

# GERMAN

---

Paper 9717/01  
Speaking

## General comments

There was a wide range of entry and the great majority of candidates were correctly entered at this level. Most Centres entered a small number of candidates, typically two or three. Some candidates were clearly native German speakers. Others had a German-speaking parent, whilst others had acquired the language in Germany or Switzerland. The majority were, however, taught the language at School or in some cases by a teacher. There was a good range of mainly appropriate, German based Topics, though some lacked sufficient depth, and some interesting General Conversations. A few Centres had not prepared their candidates to talk about the culture or heritage of a German-speaking country and therefore the Presentation marks were lower than expected.

The majority of Centres appeared to be well aware of the general format of the examination and of the mark scheme. The tests were usually well conducted the mark scheme appropriately applied. Please remember that internal moderation will have to take place between the various Examiners at larger Centres where more than one Examiner is conducting the tests. Please test the quality of the recording equipment before starting the examination and ensure a quiet environment. Noisy, poorly recorded tests are very hard to moderate. Please check, particularly, that a candidate's test has actually recorded before submitting it for moderation.

Please remember to label both the c.d. or tape, and the box they are in, and to keep AS and A level on separate tapes if possible. Please do not let a test run on to the other side, if recording on tape. Keep to the twenty minute maximum.

Please also enclose a MS1 mark-sheet and fill in the WMS working mark-sheet correctly, with a mark for each criterion (not just a global mark per section) which does not exceed the permitted maximum. It is very difficult to moderate without a WMS to indicate where individual marks have been allocated.

Many of the following points have appeared in previous reports. They are, however, worth noting, in order to maximise candidate marks.

- The candidate must ask at least two questions in the **Topic Conversation** and in the **General Conversation**. It is stated in the syllabus that candidates are required "to seek information from and the opinions of the teacher". Some Centres did not appear to be aware of this. Others awarded marks for "Seeking information and opinions" even though no questions had been asked. If the candidate fails to ask any questions, he or she should be prompted by the Examiner, and if still no question is forthcoming then no marks can be awarded and a total of ten marks would be lost. If only one question is asked, the maximum mark is 3 out of 5 in both **Section 2** and **Section 3**. Questions should be varied and reasonably substantial: "Und du?" is not really sufficient. Examiners should keep replies really brief, as these attract no marks for the candidate.
- Please make a clear distinction between **Section 2** and **Section 3** by announcing to the candidate that the switch to General Conversation is now being made.
- Similarly, make a clear distinction between the Presentation and the Topic Conversation. It is not a good idea to ask questions during a Presentation, but the candidate should be allowed to speak uninterrupted for about three minutes, and then a question could be put to bring it to a close and to move on to the next part of the test.
- Presentations need to be well planned and not too long. Again this year they mostly were, though some were too long by several minutes.
- Please do not allow the whole examination to last too long. The stipulated time is twenty minutes but some Centres, particularly when there was perhaps only one candidate, far exceeded the limit. This does not benefit the candidate in any way.
- Please ensure that Presentation relates specifically to a German-speaking country, as the content mark should be halved if this is not the case. A candidate, especially perhaps a German native speaker, must,

therefore, not talk exclusively with regard to the country where he or she is currently living. Some form of comparison is, of course permissible as long as the target country provides the main focus.

- For the candidate to be able to access a mark from the “top box” for Responsiveness in the conversation sections some challenging questions are required from time to time, so that some form of “debate” can take place. Even, or perhaps especially, a fluent candidate should occasionally have his or her opinions challenged
- Some Centres could afford to be more generous with marks for Accuracy and Feel for the Language in the case of native or near-native speakers, as of course this mark scheme is primarily aimed at non-native speakers and, therefore, perfection is not required, even for a maximum mark.
- Individual Centre Reports will have highlighted any other issues.

### **Comments on specific questions**

There are no further comments on the specific sections of the Speaking test.

# GERMAN

---

Paper 9717/02  
Reading and Writing

## General comments

The subject matter of this year's Paper (Online Social Networks) was clearly both accessible and appealing to a considerable majority of this year's candidates. A significant number of papers were of a very high standard linguistically, but overall the range of marks achieved was wide, as has been the case in previous years. Some errors appeared to arise from an imprecise or over-hasty reading of the questions, which may perhaps have been the result of a certain over-confidence as regards the topic. This sometimes created a difficulty also with answers to the Exercise 5 summary task, where candidates did not restrict themselves for part (a) to the advantages and disadvantages *presented in the two texts*.

For Exercises 3, 4 and 5, attention must also again be drawn to the requirement that candidates use their own words in their responses. Substantial lifting of textual material cannot receive credit. The guidance ***ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben*** is highlighted in the instructions to Exercises 3 and 4, and comprehension is by no means necessarily communicated simply by the mechanics of German word order requirements. Given that paragraph indicators are provided at the end of each question in the Comprehension Exercises 3 and 4, showing where the answer material is to be found, it is clearly necessary that candidates indicate their understanding of the content, and also of the force of the question asked. An answer which begins, for example, with *Der Text/der Autor sagt, dass.....* will not necessarily show understanding of the question at all. Where imagery, idioms and key or heightened vocabulary are used to suggest or convey ideas in the texts, candidates should expect to show their understanding of these in their own words.

The standard of difficulty of the Paper as a whole was considered very comparable with that of 2009.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1 [Erster Teil]**

#### **Exercise 1**

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (b) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (c) This was mostly answered correctly, but there was occasional difficulty. One or two candidates offered *weg* as the synonym. This was not awarded.
- (d) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (e) This was mostly answered correctly, although in some cases *wegen* was not seen as a preposition.

#### **Exercise 2**

This exercise was clearly found challenging by weaker candidates. It should also be noted that this is an exercise in grammatical manipulation, not interpretation, and the meaning of the statements should not be changed.

- (a) This was usually answered correctly. However, a change of tense was not appropriate.
- (b) This was often answered correctly. However, the dative 'n' on *Nutzern* was not routinely recognized.



- (c) Some candidates attempted to reinterpret this statement, without using *attraktiv*. This took their answers too far from the original. There was also some difficulty with the dative after *von*.
- (d) This was often answered correctly. Again, there were some attempts to replace *mühe* with approximate or inexact ideas. Some answers offered *Mühe* without a verb.
- (e) This was often answered correctly. However, (*weil sie nicht mehr*) *allein sind* - present tense completion on its own – gives a different message.

### Exercise 3

Many candidates were able to manipulate the language of the text effectively, and produce ‘own language’ answers, but, as already indicated, there was some reluctance to move away from even simple key language items and text sequencing – e.g.: *intimste Dinge mit einem großen Freundeskreis teilen können*. (Text 1, line 16) - to show genuine understanding. A few candidates answered in note form, where lifting from the original material was predictably more often in evidence. Whilst full sentence answers are not an absolute requirement for comprehension marks, note-form answers should nevertheless follow the demands of the question concerned. Short phrase answers may also omit important detail. Candidates should further recognize that their ‘quality of language’ marks may be compromised by note-form answers. Most importantly, the simple reproduction of a section of the text by way of an answer, without manipulation or recognition of the question, cannot receive full credit.

- (a) Most candidates gained the one mark here.
- (b) Few candidates seemed to think in much depth about the implications of *Bühne*, but were nonetheless often able to earn 3 of the 4 marks available from the text material which followed this.

Despite having provided a correct answer to the preceding **Question (a)**, a number of answers for this **Question (b)** went on to include details about the second *Mitgliedergruppe* as exemplified in the remainder of the paragraph.

- (c) (i) One mark was usually gained here easily. A number of candidates appeared to overlook the word *anfängs* in this question, and found subsequently that they had to re-arrange their answers to parts (i) and (ii). Careful first reading of the questions for differentiation is always to be recommended.
- (ii) Two marks were usually gained here easily. Occasionally the implications of Künast’s 2200 *Freunde* were not further developed.
- (d) Answers here were not always well considered, and ignored what the sociologist actually said.
- (e) This was often answered correctly, but some weaker candidates assumed that the answer was to be found in the quotation.
- (f) Answers to this last question were often able to earn the 3 marks. References to the posting of good photographs, however, were often not interpreted.

### Section 2 [Zweiter Teil]

#### Exercise 4

This exercise, as should be expected, was a little more difficult in the main, but candidates often coped well, possibly finding some of the material more concrete, and easier to relate to some of the questions.

Again there were problems with extensive text reproduction. Weaker candidates clearly tend to find it more difficult to ‘keep going’ and may therefore start to rely more heavily on text-lifting. They may well also find themselves with insufficient time remaining.

- (a) Many candidates were able to gain 2, if not 3 marks here. There was occasional free interpretation of *mindestens*, which should not be conveyed as *unter* or *über*.
- (b) This was mostly answered correctly, but some weaker candidates focused on *Kinder und Jugendliche* in line 11.



- (c) (i) This did not prove difficult. Most candidates were able to earn the 3 marks here.
- (ii) This was answered well, often with some excellent and elaborate 'own language' versions.
- (d) Not all candidates appeared to understand the text of paragraph 4, and there was some difficulty in relating it to the *wie genau...* of the question. That it was teachers who could abuse the information accessed was not always appreciated.
- (e) (i) The first part of paragraph 5 caused some difficulty: *viele Profile schnell angeklickt* was re-interpreted as *ein Profil oft angeklickt* by some candidates. This is clearly quite a different point, and incorrect.
- (ii) One mark was easily gained for this last question. The second difficulty in respect of the *Attraktion* of such networks was not always clearly conveyed.

### Exercise 5

In their responses to this task candidates are required to summarise the issues and arguments presented in the two texts in their own words in the form of a mini-essay. A simple list of points is not an appropriate format. However, it is clearly important that they read the question carefully. This year a summary as presented in the texts of the advantages and disadvantages of social network sites was asked for. This is not the same task as a summary of the two texts themselves. Some of the factual details given were therefore not always appropriate. Both texts should be referred to, and candidates should expect to present a meaningful overview of the main features, and how they relate to each other, ideally by means of contrast and comparison. It was pleasing to note that many candidates had worked on a plan before writing up their answer, and this is evident good practice.

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 by re-affirming the question in full. 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 should ensure that candidates are aware of this. As a general point, candidates would undoubtedly benefit from focused practice in the skills of summary, which amount to more than just picking out elements in the passage(s). There were plenty of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were easily able to earn six or seven of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question.

Most candidates evidently prefer to address Exercise 5 in two distinct parts and indicate **(a)** and **(b)** in their response. Accordingly, personal views are then best omitted from part **(a)**, the 'textual summary', which may perhaps not support the candidate's views. If they prefer, however, candidates are at liberty to write a 'combination' essay, making their personal views clear by commenting additionally on points made in the texts.

Marks of two and three out of the potential five for part **(b)**, 'personal response', were quite common, but there was some simple repetition of text material, and relatively few 'own' ideas.

A small number of answers were significantly shorter than 140 words, and candidates should also recognize that this will limit the language mark available. It is clearly practical for candidates to provide a word-count, but a significant number this year were far from accurate.

#### Language:

The remaining five marks in **Exercise 5** are for the quality of the language, and for most candidates marks here were broadly comparable with those awarded for **Exercises 3 and 4**, as might reasonably be expected.

It is worth reiterating, however, that a good number of candidates wrote both fluently and impressively, and their responses made for some excellent reading.



# GERMAN

---

Paper 9717/03

Essay

## General Comments:

This paper produced the full range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to the unclear or unfocused work of weaker candidates, who were very much in the minority. The language produced was equally diverse.

There are a number of candidates of native speaker standard who write very articulately. Some are semi-native speakers: although they write quite fluently, they often make phonetic spelling errors, such as: the confusion between *das* / *dass* and *ä* / *e* sounds. There also appears to be a rather relaxed attitude to the use of capital letters for nouns and to punctuation, especially commas.

Many non-native-speaker candidates have an excellent command of German and achieve marks 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. There are some candidates who are over-ambitious; they preface almost every sentence with a complex construction, which detracts from the clarity of their writing and often becomes incongruous when a banal statement is prefaced by an elaborate introductory phrase.

Many candidates seem to feel that it is obligatory to write up to the limit of 400 words. This can have an adverse effect on their marks for Language, because there is a greater potential for error and the candidate has less time for re-reading and checking for avoidable mistakes. As far as the Content is concerned, greater length does not automatically equate to more marks. A succinct, well structured but shorter essay creates a much better impression than a rambling, repetitive one. Time spent planning what to write is never wasted.

Candidates need to answer the question set; those who wrote an essay they had prepared on that particular topic, rather than responding to the question on the paper, were limited to low band marks. It would seem good practice for the candidate to copy out the question before starting on the essay and constantly refer back to this title to ensure that what he or she is writing remains relevant.

## Question 1

*Wie haben sich die Beziehungen zwischen Männern und Frauen in der letzten Zeit geändert?*

This question was chosen by a minority of candidates. There were a few excellent responses. Some essays would have fitted better in the topic area *Chancengleichheit* because the candidates wrote about the changing situation of men and women in the workplace and the home. The fact that they did not go on to discuss how this affected the relationships between men and women meant that they had not fully addressed the title.

## Question 2

*Ist die Lebensqualität besser auf dem Lande als in der Stadt? Was meinen Sie?*

This was by far the most frequently chosen essay title. Although the title is straightforward, it is also very wide and therefore deceptively simple. Few defined what they considered *Lebensqualität* to be, but most candidates had given some consideration to the structure of their essay. Many of the ideas expressed were relevant but often simplistic – especially concerning life in the countryside. Most candidates managed to write adequately on the subject, but there were few really well-argued, detailed and insightful essays.

There was clearly a need to express the notion of "facilities", which is not that easy in German: many candidates referred to *Infrastruktur*, which was a good solution, unless they tried to make it plural. Some

candidates ignored the help offered in the title and used *in* as the preposition with *Land* and the wrong gender for *Lebensqualität*. Following English rather than German usage, *Leben* often lacked a definite article.

### Question 3

*Alle Drogen sollten verboten werden. Wie stehen Sie dazu?*

This was the second most frequently answered question. There were some thoughtful essays, which discussed the difficulties of banning drugs, but many wandered off at a tangent. A number of candidates wrote a general essay on the effects of drugs on individuals and society, which failed to address the question. The better essays took the trouble to define what they understood by *Drogen*: some chose to include medicines, which was quite legitimate, as was the view that alcohol and cigarettes should also count as drugs.

### Question 4

*Wenn man körperlich behindert ist, muss man eine erfolgreiche Karriere ganz ausschließen. Was meinen Sie dazu?*

There were too few responses to this question to make general comment appropriate.

### Question 5

*„Der Umwelt zuliebe fliege ich nicht mehr.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?*

This was the third most popular question and generated some very good essays, although most candidates appeared to have little knowledge about aircraft pollution. No one could envisage abandoning air travel and some seemed genuinely shocked at such a proposition. A significant number of candidates found it difficult to manipulate their knowledge to respond to the statement in the title: having written *Umwelt* as their title, they described pollution and deforestation and their detrimental effects on the environment without once mentioning flying or planes, thus gaining very few marks for Content.

# GERMAN

---

Paper 9717/04

Texts

## General Comments

In this section of the examination candidates are expected both to demonstrate knowledge of the texts and an understanding of how the texts work. Candidates who did well were able to show good knowledge of the text, choosing good examples to illustrate points made and structuring their argument well. The majority of the candidates had good knowledge of the texts and many were able to marshal their thoughts into coherent, relevant essays.

A number of the difficulties encountered by candidates were similar to those highlighted every year: relevance to the question and an ability to organise their essays coherently in the appropriate language were crucial.

**Layout and Labelling:** The majority of candidates labelled their work conclusively, but it would have helped greatly if both, overall question and sub-question, were clearly recognisable for all three chosen essays, so that no errors occur.

Clear labelling of individual essays with clear paragraphing throughout the essays themselves seemed to be linked to a more organised and structured approach.

**Following Instructions:** A very small minority of candidates only wrote two essays rather than the three pieces demanded for this paper. One can only assume that in their case the title page of the paper has been read incorrectly.

All three essays should have a length of about 500 words each to allow candidates to make a variety of points pertaining to the question of their choice. Some answers were significantly shorter and therefore candidates penalised themselves by not mentioning enough detail to access the higher marks.

**Focus on the terms of the question:** The essay titles are very carefully worded and candidates' first task when tackling an essay must be to decide what is expected of them. A generic, pre-learnt essay or an accumulation of knowledge listed in the answer does not constitute a good essay, however accurate the knowledge may be. It would be helpful to candidates to copy down the question and clearly label their own work to focus on their topic of choice and they can then refer back to the question in order to ask themselves whether each point they are making is relevant for the correct answer.

**Structuring the essay:** An essay should be seen as an argument. The writer is seeking to persuade the reader of the validity of the argument he/she is putting forward. An argument must be properly structured, introducing the theme, presenting evidence and leading to a conclusion. Some candidates omitted the introduction or started their essay with what would effectively be their conclusion. Other candidates did not come to any conclusion, partially because they seemed to have run out of time.

Clear paragraphing also helps to structure a coherent argument. Candidates should use one paragraph for each main point they wish to make. Some candidates wrote whole essays without any paragraphing at all which made it more difficult to discern between individual ideas. Often this also led to unnecessary repetitions and as no new ideas were introduced, no extra credit could be earned. Good candidates made relevant points in paragraphs, supported those with relevant examples and evaluated or analysed what they had read well.

**Language:** The majority of candidates were able to produce the level of language required to write good essays that could be followed easily. The expressions and idioms used to convey ideas were often sophisticated and well thought through, but it was noticeable that even candidates with a very secure grasp of vocabulary and grammar made an array of spelling mistakes not expected at this level. Around a sixth of



essays submitted proved to be more difficult to understand as candidates translated literally from their mother tongue into German and expressions were not idiomatic enough to convey ideas.

Examples of particular weaknesses:

- Usage of capital letters on verbs and adjectives instead of nouns ( *das Älteste mädchen*)
- ß and ss, the former still required after long vowels and diphthong, the latter after short vowels
- *das* and *dass* got confused a lot
- use of *kein* when *nicht ein* was written
- Using wrong past tense forms of verbs: *fliehte* instead of *floh* etc., *laufte* instead of *lief*
- Wrong prepositions changing the meaning of a sentence: *eine Beziehung mit jemandem haben* is not the same as *eine Beziehung zu jemandem haben*, *mit sich spielen* oder *gegen sich selbst spielen* is also something that needs to be differentiated.
- Register/style: the language is sometimes too informal. There is a definite issue to be addressed here, relating to candidates not being able to differentiate between spoken/colloquial and written/formal language. (*rein* und *raus* instead of *herein* und *heraus*; *drauf haben* instead of *etwas können*)
- Anglicisms: often candidates who had weaknesses in their vocabulary used English phrases and translated them into German on a one to one basis: "In meiner Meinung" instead of "Meiner Meinung nach", "Werden wir gezeigt" instead of "wird uns gezeigt"
- Candidates often varied their tenses and jumped from present to past and back without any rationale for this. Once a tense is chosen, the essay should be written in that tense and only flashbacks should be in a past form.
- Wrong picking up of gender or number in subordinate clauses: *Es gibt viele Stellen in diesem Roman, in dem ihre Zukunft angedeutet wird* should read:.....*in denen ihre Zukunft angedeutet wird.*
- Confusion between words: *physikalisch*, *physisch* and *psychisch*; *Stück* and *Spiel*, *tot* and *Tod* (adjective and noun)
- Words misspelt because the stem is not known: *verwährt* instead of *verwehrt* (comes from *sich wehren*) *gerecht* instead of *gerächt* when referring to revenge (*die Rache*)

Comments on specific questions

**Section 1**

**Question 1**

**Zweig – Schachnovelle**

Sixty-nine essays were produced on this text and the majority concentrated on the first question.

- (a) (i) The better candidates highlighted how the book was a link to words and thoughts connected to the outside/old world before he got imprisoned, and how the book was a distraction and an instrument in the fight against the boredom and monotony of captivity.
- (ii) The second part of the question was divided into two aspects. On the one hand the positive side of the book: the occupation with a new hobby, the learning process and coping without a chess board and figures, the resistance to the interrogations, the ability to cope with the loneliness, the increasing capability of the Dr. to cope without figures and board and last but not least his release from captivity after the breakdown, which might have saved his life. On the other hand the negative side: the increasing obsession with chess, the lack of sleep and exhaustion, the madness ending in illness, which in turn stays with him for the rest of his life if he does not abstain from chess forever.
- (b) The weaker candidates who chose the second question did not do as well as the weaker candidates who chose the first question. The more unstructured nature of this task did not provide enough for those candidates to focus on, and essays did often lack sensible paragraphing, contained a lot of summary and no interpretation or analysis and therefore did not reach top marks. A few candidates went as far as mentioning two or three climax points in the novel and unfortunately did not make a clear decision which one was the absolute climax for them, when this was asked for.

## Question 2

### König – *Ich fühl mich so fifty-fifty*

64 candidates wrote about these questions, many of whom chose to write about the extract from the book. The answers were well considered in the majority of cases.

- (a) (i) The first part question asked the candidate to look at how the party had changed the family's life. Very good candidates mentioned not only the dad, but also Sabine's and Mario's frustrated career plans, the fact that the Dehnerts were not allowed to travel, that Sabine got picked on in School and that nobody really said their honest opinion.
- (ii) In the second part Mario's flight and the effect on the family had to be discussed. The motivation for the flight was his desire for a different career and the gap year, his dislike of the Volksarmee, the fact that he felt imprisoned and his predilection for all things West German. The effect on the family was that the mother went to join him and then stayed in the West, too, the bullying through the teachers of Sabine, the doubts of other friends towards Sabine and the dad and then Sabine's flight, too.
- (b) In the second question candidates were asked whether or not they thought Sabine was a coward for not saying her opinion. Answers, which scored the top marks were well-considered opinions, which linked the book to the DDR politics and included knowledge of the oppression and sanctions people faced when saying something that did run counter to the state opinions. Very few candidates stated that they understood and condoned Sabine's attitude, but still thought she was behaving cowardly, a stance, which made very little sense.

## Question 3

### Wimschneider – *Herbstmilch*

Thirty candidates wrote about this book.

- (a) (i) The essays written on this question showed that the extract had been understood by everyone and candidates clearly worked out that the situation had worsened and that the children were missing the mum and had to increase their workload drastically.
- Better candidates understood that the dad faced financial hardship and was trying to do his best even though it did not always seem like it and that the family worked as a team. Despite all of this Anna still had to do the lion's share of the work and it was hardest for her that the mum had died.
- (ii) The second part of the question divided the writers into two camps: most thought Anna was well-prepared for her future life, as she had learnt cooking, sewing and cleaning and that she knew how to work hard. Even her expectations were low enough to cope with the new life and not be too disheartened. Some candidates thought that Anna did not get enough schooling to be prepared for her later life, so she was limited to being a farmer's wife, a valid point made. One or two people looked closely at what the missing mother meant to Anna and said Anna was not prepared well enough for becoming a teenager and a woman, an interesting point most people omitted.
- (b) The candidates who chose the second question had some idea about the hardships farmers faced when one member of the family died and the workforce was depleted. They mentioned that the dad did not have much of a choice if he wanted all the family to stay alive and together. Although some thought that Anna was treated harshly by the dad and the brothers, this was balanced by examples where the dad had supported Anna: against the vicar, when he allowed her to go out and finally when he let her marry Albert.

## Section 2

### Question 4

#### Fontane – *Effi Briest*

This text was chosen by 34 candidates, and the majority of those went for the second question.

- (a) Only a few candidates chose this question and some answers did not consider carefully what “Hochmut” actually meant. The answers were delineating Effi’s career as Instetten’s wife and her fall at the end, but only the very best candidates linked this to the beginning attitude of Effi’s, namely that any good-looking, affluent and influential marriage candidate would make her happy, which is the cause of Hulda’s remark.
- (b) The second question was more popular than the first, candidates mostly argued that the wedding was the abrupt end of Effi’s childhood and that all her attempts to fit into society were blighted by the fact that she was still too impulsive and child-like in order to feel part of her social surroundings. Better candidates also mentioned Instetten’s attempts to educate Effi and therefore his treatment of her as a child, but at the same time his ignorance of her need for company and love. Outstanding candidates linked Effi’s end in Hohencremmen to her childhood – she dies back at home where she started and is as relaxed as she was as a child in her final days.

### Question 5

#### Dürrenmatt – *Der Besuch der alten Dame*

72 essays were written about this text, with both questions proving equally popular.

- (a) A lot of candidates chose the first question on this text and came up with a variety of comical and tragic elements, which in their mixture made the play grotesque. The best candidates gave a definition of grotesque and proceeded from there to explain that the comical elements were overplayed and led to the feeling that the spectator had of wanting to laugh, but being shocked at the same time (“Das Lachen bleibt einem im Halse stecken”).
- (b) The second question highlighted a weakness: The majority of candidates focused on one “Ruin” only, namely the financial ruin of Gullen. Better candidates mentioned the moral downfall of the citizens of Gullen and very outstanding candidates wrote about the fact that Claire’s initial moral and financial plight caused her revenge and the bankruptcy of Gullen in the first instance. Some candidates also included Koby, Toby and Loby in their list of ruined individuals – a good point made.

### Question 6

#### Wohmann – *Treibjagd, Erzählungen*

Only one essay was produced on the (b) part of these questions.

The candidate mentioned three titles and their relevance to the story and worked out that the titles often were ironic or indicated part of what was really happening in the story. Often the story titles refer to two things: “Treibjagd” is a form of hunting normally used for animals, but is applied to a human being in the story. It could have been mentioned that “In einem Dorf wie unserem” evokes knowledge of everyday conventions, which are then slightly turned on their head by highlighting the negative aspects of people living together in a village.