GERMAN

Paper 9717/01
Speaking

General comments

There was a wide range of entry, mostly from Centres with 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 either in Germany itself or at School. There was a good range of mainly appropriate, German based Topics and some interesting General Conversations.

The majority of Centres appeared to be well aware of the general format of the examination and of the mark scheme. These Centres conducted the tests well and applied the mark scheme appropriately.

Paperwork relating to the examination was generally well and accurately completed. Some Centres need to be aware that there are two types of mark sheet to be completed: the Working Mark Sheet, included in the syllabus, and the Internal Assessment Mark Sheet, to which marks from the Working Mark Sheet should be transferred. Marks should be entered in each column of the Working Mark Sheet, rather than just a global total per section. Each column corresponds to one of the criteria set out in the mark scheme. It makes the Moderator's task more straightforward if it is possible to see exactly how marks have been awarded.

The Examiner's name should also appear on the bottom of the Working Mark Sheet.

It is important before starting the examination that both candidates and Examiners are familiar with the format and timings of the examination:

> 3 to 3½ minutes for the Presentation (on a topic chosen and prepared beforehand by the candidate with clear reference to culture or society in a German-speaking country);
> 7 to 8 minutes of conversation about that topic;
> 8 to 9 minutes of General Conversation (covering topic areas different from the one chosen for the Presentation).

Many of the following points have appeared in previous reports and fortunately apply only to a relatively small number of Centres. They are, however, very much 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. Candidates will not be penalised for being prompted in this way. If there is still no question 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***.
- 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. A few Examiners started asking questions during the Presentation. This is not a good idea, as the candidate is being judged on his or her ability to speak uninterrupted for about three minutes. The Topic Presentation is the opportunity for candidates to develop their chosen topic. Examiner's questions should try to allow them to do this. Questions should not just ask candidates to restate what they said originally, but should look for additional information, reasons and opinions as appropriate. The aim is for both the Topic and General Conversation elements to be lively and spontaneous. Candidates are encouraged to prepare thoroughly for the test at the same time as guarding against over-rehearsing in advance.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

- Please do not allow the 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 the 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.
- To obtain a top mark for Responsiveness in the conversation sections, the mark-scheme requires candidates, amongst other criteria, to “defend their point of view”. This implies that some challenging questions should be put from time to time or that some form of debate could in fact take place. It is not sufficient for a fluent candidate to utter his/her opinions unchallenged.
- 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.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

GERMAN

Paper 9717/02
Reading and Writing

General comments

Whilst the subject matter of this year's paper was rather more specialized than in some previous years, the questions set proved accessible, such that the level of difficulty overall was judged similar to last year. Most candidates appeared familiar with the topic: nuclear power, its advantages and drawbacks and the attitude of the German government to it, and quite a few wrote their answers with obvious enthusiasm, and were even keen to provide further explanatory details. Whilst this is laudable in many respects, there are unfortunately no extras marks available within **Questions 3** and **4** for such material. Some candidates found it difficult to move away from the phrasing in the texts. It is essential that the guidance *ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben* and in *Ihren eigenen Worten* is properly heeded, and that candidates understand that credit cannot be earned for answers that are simply lifted from the text. A majority of the candidates entered performed well and wrote fluently; this year again there were few very weak candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 [*Erster Teil*]

Question 1

(a) This was usually answered correctly.

(b) This was usually answered correctly.

(c) This was usually answered correctly. Occasionally *zur* was omitted from *Zur gleichen Zeit*, rendering the answer incorrect.

(d) Finding words in the text that corresponded to *mit Ausnahme von* caused problems for a few candidates, who tried to find an alternative noun answer, instead of the correct answer from the text: *außer*.

(e) This was usually answered correctly.

Question 2

This exercise was also done well in most cases.

(a) This was usually answered correctly.

(b) This was usually answered correctly. However, there was no justification for changing the tense, nor for adding a modal verb.

(c) This occasionally caused problems, with *Debatte* apparently not recognized as a singular noun, though this should not in fact have affected the correct answer.

(d) Incorrect answers here were quite frequently down to the use of the present tense, instead of the imperfect called for here.

(e) A fair number of answers gave the correct case and adjective ending agreement.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

Question 3

The language of the text was familiar to most candidates, but, as already mentioned, there was some reluctance to move away from the idiom and vocabulary given, and to convey the ideas in a different way, thereby showing understanding. Where a candidate simply reproduces a section of the text by way of an answer, without manipulating it in any way, no marks can be awarded. By and large the nouns in the text were accessible, however some attempts simply to re-arrange the syntax revealed a lack of proper appreciation of the point of the question.

(a) Most candidates gained 2 or 3 marks here, but there was occasional lack of clarity over the role of *Umweltschutz*, and a general reluctance on the part of candidates to explain *wurden zu Alltagsthemen* in their own words. The points were also sometimes offered in the present tense instead of the past, and this had to be taken into account when assessing the language mark for the whole set of answers to **Question 3**.

(b) This was usually well answered: *Was passiert mit den restlichen 17 Atomkraftwerken in Deutschland?* with some good attempts at alternative verbs. However, it should be noted that the use of a past tense renders the answer incorrect.

(c) This was usually answered correctly for the 2 marks, but again the language and syntax of the text were often quite heavily relied upon.

(d) Most candidates were able to produce at least two of the five possible points in response to the question: *Welche Vorteile sollen die alternativen Energien haben?* in order to earn their full 2 marks.

(e) Most candidates earned 2 marks here, but a surprising number retained the double negative in *nicht unbegrenzt vorhanden*, instead of going for a simple formulation such as: *könnte zu Ende gehen*.

(f) (i) Candidates needed to refer to the possible destinations for the disposal of atomic waste mentioned in the text, in response to the question posed there: *Wohin mit dem radioaktiven Müll?* The phrase *in der Tiefe* is important in relation to both *Erde* and *Meer*: *In Beton auf Ewigkeit in der Tiefe der Erde oder des Meeres vergraben*. These alternatives are listed alongside that of sending the waste out of Germany, i.e. abroad/exporting it. These are the 3 main solutions mentioned. Answers which suggested that the waste could simply be thrown into the sea or buried in the ground had missed the point. The idea of re-processing the waste or *Wiederaufbereitung* was likewise secondary to that of first sending it out of the country. Despite the detail required at this stage in the question paper, almost all candidates scored some marks on this question.

(ii) This was mostly answered correctly for the two marks, with some candidates keenly offering further explanation as to why *Sicherheit* is such a serious consideration when transporting atomic waste.

Section 2 [*Zweiter Teil]*

Question 4

This exercise was generally a little more difficult, as should be expected at this stage in the question paper, and again candidates lost marks as a result of simply reproducing material from the text. The instruction *ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben* stated in the instructions for Exercise 3 is repeated for Exercise 4. Candidates should also note that the specific paragraph guidance accompanying each question is intended to help them with the text. Simply repeating information or giving their own ideas on the subject are not likely to be appropriate for the reward of marks in **Questions 3** and **4**.

(a) Most candidates gained 1 mark here, recognizing the insufficiency of the *erneuerbare Energien*. Fewer picked up on Germany being isolated within the G-8 nations on this issue, however, and very few noted the *mit Recht* in the text, which indicated that the politicians agreed with the other G-8 nations on this issue.

(b) A number of candidates found this question difficult, and answers quite often repeated the idea of *mehr Zeit* in the question, without considering the *wie?* Others misunderstood the reference to *Energieeinsparung* and suggested that more time could be gained by saving energy.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

(c) Most candidates gained two marks here. Vague references to supporting or protecting the climate in response to the specific *die internationalen Klimaschutzziele* in the text were insufficient, however.

(d) Most candidates identified the appropriate material, but marks were occasionally lost for simple reproduction of the text after *die 30 Prozent Stromversorgung*. References to *ideologische Gründe* were also sometimes made, but not expanded upon.

(e) Most candidates gained two marks here.

(f) Most candidates gained two marks here. Very occasionally a candidate's answer appeared to be suggesting that the *Energiemix* meant an actual combination or literal mixing up together of different energy sources, but this was rare. Most recognized that *Kernkraft* had to be included for the second mark.

(g) Two out of the three marks were commonly gained for this question, but the pressure of time issue was rarely satisfactorily explained. Many candidates repeated or simply re-arranged the syntax of *Bis ..... haben wir wenig erreicht und möglicherweise zu viel verloren* without showing any appreciation of what the *nicht auskommen* in the final line here meant.

Question 5

In their responses to this task candidates are required to summarise the arguments presented in the two texts in their own words. Both texts should be referred to, and candidates should look to present an overview of the main points, ideally by means of points of contrast and comparison. It should be made clear to candidates that the word limit of 140 encompasses <u>both</u> parts of the question, and that therefore the conciseness and effectiveness of their writing is likely to have a bearing on achievement. The general pattern is for opening sentences that are clearly often prepared, which is obviously good practice, but candidates should be wary of expending too many words at the beginning of their answers before addressing the main content. Again this year a significant number of candidates wrote at considerable length, without regard for the word limit, and in such cases they tended to lose out on the opportunity to gain marks for the *personal response* part of their answer, because they left this too late. It is essential that candidates realize that marking of this exercise ceases at the end of the sentence after 140 words, with a final cut-off at 150 words. In general, candidates would undoubtedly benefit from focused practice in the skills of summary. There were plenty of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to gain around seven out of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question.

Most candidates preferred to address **Question 5** in two distinct parts, and most expressed a pleasingly clear stance on the issue, albeit sometimes limited and quite frequently responding simply to the element of danger as discussed in Text 1. A few found themselves simply repeating what they had already written in the first part of their answer, and in the same words, whilst others found that they had run out of ideas by the time they reached the second, *personal response* part of their answer. This again suggests that there is a case for practice in how candidates can most effectively convey their opinion on the arguments, along with the arguments themselves. This offers the advantage of conserving words and avoiding repetition, but it should also be noted that answers which are significantly shorter than 140 words will limit the language mark available. Where personal views are incorporated within the textual summary, however, candidates should recognize the need to make clear that these <u>are</u> personal views, and not assumptions which the text(s) may not support.

Marks of two and three out of the potential five for personal response were more usual than higher marks, as in previous years.

<u>Language</u>:

The remaining five marks in **Question 5** are for the quality of the language, and for most candidates these were broadly comparable with those awarded for **Questions 3 and 4**, as might reasonably be expected. Many candidates wrote fluently, if not always accurately, and confusion of *dass* and *das* remains frequent. Punctuation also continues to be rather unreliable, making syntax sometimes clumsy and difficult to follow, and the requirement in German for commas between clauses continues to be quite widely overlooked.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

GERMAN

Paper 9717/03
Essay

General Comments

As at previous sessions, there was a considerable range in both the quality of the content and the language competence displayed in the essays submitted. Candidate performance overall was of a good standard.

There were a number of candidates with some native speaker experience who, although they wrote quite fluently, made some phonetic spelling errors. The most common of these was the confusion between *das / dass* and *ä / e* sounds. There appeared also to be a rather relaxed attitude to the use of capital letters for nouns and to punctuation, especially commas.

Of the non-native-speaker candidates there were many with an excellent command of the language. They had an impressive array of vocabulary at their disposal, both general and topic-specific; indeed most candidates had sufficient vocabulary to express their ideas effectively.

Although many essays were clearly structured and coherently argued, only a minority of candidates wrote out the title they had chosen on the paper before they started. For those candidates who tended to address the topic rather than the specific title, it would help them to respond more effectively to the title. There was evidence in some cases that candidates had chosen the topic area they wanted to write about and then paid little heed to the title. Time spent studying the title and planning the essay is never wasted.

Question 1

Welche Konflikte zwischen den Generationen schaden der Gesellschaft und wie könnte man Ihrer Meinung nach diese Probleme lösen?

This question was chosen by a substantial minority of candidates. Most candidates had a clear grasp of generational conflict but many appeared to have difficulty relating this to the element of the question which required them to focus on the damage these conflicts inflict on society. Indeed many ignored this element altogether and merely gave examples of conflict situations and suggested how they could be resolved. This approach, of course, restricted the Content marks that could be awarded.

There was the usual confusion between *Jugendliche, Jugend* and *Jungen* which led to errors in meaning, endings and number. *Das Problem* often appeared as *die Probleme* used as singular.

Question 2

„Im Internet stecken mehr Gefahren als Vorteile.“ Sind Sie auch der Meinung?

This was the most popular question: the advantages and disadvantages of the Internet appeared not only to have been widely discussed by candidates but also to be of genuine interest to them. No candidate was short of material; indeed it proved to be quite challenging to find the right balance between detail and generalisation and at the same time keep within the 400 word limit. Many candidates restricted themselves to describing the attributes or otherwise of the Internet rather than explaining why these might be considered advantageous or dangerous. The essays were usually well structured by grouping the positives and negatives separately, although some very good essays explored aspects of the Internet which had both good and bad points and structured their essays according to theme. Some candidates announced their opinion in the introduction, even though it would seem more logical to discuss the two sides of the argument and decide between them in the conclusion.

As the language of the Internet is almost an international language in its own right, vocabulary posed few problems for candidates. There was, however, a surprising number who were unsure of the gender of *Internet* and sometimes chose to leave out the article altogether.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

Question 3

„Unser Bildungssystem richtet sich zu sehr auf Prüfungen, nicht genug auf das Individuum." Sind Sie auch so pessimistisch?

Since examinations are clearly uppermost in a candidate's mind at the time of writing, this topic appealed to many. Opinions were divided but most agreed that examinations were a necessary evil. Most candidates discussed this aspect of the title readily but had more difficulty with the development of the individual. There were some interesting insights into the education system in the candidates' own country although some candidates were tempted into descriptions, rather than the analysis called for in the title.

Question 4

Wie kann die Erste Welt der Dritten Welt vernünftig helfen?

This essay question produced some very thoughtful and quite sophisticated essays. Weaker candidates, however, tended to overlook the word *vernünftig* in the title. This required some evaluation of the help to be given by the developed world to the Third World and not merely a list of possible ways of delivering aid.

Many candidates tried to use the *Erste Welt* and *Dritten Welt* from the title as adjectives. That *helfen* takes the dative was recognised by a pleasing number of candidates.

Question 5

„Investitionen in das kulturelle Erbe eines Landes ist Geldverschwendung." Nehmen Sie Stellung zu dieser Aussage.

This question was the least popular with candidates, probably because it lies further from their immediate sphere of interest than the other topics. Those who did attempt this question seemed to have chosen well. They appeared to be ambitious and thoughtful candidates who produced essays that showed some insight.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

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, with well-chosen examples to illustrate points made, and structured their argument well. Most candidates had sound 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 in previous years: relevance to the question and an ability to organise their essays coherently were crucial.

Layout and Labelling: A small number of candidates did not label their work clearly. They wrote the overall question number down but omitted to specify the sub-question they were answering. This meant that the Examiner had to judge the answer according to the question that it fitted best. In some cases, candidates' work was stapled or bound together in a random way, making it difficult to determine where one essay finished and the next one started. These points are important from the candidate's point of view as clear labelling of individual essays together with clear paragraphing throughout the essays is often linked to a more organised and structured approach overall.

Following Instructions: The syllabus makes it clear that candidates are required to answer **three** questions in the target language on three **different** texts and this instruction is repeated on the front cover of the question paper. A few candidates wrote just one or two essays rather than the three required. In those rare cases where candidates wrote two essays on the same text they could unfortunately not be credited for one of their essays.

Focus on the terms of the question: Copying down the question and clearly labelling their work can help candidates to focus on their topic of choice and they can then refer to the question in order to ask themselves whether each point they are making is relevant to their answer. The essay titles are carefully worded and candidates' first task when tackling an essay is to decide what is expected. A number of candidates engaged well with the title set and focused on the issues raised. On a few occasions, however, the titles were ignored and candidates simply wrote down what they knew about the books, rather than answering the questions. This limits the extent to which such candidates can be credited under the mark scheme.

Structuring the essay: Candidates who demonstrated the ability to organise their material and structure their argument effectively were able to access the higher mark bands. An essay is an argument, with the writer seeking to persuade the reader of the validity of their argument. To persuade the reader an argument needs to be properly structured, introducing the theme, presenting evidence and leading to a conclusion. Some candidates did not introduce their work or started with what would effectively be their conclusion, while others did not come to any conclusion. This made their overall argument less persuasive.

Clear paragraphing also helps to structure a coherent argument and a number of candidates demonstrated this effectively. Essays where there were no paragraphs often lacked coherence as well, with some candidates jumping from one point to the next, without giving relevant examples or evaluating or analysing the material as required.

Language: It was pleasing to see an increased number of candidates this year able to produce the level of language required to write essays that could easily be followed. Weaknesses in vocabulary, punctuation and grammar still made some essays more difficult to read, as well as limiting the marks that candidates could access under the mark scheme.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

Examples of particular weaknesses:

- Inconsistent usage of capital letters: omission from nouns, use with verbs and adjectives.
- Cases, especially dative singular and plural.
- ß and ss, the former still required after long vowels and diphthongs, the latter after short vowels.
- confusion between *das* and *dass.*
- writing *nicht ein* for *kein*.
- vocabulary errors: *Eigentümer*, meaning people, mistaken for plural of *Eigentum*; *Hitler-Anfänger* instead of *Hitler-Anhänger* ; *Analphabetikerin* for *Analphabetin*.
- Incorrect past tense forms: *er stiehlte* instead of *er stahl*; *wurfte* instead of *warf*.
- Omission of umlauts: *jüngere*; *ändern*; *töten*.
- Register/style: language can be too informal. It is important for candidates to differentiate in their responses on this paper between a spoken/colloquial and a written/formal style, the latter being generally more appropriate here.
- Anglicisms: In a number of instances where candidates' vocabulary was weak, English phrases were translated word for word into German: *In meiner Meinung* for *Meiner Meinung nach* is probably the most frequently found example.

Length: Some candidates' answers were too short. In a number of cases what was written indicated the potential for a better performance if the candidate had continued with and developed their essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Von Droste-Hülshoff – *Die Judenbuche*

This text was reasonably popular with candidates, with more choosing the commentary than the essay question.

(a) (i) Better candidates went through the extract systematically and listed all the points that were making Brandis feel uneasy: the heat, the ravens, the lack of vegetation and the foul-smelling mushrooms, as well as the behaviour of the dog. Some weaker candidates confused Friedrich with Johannes and seemed to be uncertain which character had hanged himself from the tree.

(ii) The second part of the question was successfully dealt with on the whole, although a small minority talked about justice throughout the story rather than at the end as specified in the question. Underlining key words and copying out the title of the question could have helped prevent this.

(b) The candidates who chose the second question on this book usually answered reasonably well. They were able to point out that justice could be done without any need for a court and that the inscription on the tree linked the murder and the murderer even after a number of years had passed. There was a tendency on the part of some candidates to tell the story, without focusing closely on the question.

Question 2

Richter – *Damals war es Friedrich*

This text proved popular with candidates, many of whom chose to write about the extract from the book. The answers were mostly well considered.

(a) (i) The first part of the commentary question asked candidates to look at the passage in some detail. Candidates were asked to explain how the situation had arisen and why the policeman did not believe the boys.

(ii) In the second part of this question candidates were asked to link the extract to the rest of the book, which some candidates responded to well by linking other episodes systematically to the events and people in the extract.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

(b) This essay question was also relatively popular. Candidates were asked to describe how society in the Third Reich was depicted in the book. Some candidates listed facts they knew about the Third Reich independently of the book and made only passing reference to the text. More successful attempts showed how in the book and in the Third Reich anti-Semitism had spread and become more visible during the period in question. Some candidates were able to link the characters in the book to various groups in society, which showed a high level of insight and a clear understanding of the author's intentions.

Question 3

Wimschneider – *Herbstmilch*

(a) There was a relatively small number of candidates for this question and some answers showed that the extract had not been fully understood.

(i) A minority of candidates thought that Anna was an adult when the visit occurred and wrote about her mother-in-law having sent the nuns to check on how Anna was managing. However, most candidates were able to explain the reasons for the interference by outsiders in the affairs of the household as arising out of curiosity and misplaced religious zeal.

(ii) Candidates seemed to find the second part of the question harder to answer. Most gave just one example of people elsewhere in the book interfering in Anna's affairs, namely her mother-in-law, and focused their attention on her. Candidates were less likely to mention Anna's brothers or her neighbours, those who were well-meaning and those who were less so.

(b) Candidates who chose the second question had a range of views on the role of religion in Anna's life and wrote effectively about the change in Anna's attitude towards it. Candidates referred to Anna's children and her life as a pensioner and included well-chosen examples from the book in their answers.

Section 2

Question 4

Fontane – *Effi Briest*

This text was chosen by just a few candidates, and the majority of those opted for the second question. All of the essays included a number of general statements; the language in some instances was rather colloquial.

(a) Most candidates agreed that Effi's mother was right to be concerned about her daughter in view of Effi's tempestuous nature. In developing their answer they concluded that Instetten was not the right husband for a young girl with this kind of attitude, though evidence provided from the book by some candidates to support this view was rather thin. Most candidates spoke of Instetten's absence and his lack of humour, but few referred to the haunted house or to the shock caused by the affair.

(b) The second question, concerning major social issues of the day dealt with in the novel, produced some interesting results. Several candidates compared the role of women in society at the time with the position nowadays. Instetten's behaviour was described as neglectful of Effi, though candidates also attributed some of the blame for the failure of her marriage to Effi herself and to her parents. A number of candidates omitted reference to some important aspects of the society of the time, such as the significance of honour and fidelity and social class, and the result was that answers were less closely linked to the question than they could have been.

Question 5

Dürrenmatt – *Der Besuch der alten Dame*

This text was popular with candidates, most of whom chose to answer the first of the two essay titles.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com

(a) Many candidates chose to answer the first question on this text, relating to the extent to which the play could be regarded as topical. Candidates generally were of the opinion that the play was still up to date, because the themes were current ones: revenge, greed, wanting to be rich. They were able to explain why the play had some old-fashioned elements in it – TV sets, for example, instead of DVD-players, and I-pods, though these did not detract from its power for a modern audience. Better candidates built on this foundation to show how the core themes and their implications were personified by characters in the play: members of the family losing touch with each other as their material wealth increased; the punishment meted out to the judge and the witnesses in the play. These candidates were generally able to link their examples to the themes using German of a good standard.

(b) The second question was less popular with candidates. It required a precise definition of the word *Zufall*. Where candidates did not take this as their starting point, the question was hard to answer effectively. Where, on the other hand, candidates did do this, they had a sound base to start from and could refer to a range of different instances of chance and/or fate in action in the play, from the chance that led Klara to marry a billionaire to Ill's ultimate destiny.

Question 6

Schlink – *Der Vorleser*

This text again proved popular with candidates and some good quality answers were produced in response to both questions.

(a) A number of candidates chose the first question which asked them to consider whether Hanna Schmitz was a criminal who deserved a life sentence. There were some sound and well-structured answers in response. Most candidates had a clear opinion about the sentence Hanna had been given and made it clear that they thought her inability to read and write should have led to mitigating circumstances.

(b) The best essay written in response to this question on the part played by lies and lying in the book started off by identifying different types of lying that had occurred: downright lying; telling partial truths; staying silent. These were then set in context and their impact on the people involved discussed. Candidates who focused in their answer on either one of the main characters without linking them under this heading were less successful.

© UCLES 2008
www.theallpapers.com