narrator, and explored them effectively, selecting relevant evidence from the work, and considering how much of what Michael tells us that we should accept.

Further down the range, candidates mentioned some of the same issues, and asserted that these made Michael unreliable or untrustworthy, without giving a real sense that they understood what unreliable or untrustworthy meant.

Towards the lower end of the range, candidates made points about Michael and asserted that these made Michael untrustworthy, without real links between the points they made and the conclusions they drew. For instance, Michael is very young in the first part, so he is untrustworthy.

Further down the range, candidates were able to make some comments about Michael without reference to his reliability or trustworthiness.

Beurteilen Sie, inwiefern Michael ein glaubwürdiger Erzähler ist

~~Evaluate to what extent Michael is a reliable narrator~~

Plan

① P - Er ist ein glaub. Erz. ~~war~~

E - Er erinnert sich an K. in einer Reihe von Bildern - es gibt viel Details und sie sind abstrakt

A - Der Leser weiß, dass er glaub. ist, weil ~~da~~ seine Erinnerungen sehr klar und abstrakt sind. Es ist genauso wie es passiert sind. Es hilft uns zu glauben dass er ehrlich und zuverlässig ist.

R - Er ist ein glaub. Erz. weil er hat klare Erinnerung mit viele Details ~~in~~ in einer Reihe von Bildern

② P - Er ist kein gl. Erz.

E - Er hat viele Erinnerungslücke. Er erinnert sich nicht an wie er ~~zu~~ seine Eltern bezeugt hat, oder was er und Niemann hat über Gespräche am erst mal

A - Er ist ungl. weil es gibt Sachen dass er erinnert nicht. Der Leser weiß die ganze Geschichte nicht. Er konnte vergessen haben etwas wichtiges.

R - Er ist kein gl. Erz. weil ~~er~~ er hat manche seiner Erinnerungen vergessen und wir wissen die ganze Geschichte nicht.

~~Wichtig~~

✓ passiv  
✓ plusquam  
indirekte rede  
subjunktiv





er sich erinnern kann. Wir sehen nur durch seine Perspektive. In dieser Art und Weise ist Michael kein ~~glaubwürdig~~ glaubwürdiger Erzähler weil er manche seiner Erinnerungen vergessen ~~hat~~ <sup>hat</sup> und wir wissen die ganze Geschichte nicht - er ist ~~unzuverlässig~~ unzuverlässig.

Schlussfolgend kann man sagen, dass Michael <sup>ein</sup> ziemlich aber nicht ganz glaubwürdiger Erzähler ist. Viele ~~von~~ seiner Erinnerungen sind klar und haben viele Details, aber er hat auch viele Erinnerungslücken, und deshalb wissen wir die ganze Geschichte nicht.



The candidate has organised the essay into reasons why Michael is reliable and reasons why he isn't, and there is some exploration, but it tends to be repetitive and lacks depth, and the logical connections are not strong. For instance, on the first page, the candidate talks about the detail of the imagery showing that Michael has a good memory – but this in itself does not show that he is reliable. Detail can be fabricated or misremembered. Memory is really important in the work, and Michael's memories are shifting.

The second paragraph does refer to problems with gaps in Michael's memory, but this is presented as a contradiction of the first point, and appears rather illogical. This paragraph shifts between points relating to gaps in memory and points relating to perspective. There is so much more that needs to be explored about memory, and Michael's perspective as first person narrator does not make him unreliable as such – just limited to his own perspective.

This essay is beginning to show some signs of critical response, and is somewhat organised, but needs to dig deeper, and to think about logical connections and justification, not only about "reasons why he is reliable" and "reasons why he isn't" to move to the next level.

There are some lovely structures combined with some very simple language, some variety in vocabulary combined with overuse of "ist" and "hat". There is some essay signposting language, and some technical language, but there could be more – conjunctions to connect the ideas would help. The language is mainly accurate.

Critical and analytical response: 12 marks

Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary: 16 marks

Accuracy of language: 9 marks



Think about using logical and linguistic links between ideas.

Explain and justify.

Explore beyond the first idea.

## Question 5 (b)

Candidates responded with enthusiasm to this question and accessed the full range of marks.

There were some very strong responses, in which candidates considered Hanna's various actions, and whether they could be excused by her illiteracy, with distinction between excusing, justifying, explaining and allowing the reader to feel sympathy. These candidates tended to feel that some actions, such as violence and abuse of Michael could not be excused by her illiteracy, because illiterate people can tell the difference between right and wrong. These candidates tended also to refer to Hanna as a metaphor for Germany.

Towards the middle of the range, candidates tended to consider whether Hanna's actions could be justified (rather than excused by her illiteracy), and tended to consider her actions as a block, rather than differentiating.

Towards the lower end of the range, candidates tended to tell Hanna's story, and narrate what she did because of her illiteracy.

In diesem Essay möchte ich untersuchen, inwieweit Hannas Analphabetismus ihre Taten entschuldigt. Im 'Vorleser' beschreibt Schlink Hannas Verhalten sowohl als sie mit Michael ist, als auch als sie Aufseherin ~~ist~~ <sup>war</sup>. Obwohl ihr Analphabetismus wahrscheinlich das Problem ihre Taten erklärt, ist ~~die Frage~~ <sup>die Frage</sup> von Entschuldigung komplizierter.

Zunächst will ich Hannas Beziehung mit Michael besprechen, denn viele Kritiker glauben, dass sie Missbrauch sei. Als Michael früh im Morgen geht, um Hanna ~~Erkenntnis~~ <sup>etwas</sup> zu kriegen, schreibt er ihr einen Zettel. ~~Aber~~ <sup>Jedoch kann</sup> sie kann ihn wegen ihres Analphabetismus nicht lesen, und deswegen peitscht sie ~~ihn~~ <sup>Michael</sup> mit einem Gürtel aus. Das ist nur ein Beispiel von den Problemen, die in Hanna und Michaels ~~Be~~ <sup>Verhältnis</sup> zu sehen sind. Im ersten Teil ist Michael jung, und er versteht nicht <sup>Er nimmt alles auf sich.</sup> klar, dass Hanna ihn schlecht behandelt. <sup>Obwohl</sup> ihr Analphabetismus der Grund dafür ist, dass sie nicht immer ~~zu~~ <sup>zu</sup> Dingen weiß, die Michael als offensichtlich betrachtet, bedeutet das nicht, dass ihr Verhalten entschuldigt werden kann. ~~Die~~ <sup>Diese</sup> Beziehung ist Missbrauch, und weil Hanna die Erwachsene ist, ist sie verantwortlich.

Überdies ist Hannas Zeit als Wache wichtig, wenn wir uns mit der <sup>im KZ</sup> Entschuldigung von ihren Taten <sup>befassen</sup> wollen. Man könnte sagen, dass Hanna nicht wissen konnte, dass es Alternativen gab. <sup>§</sup> Vor dem ~~Gericht~~ <sup>Gericht</sup> fragt sie dem Richter: „Was hätten Sie denn gemacht?“ Diese Frage fungiert als einen Beweis dafür, dass Hanna nicht böse war, weil sie böse werden wollte. Hanna Arendt hat über „das Banalität des Bösen“ <sup>geschrieben</sup> ~~gesprochen~~, und sagte, dass Übel ~~ist~~ <sup>ist</sup> oft nur eine Folge von

einem Mangel an Überlegung sei. Hanna ist Analphabetin, und infolgedessen hat sie <sup>möglicherweise</sup> nicht die Mündigkeit, moralische Ideen zu verstehen. Es ist <sup>deswegen</sup> wieder bemerkenswert, dass Hanna Analphabetismus ihre Taten erklärt, aber vielleicht nicht völlig entschuldigt.

Trotzdem glaubt Hanna meiner Meinung nach am Ende, dass sie <sup>total</sup> schuldig war ist. Die für viele Jahre im Gefängnis bleibende Hanna wird <sup>von den KZs</sup> alphabetisch, und dann liest sie viele Bücher, die ~~über die KZs~~ erzählen. Wegen des Ich-Erzählers hören wir nie von Hannas Perspektive, aber Michael beschreibt ihren Sinn von Schuld. Es scheint, als ob Hanna Selbstmord begangen hätte, weil sie gedacht hätte, dass sie zu schuldig zu leben wäre. Davon lässt sich schließen, dass sie glaubt, dass ihre Taten <sup>nicht völlig</sup> ~~völlig nicht~~ entschuldigt <sup>werden könnten,</sup> ~~wurden~~, obwohl sie analphabetisch war, als sie im KZ war.

Es ist auch wichtig, den <sup>historischen</sup> ~~historischen~~ Kontext dieser Romane zu in Betracht zu ziehen, als wir uns fragen, inwieweit Schlink Hannas Verhalten aufgrund ihres Analphabetismus entschuldigen wollte. Ihr Analphabetismus repräsentiert die Unmündigkeit des alten Deutschland angesichts der Vernichtung der Juden. Michael und Hannas komplizierte und kontroverse Beziehung spiegelt die Mischung von Liebe und Verurteilung, die es zwischen den der Tätergeneration und der zweiten Generation gab. Der Stil der Sprache im „Vorleser“ ist betäubt, und als Michael von seinem Wunsch spricht, Hannas Verbrechen zugleich zu verstehen und zu verurteilen, sagt er: „Es war dafür zu furchtbar“. In ~~meiner~~ meiner Ansicht suggeriert das, dass Schlink die

der Schuld  
Komplexität des Problems <sup>erkennt</sup>, aber immer noch ~~die Taten~~ <sup>das Verhalten</sup> der  
Tätergeneration nicht entschuldigen kann. ~~Und es auch in der~~  
auch gezeigt, weil <sup>Das wird durch die Metapher</sup>  
~~Metapher~~ Hannas Analphabetismus nicht <sup>ist,</sup> genug <sup>um</sup> Entschuldigung  
zu verdienen.

Nach dem Abwägen dieser Punkte komme ich zum Schluss, dass  
Hannas Analphabetismus ihre Taten erklärt, aber nicht entschuldigt.  
Sie ist immer noch für ihren Missbrauch von Michael und ihr  
Verhalten im KZ verantwortlich. Ich ~~weiß~~ <sup>glaube</sup> das, nicht nur weil sie  
sich selbst nicht verzeihen kann, sondern auch weil Schlink <sup>durch sie</sup> ~~über~~ <sup>repräsentiert</sup> die  
Tätergeneration im Zweite Weltkrieg ~~spricht~~, die natürlich schuldig  
war.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a very strong essay in terms of critical response and language.

Critical and analytical response: 20 marks

Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary: 20 marks

Accuracy of language: 10 marks

## Question 16 (a)

This question was enthusiastically responded to by candidates. There were some very pleasing responses, and the full range of marks was accessed.

Candidates were generally well prepared to talk about Wiesler and how he changes, and most were able to relate what they knew to the question. There were some extremely strong responses where candidates had considered both what the criteria might be to constitute being a hero, and also had understanding of tragedy, and how you might define a tragic hero. Some related to Campbell's hero's journey and some to Greek tragedy (losing status, fall because of one error or flaw etc). One candidate referred to criteria I didn't recognise but suspect to come from Manga or role playing games, and they were reasonable, along the lines of facing up to guilt. Most candidates were able to talk about the sad or depressing aspects of Wiesler's life, and the fact that he lost his job because he did a good thing, and related these to being tragic. Even weaker responses were able to say, "saving Dreymann made him a hero" and "his sad, grey life and needing a prostitute compared to the colour and loving relationship between CMS and Dreymann show that he was a tragic figure." A few candidates slipped up and mentioned Ill as a tragic hero once or twice, indicating that they were applying ideas from their learning about Text 3 to the film. This was seen as positive, and the error a mere slip of the pen.



In diesem Essay möchte ich beurteilen, inwiefern  
Wiesler ein bürgerlicher Held ist.

12

Am ~~Anfang~~<sup>Anfang</sup> werde ich über Wieslers Hintergrund  
sprechen. Er ist ein Mitglied von der Stasi, "die  
schlimmsten Männer sind" und "viele Menschen  
einsperren". Deshalb denken die meisten, dass  
Wiesler nicht nur ein bürgerlicher Held ist, sondern  
auch nicht ein ~~ein~~<sup>kein</sup> Held.

53

Ein weiterer Punkt ist, wie Wieslers Meinung sich  
ändert hat. Zum Beispiel liest Wiesler Brecht  
und hört "Sonaten vom guten Menschen" von  
Beymans Klavier. Ich denke, dass die ~~unfähigkeit~~  
unfähigkeit sehr wichtig ist, weil Donnermarsch

87

wiesters ~~wahre~~ wahne Emotionen zeigt. Man

~~könnte~~ könnte sagen, dass <sup>von</sup> ~~von~~ diesem Zeitpunkt

~~ist~~ ~~wiester~~ beginnt Wiestler ein tragischer Held

zu sein, weil er nicht seiner Meinung nach

112 ~~am~~ ~~verändert~~ ~~er~~ ~~verändert~~ verändert.

Ich glaube, dass die Hauptgrund das Wiestler

~~vielleicht~~ ~~ist~~ vielleicht ein tragischer Held ist ~~ist~~  
ist, weil mit die stari

ist, weil er seiner Job und Respekt verliert

hat. Wiestler hat keine Frau oder Kinder ~~aber~~ aber

nur ein machtig Job. Ohne das ist Wiestler

~~Wiestler~~ sehr einsam und deshalb ein tragischer Held.

Ich denke, dass seiner anderen Job mit Karten

entschliefen hat ~~es~~ kein gutes Lohn und Macht

Im Gegensatz zu seiner Job mit die stasi. Das ist

sehr brav und tragisch.

187

Auf der anderen Seite könnte man sagen, dass

Wiesler kein tragischer Held ist. Eine Beweise

für das wäre, wenn Christa-Maria Sieland

sagt dass zu Wiesler ~~ist~~ „Sie sind eine

guter Mensch“. Das zeigt eine bessere

Seite von Wiesler, wenn er nicht tragischer

ist.

227

Außerdem kennt Wiesler vielleicht, dass er seiner

Job wertlos wird. Er hat viele Geheimnisse

erfunden aber er hat nicht ~~erzählt~~ zu Cowbitz

erzählt erzählt. ~~erzählt~~. Das zeigt, wie wichtig

253

wieslers Veränderung ist, weil er denkt mehr

2 über unschuldig Leuten aus seiner Job. Das ist

↳

271 ist nicht ~~erzähl~~-tragisch.

Es ist klar zu sehen, dass Dreyman denkt, dass

wiesler ein Held <sup>ist</sup> ~~ist~~. Dreyman Schrie

Schreibt, 'sonnte vom Guten Mensch' und hat es

wiesler ~~ger~~ zu Wiesler gewidmet. Ich glaube dass

sehr interessant, weil er Wiesler als ein gut

309 Held dargestellt.

Alles in allem, denke ich das Wiesler nicht ein

tragisch Held ist. Obwohl er seinen Job und Respekt

verliert, ist Wiesler eine guter Mensch und das ist  
wichtiger wichtigsten am ~~Leben~~ <sup>ein</sup> Held zu sein.

237  
242



This candidate sometimes loses focus and talks more about Wiesler's change than whether or not he is a tragic hero, although there are repeated attempts to link what is said to the question. These links are not all fully logical or effective. However, there are some reasonable interpretations and clear attempts to respond critically. The candidate takes "being a good person" and "doing the right thing" as equivalent to being a hero, which does not always work, and being "sad" as being tragic. In the paragraph where the candidate says that, although Wiesler knows he will lose his job, he helps Dreymann, and this placing of other people above his own job is not in fact tragic, there is some emerging critical response. The candidate's view runs counter to the view from Greek tragedy that a tragic hero must have a loss of status, but this is not a Greek tragedy, and based on today's values, the candidate's argument is persuasive. There is a sense that the candidate might have explored more, had they had the language to say what they wanted to, rather than what they could say.

Language is generally relatively simple, and there are inaccuracies, including in verb formation. However, the candidate generally communicates, and makes reasonable use of essay language, technical language and vocabulary specific to the film.

Critical and analytical response: 12 marks

Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary: 12 marks

Accuracy of language: 6 marks



Clarify and justify the criteria for being a tragic hero more clearly.

Explain the links more clearly. For example, explain why becoming a good person makes him less tragic.

## Question 16 (b)

A fairly small proportion of candidates selected this question.

There were some very impressive responses, where candidates were able to talk about the ways in which the film is true or untrue to history affected the quality of the film. They were able to discuss the authentic props and locations, and the degree of authenticity of the atmosphere of repression and the abuse of power, sometimes suggesting that the film was intended to portray these specific aspects of the GDR and it did so well, but could not be representative of every aspect. Some of these candidates were able to cite critiques of the film, specifically that anyone who had reached Wiesler's level in the Stasi would not have had the empathy to respond as he did to the Dreymanns, and that for this reason, the director was refused permission to film in the original Stasi prison. There was difference of opinion about whether this affected the quality of the film, depending on what the film's purpose was – candidates who thought that accurately portraying the regime thought Wiesler's unbelievable change of heart affected the quality of the film more than candidates who thought the purpose of the film was to convey certain messages, portray people in difficult situations, or simply, to be an entertaining, award-winning film.

Towards the middle of the range, candidates talked about some ways in which the film was or was not an accurate historical portrayal, often mentioning props, repression and perspective, but not always effectively relating their points to the quality of the film.

Towards the lower end of the range, candidates talked about the Stasi.

## Question 22 (a)

This question was addressed relatively enthusiastically by candidates and responses covered the whole range of marks.

At the top end of the range, candidates were able to discuss East and West Germany as parallel worlds with some development, reference to space imagery and making specific reference to Alex' words about his father, "Er lebte in seiner Welt und ich in meiner.". They considered the additional parallel worlds of the "GDR" inside Christiane's bedroom and the changing world outside. Candidates were able to relate this to the messages and key concepts of the film.

Towards the middle of the range, candidates focused predominantly on the difference between Christiane's bedroom and the outside world, with fewer references to the messages and key concepts.

Towards the bottom of the range, candidates tended to describe some differences.

## Question 22 (b)

A relatively small cohort of candidates selected this question.

At the top end of the range candidates were very well prepared to talk about the use of a variety of techniques used to create the atmosphere of Ostalgia: music, lighting, props, the use of Super8 film to depict an idyllic childhood, authentic GDR film and the use of minor characters.

Towards the middle of the range, candidates tended to talk about techniques with unconvincing references to Ostalgia, or sometimes, to Ostalgia with only limited references to techniques.

Towards the bottom of the range, candidates tended to talk about characters' different attitudes to East and West, which was less relevant.

## Paper Summary

When judging language, examiners are looking for:

- effective communication;
- solid verb constructions with accurate agreements and a range of well-formed tenses;
- accurate word order;
- consistency – for instance, if the candidate thinks that a noun is masculine (even if it isn't), it should be masculine every time they use it, and possessives and adjectives should agree;
- a range of well-formed structures, including “um ... zu”, relative and subordinate clauses, inversion, and tenses. These should all be used for the purpose of answering the question, not artificially inserted;
- articulate language, where a candidate is able to say what they want to say rather than only what they can say;
- complexity which is within the candidate's reach. Overstretching can be counterproductive.

When judging critical response, examiners are looking for:

- response to the work within the context of the question. Very long essays tend to include too much, and to lose focus on the question, which is self-limiting;
- critical response which addresses the question. This might take the form of PEE(L) – point, evidence, evaluation, (link to the question), for example;
- planning: this does not need to be a full written plan, but the essay should show signs that the candidate has thought about which evidence is relevant to the question and how to form an argument to support their answer to the question;
- arguments which link together.

What candidates should avoid:

- writing everything they know – this will limit their performance against the marking criteria in terms of focus on the question and selection of evidence. It doesn't matter how good the ideas are if they are not relevant to the question;
- trying to use very complex language which they have not yet fully mastered. However carefully learned, this tends to go wrong in exam conditions;
- answering the question they wish had been asked instead of the one that was asked.



## **Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

