



L-Università  
ta' Malta

MATSEC  
Examinations Board



# Examiners' Report

## IM GERMAN

Special September Session 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	STATISTICAL INFORMATION .....	2
B.	GENERAL REMARKS .....	2
	General Remarks on the Written Examination .....	2
C.	COMMENTS ON PAPER II .....	2
	Essay and Letter .....	2
	Reading Comprehension .....	3
	Landeskunde .....	3
D.	CONCLUDING COMMENTS .....	3

## A. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

The total number of candidates who registered to sit for Intermediate German was **65**. This number is greater than the number of candidates, who sat for the main session in 2019, which was **38** but compares well to the total number of candidates who sat for the main and September session in 2019. This year the candidates sat for Paper II only.

Table 1 shows the distribution of grades for the Special September Session 2020.

GRADE	A	B	C	D	E	F	ABS	TOTAL
NO. OF CANDIDATES	7	9	12	11	11	5	10	65
% OF TOTAL	10.8	13.8	18.5	16.9	16.9	7.7	15.4	100.0

*Table 1: Distribution of grades for IM German 2020 Special September Session*

## B. GENERAL REMARKS

### General Remarks on the Written Examination

This year the examination was based on a new syllabus. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the candidates were tested only on their written skills and as a result the examination consisted only of two written tasks, the reading comprehension and the culture section. In general the level was quite low when compared to other years.

## C. COMMENTS ON PAPER II

### Essay and Letter

33 candidates chose the narrative title, 9 candidates chose the descriptive title, while the argumentative essay was chosen by 11 candidates. This shows that once again the candidates prefer to write a narrative essay to other genres. The candidates attained quite low marks in this task, especially in the narrative and descriptive essays. Some interpreted the title "Ein Tag als Tourist auf Malta" as a recommendation and others wrote statements and/or arguments which were out of point.

Although the letter included instructions for the candidates to include the "Anrede" and "Datum", some of the candidates still left these out. Wrong salutations such as "Lieber Artikel Schreiber" or "Liebe Leute" and improper greetings such as "Danke" or "Freundliches Güten" were produced at the end.

The usual mistakes namely in orthography, articles, declension of adjectives and conjugation as well as in sentence structure were evident this year. The use of English vocabulary with a German twist was also noted. This applies also to the way the candidates expressed themselves.

### Reading Comprehension

There was no change in this part of the exam in the new syllabus. The candidates showed good receptive skills with only a few questions posing a difficulty for some. In the third question of the comprehension, there were many pupils who just gave "verkaufen und "kaufen" as an answer. In question 5 of the comprehension, most candidates used the preposition "vor" (instead of "seit") in their answer and did not include "etwa" or other similar words.

In the grammar section the performance of the majority of the pupils was good, with only a few displaying lack of grammatical knowledge and producing wrong answers.

### Landeskunde

The culture section had a new format compared to the old syllabus. In the new syllabus three tasks are set:

- Section A: Question and short answers
- Section B: A cloze test, in which the candidates have to fill their own words
- Section C: Writing a short paragraph about a certain topic.

The level was average, with some candidates attaining good marks, while the performance of others was poor. In section A many provided wrong answers implying lack of preparation for the task. In Section B most candidates did well. Some candidates were out of point in Section C and a number of candidates who chose to write about "einige Produkte (some products), wrote only about one product and in many cases about cars. Candidates need to be prepared better for this section.

### D. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Once again the performance of the candidates was better in the receptive skills rather than in the production skills. Lack of vocabulary was evident throughout. Candidates should be reminded to apply the grammar rules in their writing tasks as well, as one could sometimes note inconsistencies in the performance of the candidates in the grammar section and in the production tasks. Though in the culture section, an improvement was noted, it is recommended that the candidates prepare themselves more for this section.

Chairperson  
Examination Panel 2020