



---

**GERMAN (PRINCIPAL)**

**9780/04**

Paper 4 Topics and Texts

**May/June 2017**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages.

**Part I: Cultural Topics**

Candidates are to attempt one question from Part I: Topics and will write their answers in the Target Language as these texts/films are to be studied primarily in cultural context (be it historical, political, social) as well as a literary/cinematic one.

Answers are to be marked out of 30 according to the criteria below:

- 20 for Content [AO3: 10 marks, AO4: 10 marks]
- 10 for Language [AO2]

This paper is intended to test candidates' knowledge and understanding of a topic and their ability to use this knowledge to answer questions in a clear and focused manner. A sophisticated literary approach is not expected (although at the highest levels it is sometimes seen), but great value is placed on evidence of a first-hand response and thoughtful, personal evaluation of what candidates have studied. Candidates may have been encouraged to depend closely on prepared notes and quotations: quotation for its own sake is not useful, though it will not be undervalued if used appropriately to illustrate a point in the answer. This applies to films as well as literary texts. Texts and notes may not be taken into the examination.

Candidates will not tend to show **all** the qualities or faults described in any one mark-band. Examiners will attempt to weigh all these up at every borderline, in order to see whether the work can be considered for the category above.

Examiners will take a positive and flexible approach and, even when there are obvious flaws in an answer, reward evidence of knowledge and especially any signs of understanding and careful organisation. In the marking of these questions, specific guidelines will be given for each question, agreed by the examination team.

| <b>Part I: Topics – Content</b> |                     |   |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| <b>18–20</b>                    | <i>Excellent</i>    | Excellent ability to organise material in relation to the question. Comprehensive knowledge of both texts/films. Ability to look beyond the immediate material and to show good understanding of underlying themes.   |
| <b>15–17</b>                    | <i>Very good</i>    | A thoughtful and well argued response to the question. Thorough knowledge of both texts/films. Detailed understanding and illustration of thematic and comparative issues.  |
| <b>12–14</b>                    | <i>Good</i>         | A well argued response to the question. Equally sound knowledge of both texts/films. Good understanding and illustration of the thematic and comparative issues.  |
| <b>9–11</b>                     | <i>Satisfactory</i> | A mainly relevant response to the question. Shows fair knowledge of texts/films. Some understanding and illustration of the thematic and comparative issues AND/OR good understanding of texts/films, but lacking detail. Stronger on one text/film than the other. |
| <b>5–8</b>                      | <i>Weak</i>         | An uneven OR basic response to the question. Shows some knowledge and understanding of the texts/films. Includes some relevant points, but development and illustration are limited. Contains padding AND/OR has some obvious omissions OR is largely narrative.    |
| <b>1–4</b>                      | <i>Poor</i>         | Little attempt to answer the question. Poor knowledge and understanding of the texts/films. Insubstantial with very little relevance.   |
| <b>0</b>                        |                     | No rewardable content.  |

| <b>Part I: Topics – Language</b> |                     |  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>10</b>                        | <i>Excellent</i>    | Almost flawless. Excellent range of vocabulary and complex sentence patterns. Good sense of idiom.   |
| <b>8–9</b>                       | <i>Very good</i>    | Highly accurate. Wide range of vocabulary and complex sentence patterns. Some sense of idiom.  |
| <b>6–7</b>                       | <i>Good</i>         | Generally accurate. Good range of vocabulary and some complex sentence patterns.   |
| <b>4–5</b>                       | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Predominantly simple patterns correctly used and/or some complex language attempted, but with variable success. Adequate range of vocabulary, but some repetition. |
| <b>2–3</b>                       | <i>Weak</i>         | Persistent errors. Simple and repetitive sentence patterns. Limited vocabulary.  |
| <b>1</b>                         | <i>Poor</i>         | Little evidence of grammatical awareness. Very limited vocabulary.   |
| <b>0</b>                         |                     | No rewardable language.  |

**Part II: Literary Texts**

Candidates are to attempt **one** question from Part II: Texts and will write their answers in English as these texts are to be studied primarily from a literary point of view.

Answers are to be marked out of 30 according to the criteria below:

- 25 for content [AO3: 10 marks, AO4: 15 marks]
- 5 for structure [AO3]

Examiners will look for a candidate's ability to engage with literary texts and to produce answers which show knowledge, understanding and close analysis of the text. A more sophisticated literary approach is expected than for answers to Part I. Great value is placed on detailed knowledge and understanding of the text; on the construction of an argument which engages the terms of the question and on a close and sophisticated analysis of sections of the text pertinent to the terms of the question. Candidates may have been encouraged to depend closely on prepared notes and quotation: quotation for its own sake is not useful, although it will gain credit if used appropriately to illustrate a point in the answer. Texts and notes may not be taken into the examination.

Candidates will not tend to show **all** the qualities or faults described in any one mark-band. Examiners will attempt to weigh all these up at every borderline, in order to see whether the work can be considered in the category above.

Examiners will take a positive and flexible approach and, even when there are obvious flaws in an answer, reward evidence of knowledge and understanding and especially any signs of analysis and organisation.

In the marking of these questions, specific guidelines will be given for each essay, agreed by the examination team.

| <b>Part II: Texts – Content</b> |                     |  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>23–25</b>                    | <i>Excellent</i>    | Excellent ability to organise material in relation to the question. Comprehensive response with an extensive number of relevant points targeting the terms of the question with precision. Displays detailed knowledge and sustained analysis.   |
| <b>19–22</b>                    | <i>Very good</i>    | A thoughtful and well argued response to the question. Includes a large number of relevant points, well illustrated. Displays thorough knowledge, good understanding and analysis of the text.   |
| <b>15–18</b>                    | <i>Good</i>         | A well argued response to the question. Includes a good number of relevant points, most of which are developed and illustrated. Some limitations of insight, but a coherent approach.  |
| <b>11–14</b>                    | <i>Satisfactory</i> | A mainly relevant response to the question. Shows fair knowledge and understanding of the text. Includes a fair number of relevant points not always linked and/or developed.  |
| <b>6–10</b>                     | <i>Weak</i>         | An uneven OR basic response to the question. Shows some knowledge and understanding of the text. Includes some relevant points, but development and illustration are limited. Contains padding AND/OR has some obvious omissions OR is largely narrative.  |
| <b>1–5</b>                      | <i>Poor</i>         | Little attempt to answer the question. Only elementary knowledge and understanding of the text. Makes very few relevant points and even these are largely undeveloped and unsubstantiated. OR a response which makes hardly any attempt to address the terms of the question but which displays a basic general knowledge of the text. |
| <b>0</b>                        |                     | No rewardable content.   |

| <b>Part II: Texts – Structure</b> |                     |   |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| <b>5</b>                          | <i>Very Good</i>    | A well structured and coherent piece of writing, with ideas and arguments clearly linked throughout. All paragraphs well constructed. Includes a comprehensive introduction and conclusion. |
| <b>4</b>                          | <i>Good</i>         | A clear structure, with logical presentation of ideas. Most paragraphs well constructed. Includes an adequate introduction and conclusion.  |
| <b>3</b>                          | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Some success in organising material and ideas into a structured piece of writing. A reasonable attempt to paragraph but weakness in introduction and conclusion.                            |
| <b>2</b>                          | <i>Weak</i>         | Some attempt to organise material and ideas into a structured piece of writing. Many single-sentence paragraphs or no attempt at paragraphing. Organisation of ideas not always logical.    |
| <b>1</b>                          | <i>Poor</i>         | No attempt to organise material and ideas into a structured piece of writing. Incoherent. Ideas introduced in no apparent order.  |
| <b>0</b>                          |                     | No rewardable structure.  |