

GERMAN

Paper 0525/11
Listening (Multiple Choice)

Question Number	Key
1	C
2	B
3	D
4	A
5	B
6	D
7	A
8	A

Question Number	Key
9	C
10	D
11	B
12	A
13	C
14	B

Question Number	Key
15	E
16	D
17	F
18	B
19	C

Question Number	Key
20	A
21	C
22	B
23	B
24	A
25	A
26	B
27	B
28	C

Question Number	Key
29	B
30	B
31	A
32	C
33	D
34	A

Question Number	Key
35	B / E
36	B / C
37	A / D

General comments

June 2022 was the second year that the Listening test consisted entirely of multiple-choice items.

The German extracts gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual pieces, to testing their ability to understand specific information, as well as opinions and explanations, in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

As intended, candidates generally performed well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. The number of correct answers was lower in **Question 6**, possibly because all the options involved *Schuhe* and were only differentiated by a prefix. **Question 8** also involved an element of distraction which was perhaps too subtle at this stage of the examination, as candidates had to distinguish between the correct answer **A** *vor dem Haus* and the distractor **C** which depicted a girl in a house and almost the same number of candidates chose the incorrect option **C** as the correct option **A**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured the programme for a film club. The vocabulary becomes a little more challenging than in the first section of the examination. In **Question 11** the word *Schmuck* seems not to have been widely recognised and, given the even distribution over the other options, which were all entirely plausible, it seems that a number of candidates just made a guess. To a lesser degree this was also the case in **Question 12** where the animal (*Löwe*) was often not correctly identified.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends discussing a farewell party for one of their classmates. This task moves not only from pictures to words but from a selection of 4 to 6 options, only one of which is redundant. The level of difficulty varied: candidates performed well when it was just a question of matching Oskar with *Musik* (**17F**), but in **Question 18** detailed listening was involved to choose the correct option **B** rather than option **A** which proved to be an effective distractor. Candidates also jumped to conclusions on hearing and seeing the word *Party* in **Question 16** and chose the incorrect option **B**.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two youngsters talking about their grandparents. The exercise represented a step up in difficulty and discriminated accordingly. **Question 24** attracted more answers to the incorrect option **C** than to the correct option **A** presumably because of word matching *Technik* but not understanding what Antonio was actually saying.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Natalie about her lifestyle. This was an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper as it targets candidates with the ability to pick out specific details and to recognise attitudes and opinions.

Those candidates who made incorrect choices appeared to be seizing on items of vocabulary common to both the dialogue and the statements on the question paper to make their choice, rather than understanding the details of the interview. This was especially the case in **Question 30** where many more candidates opted for the incorrect option **A** than for the correct option **B** having heard the word *Hilfsorganisation* twice. In **Question 33** almost as many candidates opted for **C** as the correct option **D**, having heard *Zeit*, but having not fully understood what Natalie was saying.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Luisa and her friend Andreas about the development of an electric aeroplane. For each question in this exercise candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper and again required listening for detail and assessing attitudes and opinions.

Candidates generally performed well in this final task of the examination. Nevertheless Option **36A** proved to be an effective distractor because of word matching *Blumen*. Option **39** which required the candidate to identify the attitude of the speaker, also discriminated well. There was no particular pattern to the other incorrect choices.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/12
Listening (Multiple Choice)

Question Number	Key
1	D
2	B
3	C
4	D
5	A
6	B
7	C
8	B

Question Number	Key
9	A
10	C
11	B
12	D
13	C
14	A

Question Number	Key
15	D
16	E
17	F
18	C
19	B

Question Number	Key
20	B
21	B
22	B
23	A
24	C
25	C
26	C
27	A
28	B

Question Number	Key
29	D
30	B
31	A
32	B
33	C
34	C

Question Number	Key
35	A / C
36	A / D
37	A / E

General comments

2022 was the second June session where the Listening test consisted entirely of multiple-choice questions. The candidature performed very well and candidates attempted all questions.

The German extracts heard by candidates gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the

candidates' ability to understand information contained in short factual pieces, to testing their ability to pick out not only specific information, but also opinions and attitudes, in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

Candidates performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short and the correct answers were identified by almost all candidates. In **Question 2** a few candidates were not able to correctly identify **B** *Hose* and opted for **C** or **D**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract in which jobs were being advertised. Candidates also performed well in this exercise. For **Question 13**, some candidates did not recognise *Rasenmähen* and incorrectly chose **B**. Otherwise there was no clear pattern of incorrect answers.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends looking for somewhere to live. The examination starts to get more challenging at this point. This was especially the case for **Question 15**, where **A** and **B** proved effective distractors for those candidates not familiar with the word *Aufzug*. For **Question 19** there was no particular pattern to the incorrect answers.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews with young people and their attitude to the weather. The exercise represented a step up in the incline of difficulty because there is a greater element of distraction.

Questions 20 to 23 were generally answered well but **Question 24** perplexed those candidates who did not make the association between *Campingplatz* and *zeltet*.

In the second interview **Question 27** required careful listening to identify how Barbara went to school. **Question 28** was testing attitude rather than facts and those candidates who heard *kälter* in the interview and chose option **A** did not fully understand what was being said.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Matthias, a cat sitter. This is an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper as it has four options to choose from in response to each question. It targets candidates with the ability to pick out specific details and be aware of attitudes and opinions.

The number 150 000 in **Question 32** option **C** attracted many candidates who overlooked the fact that this was the sum he had saved, not the sum he had earned. In **Question 33** a number of candidates chose distractor **A** rather than the correct option **C**. Very few candidates chose the correct option **C** in **Question 34** which referred to Matthias' aspirations for the future. Candidates heard that he had founded an internet company referred to in **B** but overlooked the future element: *hat er vor* and incorrectly chose this option. The correct option **C** was testing attitude and contained no common vocabulary with the listening text.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Katrin and Florian about lifts and the surprising ways they influence our lives. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper and again required listening for detail and assessing opinions.

With the exception of **Question 35** two thirds of candidates identified the true statements correctly. In **Question 35** Florian's love of cars (option **C**) could be inferred from the conversation but quite a few candidates chose option **E** having just heard the words: *das Auto und die Eisenbahn*.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/13
Listening (Multiple Choice)

Question Number	Key
1	C
2	B
3	D
4	A
5	B
6	D
7	A
8	A

Question Number	Key
9	C
10	D
11	B
12	A
13	C
14	B

Question Number	Key
15	E
16	D
17	F
18	B
19	C

Question Number	Key
20	A
21	C
22	B
23	B
24	A
25	A
26	B
27	B
28	C

Question Number	Key
29	B
30	B
31	A
32	C
33	D
34	A

Question Number	Key
35	B / E
36	B / C
37	A / D

General comments

June 2022 was the second year that the Listening test consisted entirely of multiple-choice items.

The German extracts gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual pieces, to testing their ability to understand specific information, as well as opinions and explanations, in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

As intended, candidates generally performed well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. The number of correct answers was lower in **Question 6**, possibly because all the options involved *Schuhe* and were only differentiated by a prefix. **Question 8** also involved an element of distraction which was perhaps too subtle at this stage of the examination, as candidates had to distinguish between the correct answer **A** *vor dem Haus* and the distractor **C** which depicted a girl *in* a house and almost the same number of candidates chose the incorrect option **C** as the correct option **A**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured the programme for a film club. The vocabulary becomes a little more challenging than in the first section of the examination. In **Question 11** the word *Schmuck* seems not to have been widely recognised and, given the even distribution over the other options, which were all entirely plausible, it seems that a number of candidates just made a guess. To a lesser degree this was also the case in **Question 12** where the animal (*Löwe*) was often not correctly identified.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends discussing a farewell party for one of their classmates. This task moves not only from pictures to words but from a selection of 4 to 6 options, only one of which is redundant. The level of difficulty varied: candidates performed well when it was just a question of matching Oskar with *Musik* (**17F**), but in **Question 18** detailed listening was involved to choose the correct option **B** rather than option **A** which proved to be an effective distractor. Candidates also jumped to conclusions on hearing and seeing the word *Party* in **Question 16** and chose the incorrect option **B**.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two youngsters talking about their grandparents. The exercise represented a step up in difficulty and discriminated accordingly. **Question 24** attracted more answers to the incorrect option **C** than to the correct option **A** presumably because of word matching *Technik* but not understanding what Antonio was actually saying.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Natalie about her lifestyle. This was an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper as it targets candidates with the ability to pick out specific details and to recognise attitudes and opinions.

Those candidates who made incorrect choices appeared to be seizing on items of vocabulary common to both the dialogue and the statements on the question paper to make their choice, rather than understanding the details of the interview. This was especially the case in **Question 30** where many more candidates opted for the incorrect option **A** than for the correct option **B** having heard the word *Hilfsorganisation* twice. In **Question 33** almost as many candidates opted for **C** as the correct option **D**, having heard *Zeit*, but having not fully understood what Natalie was saying.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Luisa and her friend Andreas about the development of an electric aeroplane. For each question in this exercise candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper and again required listening for detail and assessing attitudes and opinions.

Candidates generally performed well in this final task of the examination. Nevertheless Option **36A** proved to be an effective distractor because of word matching *Blumen*. Option **39** which required the candidate to identify the attitude of the speaker, also discriminated well. There was no particular pattern to the other incorrect choices.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/21 Reading
--

Key message

Candidates should be aware that in the case of Question Groups 4 and 6, the subject needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answer unambiguous.

General observations

The paper was answered very well by many candidates. In some cases, candidates did not read the text closely enough for Question group 5. On some occasions candidates added extra information in answers which was not required. Any manipulations must be correct in these circumstances

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

(a) – (e) Candidates had no problem with this first **Question group**.

Question group 2

(a) – (e) This was completed well by many candidates did not seem to be familiar with the vocabulary, but there was no discernible pattern of errors.

Question group 3

(a) – (g) Accomplishment for this Question group was good overall. Where errors occurred, there was no discernible pattern.

Question group 4

(a) – (k) Although there were many good responses to Questions in this Question group, some candidates failed to answer the question that was asked. It may be that some candidates need to pay closer attention to the interrogative.

Most answered **4(a)** correctly.

For **4(b)** there were many correct answers, weaker candidates wrote *in der nächsten Stadt* as an answer.

For **4(c)** there were some incorrect, seemingly random answers here with some candidates including *aber* which was not credited.

For **4(d)** some candidates merely wrote (*ein bisschen*) *Angst* which was deemed to answer the question or else lifted from the text and wrote *ein bisschen Angst hatte* which was not credited.

For **4(e)** Almost all candidates had understood the question and supplied an answer about travelling by bus. Some of the answers were not credited as they were in the present tense or used the verb *gehen*.

Across **4(f) (i)** and **(ii)** Most candidates scored at least one point for *Sport (gemacht)*. Some candidates wrote *Kindern gemalt* as the other activity and this was not credited.

For **4(g) to (j)** most candidates identified the correct piece of information in the text and answered appropriately.

For **4(k)** Most candidates located the information and answered appropriately. Some used the wrong form of *gehen* and the point was not awarded.

Question group 5

- (a) – (e)** Relatively few candidates acquitted themselves well here and gained full marks. Some candidates scored 0 or 1. It seemed that many candidates had not grasped that close reading rather than word-spotting was required.

Although there were many good responses to questions in this Question group, some candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the question, so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates gave the wrong information, i.e., facts which were in the text but did not answer the question, suggesting they had not really understood the interrogatives or had not focused on them. It seemed that some candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied chunks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

Question group 6

- (a) – (i)** For **6(a)** there were many good answers, but some candidates copied *mit der Pubertät* from the text which is not an answer to the question asked.

For **6(b)** some candidates added *liegen würden* to their otherwise correct answer and were not awarded the point.

6(c) Most candidates dealt with this question appropriately.

For **6(d) (i)** and **(ii)** responses varied with some candidates scoring both points, whilst others lifted irrelevant pieces of text or found the relevant part of the text and failed to change the person of the verb.

6(e) most candidates located the correct piece of information and referred to school in their answer. Answers which did not mention school and began *Es* or *Sie beginnt* were not credited.

For **6(f)(i)** and **(ii)** few answers could be credited.

6(g) was answered well by most candidates.

For **6(h)** few answers could be credited

For **6(i)** Candidates either understood and wrote appropriate answers or else seemed to make a random selection of one of the interviewees or wrote *die Eltern*.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/22 Reading
--

Key message

Question group 1: Candidates match a series of short statements with the correct pictures.

Question group 2: Candidates match a series of short notices or signs commonly found in public places with an explanatory statement. The texts are all set in the same context.

Question group 3: Candidates answer multiple-choice questions with three options on a short text.

Question group 4: Candidates demonstrate understanding of a text, by answering straightforward, open questions. The emphasis is on answer location, and not on precise lifting, however the subject, personal pronouns and possessives need to be unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct.

Question group 5: Candidates match a series of descriptions of the requirements, interests or skills of different people with the correct description of places, events, services or activities. All texts are on a common theme.

Question group 6: Candidates are asked to respond to Questions requiring both gist and detailed understanding. Whilst selective lifting may be appropriate to answer some Questions, mere location and transcription indicating vague understanding is not: The subject, personal pronouns and possessives need to be unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct.

General comments

The paper was tackled very well by many of the candidates. Candidates should be aware that in the case of **Question Groups 4 and 6**, the subject needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answer unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct including when a candidate adds extra material not needed to answer the question. For **Question Group 5** those candidates who read the texts carefully rather than word-spot perform well in this task.

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1 (a)–(e)

Candidates performed very well in matching pictures and sentences.

Question group 2 (a)–(e)

This was completed well for the most part, but many candidates did not appear to understand *Drogerie* and/or *Seife*, so **(d)** was often wrong.

Question group 3 (a)–(g)

Accomplishment for this Question group was mixed, with **(a)** and **(b)** causing relatively few problems for most candidates. However, **(c)** to **(g)** was achieved with a more varied degree of success. For **(c)** some candidates did not seem to be able to understand that they needed to consider the *Freitag* and *Samstag* idea and apply it to the idea of *zweimal die Woche*. In **(g)** a significant number of candidates incorrectly connected *ab und zu* with *immer* in the text and selected answer **(a)** *die Tische abräumen* instead of **(c)**.

Question group 4 (a)–(k)

- (a) Was mostly answered well. Weaker candidates wrote *Sie fühlen gesünder* or else *sich gesünder*, hence it was the reflexive nature of the verb which proved problematic for them.
- (b) Was mostly answered correctly with a wide variety of responses.
- (c) Was mostly answered well. Those who read further ahead in the text and located ideas about eating or drinking and incorrectly inserted them as the answers were not credited.
- (d) This was well answered by candidates. Weaker candidates generally used a full sentence and incorrectly used the verb in the present tense, i.e., *Lars hat ein Glas Cola*.
- (e) There was a varied set of responses to this question. Some candidates simply wrote *Hunger* without indicating to whom this idea was connected. A significant number of candidates again used the present tense which invalidated the response.
- (f) Most candidates answered this question well. A significant number wrote *er hatte schlechte Laune* which did not answer the question and thus not credited.
- (g) Most candidates answered well here. A minority wrote only *Kopfschmerzen*, which, like the *Hunger* response above, did not give an indication to whom it referred and thus not credited.
- (h) and (i) Both were well-answered by most candidates.
- (j) There were many good answers here.
- (k) Was answered correctly by most candidates.

Question group 5 (a)–(e)

There were many good responses in this Question group. Weaker candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the texts rather than rely on word-spotting. 5(a) and (b) seemed the most problematic. Some candidates not seeming to link *Chinesisch* with *asiatische* in the text. 5(c) to (e) were generally correct.

Question group 6 (a)–(i)

In some cases, candidates did not look closely at the question, and lifted a piece of text which did not answer what had been asked. Inaccurate tense, grammar and syntax sometimes meant the answer could not be credited with a point.

- (a) A high number of candidates were not awarded due to inaccuracy of grammar with either *eine/einer* or the ending of *energiegeladen/e/n*.
- (b) Not many candidates answered correctly. Many used *verbringen* inappropriately, or else used *zu* inappropriately.
- (c) There were some correct responses, but *Wien* was a frequent incorrect response here.
- (d) A significant number of candidates wrote *sein/seine* instead of *ihr/ihre* or mentioned the aunt instead of the grandfather.
- (e) Most candidates answered this well especially as they could use either past or present tense in their response.
- (f) When candidates kept the response simple, they were generally credited. A significant number of candidates added extra information and invalidated the point.
- (g) Many candidates lifted the *bei* reference out of the text and started their response with that, which meant their answer could not be credited.

- (h) This proved to be problematic for many candidates. Candidates who wrote *sein Bruder wiederzusehen* could not be credited as the answer required *seinen*. Some candidates lifted *ihn*, from the text, which could not be credited as it was not known to whom *ihn* referred.
- (i) A significant number of candidates correctly mentioned travelling to Mexico by boat. Weaker candidates missed the boat reference writing *nach Mexiko fahren* without the method of transport being referred to.

The response regarding eating Mexican food was often not credited as it contained a superfluous *zu* before the infinitive.

The *Baseballspiel* response was uncredited for many candidates for a variety of reasons. The first was that candidates seemed to have understood that Mehmet and his brother were going to play rather than watch baseball. Some candidates confused *sein* with *ihr* or *dein*. Other candidates used the *zu* or *um...zu* construction incorrectly. Others appeared to not understand *mitnehmen*.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/23 Reading
--

Key message

Candidates should be aware that in the case of Question Groups 4 and 6, the subject needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answer unambiguous.

General observations

The paper was answered very well by many candidates. In some cases, candidates did not read the text closely enough for Question group 5. On some occasions candidates added extra information in answers which was not required. Any manipulations must be correct in these circumstances

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

(a) – (e) Candidates had no problem with this first **Question group**.

Question group 2

(a) – (e) This was completed well by many candidates did not seem to be familiar with the vocabulary, but there was no discernible pattern of errors.

Question group 3

(a) – (g) Accomplishment for this Question group was good overall. Where errors occurred, there was no discernible pattern.

Question group 4

(a) – (k) Although there were many good responses to Questions in this Question group, some candidates failed to answer the question that was asked. It may be that some candidates need to pay closer attention to the interrogative.

Most answered **4(a)** correctly.

For **4(b)** there were many correct answers, weaker candidates wrote *in der nächsten Stadt* as an answer.

For **4(c)** there were some incorrect, seemingly random answers here with some candidates including *aber* which was not credited.

For **4(d)** some candidates merely wrote (*ein bisschen*) *Angst* which was deemed to answer the question or else lifted from the text and wrote *ein bisschen Angst hatte* which was not credited.

For **4(e)** Almost all candidates had understood the question and supplied an answer about travelling by bus. Some of the answers were not credited as they were in the present tense or used the verb *gehen*.

Across **4(f) (i)** and **(ii)** Most candidates scored at least one point for *Sport (gemacht)*. Some candidates wrote *Kindern gemalt* as the other activity and this was not credited.

For **4(g)** to **(j)** most candidates identified the correct piece of information in the text and answered appropriately.

For **4(k)** Most candidates located the information and answered appropriately. Some used the wrong form of *gehen* and the point was not awarded.

Question group 5

- (a) – (e)** Relatively few candidates acquitted themselves well here and gained full marks. Some candidates scored 0 or 1. It seemed that many candidates had not grasped that close reading rather than word-spotting was required.

Although there were many good responses to questions in this Question group, some candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the question, so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates gave the wrong information, i.e., facts which were in the text but did not answer the question, suggesting they had not really understood the interrogatives or had not focused on them. It seemed that some candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied chunks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

Question group 6

- (a) – (i)** For **6(a)** there were many good answers, but some candidates copied *mit der Pubertät* from the text which is not an answer to the question asked.

For **6(b)** some candidates added *liegen würden* to their otherwise correct answer and were not awarded the point.

6(c) Most candidates dealt with this question appropriately.

For **6(d) (i)** and **(ii)** responses varied with some candidates scoring both points, whilst others lifted irrelevant pieces of text or found the relevant part of the text and failed to change the person of the verb.

6(e) most candidates located the correct piece of information and referred to school in their answer. Answers which did not mention school and began *Es* or *Sie beginnt* were not credited.

For **6(f)(i)** and **(ii)** few answers could be credited.

6(g) was answered well by most candidates.

For **6(h)** few answers could be credited

For **6(i)** Candidates either understood and wrote appropriate answers or else seemed to make a random selection of one of the interviewees or wrote *die Eltern*.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/03 Speaking

Key messages

- The Speaking component is now a genuine communication exercise, based within familiar situations.
- The emphasis is firmly upon natural, spontaneous conversation.
- The mark scheme reinforces the aim of promoting more effective communication.
- The structure of the Role Plays and Topic Conversations requires good understanding of the spoken language and spontaneity of response.
- Communication can be achieved even without strict grammatical accuracy, as long as the language employed is appropriate to the situation and clear enough to be understood.
- In the role plays successful communication can be achieved in relatively short responses, but for higher marks in the conversations the language offered must be more expansive.
- Throughout the topic conversations ideas and opinions should be expressed, developed and justified.
- Candidates should be able to converse on familiar topics, describe events, experiences and ambitions, give reasons, evaluations and explanations for their ideas and plans, or relate a brief story

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for June 2022.

As in the June and November examinations in 2021, the large majority of centres conducted the Speaking Test very well in this third session of the new syllabus. Most candidates seemed well prepared for the exam and its demands, and most Examiners conducted the role plays and conversations enthusiastically and in lively fashion. There were many fluent and detailed conversations that were a pleasure to listen to. A different approach is required for this syllabus, both in preparing candidates for the examination and in conducting it. Most Examiners have adapted very quickly to the new requirements and displayed an efficient yet friendly manner, and confident awareness of the structure and timing of the various sections of the examination. Many are patient, allowing time for the candidates to think, and prompting them to give fuller responses and to develop their ideas further.

In the Role Plays most complied with the instructions as to how many times a question might be repeated, and in the Topic Conversations as to when the alternative questions provided should be used. Examiners can encourage fuller responses by asking appropriate extension questions, such as *Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr*, or provide effective alternatives of their own. Any point raised by the candidate may be converted into an extension question. For example, if a candidate discussing *Freizeit* replies *Mein Hobby ist Sport*, a legitimate extension question might be *Was für Sport?* A few Examiners changed the wording of some of the role play questions, which is not permissible. Some centres had clearly advised candidates always to give extended answers, even to the more basic questions in the role plays, which is not necessary and could be counter-productive, if the main point of the answer becomes obscured.

Many Examiners were able to conduct successful conversations – lasting approximately 4 minutes – on each individual topic by using only the five questions provided in the Teachers' Instructions. Others ensured that there was enough material for a good Communication mark by asking up to two further questions of their own choice. This is particularly important in cases where candidates have been rather brief in their answers to the 5 scripted questions and have thus not provided enough evidence of the quality of their communication and language. There were, fortunately, only a few centres where too many further questions were asked. As these were often closed questions their candidates were not encouraged to be expansive in their answers. It should also be noted that the alternative questions provided are only intended to be used with candidates who have not understood the original question. They are not additional questions, even though some of them were clearly quite accessible and did indeed result in some good answers from those who required them. There were a few centres where the conversations were far too short, at two minutes or

less. Although the role plays are not timed, they should ideally be completed in two to three minutes and the whole test in ten or eleven minutes. Most centres achieved this successfully.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays

The new format, with candidates seeing only the scenario during their preparation period, without any outline of the planned questions, again proved to be a success. There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all Examiners coped very well with the requirements. The first two questions are designed to elicit straightforward answers within a present tense time frame. These responses can be very brief, but longer answers can be equally effective, as long as the main point of the question is clearly addressed. The remaining three questions are intended to produce responses that are either in a past or future time frame or requiring an opinion or justification of a statement. Here also, the length of the answer is not important. Full marks are given for all complete answers, where the meaning is clear and unambiguous.

It is important for Examiners to stick exactly to the script as given, as this ensures equality of opportunity for all candidates. If a candidate does not comprehend a question the first time it is asked, it can be repeated once. Most Examiners did this very well and very few either failed to repeat the question or, at the other extreme, repeated it several times.

The marking of the role plays was in most cases commendably accurate. Occasionally, Examiners were slightly harsh in their interpretation of what constitutes a 'minor error'. An incorrect auxiliary or verb ending may still be part of a clearly understandable response, where 'the information is communicated', as the mark scheme descriptor for two marks states. The important criterion for awarding a mark of one is: 'Errors impede communication'. An incorrect time frame can obscure the meaning, as can an incomplete answer. A good indicator of a one-mark answer could also be the perceived need for the Examiner to have asked a notional *Wie bitte?* question. There were relatively few marks of zero, (for no creditable response), as all the role plays proved to be accessible to most candidates.

All nine role plays seemed to work well, though each contained one relatively demanding question. A great effort had been made to avoid setting questions where knowledge of one specific item of vocabulary might determine whether or not a candidate could answer a particular question. There were very few silences, and some performances were very lively and realistic sounding. Teachers preparing candidates for role plays should ensure that candidates realise that nothing in a role play needs to be 'true', for example a concert that they may or may not have ever attended, a meal that they may not actually have cooked themselves, or a holiday they may not have actually gone on. It is easier perhaps to plan potential future tense or *ich möchte* responses, as they are all to a certain extent 'wishful thinking'. Some questions types also need more practice, and especially, from the evidence of this session, *seit wann?* and *wen?*, (which needed to be pronounced more clearly for the benefit of some candidates).

Comments on the individual Role Plays:

Card 1: (In a language school)

This was well done by most, though many could not use *seit* in the first response with the correct tense. Not all knew the names of the other languages that they spoke and the response to *welche Sprachen sprichst du?* was often *ich sprache*.

Card 2: (schools and environment)

The most common error was not picking up on *unsere Schule* and instead talking about the candidate's own school rather than the exchange school in the role play. The topic of *Umwelt* seemed very well-known and there were some interesting answers to the final question, which asked who did more for the environment, the candidate's school or their family.

Card 3: (At the dentist)

Most candidates coped extremely well with what appeared superficially to be a more complex role play. Few seemed surprised by the first question as to their native language, but again many could not respond correctly to *seit wann?* Some used an incorrect present tense to respond to the question *Was war das Problem?*

Card 4: (Discussing music)

This caused few problems and some clear views were expressed. Not everyone could describe a visit to a concert particularly well though, and this could certainly be practised in future, remembering that as a role play situation the concert attended may well be imaginary. *Ich war noch nie auf einem Konzert* would be accepted as a valid response anyway, as it was on this occasion.

Card 5: (Lost item in a hotel)

This was mostly quite well done, though candidates could not always think of where in the hotel they might have been, or why. The restaurant was the obvious choice. A present for a relative was the most popular response as to what was in the bag that was so important to them, though again some candidates found this more difficult. There was some misunderstanding of the final question, referring as it did to 'the rest of the day' and not the rest of the stay.

Card 6: (Talking about family life)

There were very few apparent difficulties here, apart from *unser* again causing a little confusion, as in Role Play two.

Card 7: (Discussing weather and holidays)

Was gefällt dir? as the very first question seemed to catch some people by surprise, otherwise there were again few problems.

Card 8: (In a maths lesson in Germany)

Yet again *seit wann* caused a few problems and not everyone could link their favourite subject particularly well to a future career choice.

Card 9: (Holiday job in a hotel)

Only *schwierig* caused any real difficulty.

Topic Conversations

As with the Role Plays, both candidates and Examiners coped well with the new requirements. Many complex and meaningful conversations were developed. The fact that questions to the conversations are now scripted offers several advantages, as closed questions, which in the previous syllabus often prevented even good candidates from developing their answers and expanding on a topic, cannot be asked any more. Also, as every candidate is asked the same questions, there is genuine comparability of standards and greater fairness.

Most Examiners asked questions exactly as printed. The majority also repeated questions when required and went on to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were forthcoming to the original questions. It should be remembered though, that these are not additional (easier) questions for the better candidates. There were in fact many good answers to the alternative questions from a good range of candidates. Also, Examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like *Kannst du noch mehr darüber sagen?*, with the effect that most candidates managed to produce sufficiently long and meaningful conversations by answering the 5 questions in some detail. Good use was also made of the fact that Examiners can ask up to 2 extension questions, if the conversation was too short or insubstantial, and, again, the majority of centres did this very well. It was very pleasing to hear that in nearly all cases a similar standard was maintained in responses to extension questions as had been evident with the set questions, and there was little evidence of memorising or over-rehearsal in any of the further questions asked by Examiners.

Many exams were a pleasure to listen to with candidates producing interesting content and ambitious language. It was very good to hear candidates use subordinating conjunctions *indem*, *nachdem*, *damit*, *sobald* which helped candidates develop, justify or explain what they were saying. Similarly, words and phrases like *außerdem* and *aus diesem Grund* were used by candidates who were at the top of the range

It is also worth remembering that candidates are no longer restricted to the top of the 'poor' box in the mark scheme, if they do not produce completely correct past and future tenses. Instead, a candidate's use of tenses is now marked as part of the general impression for Quality of Language, using the descriptors provided in the mark scheme. Accurate use of tenses is only one aspect of the range of structures listed in the syllabus that the final Quality of Language mark will be based on. This mark also takes into account other aspects of language use, such as the range of vocabulary used and the intonation and fluency of a candidate.

On the whole, the descriptors in the mark scheme for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language' were used very accurately by Examiners in deciding on the mark bands and marks they awarded. Fewer adjustments to the marks had to be made than with the old syllabus and mark scheme.

As in the role play situations, there was no appreciable difference in difficulty between the 7 topics, each of which however offered at least one challenging question. Performances and marks achieved appeared to confirm that the balance was right on this occasion.

Brief comments on each of the Topics:

1. **Health** – even the difficult **Question 4** brought some very good answers, with references to the greater availability of health information today and yet the greater desire for fast food. The alternative question here proved especially useful and clarified *vor 30 Jahren* for those who had been confused by the expression.
2. **At home** – *im Haushalt* was misinterpreted by some to mean *at home* and some incorrect responses resulted, such as watching TV or doing homework.
3. **Free time and holidays** – as in the role plays *seit wann?* was sometimes used incorrectly but there were few difficulties otherwise
4. **Tourism** – there were some very interesting answers to **Questions 4 and 5**, and candidates coped very well with the challenges here.
5. **Traditions and festivals** – not everyone could pronounce *Ostern*, if they used it as an answer to **Question 2**; the question with *wen?* was often misunderstood; on the other hand, there were some very interesting and detailed responses to the fairly complex **Question 5**.
6. **School** – the simple question with *machst du?* was often understood as *magst du?*; **Question 4** about the importance of maths and physics was often answered enthusiastically and it was not deemed necessary for candidates to have fully understood the concept of *Pflichtfächer*. Unfortunately, not many seemed to have done very much that was 'interesting' in school recently, judging by some answers to question three.
7. **Town and country** – this topic also proved to offer an accessible and acceptable challenge, where the only misunderstanding was frequently *auf dem Land* in the very first question. Rather surprisingly, considering the title of the topic, this tended to be confused with 'in your country'.

Randomisation:

Nearly all centres followed the randomisation guidelines given in the Teachers' Notes. This is very important for reasons of fairness and confidentiality especially in centres with a large number of candidates. The pairings of role plays and topics given in the Randomisation sheet also makes sure that candidates are given the opportunity to show what they are capable of in a variety of topic areas.

Recordings:

Most centres uploaded an appropriate size sample to 'Submit for Assessment' though some uploaded all their recordings, which was not necessary. Fortunately, there appeared to be relatively few recordings where part or all of a speaking test was inaudible. Even though the majority of recordings were of a good quality, a small minority of centres continue to place the microphone too far from the candidates, so that it is difficult to hear them. Before recording commences, and again before the recordings are uploaded, spot checks should be made to ensure the audibility of both Examiner and candidate.

Administration:

Administration in centres was generally good, and in this session very few centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheets (WMS). The WMS are far clearer on screen if they are word processed, and please type or write the examining teacher's name as clearly as possible. Assessment seemed to be quite consistent, and the order of merit was usually correct.

Marking by centres:

Scaling was required in fewer centres than with the old syllabus. Although the slight tendency was for marking to be too generous rather than too severe, this was less evident than in the past. As mentioned above, there was occasional severity in marking the role plays, but most centres had made good use of the excellent descriptors in the mark schemes for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language', and thus managed to mark their candidates accurately. Reasons for occasional excessive generosity included awarding high marks for Communication, when candidates had offered few ideas and opinions, and for Language, when they did not use a particularly good range of vocabulary or structures.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/41
Writing

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/42 Writing
--

Key messages

For **Question 1**, centres should remind candidates to complete every gap, without leaving blanks.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should be sure to cover each of the bullet points set. For this, it helps if candidates work through the tasks in order. Candidates should check each task for the tense it requires and should ensure that their answer is given in the required time frame. In **Question 3**, candidates must be prepared to demonstrate the use of past, present, and future time frames across the tasks. Candidates should be encouraged to read each task carefully and to respond to the specifics, rather than writing generally on the topic area.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared for the requirements of this examination. Many candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding as well as demonstrating good language use and responding with opinion and reason.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates needed to fill in an order form for a visit to a museum. Candidates were asked to give the month of their visit, the category of people attending (in addition to adults), the length of their visit and two items that they would like to buy in the museum shop. Many candidates completed this and the majority attempted to answer at least 4 of the 5 points. Though many candidates achieved the full 5 marks, some did not. Spelling was not always correct, but errors were accepted if communication was achieved, as indicated by the mark scheme.

The first vocabulary item (month) was achieved by the majority of candidates. A few candidates chose to write a number rather than writing out the month in full.

For the second vocabulary item, most candidates successfully scored the mark with answers such as *Kinder/Jungen/Studenten*. However, some candidates gave a person already covered by the term *Erwachsene* (mentioned on the form), and so such answers could not be credited. There were some unusual attempts which did not score (e.g., *Siewachsene*, *Esel*). It seemed that some candidates had not understood the word *Erwachsene*.

The third vocabulary item was often correctly given, with many candidates mentioning a number of *Stunden/Minuten* but a significant number of candidates gave *Uhr* in place of *Stunden*. Candidates also did not score if they gave a length of time that would not fit with a museum visit (eg *Tage*). Candidates should be advised to read the context of the question carefully to help inform their choice of answers.

A wide variety of answers were given for the fourth and fifth vocabulary items, with the majority being accepted as objects that could be purchased in a museum shop. Some common errors here included *trinken*, as well as misspellings which resulted in a change of meaning (e.g. *Buche* for *Buch*).

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of animals. The sub-questions were expressed in 4 bullet points. Some candidates wrote generally about animals or about a particular animal, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing the specifics of the task set and so could not score on the specific bullet points.

The question was marked based on tasks covered, relevancy, meaning/communication, vocabulary/structure and linking words/connectors.

Most candidates attempted this question and many were able to score well. Many candidates wrote at length, on task and in good, basic German. However, this session a significant proportion of candidates answered only 4 bullet points or fewer. Others were unnecessarily ambitious and answers lacked accuracy. Some weaker candidates answered well by communicating 5 bullet points successfully, despite a lack of overall accuracy.

For this question, the word *Tiere* was not always known. However, candidates who were unsure of this vocabulary item usually still managed to answer some bullet points, and the majority understood *Haustiere* in bullet point 4.

Generally, the language used was good, with many candidates scoring well but verb conjugation was sometimes problematic, especially for weaker candidates. A variety of vocabulary was commonly used and many candidates added simple explanations with linking words. The best answers used an interesting range of topic vocabulary, clear opinions and a range of connectives with correct word order (e.g., after *wenn/weil/dass/obwohl*).

Bullet point 1 asked why candidates liked or did not like animals. There were many varied and creative responses here, but the task presented a challenge for a significant minority of candidates who struggled to manipulate the verb *mögen*. Others gave an opinion but did not go on to give an explanation.

Bullet point 2 asked for a description of a typical animal from their country. There were some very good responses with descriptions of interesting animals, including references to pandas, koalas, monkeys, lions, tigers, elephants, bears, birds, dolphins as well as the more usual cats and dogs. Most candidates managed to make a statement about the animal, with colour and size providing common answers. However, some candidates just listed the names of animals without including any further description. Candidates should note that a description should include more than a name.

Bullet point 3 asked where candidates usually see animals. *Im Zoo* was a common answer but candidates provided a rich variety of possible places, such as the *Nationalpark* which featured regularly. Animals were also spotted in the countryside, in mountains, in gardens, at home, at the farm, in lakes, at the seaside, as well as in town and in the street.

Bullet point 4 asked whether candidates would like to have a pet in the future and bullet point 5 required a reason for their opinion. These were generally answered well, but some candidates did follow the information in the question *in der Zukunft*, writing instead about current pets. The verb *mögen* again presented a challenge with candidates often confusing *ich mochte/ich möchte*.

Question 3

Most candidates answered one of the two questions as set. However, there were a few candidates who wrote on a different topic or who copied out some of the language of the question. There were a few very short answers from candidates whose levels of German were insufficient to attempt the question as set.

The question is assessed for Task Completion, Range and Accuracy.

Range

The banded mark scheme for Range covers the use of extended sentences, the variety of linking words/connectors, the use of simple/complex structures, and the range of vocabulary. The use of conjunctions, subordinate clauses, relative clauses, negatives, adjectives and adverbs, etc. are all part of this marking criteria.

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3(a)** allowed for a range of sport/football-related vocabulary, and **Question 3(b)** covered vocabulary on the topic of work. Many candidates had a good range of task-related vocabulary, but English vocabulary was sometimes used to describe the football match in **Question 3(a)**, and some candidates used vocabulary from other languages.

This series there were a few examples of answers with only very simple structures, and many candidates attempted longer sentences using a range of conjunctions.

The strongest candidates demonstrated an ability to use a variety of subordinating conjunctions (*deshalb*, *jedoch*, *außerdem* were regularly seen), accurate *wenn/weil/dass* clauses, relative clauses, adjective endings and more sophisticated verb structures, such as the use of *um...zu...*. However, generally the language was not particularly sophisticated. Weaker candidates tried to use extended sentences in their answers but generally, *und* and *weil* were the most commonly used conjunctions. Candidates should be encouraged to use a greater range. Similarly, there were few relative and subordinate clauses and very few negatives other than *nicht*. However, some candidates used a range of modal verbs successfully.

Accuracy

The banded mark scheme for Accuracy covers spelling and grammar and addresses the impact of errors on overall communication. This includes the accuracy of verb forms and tenses, gender, case agreement, adjective endings, word order and capital/lower-case letters in nouns.

Poor spelling was an issue in many answers and sometimes affected the meaning. For example, *wann* was used routinely instead of *wenn*, *dass* for *das*, and *Mann* for *man*.

Verbs presented challenges for many students this series. The use of the future and conditional were generally good, but both the present and past tenses caused difficulties for many candidates. In **Question 3(a)**, the present tense was often used to describe the football match but present tense verb endings were frequently not matched with the appropriate subject. In both **Questions 3(a)** and **(b)**, past participles of basic verbs (e.g., *spielen*, *gehen*, *fahren*) were often incorrectly formed.

Candidates struggled to form the comparative/superlative forms of adjectives. Attempts at 'healthier', for example, were often presented as *gesunderer*.

Many candidates were successful in conveying information without communication being impeded but overall the level of accuracy was only good in answers from stronger candidates. These candidates showed their ability to use verbs, word order, cases, etc. highly effectively.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write an email to their friend about a visit last week to see a football game at the stadium.

Candidates did not always address the precise requirement of particular bullet points. Others wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic but did not give the specific details/opinions/reasons required by the bullet points. Overall though, many were able to make convincing responses to the sub-questions.

Bullet point 1 required candidates to say who they were at the stadium with. A significant proportion of candidates used the present tense where the question was phrased in the past. The dative was rarely used after *mit*. Candidates should be reminded to check their prepositions.

Bullet point 2 asked candidates to describe the game they saw. Candidates generally gave good descriptions, mentioning the players, the overall score, the food consumed, etc. A past tense was required for this answer but many candidates wrote in the present tense or used a mixture of tenses. There were a few short answers (*das Spiel war interessant/super*), others simply described a favourite player of their team, and there were many instances of candidates not knowing the German for words such as goal, score, player, team. Candidates who knew the necessary vocabulary wrote knowledgeably and accurately.

In bullet point 3, there was a good range of detailed arguments for and against watching sport on TV or live. Sometimes these became a little muddled in the effort to produce a balanced argument, but most candidates communicated satisfactorily. Vocabulary was at times limited, with simple reasons given. However, some

good adjectives (e.g. *bequem*) were used to describe watching at home, and there were plenty of descriptions of the ease of eating/drinking from the comfort of the sofa at home.

Bullet point 4 asked for a reason as to whether children should do more sport in school, or not. Many responses were quite simple, such as references to needing to improve fitness. The strongest answers were detailed and nuanced and included, for example, references to needing further qualifications, making friends, getting away from electronic devices, etc. However, some candidates misunderstood the task and simply described the sports they currently do in school. A significant minority wrote about *Jungen* rather than *junge Leute*. Candidates should take care to respond to the precise question asked. Here, simply explaining why sport is good for health did not directly respond to the question about whether young people ought to do more sport in school. There was also some confusion as to the meanings of *gesund* and *Gesundheit*.

Bullet point 5 asked for an explanation as to what the candidate would like to do in the future to stay fit. This was usually completed well with most candidates talking about their plans to exercise, take up a new sport or to eat healthily in the future. However, several candidates just wrote about their plans for playing in a school team or doing sport/exercise next week, and others entirely missed the future aspect of this question, showing that they had not understood the reference to *später im Leben*. As a future time frame was required, a number of candidates were not successful in this task.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of jobs and work.

Bullet point 1 required candidates to describe a work experience placement or part-time job that they had had in the past. Most candidates were able to produce a good response to this, but some past tense formation was inaccurate. However, part-time jobs is a theme often prepared in class and so there were many examples of long and detailed, although not always accurate, descriptions of a recent job.

Bullet point 2 required candidates to describe the job that they had wanted to have when they were young. This proved challenging for those who had not understood *Traumberuf*, and for those who struggled with the past tense here. Some simply described their current dream job, without reference to the past.

Bullet point 3 asked candidates to explain what is necessary for happiness in a job. Many candidates simply confirmed the importance of needing to be happy at work, whilst others produced a list of personal qualities essential to being good at a job. Those who were successful in the task found a way to write about the importance of enjoying their job, earning money or having sympathetic colleagues.

Bullet point 4 asked for opinions on the age at which young people should start to earn their own money. This proved challenging for many candidates who did not give a reference to a specific age and who simply wrote about reasons for earning money.

Bullet point 5 required candidates to explain where they would like to work in the future. Overall, this was done well with candidates writing at length about their future career plans. However, some candidates did not check the instructions and talked about their ideal future job but did not mention where they wanted to work.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/43 Writing
--

Key messages

For **Question 1**, centres should remind candidates to complete every gap, without leaving blanks.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should be sure to cover each of the bullet points set. For this, it helps if the candidates work through the tasks in a sequential fashion. Candidates should check each task for the tense it requires and should ensure that their answer is given in the required time frame. In **Question 3** candidates must be prepared to demonstrate the use of past, present, and future time frames across the tasks. Candidates should be encouraged to read each task carefully and to respond to the specifics, rather than writing generally on the topic area.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared for the requirements of this examination. A pleasing number of candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding, as well as demonstrating good language use and responding with opinion and reason. Some centres should take more careful note of the specific requirements of the examination and should ensure that their candidates are ready for the expectations of the current examination format.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

In **Question 1**, candidates are required to produce 5 items of vocabulary, as part of a form-filling exercise. Candidates can gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary of these five items.

This session, the candidates were required to fill in a booking form, for a visit to the cinema. Candidates were asked to give the month of their visit, the category of person attending (in addition to adults), two drinks that they would like to buy at the cinema and the area in the cinema where they would like to sit. Some candidates did complete this first question easily. However, there were many candidates this year who did not achieve the full 5 marks, and a significant number of candidates left one or more blanks. Spellings were not always correct but were accepted if communication was achieved (as indicated by the mark scheme).

The first vocabulary item (month) was achieved by most candidates.

For the second vocabulary item, the majority of candidates successfully scored the mark with the answer *Kinder*, though a range of answers were accepted here. Some candidates, however, gave a person already covered by the term *Erwachsene* (mentioned on the form), and so such answers could not be credited. It seemed that a number of candidates had not understood the word *Erwachsene*.

The third and fourth vocabulary items were often successful, with many candidates giving the vocabulary for drinks they would like to purchase. However, the word *Getränke* seemed not to be known by a number of candidates, who left items three and four blank.

The fifth vocabulary item proved challenging for candidates, many of whom did not seem familiar with vocabulary for where they might sit. Some were successful with *hinten* / *rechts* / *links*, but others simply left a blank.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer five sub-questions on the topic of school. The sub-questions were expressed in four bullet points. This is a straightforward exercise, where candidates are required to read and respond to the particulars of each sub-question (rather than writing generally on a given topic area). Candidates who wrote generally about school or education, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing the specifics of the task set, could not score on the specific bullet points which they had not covered.

The question was marked out of a maximum of 12 marks from a banded mark scheme covering: tasks covered, relevancy, meaning/communication, vocabulary/structure and linking words/connectors.

Most, though not all, candidates attempted this question, and many were able to score well. A good number of candidates wrote well, remained on task and used good, basic German, though this session saw a significant number of candidates attempting only some of the points, with a number not communicating beyond the first or second bullet point. Given that the topic area was one that should have been easily accessible to the majority, it did seem that some had been particularly adversely affected by gaps in their learning, perhaps related to the challenges of the pandemic times.

Generally, the language used was pleasing, with many candidates scoring well, though verb conjugation continues to present difficulties, especially for weaker candidates. However, a range of vocabulary was commonly used on this topic area, and many candidates added simple explanations with linking words. The best answers used a pleasing range of topic vocabulary, gave clear opinions and used a range of connectives. However, the most commonly used connectives remain *und* and *weil*.

Task 1 asked the candidate to describe their school. Most candidates gave the name of their school, and referred to its size or location, with some going on to give more detail about the teachers, students or facilities.

Task 2 asked whether the candidate likes their school or not and Task 3 required a reason for their opinion. Whilst many were successful in their responses here, the task presented a challenge for a number of candidates who struggled to manipulate the verb *mögen*. Others gave an opinion but did not go on to explain their reasoning.

Task 4 asked what the candidate usually does during breaktime. There were many good answers here, with the majority of candidates referring to spending time with friends, eating their lunch or playing outside.

Task 5 asked what the candidate will do in the future after leaving school. Whilst some candidates were able to answer well on this, a significant number of candidates did not take into account the stimulus *in der Zukunft*, writing instead about what they will do after school tomorrow or next week, and interpreting *nach der Schulzeit* as after the end of the school day, rather than after leaving school.

Question 3

There were two options for **Question 3**. This session there were more candidates answering **Question 3(a)** over **Question 3(b)**. Given that the topic area for **Question 3(b)** was perhaps more accessible than that of **Question 3(a)**, it did seem that perhaps candidates sometimes select **Question 3(a)** simply because it appears first on the paper.

There were a few candidates who wrote off topic or who copied out some of the language of the rubric. The majority, though, sought to answer the question as set. There were a few very short answers from candidates whose levels of German were insufficient to attempt the question as set.

The question was marked out of a maximum of 28 marks from three banded mark schemes, with a maximum of 10 marks for Task Completion, 10 for Range and 8 for Accuracy.

Task Completion:

Marks gained by candidates for their Task Completion depended on how well they had understood and responded to the specific tasks set. The banded mark scheme focuses on how successfully the tasks are completed, how much information is conveyed and how relevant the detail is. (See details for specific questions **Question 3(a)/Question 3(b)** below.)

Range:

The banded mark scheme for Range looked at the use of extended sentences, the variety of linking words/connectors, the use of simple/complex structures, and the range of vocabulary. When selecting the mark from this banded scheme, examiners considered the use of conjunctions, subordinate clauses, relative clauses, negatives, adjectives and adverbs etc.

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3(a)** allowed for a range of vocabulary related to the topic of a museum outing, whilst **Question 3(b)** offered the chance for vocabulary on the topic of travel. Many candidates had a decent range of task-related vocabulary at their disposal, though others wrote short answers and were more challenged in their range of vocabulary use.

The best candidates demonstrated an ability to use a variety of conjunctions with accurate *wenn / weil / dass* clauses, relative clauses, adjective endings and more sophisticated verb structures, such as the use of *um...zu...*. However, the language, on the whole, seemed less sophisticated than previously, which is perhaps unsurprising given the disruption to teaching during the pandemic years. The less able candidates tried to use extended sentences in their answers but *und* and *weil* remain the most commonly used conjunctions. Centres would do well to encourage a greater range of language from all their candidates. Similarly, there were few relative and subordinate clauses, and very few negatives other than *nicht*. Although this year it was pleasing to see some candidates using a range of modal verbs more successfully, there were fewer of these in evidence than might be expected or hoped for at this level.

Accuracy:

The banded mark scheme for Accuracy covers spelling and grammar, and addresses the impact of errors on overall communication. When selecting the mark from this band, examiners considered, for example, the accuracy of verb forms and tenses, gender, case agreement, adjective endings, word order and capital/lower-case letters in nouns.

Poor spelling was an issue in many scripts and sometimes affected the meaning. Verbs again presented challenges for many students this session. Whilst the use of the future and conditional were generally good, both the present and past tenses caused difficulties for many candidates. Even in the present tense, verb endings were not always matched with the appropriate subject. In both **Question 3(a)** and **Question 3(b)**, past participles of basic verbs (e.g. *spielen, gehen, fahren*) were often incorrectly formed.

Many candidates were successful in conveying information without communication being impeded but, overall, the level of accuracy in this year's scripts seemed lower than might be expected – again, this may well be a result of pandemic-related interruptions to education. However, the best candidates were, as in previous years, highly accurate and showed their ability to use verbs, word order, cases, etc highly effectively.

Question 3

(a) Candidates were required to write an email to their friend, about a trip last week to a museum

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to say with whom they visited the museum. This should have been a straightforward introduction to the question, but the task was not always successful as might have been expected because some candidates used the present tense where the question was phrased in the past. Centres would do well to remind candidates to check the tense required. The dative was rarely used after *mit*. Again, centres should remind candidates to check their prepositions.

Task 2 asked the candidate to describe what they saw or did in the museum. Candidates generally gave pleasing descriptions, mentioning specific books/objects of art etc, though some referred primarily to the friends they were with or the food they ate. A past tense was required for this answer but many candidates struggled with accurate perfect tense use. There were a number using the present tense or the infinitive instead of past participles.

In Task 3, candidates were asked to explain a reason for museums being favoured (or not) by young people. There were some very pleasing efforts here with a number of candidates communicating well, using a range of adjectives and reasons. For others, vocabulary was more limited, with straightforward reasons given, and some candidates simply left this task blank.

Task 4 asked for a reason as to why museum entry should be free of charge, or not. Many responses were quite simple, with commonly known adjectives being used (eg *wichtig*, *gut*, etc), but the best answers were detailed with more sophisticated reasoning, for example, with references to access for all, the benefits to education, or discussion about how past history is significant for us in the modern world.

Task 5 asked for an explanation as to what sort of outing the candidate would like to do next time. On the whole, this was completed well with the majority of candidates talking about their plans to go for a picnic with family/visit a theme park or travel to another town/country. A future time frame was required for this task, and number of candidates were not successful in this task because they wrote in the present.

(b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of travel.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to describe where they travelled in their holidays last year. Most candidates were able to produce a pleasing response to this, though accurate past tense formation remains a challenge for many. However, past holidays is a theme often prepared in class and so there were many examples of long and detailed, although not always accurate, descriptions of previous holidays/trips.

Task 2 required candidates to describe what they saw on their travels. Again this was easily accessible for many who had familiar topic vocabulary and language at their disposal, though, even on a familiar topic area, the majority of candidates used the most commonly known past participles (*gesehen* / *gegessen* / *gemacht*, etc).

Task 3 asked candidates to explain why it's important for young people to see the world. This was a more complex task but the majority were able to refer to the importance of new experiences, with some mentioning other languages, cultures, or the significance for their own future work.

Task 4 asked how one can best travel in an environmentally friendly way. This proved challenging for some candidates who were limited in their responses but many gave very pleasing answers, with some referring to avoiding aeroplanes and travelling only by train/bike, whilst others focussed on other aspects, such as the use of cloth bags for travelling

Task 5 required candidates to explain where they would like to travel in the future. On the whole, this was well done, with candidates writing at length about their future travel plans.

General comments

Overall, it was encouraging to see many candidates tackling this paper well, despite the global interruptions to education over the last few years. Although candidates did not perhaps display the same range of vocabulary or knowledge of grammatical structures as might be expected at this level, nonetheless this was a pleasing exam session for this paper. Many candidates were successful. Given the significant difficulties associated with the recent pandemic, credit is due to all those young people and their teachers who have persevered and worked hard to prepare for exams, despite the many challenges encountered.