

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/01  
Speaking

## Key Messages

- Some of the following messages have been acted upon by Centres after appearing in previous reports, but are repeated here for reference.
- Presentations (**Section 1**) should be firmly rooted within the contemporary society or cultural heritage of a country where German is spoken. Candidates who make no reference to such a country will have their marks for Content halved, or, if there is very little reference, reduced. Native speakers of German should not assume a listener realises that they are speaking about their homeland and should also give specific details and references. It is not acceptable to make a presentation about the country of domicile, unless this occurs as part of a comparison, where information about the German-speaking country should still predominate. General presentations on such topics as “Global Warming” are often unsuitable, as it is hard to fit them into the above-mentioned form. Fairly trivial or restrictive topics, such as “Kebabs in Germany” should also be avoided.
- Both in the Topic Conversation (**Section 2**) and in the General Conversation (**Section 3**) candidates must engage in a dialogue with the Examiner and ask him or her some questions. It is not acceptable to include these questions in the Presentation, except perhaps one at the very end to introduce the Topic Conversation, nor is it acceptable to ask a large number of questions at the very end of **section 3**, having previously asked none at all. If no questions are asked within either of the sections, no marks may be awarded for Seeking Information in that section. To obtain a mark of 4 out of 5 in a section at least two questions must be asked. The maximum mark is three if there is only one question.
- Please adhere to the timings specified for this examination. In particular, the Presentation should not be allowed to be too long. An Examiner should interrupt with a question after about four minutes, and three and a half minutes would be a more appropriate length. **Section 2** and **section 3** conversations should be of approximately equal length, say around eight minutes. It is difficult to achieve a high mark for Providing Information or Responsiveness if one section is cut too short. There is no point in allowing the examination to last more than 20 minutes in total as no extra marks can be gained and a candidate might tire after this length of time.
- A quiet and perhaps relatively small room should be chosen to conduct the examination in. If machinery is operating, or if there is loud traffic or people talking in the background, or even an echo in a large space, candidates will not have optimum conditions. For preference record onto cd rather than tape, as sound quality is notably better, and please place the microphone or recording equipment where both Examiner and candidate are audible to a listener / Moderator.

## General Comments

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

### **Specific Comments on the sections of the examination**

Some of the comments above will also be relevant to this part of the report.

#### **Section 1 (Presentation)**

- The manner of delivery of the presentation should be taken into account. Only award nine or ten marks for Content if the delivery is lively and confident rather than stilted and hesitant, in addition to including the ideas and opinions stated in the mark-scheme.
- For a mark of five for Pronunciation a candidate does not have to be a native speaker. "Hesitation", though mentioned in the mark-scheme, should not really figure highly when considering Pronunciation, but perhaps more so when considering delivery of the presentation or the Language mark.
- A well-prepared presentation by a correctly entered candidate should be able to access at least 4 marks for Language, as the criteria mention a "reasonable range" of structures and (topic-specific) vocabulary, delivered "fairly fluently", and provided there is no ambiguity of meaning.
- There was an excellent range of interesting Presentation topics this year, of which the following are just a selection:  
das Engadin; Beschneidung minderjähriger Jungen; Immigration; medizinische Forschung; Deutschland in den Olympischen Spielen; Mangel an Schulsport in Deutschland; Ehrenmord; Modeschöpfer; Kinderlosigkeit; Organspendeskandal; mein Praktikum bei Mercedes; Islam in der Schweiz; Schlafstörungen; Deutschlands Rolle in der Eurokrise; Abholzung; Geschichte des Sports.

#### **Section 2 (Topic Conversation)**

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

#### **Section 3 (General Conversation)**

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

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/21  
Reading and Writing

## Key Messages

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

## General comments

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

There was some evidence that weaker candidates did not always understand the questions, tending to focus on particular words within questions, e.g.: *Obst und Gemüse* **Question 4(e)** and then moving directly to the paragraph indicated. Even though the textual paragraphs were short, some answers were then long in the attempt to include every detail.

Candidates should be advised to write clearly and legibly, and ideally to leave a line between answers within **Questions 3 and 4**, as well some distinctive space between these Question sets. It is helpful if a candidate's answer sheets are properly fastened together.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1 (Erster Teil)**

#### **Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)**

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (b) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (c) This was mostly answered correctly. Very occasionally *erst* was suggested.
- (d) This was mostly answered correctly.

- (e) This was mostly answered correctly.

### Question 2 (*Grammatical manipulation*)

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (b) This was usually answered correctly. A change of tense was not awarded. This was not required, and suggested that *wird* had not been recognised as passive in the original sentence.
- (c) This was usually answered correctly. Correct non-passive answers were accepted, provided that the article *das* before *Essverhalten* was retained.
- (d) This was usually answered correctly.
- (e) This was usually answered correctly. There was occasional difficulty with the rendering of *schmeckt*.

### Question 3

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

- (a) Most candidates were able to earn at least two marks here. However, the text statements on *Gemüse* and *Pasta* were quite often reproduced in their entirety.
- (b) There was some tendency to carry forward the idea of *Probleme* from the previous question, and so to focus on *Qualitätsunterschiede*. Some candidates then lost sight of the remainder of paragraph three.
- (c) Most candidates were able to earn at least one of the two marks available here. Not all answers embraced the two different responses of the schoolchildren. Again there was, some over-reliance on the text, and the notion of *fit* on its own was incomplete by way of an answer.
- (d) Despite close reliance on the text, a good number of candidates earned two of the three marks available here. Some answers did not include the third factor of 'concentration'.
- (e) Most candidates earned the mark for observing meal preparation. Some candidates did not appear to appreciate the 'learning' purpose of the farm visits. Others relied rather too heavily and closely on the long text sequence *mehr Interesse an der Herkunft der Nahrung zu wecken*.
- (f) Very occasionally candidates did not appear to recognise the quite different slants of this and the previous **Question (e)**, as both referred to paragraph five. There was some reluctance to express *ein viel gesünderes Miteinander* in own words, but equally some excellent own version renderings that captured the essence of this idea often simply yet perfectly – e.g.: by means of *freundlicher / freundliche(re) Atmosphäre*.

### Section 2 (*Zweiter Teil*)

#### Question 4

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

- (a) There were four acceptable answer elements here and most candidates were able to identify at least three to earn the maximum 3 marks available.
- (b) Most candidates earned the full 3 marks here. Occasionally only *Johann Lafer* was mentioned without reference to the other specialists, and occasionally candidates omitted to state the aim of the project.

- (c) This 4 mark question was generally accessible, and a good number of candidates were able to earn at least 3 marks. *Schokoriegel* or *Süßigkeiten* on their own did not sufficiently represent the point that 'snacks' were easier and therefore preferable to the children.
- (d) Weaker candidates experienced difficulty here in relating the question to the material in the paragraph, and referred simply to the factual elements of autographs and photos. Some saw *Investition* simply in terms of money.
- (e) Most candidates were able to earn two of the three marks available here. Some candidates did not identify the significance of cost variation depending on the season. There was also some evident tendency to see the *EU-Schulobstprogramm* as the same thing as the research project with which *Lafer* was involved. However, the way that answers were individually phrased did not necessarily lead to the forfeit of this last mark.

### Question 5

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

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

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

There were a good number of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to earn some five or six of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question. Candidates should aim to strike a good balance of selected textual points, drawn from the different approaches of the two texts for their overall relevance to the question. Some answers explored too much of the detail, some were too generalised or superficial and made little reference to textual points.

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

#### Language:

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

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

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/22  
Reading and Writing

## Key Messages

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

## General comments

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

There was some evidence that weaker candidates did not always understand the questions, tending to focus on particular words within questions, e.g.: *Obst und Gemüse* **Question 4(e)** and then moving directly to the paragraph indicated. Even though the textual paragraphs were short, some answers were then long in the attempt to include every detail.

Candidates should be advised to write clearly and legibly, and ideally to leave a line between answers within **Questions 3 and 4**, as well some distinctive space between these Question sets. It is helpful if a candidate's answer sheets are properly fastened together.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1 (Erster Teil)**

#### **Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)**

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (b) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (c) This was mostly answered correctly. Very occasionally *erst* was suggested.
- (d) This was mostly answered correctly.

- (e) This was mostly answered correctly.

### Question 2 (*Grammatical manipulation*)

- (a) This was mostly answered correctly.
- (b) This was usually answered correctly. A change of tense was not awarded. This was not required, and suggested that *wird* had not been recognised as passive in the original sentence.
- (c) This was usually answered correctly. Correct non-passive answers were accepted, provided that the article *das* before *Essverhalten* was retained.
- (d) This was usually answered correctly.
- (e) This was usually answered correctly. There was occasional difficulty with the rendering of *schmeckt*.

### Question 3

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

- (a) Most candidates were able to earn at least two marks here. However, the text statements on *Gemüse* and *Pasta* were quite often reproduced in their entirety.
- (b) There was some tendency to carry forward the idea of *Probleme* from the previous question, and so to focus on *Qualitätsunterschiede*. Some candidates then lost sight of the remainder of paragraph three.
- (c) Most candidates were able to earn at least one of the two marks available here. Not all answers embraced the two different responses of the schoolchildren. Again there was, some over-reliance on the text, and the notion of *fit* on its own was incomplete by way of an answer.
- (d) Despite close reliance on the text, a good number of candidates earned two of the three marks available here. Some answers did not include the third factor of 'concentration'.
- (e) Most candidates earned the mark for observing meal preparation. Some candidates did not appear to appreciate the 'learning' purpose of the farm visits. Others relied rather too heavily and closely on the long text sequence *mehr Interesse an der Herkunft der Nahrung zu wecken*.
- (f) Very occasionally candidates did not appear to recognise the quite different slants of this and the previous **Question (e)**, as both referred to paragraph five. There was some reluctance to express *ein viel gesünderes Miteinander* in own words, but equally some excellent own version renderings that captured the essence of this idea often simply yet perfectly – e.g.: by means of *freundlicher / freundliche(re) Atmosphäre*.

### Section 2 (*Zweiter Teil*)

#### Question 4

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

- (a) There were four acceptable answer elements here and most candidates were able to identify at least three to earn the maximum 3 marks available.
- (b) Most candidates earned the full 3 marks here. Occasionally only *Johann Lafer* was mentioned without reference to the other specialists, and occasionally candidates omitted to state the aim of the project.

- (c) This 4 mark question was generally accessible, and a good number of candidates were able to earn at least 3 marks. *Schokoriegel* or *Süßigkeiten* on their own did not sufficiently represent the point that 'snacks' were easier and therefore preferable to the children.
- (d) Weaker candidates experienced difficulty here in relating the question to the material in the paragraph, and referred simply to the factual elements of autographs and photos. Some saw *Investition* simply in terms of money.
- (e) Most candidates were able to earn two of the three marks available here. Some candidates did not identify the significance of cost variation depending on the season. There was also some evident tendency to see the *EU-Schulobstprogramm* as the same thing as the research project with which *Lafer* was involved. However, the way that answers were individually phrased did not necessarily lead to the forfeit of this last mark.

### Question 5

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

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

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

There were a good number of points to be made again this year, and many candidates were able to earn some five or six of the ten marks available for this summary part of the question. Candidates should aim to strike a good balance of selected textual points, drawn from the different approaches of the two texts for their overall relevance to the question. Some answers explored too much of the detail, some were too generalised or superficial and made little reference to textual points.

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

#### Language:

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

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

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/23  
Reading and Writing

## Key Messages

- In answering **Questions 3 and 4** candidates should heed the rubric ***ohne längere Satzteile direkt vom Text abzuschreiben***, which appears highlighted at the top of the respective pages.
- **Question 5 (a)** requires that candidates summarize the significant points relevant to the phrasing of question by specific reference to both texts. This should be done clearly and as concisely as possible, given the word limit requirements of “about 140 words” as stated in the Syllabus. This first part **(a)** should not include personal opinions or details of personal experience. The second part **(b)** of this question requires a personal response to the issue under discussion – this year, the future of commercial aviation - but should be considered in the wider context of overall relevance of the issue for society or the world as a whole.

## General comments

As comprehension is being tested through the target language and in written form, it is necessary that answers show understanding of the question, and of the material selected for answering, in the candidate’s own words. This is underlined by the provision of paragraph indicators at the end of each question, which show that the relevant material need not be sought elsewhere in the text.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1 (Erster Teil)**

#### **Question 1 (Vocabulary substitution)**

- (a) This was answered correctly.
- (b) This answer was incorrect.
- (c) This was answered correctly.
- (d) This answer was incorrect.
- (e) This answer was incorrect.

#### **Question 2 (Grammatical manipulation)**

- (a) This answer was incorrect. Subject/verb accord was incorrect.
- (b) This answer was incorrect. A passive construction was required.
- (c) This answer was incorrect. The separable verb *durchgehen* was not recognized.
- (d) This answer was incorrect. A *dass* clause was attempted, but incorrectly implemented.
- (e) This answer was incorrect. Subject/verb accord was incorrect.

### Question 3

As stated above, the simple reproduction of a section of the text by way of an answer does not confirm comprehension and therefore cannot receive credit.

- (a) This was answered correctly. The candidate was able to adapt the question to the material of the text.
- (b) There was some extensive lifting from the text for the first answer element.
- (c) The candidate's answer omitted to mention the shortage of space.
- (d) The candidate's answer omitted to include the notions of comfort and privacy.
- (e) There was extensive lifting from the text here, without variation or attempts to explain.
- (f) The candidate's answer did not show comprehension either of the question or the text, and copying from the text was extensive.

### Section 2 (Zweiter Teil)

#### Exercise 4

This exercise, as should be expected, was a little more difficult in the main.

- (a) The candidate's attempt to explain *ruinierte Urlaubspläne* was satisfactorily comprehensible.
- (b) Extensive copying from the text rendered the candidate's German sentence incorrect. However, one mark could be awarded in this particular instance.
- (c) The correct answer of climate change being the suggested cause of the atypical weather was negated by the candidate's *nicht*. The last part of paragraph two was unsatisfactorily – and incorrectly - copied.
- (d) The candidate's extended copying of *wenn ein Vulkan.....macht* could not be awarded and did not provide a satisfactory answer to the question.
- (e) There was extensive reliance on the text here, but sufficient material could be extracted for the award of 2 marks.
- (f) The candidate's answer did not show comprehension of *Beliebtheit* or of the question.

### Question 5

Candidates are here required to summarise the issues and arguments presented in the two texts, as relative to the direction of the question given (*cf Key Messages*, above). Reference must be made to both texts. Essential relevance, as well as conciseness and the effectiveness of the writing, will have a bearing on achievement. Words should not be wasted by too long or too general an introduction, and it is strongly recommended that candidates allow themselves time to plan their response. As the task of assembling and linking selected points effectively is not a naturally easy one for candidates, it is clear that summary skills for this purpose need to be quite well practised in advance. Whilst each text may be dealt with separately in the answer to part (a), a useful approach can also be to compare and contrast ideas in the two texts, in order to link appropriate points. This can save words, and so aid conciseness.

Whilst the candidate observed the word limit requirements for parts (a) and (b) of this question, both answer parts were personalized and repetitive in content. In order to score higher marks, it was required to weigh up the considerations and ideas expressed in the texts for the future of air passenger transport.

Language:

The remaining five marks in **Question 5** are for the quality of the language. The candidate's performance, consistent with own language offered in answers in **Questions 3 and 4**, showed that there were difficulties with subject/verb agreement, with word order, prepositional case and with range of vocabulary – eg: *in die Zukunft, man können die wetter kontrollieren*. Whilst there was some awareness of modal verbs – *muss* and *können*, sentence structure was simple, and not always comprehensible – eg: *Mann muss nur in dem Pläne sitzen und bleiben dann sie können auf alle Kontinente auswirkte*. Content relied here quite heavily on repetition of material eg: *Fliegen ist .....*. In order to score highly for Language, candidates need to demonstrate an ability to write consistently accurate and to use more complex structures.

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/31  
Essay

## General Comments:

The essays were mainly distributed between the first four topics on both papers this series, with *Cultural Life* being the least popular topic. As always there was the complete range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to those where the candidate struggled both for ideas and the means to express them.

It was pleasing that most candidates wrote within the prescribed number of words (between 250 and 400), as a longer essay does not necessarily increase the number of marks either for Content or Language. Nearly all candidates are aware of the need to provide an introduction and a conclusion and use paragraphs well. It is important that candidates study the essay question carefully so that they are clear about what they are being asked to discuss. Those who had read one or two vocabulary items in the title and then made false assumptions about what was required were limited to low band marks. The same was true for those who wrote an essay on the topic area which failed to address the specific title. It would seem good practice for the candidates to copy out the question before starting on the essay and constantly refer back to this title to ensure that the points they are making are relevant. Some thinking time before starting to write is very beneficial, as an essay with considered arguments makes a better impression than one with a number of very superficial observations.

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

Common errors:

- the use of *man* causes difficulties with possessives for many candidates. As a result many switch to 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural which creates confusion between singular and plural verb endings.
- confusion between *ob* and *wenn*
- word order after subordinating conjunctions
- using *sollen* instead of *sollten*
- the incorrect use of *bekommen* to mean 'become'
- a lack of article

## Question 1

*Wir leben immer länger. Sollten wir deshalb auch immer länger arbeiten? Was meinen Sie?*

There were plenty of directions to explore in this title: from the effects on the individual to the consequences for the state. Most candidates who wrote on this topic managed to produce a good number of arguments for and against working beyond the current pensionable age and were quite evenly divided in their conclusions.

## Question 2

*Die traditionelle Zeitung aus Papier ist ein veraltetes Kommunikationsmittel, das bald verschwinden wird. Teilen Sie diese Meinung?*

Candidates had plenty of ideas at their disposal for this title. As young people, most had experience of, and preferred, online news but few seemed to think the demise of the traditional newspaper was imminent.

## Question 3

*„Es ist nur möglich die Natur zu retten, wenn man die Menschen von ihr fernhält.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?*

Most candidates who opted for this essay disagreed with the statement, although they were almost all in favour of intervening on behalf of the natural world. The points made tended to be rather general but a few essays made reference to aboriginal peoples who lived in harmony with their environment.

## Question 4

*„Alles, was man zum Lernen braucht, steht im Internet.“ Könnte der Computer den Lehrer im Klassenzimmer ersetzen? Was wären Ihrer Meinung nach die Vorteile und Nachteile davon?*

The subject matter of this essay was within the personal experience of the many candidates who chose this title. They made many valid and sometimes insightful points about the nature of the learning process. It would seem that, if it is left to the candidates, teachers need not fear for their jobs.

## Question 5

*Die Mehrheit der berühmten Kunstwerke wurde von Männern geschaffen. Sind Frauen als Künstler Ihrer Meinung nach weniger begabt?*

This topic is always a minority interest and this series was no exception. The essays tend to be at either end of the spectrum: those that are thoughtful and coherently argued or those that tend to be sketchy and where the candidate often disregards or misunderstands the title.

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/32  
Essay

## General Comments:

The essays were mainly distributed between the first four topics on both papers this series, with *Cultural Life* being the least popular topic. As always there was the complete range of responses: from thoughtful, well-structured essays to those where the candidate struggled both for ideas and the means to express them.

It was pleasing that most candidates wrote within the prescribed number of words (between 250 and 400), as a longer essay does not necessarily increase the number of marks either for Content or Language. Nearly all candidates are aware of the need to provide an introduction and a conclusion and use paragraphs well. It is important that candidates study the essay question carefully so that they are clear about what they are being asked to discuss. Those who had read one or two vocabulary items in the title and then made false assumptions about what was required were limited to low band marks. The same was true for those who wrote an essay on the topic area which failed to address the specific title. It would seem good practice for the candidates to copy out the question before starting on the essay and constantly refer back to this title to ensure that the points they are making are relevant. Some thinking time before starting to write is very beneficial, as an essay with considered arguments makes a better impression than one with a number of very superficial observations.

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

Common errors:

- the use of *man* causes difficulties with possessives for many candidates. As a result many switch to 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural which creates confusion between singular and plural verb endings.
- confusion between *ob* and *wenn*
- word order after subordinating conjunctions
- using *sollen* instead of *sollten*
- the incorrect use of *bekommen* to mean 'become'
- a lack of article

## Question 1

*Wir leben immer länger. Sollten wir deshalb auch immer länger arbeiten? Was meinen Sie?*

There were plenty of directions to explore in this title: from the effects on the individual to the consequences for the state. Most candidates who wrote on this topic managed to produce a good number of arguments for and against working beyond the current pensionable age and were quite evenly divided in their conclusions.

## Question 2

*Die traditionelle Zeitung aus Papier ist ein veraltetes Kommunikationsmittel, das bald verschwinden wird. Teilen Sie diese Meinung?*

Candidates had plenty of ideas at their disposal for this title. As young people, most had experience of, and preferred, online news but few seemed to think the demise of the traditional newspaper was imminent.

## Question 3

*„Es ist nur möglich die Natur zu retten, wenn man die Menschen von ihr fernhält.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?*

Most candidates who opted for this essay disagreed with the statement, although they were almost all in favour of intervening on behalf of the natural world. The points made tended to be rather general but a few essays made reference to aboriginal peoples who lived in harmony with their environment.

## Question 4

*„Alles, was man zum Lernen braucht, steht im Internet.“ Könnte der Computer den Lehrer im Klassenzimmer ersetzen? Was wären Ihrer Meinung nach die Vorteile und Nachteile davon?*

The subject matter of this essay was within the personal experience of the many candidates who chose this title. They made many valid and sometimes insightful points about the nature of the learning process. It would seem that, if it is left to the candidates, teachers need not fear for their jobs.

## Question 5

*Die Mehrheit der berühmten Kunstwerke wurde von Männern geschaffen. Sind Frauen als Künstler Ihrer Meinung nach weniger begabt?*

This topic is always a minority interest and this series was no exception. The essays tend to be at either end of the spectrum: those that are thoughtful and coherently argued or those that tend to be sketchy and where the candidate often disregards or misunderstands the title.

# GERMAN

---

Paper 8683/33  
(HK100) Essay

## Key messages

In order to perform well in this paper, candidates should:

- select the title with which they feel most comfortable;
- write a response that is clearly relevant, well illustrated, coherently structured and well informed;
- use German which is accurate and of a suitably advanced nature, as well as demonstrate a good use of idiom and appropriate topic-related vocabulary;
- use sentence patterns which show some evidence of complexity in a style which is easy to follow;
- leave some time at the end of the examination to check for careless language errors.

## General comments

The candidate knows how to structure an essay with an introduction, two paragraphs and a conclusion and has written an essay of an appropriate length. The points made addressed the title (which was certainly not the case in all Centres) but most of the ideas appeared in the introductory paragraph and then were repeated with some minor developments in the subsequent essay.

It is impossible to tell whether the candidate was limited by vocabulary or by ideas but the result is an essay with a fairly narrow range of vocabulary. There is an attempt at a variety of structure (wenn, weil clauses and changes of word order, for example starting the sentence with *deshalb, dann*) but this is not always successfully achieved. Errors included: confusion of *man* and *Mann* and then continuing with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural (presumably to avoid the problem of which possessive to use with *man*), the use of *man* with a plural verb, missing articles and the misuse of *bekommen* to mean 'become'.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

„Zu viel Freizeit verursacht nur Probleme.“ Wie stehen Sie zu dieser Aussage?

The psychological effect of too much free time was mentioned but the candidate did not pursue the idea of why someone might have too much free time. Bearing in mind that the topic is *Work and Leisure* it seems reasonable to expect him/her to touch on unemployment and its consequences. At this level a successful essay needs to go beyond vague generalizations that are not backed up by giving specific examples which illustrate and clarify the point being made. It is always good practice to work out the possible implications of the title and order one's ideas before starting to write.

**Questions 2, 3, 4, 5** There were no responses from Hong Kong Centres to these titles