

GERMAN

Paper 9780/01
Speaking

Key message

In order to do well in this examination, candidates should:

- in Part I, consider the issue raised in their chosen article and their own reaction(s) to it
- in Part II, choose a subject which genuinely interests them and which clearly relates to a country where the target language is spoken
- in Parts I and II, be prepared to take the lead in the conversation
- in Parts I and II, be ready to engage in natural and spontaneous discussion.

General comments

The examination was tackled with a high degree of success by most candidates. Many approached the tasks with confidence and were able to cope with its demands without any major difficulties. The majority of the candidates appeared to be well-prepared.

The key to success is effective communication on a variety of topics. Candidates need to have a wide range of structures and vocabulary at their disposal, and they need to be able to use the language they have acquired with confidence. A certain amount of versatility for responding to unexpected questions is also desirable.

All candidates were familiar with the format of the examination.

Part 1: newspaper article and related themes

Four articles under the general headings of Education, Sport, Media and Employment and unemployment were offered, with candidates choosing one at the start of the preparation time. The themes of all four topics proved accessible to candidates and they presented a large range of creative ideas and personal views.

Candidates made good use of the opportunity given to them during the preparation period for making brief notes. These notes can be used as prompts or reminders during the examination, but must not impede a spontaneous and genuine conversation. After choosing the article in the initial part of the preparation period, candidates then had to study the article, knowing that they were expected first to give a brief overview of the contents of the article, then to offer views on issues arising directly from the article, and finally to comment on broader issues related to the general heading on the card. While candidates need not be specialists on the topic discussed in the text, they are expected to be able to justify any opinions they offer on the topic.

Many candidates took the opportunity given by the cards to discuss issues at an impressively high level, showing good to excellent understanding of the articles and the issues discussed in them. Similarly, most candidates were able to score high marks for Range and Accuracy as well as Pronunciation and Intonation. It was evident that they had been taught the linguistic skills needed to communicate competently and spontaneously, and that they had at their disposal the linguistic structures necessary to perform well in Part 1. Candidates made good – and in some cases excellent – attempts to lead the conversation. It is worth noting that the mark scheme rewards the ability to hold a fluent and spontaneous conversation, while using a range of complex vocabulary and structures. For top marks candidates are expected to take the initiative in developing and expanding the discussion and to argue their point(s) of view convincingly.

Comments on the individual articles

Card 1: *Schüler in Österreich geben ihren Lehrern Noten*

The text was summarised without difficulties. Questions on the text covered: the criteria students might use for this exercise; whether anonymous feedback was a good strategy; and whether the outcomes should be discussed by the candidates and their teachers. Questions on wider issues dealt with the importance of lifelong learning, the pressures of school life, the value of league tables and whether, in an age when so much information is accessible through the Internet, teachers still have an important role to play in education.

Card 2: *Doping im sportlichen Alltag*

Again, summarising the text caused few difficulties. Questions on the text touched on: reasons why amateurs might use performance-enhancing substances; whether education on related health issues is necessary and effective; and healthy living. Wider issues discussed included commercialism and corruption in professional sport, as well as the effect on the health of young people of a sports culture in which the emphasis is increasingly placed on watching rather than participating.

Card 3: *UNESCO-Tag der Pressefreiheit*

Many summaries were excellent. Issues discussed included: the freedom of the press in different parts of the world; whether there should be any press restrictions (for example in the reporting on wars and conflicts); and how important it is for citizens to be well informed about what goes on in their countries. There were wider discussions on the relevance of the Leveson Inquiry and the issues raised by the *News of the World* scandal, media plurality and the merits and drawbacks of the Internet in relation to free expression and libel.

Card 4: *Arbeitslosigkeit – eine vielseitige Misere*

Again, the text was summarised without difficulties. Questions were asked on the pressures of unemployment on family life and the benefits and drawbacks of financial assistance or psychological support for unemployed people and their families. Many candidates offered potential solutions to this problem unprompted. Wider issues raised were about the ever-changing world of work, workers' migration within the EU, globalisation and the potential conflict between sustainability and continued economic growth.

Part 2: prepared oral topic

This section of the test was almost invariably done very well. Most candidates had researched their chosen topics thoroughly. Topics reflected personal interests and passions, and consequently candidates showed good commitment and depth in their discussions. Themes were discussed maturely and often with a good degree of finesse.

Candidates were invited to say why they had chosen their topic. The discussions then followed the headings submitted previously. Almost all candidates had the relevant factual knowledge and vocabulary at their fingertips. In addition, they coped well with questions asking for clarification and personal opinions. Good factual knowledge was usually matched by an ambitious range of linguistic structures, as well as authentic pronunciation and intonation.

The range of topics was wider than in previous sessions and included historical figures and events, various aspects of music, the arts and film, literature, political and current affairs and environmental topics. The following specific titles (in no particular order) may give an impression of the breadth of choice:

Angela Merkel
Hartz IV
Hohenschönhausen
Die Sorben
Der Bayernkönig Ludwig II
Der Deutsche Bundestag
Die Rote Armee Fraktion
Leni Riefenstahl
Wernher von Braun
Rudolf Steiner und die Waldorfschulen
Die Habsburger
Die Philosophie Nietzsches

Beethovens Klaviersonaten
Der Atomausstieg
Rock am Ring
Franz Kafka – Der Prozess
Die Olympischen Spiele 1936 in Berlin
Paul Celans Todesfuge
Gabriele Münter und „der Blaue Reiter“
Das Konzentrationslager Dachau
Fritz Langs Metropolis
BMW
Bierbrauen in München

Communication with Centres prior to the examination was efficient and effective. Agreement about exam dates was reached early and most candidate topic sheets were received by the visiting Examiner in good time. Centres are strongly reminded, however, that candidates are not permitted to choose any of the set texts or films examined in Paper 4 as their topic or as a sub-heading for their topic. Topic forms which do not comply with this rule will be returned to the Centre for amendment.

Finally, there is no doubt that candidates had taken a great deal of care to prepare for this examination. Their hard work, enthusiasm and readiness to interact with the visiting Examiner were evident throughout.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 9780/02 Reading and Listening</p>
--

Key message

In order to do well in this examination, candidates should:

- focus only on the required information and communicate it precisely in their answers
- pay particular attention to conveying the required information in unambiguous language.

General comments

In the Reading part of the examination (**Part I**), candidates are expected to answer two sets of questions – one in German, the other in English – as well as to translate a short passage from English into German. For the Listening part of the examination (**Part II**), candidates listen to three recorded interviews in German. They then have to answer two sets of questions – one in German and another in English – and write a guided summary. The questions are carefully worded and require an equally precise response. Overall, the candidates performed very well and achieved good results this year.

Comments on specific questions

Part I – Lesetext 1

This task produced a mixed range of responses, including from some of the best candidates. Generally, candidates fared best in **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Question 1

A number of candidates struggled with the word *Verlegenheit* or did not know its adjectival form. Others used the word *nervös* in the English sense of the word 'nervous', which meant their answers were incorrect.

Question 2

This was generally answered correctly, although a number of candidates mistook a greeting replaced by a smile for a greeting accompanied by a smile.

Question 3

There were no particular difficulties with this question.

Question 4

This question was generally answered correctly, although some candidates appeared to have overlooked the qualifying adverb *besonders* in the question. Consequently, these candidates wrote answers which focused on *Depressionen* instead of *Schmerzpatienten*.

Question 5

This was generally answered correctly.

Question 6

This was generally answered correctly.

Part I – Lesetext 2

Overall, this exercise produced good answers in English. A good range of vocabulary was important. Some candidates, however, did not understand words such as *abweichen*, *bergen* or *aussetzen*. **Question 12** was particularly challenging for some because the second part could only be answered by inference.

Question 7

Most candidates were able to answer this question correctly.

Question 8

- (a) There were no particular difficulties with this question.
- (b) This was generally answered correctly, although candidates who did not mention the extent of the change in levels of adrenalin were unable to score the mark.

Question 9

This question was generally answered correctly. However, a number of candidates came to the incorrect conclusion that people who are willing to take risks by practising extreme sports are less afraid of nuclear power stations than people who are not inclined to engage in these sports.

Question 10

This question was generally answered correctly.

Question 11

The answer 'Because people do not want to die' was a truism. To be awarded the mark, candidates had to convey that the primary goal of the majority of people was to ensure their survival, or that only a minority of people could afford not to have to worry primarily about this.

Question 12

The second part of this question was inferential and the second mark was only awarded if the idea of artificially created risk was successfully conveyed.

Part 1 - Lesetext 3

This exercise requires a good range of vocabulary as well as sound grammar. In spite of the challenges, many candidates completed the task successfully.

Question 13

With the exception of the last two sentences, the passage was written in the simple past tense with some verb forms requiring the pluperfect. The most common grammatical difficulties encountered were with verb-subject agreement, adjectival endings and word order. Other grammatical challenges included the use of the infinitive and the subjunctive mode. Vocabulary and idiom which caused particular problems included: *der Sprung*, *die Ausrüstung* and *sowohl... als auch*. A number of candidates used the wrong preposition in certain expressions, e.g. *auf* instead of *in* for 'got on the plane'.

Part II - Hörtext 1

As with the first two reading exercises, full sentences are usually not required for a correct response. Overall, most candidates did well. Some found **Question 19** challenging.

Question 14

This was generally answered correctly, although some candidates were not awarded the mark because they did not mention that the lack of women in leading positions was in spite of their high level of education.

Question 15

There were no particular difficulties with this question.

Question 16

This question was generally answered correctly.

Question 17

There were no particular difficulties with this question.

Question 18

This was generally answered well, although some candidates conflated the meaning of *gewisse* with *Gewissen*, thereby producing an incorrect answer.

Question 19

Some candidates attributed the unchanged situation of the man being the breadwinner to his desire to remain in charge, whereas the correct answer was that it was often women who took a pragmatic, financial decision to let the man be the breadwinner because he earned more money.

Question 20

This was generally answered correctly.

Part II - Hörtext 2

Overall, candidates did rather well in this exercise. However, certain words proved to be challenging for some, such as *Fördermittel* or *lautmalerisch*, leading to some wrong answers.

Question 21

This was generally answered correctly.

Question 22

- (i) There were no particular difficulties with this question.
- (ii) This was generally answered correctly.

Question 23

A number of candidates found the comparison targeted by the question difficult to understand. The crucial word to comprehend here was *Fördermittel*.

Question 24

There were no particular difficulties with this question.

Question 25

This was generally answered correctly.

Question 26

There were no real problems with this question, although some candidates did not identify the exchange of ideas between fans as the right answer.

Part II - Hörtext 3

As in previous years, the summary proved to be a particularly challenging exercise for some candidates. Candidates had to be disciplined in order to cover all five bullet points within the word limit. Several

candidates lost valuable marks by writing too many words or through lack of precision. Most candidates, nevertheless, did quite well.

Question 27

- *Decision to be taken in Heligoland and the historical background to it.*
Some candidates got the history of Heligoland the wrong way round, stating that the two islands were joined together as a result of the storm in 1721.
- *Benefits of the proposed changes for travel and water sports.*
This was generally answered correctly, although quite a few candidates did not answer the question accurately enough to be awarded full marks for it. 'Creating opportunities for surfing' was not accepted, and neither was the translation of *Landungsbrücke* as 'port'.
- *Further benefits for the economy and tourism.*
Many candidates received one of the two marks for writing about the creation of new jobs. A number of them, however, did not take the word *zirka* on board, thus creating the impression that exactly 100 jobs were going to be generated. Some candidates did not mention other benefits discussed in the interview, including the construction of a wind farm and new hotels.
- *Public opinion on the proposed changes.*
In order to obtain full marks candidates had to mention at least one positive and one negative aspect, e.g. the islanders' recognition of the need for more building space (positive) and the critics' fear that the island's identity would be watered down (negative).
- *The cost and financial viability of the project.*
This was generally answered correctly.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 9780/03 Writing and Usage</p>
--

Key message

In order to do well in this examination, candidates should:

- in Part I, choose a title on which they have something to say and for which they have command of appropriate structures and lexis
- in Part I, plan their essay to produce well-structured and persuasive arguments
- in Part I, write complex sentences when appropriate, but without losing the thread of the argument
- in Part II, read each question carefully and make sure they understand the sense of the sentence(s)
- in Parts I and II, carefully proofread their responses.

General comments

In **Part 1**, successful candidates planned their essays by structuring their thoughts into a coherent, relevant response. They illustrated points appropriately through description, analysis and evaluation. In **Part 2**, candidates have to conjugate verbs, manipulate syntax and complete a grammar cloze type test. The tasks in this part of the examination demand detailed knowledge of grammar in its application.

Comments on specific questions

Part 1: Discursive Essay

Only a small number of candidates appeared not to have grasped the demands of their chosen topic. Most candidates who went over the recommended 350-450 word limit, however, ran out of things to discuss and started to repeat material used earlier.

Focus on the terms of the question: most candidates engaged very well with the terms of the essay questions and focused on the core issues. A very small number of candidates wrote essays that covered more than one topic instead of concentrating on the question at hand. The best candidates developed their ideas into coherent arguments and some wrote wholly convincing essays.

The essay titles are very carefully worded and the candidates' first task must be to pin down what the topic asks them to do. It may help to copy the chosen task from the question paper at the top of the essay, and many successful candidates in this year's examination did.

Structuring the essay: a discursive essay should be seen as an argument which seeks to persuade the reader of its validity. Effective essays introduce the argument, discuss the relevant evidence and lead to a conclusion. Some candidates struggled to write an introduction while other candidates found it hard to come to a clearly worded conclusion. Other candidates wrote introductions which were too long and included points which would have been better left for the discussion part of their essay. This often led to repetition further on in the essay. Clear paragraphing also helps to make the argument more coherent. Ideally, candidates should use one paragraph for each point they wish to discuss. Many candidates used paragraphs effectively, but a small number did not.

Language: most candidates applied German word order rules very well, which made it easy to follow their train of thought. A few candidates attempted very complex sentence patterns, though not always to good effect. The best candidates showed flair and style, and many were able to use idiomatic language correctly. In some instances, set phrases were correctly formed but not appropriate to the context in which they were used.

There were a few linguistic problems which will need to be addressed. Some candidates did not use the word *kein* in sentences such as "*Das Bildungssystem ist also nicht eine Katastrophe*" and some relatively

straightforward expressions were not used idiomatically, e.g. "Es ist Spaß ein Buch am Strand zu lesen." Also, while many candidates used a good range of complex sentence structures, some of their sentences were of such length that it became difficult to follow what they were trying to say. Spelling will, of course, always merit close attention, but some errors might have been easily picked up on had the essay been properly proofread, e.g. "*Ein Kindle ist besonders nützlich, wenn man reißt.*"

At the same time, the essays displayed many strengths this year, including:

- wholly convincing arguments which offered genuine reading pleasure
- confident use of the subjunctive, the conditional and the passive
- effective use of a variety of rhetorical and stylistic devices
- strong, cohesive paragraphing.

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates showed a detailed knowledge of German education and drew interesting comparisons with other education systems, including the English. It was good to see that most candidates avoided relying on generalisations. Some candidates felt strongly about the topic and offered solid arguments to support their views. Strong criticisms of particular education systems were almost always illustrated with appropriate examples. Some candidates chose to focus on secondary schools, while some of the other, in many cases more assured, responses referred to several other aspects of the *Bildungssystem*, including universities, vocational training, apprenticeships and work placements.
- (b) This was the most popular topic. Most answers were well written, with relevant examples and good evaluation of the main issues. Some candidates felt they had to offer statistical evidence, which did not always ring true and was not central to the task. The provision of statistical data cannot be a requirement for an unprepared essay, and such facts should only be used if it is relevant and correct. A very small number of candidates did not understand the meaning of *Bibliothek* and thought it was a place where books are purchased; they consequently argued that these places were too expensive and only for people who could afford to go there. The majority of candidates understood the question and offered well considered and convincing answers.
- (c) The best essays on this topic covered a range of points: from the importance of the Olympics for social understanding and fellowship between countries to the implications for businesses in the country where the games are held. Some candidates were very critical and argued that the games were too expensive, especially in times of austerity. All candidates offered some knowledge about the history of the games and most agreed that the Olympics remain important and have retained prestige across the world.
- (d) Candidates who chose this topic were able to draw on relevant historical facts as well as pointed references to current affairs. What made these responses particularly interesting was that the candidates appeared to be more adept at combining relevant facts and personal opinions in a coherent argument than with some of the other topics.
- (e) Overall the points made were valid, but some of the examples offered as evidence did not wholly convince and the range of topic-specific vocabulary used was less impressive than for some of the other topics. Nevertheless, some of the candidates put their case persuasively and infused their arguments with passion and precisely worded, strong opinions.

Part 2

The majority of candidates did very well in this part of the paper. They appeared to be well prepared for the linguistic skills tested and scored highly as a result.

Übung 1

The focus here was on correct verb formation, and, on the whole, candidates did well. **Question 3** caused problems for some, either because they treated *schreiben* as a regular verb, or because they used the infinitive instead of the past participle, or because they were not sure where the reflexive *mich* was to be placed. Very few candidates struggled with the past participle in **Question 4**. A variety of correct answers were offered in response to **Question 5**, but some answers, e.g. answers using *müss* or *müsste*, were not accepted. **Question 6** triggered a variety of correct responses, but in several cases candidates used *käufen*, which was not accepted.

Übung 2

This exercise mainly tests word order. **Question 7** caused few problems. A number of candidates swapped the two parts of the sentence around in **Question 8**, which was not correct as the resulting sentence was illogical, i.e. “*Da wir jeden Tag in der Mensa essen, dauert unser Schultag von 8.00 bis 16.00 Uhr.*” **Question 9** proved to pose the biggest challenge. A variety of structures were rewarded, provided they were grammatically correct, but in some cases candidates appeared not to have observed that the introductory part of the sentence was in the past tense. Others struggled with the complexity of the task as the following example illustrates: “*Maria sagte, sie werde nächstes Jahr sich auf einen dualen Ausbildungsplatz bewerben.*” **Question 10** was generally tackled very well, despite the sentence being longer and ostensibly more complex than the others in the exercise. In few instances, however, candidates produced answers with incorrect wrong word order. **Question 11** was also answered correctly by most candidates, although some produced sentences with *dürfen* or *dürfen würden*, which were not accepted.

Übung 3

Candidates performed well in this exercise, although they did not quite achieve the same degree of success as in previous sessions. Most got **Questions 12, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 23** right. The remaining questions proved to be more challenging. In **Question 13**, for instance, many candidates chose *man* over the impersonal *es*. **Question 14** tested the genitive which many candidates found difficult. The difference between *wertlos* and *wertvoll* caused some confusion in **Question 16** – either the candidates did not know the meaning of the two words, or they had not fully understood the meaning of the preceding sentences. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the candidates who scored lower language marks in their essay also found this exercise a greater challenge than most of their peers.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 9780/04 Topics and Texts</p>

Key message

In order to do well in this examination, candidates should:

- read the question with care and think about what they are asked to do
- plan their answer and organise their material with close attention to the question
- take care to include analysis and argument, and avoid simply retelling the story.

General comments

The level reached in candidates' responses was impressive this year. It was evident that some of the comments in previous years' reports had been taken on board and there was a marked improvement in the performance of candidates. Especially in the Texts part, candidates displayed a greater engagement with the terms of the questions and a better range of critical vocabulary in English.

The aim of the Topics Part is to encourage the acquisition of a broader cultural knowledge of the topic studied through the texts/films chosen. The ability to produce very comprehensive arguments with excellent understanding of the underlying themes was clear to see in the majority of answers, with some candidates producing essays of a very high standard indeed. Whilst the focus in the answers should be on the texts/films studied, they have been chosen for study because they reflect the concrete historical circumstances pertinent to the topic, and this is indeed part of the educational thinking behind this part of the paper.

As in previous years, the level of language was somewhat variable, yet in the case of quite a large number of candidates it was of a very high standard. A few candidates made rather basic errors (*Stadt/statt* confused with *Staat*; genders of *Film/Stasi*; *Individuell* confused with *Individuum*). The spelling of characters' names also proved problematic in some cases (e.g. 'Seeland' instead of Sieland; 'Dreymann' instead of Dreyman). There was better focus on the demands of the questions and fewer instances of padding or narrative. A good balance was struck between the two texts/films chosen in almost all answers. Weaker candidates often had problems venturing beyond a basic approach to the question, and often lacked the critical vocabulary necessary to produce convincing essays. It was good to see that candidates had taken on board that it is advisable to focus on only two works in their response, rather than discuss more than two works fleetingly.

The structuring and the overall standard of the English essays in Part II showed a marked improvement compared to previous years. Planning is still rather inconsistent and candidates would be well-advised to use the time allowed to think through the implications of the questions and craft a clear line of argument before putting pen to paper. The best answers gave a sustained analysis of the issues raised in the question. Quotations were again used well, as were direct allusions and paraphrasing. Weaker candidates tended not to plan their answers effectively and often took too long to engage with the task or wrote essays which were insufficiently relevant.

The candidates who attempted the commentary questions showed a better understanding of the techniques required for answering such questions than candidates in previous years, and, on the whole, achieved very good results. In delivering the syllabus, practising commentary is a very fruitful way of engaging with the text, even if candidates choose not to tackle this type of question in their examination.

Some candidates took a rather narrow approach to the question. There were notable omissions in a small number of scripts in response to some texts, especially *Der Vorleser* and *Die Verwandlung*.

In the past, candidates tended to do better in Part I than in Part II. This year, the performance in both parts was more often of an equal standard.

Candidates should be encouraged to number each question carefully. It would help if candidates would start a new side in their answer booklet for their second essay. Candidates should also be encouraged to write their essay plans in their answer booklets and to write out the title of the essay in order to reinforce in their minds what they are being asked to do.

Comments on specific questions

Part I: Cultural Topics

Die Nachkriegszeit and *Das Leben in der DDR* attracted nearly all of the responses this year and the report will focus on them rather than on *Die Wende*, as the latter topic was chosen only by a very small number of candidates.

Most answers were clearly and unambiguously expressed. Candidates used a broad range of vocabulary, and accuracy was generally sound. At the top end, candidates had an impressive command of the language, writing analytical essays with fluency and a high degree of idiom. Their syntax was self-assured and the genitive case effectively and correctly used. There were occasional weaknesses with cases and the comparative forms of adjectives. The gender of a few nouns was not always known (e.g. *Roman*, *Ehemann*), and there were some problems with weak masculine nouns (*Staat*, *Mensch*). Weaker candidates sometimes struggled to use basic vocabulary and correct word order. Some also had difficulty forming comparative adjectives, which was compounded by the fact that they were required to draw comparisons between works.

Question 2A

This proved a more popular topic than in past years and answers were generally of a high standard. The best answers showed excellent insight into the roles of men and women in post-war Germany. The texts were used very well in this regard. Knowledge and interpretation of *Das Wunder von Bern* were especially good, as were responses to *Draußen vor der Tür*. Treatment of *Das Brot der frühen Jahre* was a little more uneven, with weaker candidates struggling to engage fully with the characters of Ulla and Hedwig beyond a basic response.

Question 2B

Answers to this question varied quite widely in quality, but most candidates did well. Good comparisons were made between the degrees of pessimism in each work. Interesting parallels between the works were also pointed out, and contrasting the endings proved another fruitful line of enquiry. Weaker candidates tended to get caught up in retelling the story and struggled to engage fully with the issues raised in *Das Brot der frühen Jahre*, often slipping into approximation and conjecture. Detailed knowledge of the works is required by the mark scheme and this could have been more forthcoming in some scripts. Some basic vocabulary also proved problematic, e.g. *winnen* instead of *gewinnen*.

Question 4A

This was the most popular question on the paper, with many candidates choosing to discuss *Am kürzeren Ende der Sonnenallee* and *Das Leben der Anderen*. Most candidates displayed good knowledge of the works and were able to discuss the theme of love to good effect. Some candidates chose to expand the theme of love to include friendship thereby omitting some of the more obvious material that could have been exploited more fruitfully, particularly in the film. Most essays were effectively structured, and most candidates were able to display good analytical skills in comparing and contrasting the treatment of love and the power of the state in the different works. Occasionally there were problems with German tenses – the present tense should have been employed to recount events, for example. In weaker scripts there were problems with basic vocabulary and grammar.

Question 4B

This question also attracted a good range of answers. Candidates discussed the complexity of life in the GDR and drew comparisons between the representations of *Aussichten* in their chosen works. Answers were usually well informed and thoughtfully argued, drawing attention to the different perspectives offered in the books and the film. The communist ideals were often fruitfully juxtaposed with the reality of working in a police state. The better candidates were also able to appreciate the complexity of the impact of the state on the lives of different characters.

Part II: Literary Texts

Four texts attracted responses: *Tonio Kröger*, *Die Verwandlung*, *Leben des Galilei*, and *Der Vorleser*. Reports will only be given on those questions attempted by more than a very small number of candidates.

Question 10B

This proved to be the most popular question on Kafka. The best answers engaged wholeheartedly with the title and established a clear line of argument in a comprehensive introduction. Some answers displayed excellent sustained analysis and acknowledged the wide parameters of the question. In a number of outstanding responses the changes which the reader undergoes as the story progresses were very effectively articulated. Weaker answers tended to retell the story, with little analysis of the notion of *Verwandlung*. Some answers were distracted by overly biographical readings, which are difficult to accommodate in a short essay and led candidates away from the text itself. Structurally, most essays were sound.

Question 11B

There were a small number of responses to this question and they dealt quite successfully with the ending of the play. Textual knowledge was not always as sharp as it perhaps should have been to exploit the material in more depth. Appreciation of the role of history in the play was also less certain. Some candidates saw the end as signalling hope for the future rather than a vindication of science, for the power of the Church was indeed overcome, as the distancing effect of the play's setting makes clear to a contemporary audience. The challenge to the audience set by the ending was also not explored fully. However, most responses were coherent and focused on the terms of the question, albeit with some limitations of insight.

Question 11C

This question attracted more responses than **Question 11B**, and many candidates proved very effective in crafting a considered answer. The best answers showed an extensive knowledge of the play and engaged very well with the terms of the question. There was not always an appreciation of the distancing effect of history, which reveals the mechanics of the pursuit of knowledge, and answers were sometimes limited by a lack of reference to the wider aspects of scientific discovery. Weaker candidates employed rather basic terminology ('X is a good thing, Y is a bad thing'). The point that the pursuit of knowledge takes place in a social context – in accordance with the theory and practice of Epic Theatre – was not always made and hence the analyses tended to focus on the character of Galilei, rather than on the wider social picture or on the critical engagement with the audience.

Question 12A

The essays on this question demonstrated sustained analysis and a very good grasp of the themes and textual material. Candidates were able to comment on the significance of details in the passage and relate them to the broader significance of the novel as a whole. Their answers read very well and showed that a context style question is a good option if Centres choose to focus on the techniques involved.

Question 12B

Candidates generally agreed that there was some development in Hanna's moral awareness, though a few answers cogently argued that there was no such change and that illiteracy was no excuse for Hanna's actions and behaviour. The better candidates displayed knowledge of the concept of *Unmündigkeit*, and interesting points were made about the extent to which Hanna achieved greater moral awareness through reading. Whilst most of the discussion centred on Hanna's actions, candidates were also careful to give consideration to Michael and his role in the book as commentator. Most candidates were able to come to a clear and focused conclusion to their essays. Weaker candidates were not as convincing when it came to discussing relevant parts of the text, specifically in interpretations of the trial scene and Hanna's suicide. Instead, they relied more on conjecture than reasoned argument. Some omitted to mention Hanna's role in the Holocaust, focusing solely on the relationship between Hanna and Michael, thus presenting a rather narrow take on the question.

Question 12C

The strongest candidates displayed a very good knowledge and understanding of the text. They were able to argue persuasively that approaches to history, and in particular to the Nazi era, are complex and multi-layered. Moreover, there was awareness that the narrator is far from objective. Good answers considered the themes of justice, morality and responsibility in their discussion. Many points were well illustrated from the text. The notion that Hanna can be seen as a means of exploring and exposing the Nazi mindset (e.g. with reference to the hitchhiking scene) was not always discussed as much as it might have been. It was certainly clear that all candidates had engaged well with the text, however.