

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/11
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

GERMAN

Paper 0525/12
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

Candidates are now familiar with the multiple-choice format of the Listening Examination. All candidates provided answers to 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 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

The extracts were straightforward and short and tested pictorially. This task is designed to reassure candidates of all abilities at the start of the examination rather than to discriminate. In this, it was successful, as most candidates answered all questions correctly. A few candidates were unsure of the vocabulary item *Neffen* in **Question 7**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a trailer for a series of radio programmes about food. Candidates also performed well in this task. A few candidates did not recognize the vocabulary item *Pilze* in **Question 13** and chose answer **D**.

Questions 15–19

This matching exercise was the point at which the examination became more challenging. Candidates heard a conversation between two employees discussing how to travel to a work conference. **Question 17** caused problems for candidates as three modes of transport were mentioned in connection with *Frau Lister*: many did not associate *Fähre* with *Schiff* to get the correct answer **B** and chose **F** instead because they had also heard *Bahn*. A number of candidates did not grasp the travel plans of *Frau Schneider* in **Question 19**, because many opted for the distractor sentence **A** rather than the correct answer **C**. Option **A** proved to be an effective distractor for all questions.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews about attitudes towards school. There is a greater element of distraction even though there are only three options to choose from.

A good number of candidates answered correctly, but in **Question 20** quite a few candidates opted for the incorrect answer **A** rather than the correct option **C**. The vocabulary in **Question 26** was clearly challenging for many candidates and there was a similar number of answers for each option.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with a businessman about his attitude to wealth. The four options in each answer represent an increase in the level of difficulty and the content of the dialogue is more sophisticated. It targets candidates who are aware of inference and opinions and have the ability to listen for and pick out specific details.

At this point in the examination some candidates were making random choices according to items of vocabulary they heard rather than by understanding the content of the dialogue. This was the case in **Questions 29** and **30** where many candidates chose the incorrect options **D** and **C**. Candidates found **Question 31** particularly challenging: option **B** was an effective distractor. **A** was a popular wrong choice in **Question 32**. For **Question 34** the candidates had to assess attitude which caused problems for a good number who chose the incorrect option **C**. The most successfully answered question was **33**.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Klara and Anton about their family life and eating habits. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. Candidates found this task less challenging than the previous one. It also required listening for detail and assessing opinions but the issues were ones with which they were perhaps more familiar and around two thirds of candidates identified the true statements correctly.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/13
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

Candidates are now familiar with the multiple-choice format of the Listening Examination. All candidates provided answers to 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 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

The extracts were straightforward and short and tested pictorially. This task is designed to reassure candidates of all abilities at the start of the examination rather than to discriminate. In this, it was successful, as most candidates answered all questions correctly. A few candidates were unsure of the vocabulary item *Dosen* in **Question 4** and chose the incorrect option **D**.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a report about an organisation co-ordinating people's offers of help with those needing it. Candidates performed very well in this task. A few candidates were not sure of the German alphabet and chose the incorrect option **A** in **Question 9**.

Questions 15–19

Candidates heard a conversation between a couple planning their Christmas present list early. This matching exercise was the point at which the examination became more challenging. **Question 15** caused problems for many candidates who chose the distractor sentence **D** rather than the correct option **F**. A number of candidates seem to have been thrown by *Bank* in **Question 17** and opted for **C** or the distractor sentence **D** rather than the correct answer **A**. **Question 18** received the highest proportion of correct answers.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews about attitudes towards animals. There is a greater element of distraction even though there are only three options to choose from and the task discriminates effectively between candidates.

A good number of candidates answered correctly, but **Question 24**, the final question in the first section, proved challenging for some who heard *Blumen* and opted for the incorrect answer **B** rather than the correct option **A**. *Niedlich* in **Question 27** seemed not to be widely known given the number of candidates who opted for **B** as the true statement.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with a woman sailing solo round the world. The four options in each answer represent an increase in the level of difficulty and the content of the dialogue is more sophisticated. It targets candidates who are aware of inference and opinions and have the ability to listen for and pick out specific details.

Candidates found **Question 33** particularly challenging as it tested attitude: option **C** was an effective distractor. The most successfully answered question was **30**.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Alizeh and Matthias about the pros and cons of virtual travel. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. It required listening for detail as well as assessing opinions and discriminated effectively between candidates. A number of candidates opted for **A** as one of the correct statements in **Questions 35** and **36** and option **E** in **40**. The statement most frequently identified correctly was **E** in **Question 35**.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/21 Reading
--

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

FOREIGN LANGUAGE 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 observations

The paper was tackled very well by many 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. Attention should be paid to the position and form of verbs. 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-spotting the key performed well.

Question group 1

Most candidates performed very well in matching pictures and sentences. Some did not seem to be familiar with *Kaninchen* which resulted in some incorrect answers.

Question group 2

This was usually completed well, but many candidates did not appear to understand *Freibad* which caused problems for **d** with many candidates selecting *Jugendclub*.

Question group 3

A, c, d, and f caused relatively few problems for most candidates. However, **b, e** and **g** were more challenging. For **b**, some candidates did not seem to understand that the parents were not living in the same town. In **e**, a significant number of candidates thought the songs were written in Japanese only. For **g**, some candidates understood that the videos were forbidden in school.

Question group 4

There was a wide range of success with this question. The most successful candidates gave short, succinct answers and did not therefore make errors with unsuccessful manipulation. There were not many who did not completely locate the answer, and many candidates gained full, or nearly full marks. However, there was a large number who successfully located the answer but could not be awarded marks through faulty manipulation.

- (a) This was mostly very well answered but of those who failed to answer correctly, the most common answer was *'Es macht sich glücklich'*.
- (b) There was a significant number of incorrectly located answers giving *Zentrum von Berlin* rather than *Harz-Gebirge*.
- (c) This was generally well answered, but there were some mistakes when candidates tried to incorporate the use of *gehören* in their answers.
- (d) Both **parts 1** and **2** were generally well answered but some candidates failed to refer to the uncle and wrote simply *im Haus* which could not be credited.
- (e) This caused candidates significant problems with *sie konnten/durften* frequently omitted or incorrectly used.
- (f) There were many correct answers for this question, but also some problems with word order such as *'der Sommer nicht so gut war'*.
- (g) There were many answers which could not be credited, due mainly to considerable trouble with *'um ... zu'*, and many occurrences of *für uns*.
- (h) There were difficulties with the verbs *fallen* and *brechen* with answers which could not be credited.
- (i) The answer to this questions was usually well located and accurate, but some candidates focused on *on durfte nicht alleine im Zelt schlafen* rather than *wütend*.
- (j) This was usually correctly answered, but a few candidates focused on *mein Onkel uns zeigte* rather than sailing.
- (k) There were many difficulties here with incorrect possessives and frequent omission of *dass*. A significant number of candidates answered *Potsdam*.

Question group 5

Many candidates achieved full marks on this question and there were not many completely incorrect responses, but there were quite a few with more incorrect than correct responses. Where errors occurred, there was no obvious pattern to the incorrectly selected answers.

Question group 6

There were some very good responses with correct, accurately formulated responses to the questions. In some cases, candidates did not look closely at the precise 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.

- (a) There were many completely correct answers to both parts of this question, with occasional misuse of *wann* and *wenn* in **parts 1** and **2** respectively.

- (b) There were some difficulties with this question, mostly resulting from unsuccessful attempts to lift the answer from the text.
- (c) This proved challenging for many candidates, with all sorts of permutations of *amerikanische*, and frequent incorrect involvement of *'gibt es seit den 90er Jahren'*.
- (d) This was generally answered well, but there were some word order problems and mistakes in the use of *kannte*.
- € There were many difficulties with *müssen*, namely mistakes with the past tense, and lifts of *'musst du'*.
- (f) This appeared to be challenging for many candidates. There were references to *interessant* and *Der Grund dafür ist* and word order difficulties, but often the correct information had been identified.
- (g) There were many correct answers, but also difficulties when the answer was over complicated.
- (h) This was generally very well answered in both parts, but there was occasional confusion between *gebracht* and *gebraucht*.
- (i) There were correct answers but there were problems with the incorrect use of *Kunde*, and *konnte*.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/23 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 observations

The paper was tackled very well by many 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. Attention should be paid to the position and form of verbs. Manipulations must be correct including when candidates add extra material not needed to answer the question. For **Question group 5** those candidates who read the texts carefully rather than word-spotting the key performed well.

Question group 1

Most candidates performed very well in matching pictures and sentences. Some did not seem to be familiar with *Kekse* and clearly thought this meant cake, which resulted in some incorrect answers.

Question group 2

This was usually completed well, but many candidates did not appear to associate *Bootsfahrt* with *Fluss* which caused problems for **c**, with a variety of alternatives selected.

Question group 3

Performance on these questions was mixed. The most frequent error was for **e** where candidates decided that Stefan had found the film too long. In some cases, answers seemed to be completely random.

Question group 4

There was a wide range of success with this question. The most successful candidates gave short, succinct answers and did not therefore make errors with unsuccessful manipulation. There were not many who did not completely locate the answer, and many candidates gained full, or nearly full marks. However, there was a large number who successfully located the answer but could not be awarded marks through faulty manipulation.

- (a) This was mostly very well answered, but for those who failed to answer correctly, the most common error was to use a present tense verb when the question required an answer in the past tense.
- (b) This was usually very well answered.
- (c) This was generally well answered.
- (d) There were many good answers, but some candidates did not understand what was required and lifted from the text *dorthin fahren* or *Zelten* oder *einfach nur für einen Tag hingehen kann*.
- (e) Many candidates supplied correct answers. Those whose answers could not be credited added infinitives or a past participle after the means of transport which did not provide an answer to what had actually been asked.
- (f) This was generally answered well.
- (g) There were some answers which could not be credited, due mainly to incorrect word order when candidates lifted from the text but did not include the word *dass*.
- (h) This was generally answered well.
- (i) The answer was generally well located, but the lift *fantastischen* could not be credited. A number of candidates saw the word *nie* and decided that the experience had been a negative one.
- (j) This was correctly answered by many, but some candidates did not state where the girls wanted to stay overnight.
- (k) This was generally well answered.

Question group 5

Some candidates achieved full marks on this question, but there were quite a few with more incorrect than correct responses. Where errors occurred, there was no obvious pattern to the incorrectly selected answers.

Question group 6

There were some very good responses with correct, accurately formulated responses to the questions. In some cases, candidates did not look closely at the precise 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.

- (a) There were many completely correct answers to this question.

- (b) Some candidates used a plural verb with *die Familie* which could not be credited.
- (c) This was generally answered well.
- (d) Candidates located the answers to this question, but often these could not be credited because no subject was provided or the verb was in the present tense or the attempt to form an imperfect was unsuccessful.
- (e) This was generally answered well.
- (f) This appeared to be challenging for many candidates with a number using *weil* instead of *dass* which did not answer what was asked.
- (g) There were some correct answers from some candidates.
- (h) This was answered well by some candidates, but others failed to mention what it was that Daniel's family had not yet been persuaded to do.
- (i) There were correct answers, but some candidates listed Daniels' food preferences as *Wurst, Käse aund Fischgerichte* without saying that these were plant based or contained no animal product.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/03 Speaking

Key messages

- The Speaking component is a communication exercise, based on 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 used 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.
- 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.
- Ideas should be expressed and justified in order to achieve the highest marks for Communication.

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for June 2023.

Most candidates were well prepared for the examination and took part in role plays and conversations that were often fluent. Many were also able to react quickly to unprepared questions. Many examiners conducted the examinations in a lively fashion and displayed an efficient yet friendly manner together with a confident awareness of the structure and timing of the various sections.

In the role plays, most examiners followed the instruction that questions may be repeated once only, but not all realised that they ought to repeat a question if the initial response had been ambiguous, or simply incorrect. In the topic conversations most seemed aware of when and how the alternative questions provided should be used. Essentially, this is only after the original **Question 3, 4 or 5** has been repeated but not successfully answered. However, some have not yet mastered the technique of encouraging fuller responses in the conversations by asking appropriate extension questions. Others used the example extension questions, such as *Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr*, or provided effective alternatives, an example of which was asking *warum?* but no *warum* question had been suggested, or asking for the *Nachteile* when the question had only required the *Vorteile*. Any point raised by the candidate may be converted into an extension question. As another example, if a candidate discussing *Freizeit* replies *Mein Hobby ist Sport*, a relevant extension question might be *Was für Sport?* A few examiners changed the wording of some of the role play questions, which is not allowed. 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 counterproductive, 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 five scripted questions and have so not provided enough evidence of the quality of their communication and language. There were a few centres where too many further questions were asked. As these were often closed questions, candidates were not really encouraged to be expansive in their answers. It should also be noted that the suggested alternative questions are only intended to be used with candidates who have not understood the original question. They are not intended to be additional or further questions, even though most 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

There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners coped well with the requirements. The first two questions are designed to elicit straightforward answers within a possible 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 may be awarded 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 understand a question the first time it is asked, or gives an incorrect or unclear response in the opinion of the examiner, it should be repeated, but only once. Most examiners did this 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 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 for most candidates. Some performances were very lively and realistic-sounding. Teachers preparing candidates for role plays should ensure that they realise that nothing in a role play needs to be true, for example talking about a picnic that candidates may or may not have participated in, or a museum they may or may not have actually visited. Nor do future plans need to be true in a role play, simply in a future time frame. Some question types obviously need more practice: in this session, for example, *wie?* and *wo?* caused many candidates problems.

Comments on the Role Plays

Card 1: (Discussing food in Berlin)

There were some good responses to the question as to whether or not it is important to eat healthily. For the first two questions, "*zu Hause*" could have been interpreted either literally as "at home" or more widely as "back in your own country". Not all candidates had practised responding to "*welche Pläne*" as a pointer towards a response in a future time frame, but this question was included in this role play and in several of the others. Some candidates did not seem to hear *wo?* in the first question and responded as if it had been *was?* When reading out the questions examiners can emphasise any word they anticipate might prove important or tricky.

Card 2: (Applying for a Summer job in Germany)

Not everyone replied to the first question correctly, as to how long they had been learning German, even though "*seit 3 Jahren*" or similar should have been very well known as a response. Possibly *wie lange?* as a question form requires more practice. Few candidates could think imaginatively about what they had learned in German lessons about life in Germany, though "*Bratwurst und Bier*" were sometimes mentioned. "*Wir haben deutsche Verben gelernt*" was clearly a heart-felt response, though not the intended one.

Card 3: (Arriving at a campsite)

Question 4 could have been read by examiners with the emphasis on *familie* to help candidates to come up with an effective reason for liking or not liking holidays with their families. Many succeeded in doing so and were also able to think of good reasons as to why they had wanted to learn German. As in Role Play 1, not everyone knew the word *Pläne*.

Card 4: (A picnic in the mountains)

Wie findest du es hier? took some candidates by surprise and was not understood as “What do you think of it, do you like it?”, whilst the apparently easy questions with *was* and *wann* were also not always answered well. On the other hand, there were good responses from many candidates as to whether outings by car were preferable to travelling by bike, whilst for others this question was unexpected and therefore difficult to respond to.

Card 5: (Planning a museum visit)

Again, an easy question word *wie?* was either misheard or misunderstood, and sometimes there were even incorrect answers to the question with *wo?* All the other questions were usually well answered, but some candidates had difficulty in relating a previous museum visit. All role plays contain a question referring to the past, and it would be beneficial for centres to prepare candidates to try to anticipate possible past tense questions during the ten-minute preparation period, based on whatever role play scenario is offered to them

Card 6: (An accident while cycling)

For the first question (*Wie geht's?*) a one-word answer such as *schlecht* would have been perfectly acceptable. *Wie weit?*, the second question, caused some problems, but *nicht weit* would have been an acceptable response, or alternatively *zwei Kilometer*, or even *zehn Minuten*. The question as to how the accident happened should have been expected from the scenario and was often well prepared and well answered. What to do next was unclear to some, though any sensible suggestion within a clear future time-frame was accepted. It was interesting to hear the varied explanations as to why cycling alone was (usually) considered preferable. “I’ve got no friends here in Germany” or “I like being alone with my thoughts” were among the best responses.

Card 7: (Discussing a holiday course in Germany)

There were few problems here, other than with *Pläne* and *wo genau?*, and many good reasons were offered for the decision to take part in the holiday course, “to improve my German” being the most frequent.

Card 8: (Rucksack missing in a German skate park)

Some candidates found it difficult to say where exactly the missing rucksack had been in the skate park, but easier to say what was in it. What did you do next? was not well answered, perhaps because of problems understanding *danach*. It also proved quite difficult to explain why the rucksack had or had not been stolen, in the candidate’s opinion. *Pläne* was sometimes incorrectly adopted as a verb in this role-play: *ich plane....*, but if the message was clearly conveyed full marks were still available.

Card 9: (A long wait at Munich airport)

It became clear that some candidates did not realise that Munich was in Germany, so *nach Deutschland* was accepted, but not if it was *nach München*. Again *Pläne* was the indicator for a response in a future time frame.

Topic Conversations

As with the role plays, both candidates and examiners coped well with the requirements of the syllabus. Many complex and meaningful conversations were developed. Most examiners asked questions exactly as printed. The majority also repeated questions when required or went on to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were given to the original questions. It should be emphasised again though, that these are not additional questions for stronger candidates. There were many good answers to the alternative questions. Also, examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like *Kannst du noch mehr darüber sagen?*, so most candidates managed to produce sufficiently long and meaningful conversations by answering the five questions in some detail. In nearly all cases, a similar standard was maintained in responses to the two possible further questions as had been evident with the set questions, and there was little evidence of memorising or over-rehearsal of answers to any of the additional questions asked by examiners.

Many discussions offered interesting content and ambitious language. Marks are not restricted if candidates do not produce completely correct past and future tenses. Instead, a candidate's use of tenses is marked as part of the general impression for Quality of Language, using the descriptors provided in the mark scheme. There was some evidence that use of the past tense, and particularly of past participles, was not as strong as it could be for some candidates. While this contributed to the final Quality of Language mark, 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 accurately by examiners in deciding on the mark bands and marks they awarded.

As with the role play situations, there was little difference in difficulty between the seven topics, each of which offered at least one challenging question.

Comments on the Topic Conversations

Topic Conversation 1: Daily activities

Many candidates answered incorrectly when asked "*was ist der beste Teil des Tages?*" It was evident that *Teil* was not always well known, strangely so, as nearly everyone seemed to know *Vorteile und Nachteile*. The other questions seemed to offer few difficulties and there were often detailed responses.

Topic Conversation 2: Self, family, character

There were varied responses to **Question 4**, usually related in the past tense as intended, but responses such as "*Meine Schwester ist immer traurig...*" followed by an explanation in the present tense were also effective. For **Question 5** both the advantages and disadvantages of having lots of siblings were really required, but some ignored the *viele* and others answered only partially. Overall though, there were some very interesting and full responses to many of the questions on this topic. For **Question 3** *eine eigene Familie* caused some problems of comprehension, but the alternative question mentioning *Kinder* solved the problem.

Topic Conversation 3: At home

There were some really imaginative descriptions of future dream houses and many good, and less good, aspects of candidates' current homes were also discussed effectively. However, not everyone realised that **Question 4** related to evening activities at home with their families, and there were some less relevant responses as a result, and not always in the expected past time frame. The alternative **Question 3** mentioning *gut oder schlecht* was rarely needed as *Vor- und Nachteile* were familiar to most candidates.

Topic Conversation 4: Nature and environment

This topic seemed to appeal to candidates and was usually very well tackled. There were many, sometimes very full, details of the day's weather in various countries of the world and it was fascinating to find out what candidates could see out of their own bedroom window at home. A day spent *in der Natur* and future plans for a specific region or country where they would like eventually to live were also related enthusiastically and effectively by many candidates. Ideas about what might constitute a *Region* were interpreted generously here. Not all candidates actually understood *in der Natur*.

Topic Conversation 5: The world of work

There were modest or, more frequently, ambitious suggestions as to how much candidates might wish to earn per month in future and most could relate in detail work previously done as work experience or in a holiday job. For **Question 4**, very few candidates required the alternative question, most having understood *Informationstechnologie* without difficulty. There were also some very thoughtful responses as to why people in caring professions should be better paid, or not, according to some points of view. As with some of the other topics, a good range of vocabulary was evident among many candidates.

Topic Conversation 6: Religions and festivals

This was a potentially challenging topic, where a wide range of religious festivals were mentioned as favourites. Nearly every suggestion was accepted as a valid answer. It was not expected that **Question 3** would require a description of any religious practices, but many examples were offered. Most candidates

mentioned, for example, finding Easter eggs, getting presents or having a good time with the family as ways in which people celebrated the particular festival mentioned. There were many interesting responses to the two-part question: Are you going to get married in the future, and if so would you want a big wedding celebration?

Topic Conversation 7: School

Not everyone knew the name in German of the type of school they went to, or perhaps they misunderstood *was für?* and just offered the name of the school as a response. There were not many good accounts of something interesting done recently in school but some good responses to the seemingly more difficult final question as to whether school is a good preparation for later life.

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 pairing 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 the appropriate sample to *Submit for Assessment* but some uploaded all their recordings, which is unnecessary and not advisable. 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 placed the microphone too far from the candidates, so that it was 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 candidates' marks on the Working Mark Sheets (WMS). The WMS are far clearer on screen if they are word processed, and the examiner's name should be typed or written as clearly as possible. Assessment seemed to be quite consistent and the order of merit was usually correct.

Marking by centres

Scaling of marks was required for some centres. There was a slight tendency for marking to be too generous rather than too severe. As mentioned above, there was occasional severity in marking the role plays, but most centres made good use of the clear descriptors in the mark schemes for both Communication and Quality of Language, and so managed to mark their candidates' topic conversations 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.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/41
Writing

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

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/42
Writing 42

Key messages

Centres should remind candidates to complete every gap in **Question 1**, without leaving blanks and to avoid copying vocabulary already used on the form-fill task.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should take care to address every bullet point set. Candidates should read each task carefully and should be sure to answer them as set, rather than writing more generally on the given topic.

It is best if candidates work through the tasks in a sequential fashion, as this helps avoid omissions. Candidates should check each task for the tense required and should ensure that their answer is written in the appropriate time frame.

In **Question 3** candidates must show the use of past, present, and future time frames across the tasks. Candidates should be encouraged to check that they have done this.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared for the requirements of this examination. A number of candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding, as well as demonstrating good language use and responding with opinion and reason. Centres should continue to focus on the precise requirements of the examination and should ensure that their candidates are prepared for the specific 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 5 items.

This session, candidates were required to fill in a form at a lost property office, with details of a lost sports bag. Candidates were asked to name the day it was lost, and where it was lost, and they were asked for items of vocabulary giving a description of the bag, as well as one item that was in the bag. Many candidates completed this first question easily and the majority attempted to answer at least 4 of the 5 tasks. Spellings were not always correct but were accepted if communication was achieved (as indicated by the mark scheme).

The first vocabulary item (day) was achieved by the majority of candidates.

For the second vocabulary item, the majority of candidates successfully scored the mark with answers such as *Restaurant/Sportzentrum/Stadt*. However, some candidates gave *Fundbüro* as their answer but, since this vocabulary item was already given on the form, it could not be credited.

The third and fourth vocabulary items were often successful, with many candidates mentioning colours/size etc. However, answers expressing an opinion or a character description (e.g. *schön/hässlich/nett/intelligent*, etc.) were not credited.

A variety of answers were given for the fifth vocabulary item, with many candidates referring to sports items, phones, money, water, etc. However, *Tennisschläger*, the item given as an example, seemed to confuse

some (perhaps thinking it referred to tennis equipment or clothing) because a number of candidates then wrote *Fußballschläger*, which could not be credited.

Centres are reminded that candidates should consider the context of the question carefully, when completing their answers. Some, for example, suggested they had lost the item in their bedroom, whilst others claimed there was a swimming pool in their bag.

However, overall this task was tackled well by most candidates, and the strongest candidates used a good range of interesting and sensible vocabulary to complete the form.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of the candidate's birthday. The sub-questions were expressed in 4 bullet points. In this exercise 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 did not address 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, relevancy, meaning/communication, vocabulary/structure and linking words/connectors.

The vast majority of candidates attempted this question, and many scored well. Many candidates wrote at length, on task and in good, straightforward German. Weaker candidates were able to increase their total score on the paper by communicating 5 bullet points successfully on **Question 2**, despite their challenges with vocabulary knowledge and grammatical accuracy.

The language used was generally good, with many candidates scoring well, but verb conjugation presented a challenge, especially for weaker candidates. A variety of vocabulary was commonly used, with many candidates adding simple explanations and including linking words. The most successful answers showed a good range of topic-specific vocabulary, clear opinions and the use of connectives with correct word order. A range of connectives were used by many candidates, e.g. *und, aber, oder, weil, als, wenn, obwohl, trotzdem*.

Task 1 asked when the candidate's birthday is. This should have been a straightforward answer which candidates would be expected to have prepared. Most candidates communicated an answer, but a few candidates were unable to write their birthday accurately, using the correct preposition and ordinal number. A significant number found a way around this, by saying their birthday was *heute/nächste Woche* or *in Mai*.

Task 2 asked candidates to describe what they do on a typical birthday. Many did not understand that *an diesem Tag* required them to write about their birthday, rather than give general daily routine description. Others wrote about what happened last year on their birthday using a past tense. Some took the opportunity to write about their daily routine, with the addition of inviting friends and relatives, and eating cake. References to cake caused difficulty, however, as very few candidates were able to write *Kuchen* correctly. There were many references to kitchens instead of cake, for example, and some who chose to use a verb were challenged in their attempts to conjugate *backen*. However, some candidates used *Verwandte* and *einladen* correctly.

Task 3 asked why the candidate likes their birthday or not. The verb *mögen* again presented difficulty for candidates, resulting in frequent confusion between *ich mochte/ich möchte*. However, those who did understand the question made good attempts to answer it, showing a knowledge of vocabulary and language e.g. *Geschenke bekommen, Freunde anrufen, mit Freunden treffen, etc.*

Task 4 asked how the candidate will celebrate their birthday next year and **Task 5** required a reason for their opinion. These tasks were challenging for many candidates. The verb *feiern* was understood by a significant number of candidates as *die Ferien*. Hence, there were many answers which referred to next year's holiday plans, rather than references to the next birthday. Others read *feiern* as festival, so thought that *am liebsten feiern* meant they had to refer to their favourite festival, with candidates writing then about other celebrations, e.g. Christmas. However, those who had understood correctly usually wrote well on this task, and there were a variety of responses, ranging from plans to party with family/friends, to hopes for a special trip, or a desire simply to have a quiet birthday.

A number of candidates omitted to give the reason required in **Task 5**. Candidates are advised to answer the bullet points in order, and to double check that they have attempted to answer each point. There were some candidates who were obviously native speakers and wrote in excellent German but were careless about the

details of the tasks. Their omission of this task meant that they did not gain marks which they would have easily been capable of achieving.

Question 3

The majority of candidates attempted to answer the question as set and this session there were few candidates writing on a different topic or merely copying out the rubric. 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 3 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 each one 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.

Candidates did not always address the precise requirement of a particular bullet point, and this prevented some candidates from moving up the banded mark scheme. For some this was because they omitted part of the task, for others this was due to a lack of comprehension, and therefore an inability to respond with an adequate answer.

This session there were very few candidates who avoided the specifics of the question entirely and very few simply wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic. Overall, the majority were able to make convincing responses to most of the sub-questions.

Range:

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

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3a** encouraged use of a range of vocabulary on the topics of music and travel, as well as presenting the opportunity to include environment vocabulary, whilst **Question 3b** offered the chance for vocabulary on the topic of film and books, as well as leisure more generally. Many candidates had a good range of task-specific vocabulary at their disposal and there were clear opinions and reasons expressed.

This session there were few examples of responses with only very simple structures, and many candidates attempted longer sentences using a range of conjunctions. There were very few simple answers; many answers included more complex structures such as the use of inversion and verbs at the end of subordinate clauses. There was evidence this year that candidates had a large active vocabulary and range of language structures at their disposal.

The most used conjunctions were *und* and *weil*, but stronger candidates expanded their range and introduced *da*, *dass*, *deshalb*, *außerdem*, *jedoch*, etc. There was accurate use of *wenn/weil/dass* clauses, relative clauses, adjectives and more sophisticated verb structures, including *um...zu...*

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, accuracy of verb forms and tenses, gender, case agreement, adjective endings, word order and capital/lower-case letters in nouns are all considered.

Poor spelling was an issue for many candidates and the use of capital letters on nouns was a challenge for many. Even some of the most common vocabulary items presented challenges which led to communication and accuracy issues (e.g. *Küche/Kuchen*, *Buch/Bücher/Buche*, *Liebe/lieber/lieben*, etc.). Similarly, *wann* was often used instead of *wenn* and *dass* in place of *das*, and candidates struggled with the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives.

Verbs, including some of the most common verbs (e.g. *mögen*) presented challenges for candidates, and many candidates were unsure of the use of tenses. Use of the future was generally good, but both the present and past tenses caused difficulties for many candidates. Present tense verb endings were frequently incorrect and past participles of even the most common verbs (e.g. *fahren*) were often incorrectly formed. Awareness of auxiliary verb use was also limited for many candidates. For example, the perfect tense of *fahren* was often conjugated with *haben*. Candidates often did not form the conditional correctly (*wurde* instead of *würde* and *mochte* for *möchte*), thus invalidating their response.

Despite these challenges, many candidates were successful in conveying information without communication being impeded, and much of the German produced was accurate. Word order, for example, was generally good this session. The strongest candidates were highly accurate and showed an impressive ability to use a range of language structures, including relative clauses, negatives beyond *nicht* (e.g. *nicht nur...sondern auch...weder...noch...*), with some even using the subjunctive (e.g. *wenn ich mehr Freizeit hätte, ...*).

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write an email to their friend, about a visit last weekend to a rock festival. The strongest candidates answered this task with a full and interesting account of their trip to the festival, paying attention to the time frames required by the specific bullet points, and including higher level language to give and justify opinions and describe events.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to say why they find rock festivals good. This should have been a straightforward introduction to the question, but the task was not always completed as well as it might have been. A significant number of candidates wrote about what happened on their last visit to a rock festival, rather than expressing a general opinion in the present tense. Candidates should be reminded to check the tense required. Those who were successful generally wrote about love of music, food, lighting, dancing, other activities and had clear opinions.

Task 2 asked candidates to describe how a recent festival was. Candidates generally gave good answers, but there was some overlap with **Task 1**, and some were confused about which time frame to use. Some candidates gave general answers, e.g. *Es war toll* rather than describing what actually happened at the festival. Stronger candidates gave specific, interesting descriptions of, for example, the type of music played, which bands/singers they saw and what they thought of them, people they met, what the eating/drinking/sleeping arrangements were.

In **Task 3**, candidates were asked to describe what they did when the bus broke down on the homeward journey. However, the word *Panne* was clearly unfamiliar to many candidates and, as a result, a number of candidates either missed this point out entirely, or simply wrote a description of the journey. Some substituted with *Unfall* and went on to describe an accident. A number of candidates did also not understand *auf dem Rückweg*. Reference to this was often omitted or assumed to mean on the way to the festival.

Stronger candidates understood the question and explained what had gone wrong (with some impressive vocabulary involving punctures, spare wheels, etc.). There were some ingenious answers about the dangers of breaking down on a motorway, and many described reactions and emotions. Others wrote about what they had done (got out and walked, phoned a parent, waited, slept, ate, etc.), which were accepted, with credit being given to all answers which described the candidate's activities on the bus. *Anrufen* was often well-known and accurately used.

Task 4 asked whether it is better to travel by bus or by car. The vast majority of candidates were able to state and to justify their preference. Many candidates did not come down in favour of travelling by bus or by car but gave pros and cons of each and this was a suitable way to tackle the question and give more detail. However, the number of candidates unable to use the comparative was high, with many writing about things being *mehr umweltfreundlich*, *mehr wichtig* etc.

Task 5 asked for an explanation as to what means of transport the candidate would like to use in the future. Most candidates had a good vocabulary about public transport and were able to weigh up the pros and cons well at this level. Some understood the question in a more limited way as referring to the next festival that they would attend. Since the mark scheme specified that a future time frame was required, a number of candidates were not successful in this task. However, the majority expressed their answers in well-formed future tenses.

Many candidates used both **Tasks 4** and **5** as an opportunity to show their knowledge of language of the environment topic, with a good range of vocabulary being used (e.g. *Luftverschmutzung*, *Abgase*, *umweltfreundlich/schädlich* etc.), as well as using higher level language taught as part of this topic (*um die Umwelt zu schützen*, *man sollte umweltfreundlicher leben* etc.).

Question 3(b)

Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of films and books. The strongest candidates wrote extensively on their film and book preferences, paying close attention to the detailed requirements of the bullet points and the time frames required for each part. However, a very common problem for candidates were the spellings of *Buch* and *Bücher*, which were often inaccurate. Since both these spellings were present and correct in the rubric, there was little justification for error.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to describe, in the past tense, a recent evening when they watched a film. Most answered this well, often giving details of those with whom they watched the film, as well as where, and describing the film, its plot/actors, and the snacks they ate. A number struggled with perfect tense conjugation, with *Ich habe gefahren/gegangen* appearing often.

Task 2 required candidates to describe where they most enjoyed watching films. A significant number of candidates did not read the question carefully enough and, although they understood *am liebsten* correctly to mean 'favourite', they did not read this in conjunction with *wo* and so wrote about a favourite film. Those who did read the question carefully gave well-reasoned arguments about why they preferred the cinema or a home. Many took the opportunity to attempt use of the comparative or to use *wenn* clauses. The missing piece of vocabulary here was 'screen'. Very few used *Bildschirm*, with many resorting to *großen Fernseher* when describing the cinema screen.

Task 3 asked candidates to explain why they prefer watching films or reading books. However, the word *lieber* posed problems for a number of candidates, who tried to use it as a verb (*Ich lieber Filme als Bücher*). Stronger candidates were able to explore the relative benefits of films and reading, with extended opinions and reasons for each.

Task 4 asked candidates to describe a book recently read in school. For a number of candidates this led to some over complicated attempts to describe plots of books instead of keeping to more simple opinions. However, some gave a straightforward *Ich habe X gelesen*, *Es war interessant* and stronger candidates went beyond this, with descriptions of the plot, or reasons why they had liked/disliked the book.

Task 5 required candidates to explain what they would do next weekend to relax. Overall, this was well answered, with many candidates keeping to the theme and talking about seeing films and reading books. The majority used the future time frame which was required here. However, there were those who did not answer the question as set, and referred instead to how stressful their weekend would be with current exams and revision. Others had understood the future time frame requirement but wrote instead about how they would spend the summer holidays.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/43
Writing

Key messages

Centres should remind candidates to complete every gap in **Question 1**, without leaving blanks and to avoid copying vocabulary already used on the form-fill task.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should take care to address every bullet point set. Candidates should read each task carefully and should be sure to answer them as set, rather than writing more generally on the given topic.

It is best if candidates work through the tasks in a sequential fashion, as this helps avoid omissions. Candidates should check each task for the tense required and should ensure that their answer is written in the appropriate time frame.

In **Question 3** candidates must show the use of past, present, and future time frames across the tasks. Candidates should be encouraged to check that they have done this.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared for the requirements of this examination. A number of candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding, as well as demonstrating good language use and responding with opinion and reason. Centres should continue to focus on the precise requirements of the examination and should ensure that their candidates are prepared for the specific 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 5 items.

This session, candidates were required to fill in a form at a travel bureau, with details of a planned trip. Candidates were asked to name the chosen means of transport, the length of time for the trip, the country to be visited, and 2 activities which the candidate plans to do on the trip. Many candidates completed this first question easily and the majority attempted to answer most of the 5 tasks. Spellings were not always correct but were accepted if communication was achieved (as indicated by the mark scheme).

The first vocabulary item (transport) was achieved by the majority of candidates.

For the second vocabulary item, the majority of candidates successfully scored the mark. However, those who decided the trip would be for a few hours (rather than days/weeks) could not score if they used *Uhr* rather than *Stunde*.

The third vocabulary item was usually successful, with many candidates mentioning a suitable country.

A variety of answers were given for the fourth and fifth vocabulary items, with many candidates referring to swimming, tennis, hiking, skiing, visiting the sites, etc..

Overall, this task was tackled well by most candidates and the strongest candidates were used a good range of suitable vocabulary to complete the form.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of the candidate's house. The sub-questions were expressed in 4 bullet points. In this exercise 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 did not address 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, relevancy, meaning/communication, vocabulary/structure and linking words/connectors.

All candidates this session attempted this question, and many scored well. Many candidates wrote at length, on task and in good, straightforward German. Weaker candidates were able to increase their total score on the paper by communicating 5 bullet points successfully on **Question 2**, despite their challenges with vocabulary knowledge and grammatical accuracy.

The language used was generally good, with many candidates scoring well, though verb conjugation presented a challenge, especially for weaker candidates. A variety of vocabulary was commonly used, with many candidates adding simple explanations and including linking words. The most successful answers showed a good range of topic-specific vocabulary, clear opinions and the use of connectives with correct word order. A range of connectives was used by many candidates, e.g.. *und, aber, oder, weil, als, wenn, obwohl, trotzdem, außerdem*.

Task 1 asked candidates to describe their house. The majority of candidates were successful in this, with many giving clear accounts of the rooms/garden/location of their house. Many also went on to include opinions.

Task 2 asked why the candidate liked their house or not. Many were successful in their answers, but it seemed that the verb *mögen* was not well known to candidates in its infinitive form. Therefore a significant number omitted this task, while others gave an opinion but did not give the reason that this task required.

Task 3 asked what it is that candidates like doing in their house or garden at the weekend. Most candidates answered well, with the majority referring to their weekly homework, or leisure activities with family or friends. However, there were some who missed the requirement for the activities to be those which happened at home. Instead some gave an answer about general weekend activities, such as going into town/the cinema/shopping etc., and were therefore not successful on this task.

Task 4 asked where candidates would most like to live in the future, when they have their own home, and **Task 5** required a reason for their opinion. These tasks were generally completed successfully, with stronger candidates able to write at length using a variety of language to convey their plans and reasons, while weaker candidates were generally able to state where they will live and to give a simple explanation. However, a number of candidates wrote in the present tense about where they like to live and why, and missed the requirement here for a future time frame.

Question 3

The majority of candidates attempted to answer the question as set and this session there were few candidates writing on a different topic or merely copying out the rubric. There were a few very short answers from candidates whose levels of German were insufficient to attempt the question as set.

This question was marked out of a maximum of 28 marks from 3 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 each one 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.

Candidates did not always address the precise requirement of a particular bullet point, and this prevented some candidates from moving up the banded mark scheme. For some this was because they omitted part of the task, for others this was due to a lack of comprehension, and therefore an inability to respond with an adequate answer.

This session there were very few candidates who avoided the specifics of the question entirely and very few simply wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic. Overall, the majority were able to make convincing responses to most of the sub-questions.

Range:

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

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3(a)** encouraged use of a range of vocabulary on the topics of going out/food/free time, as well as presenting the opportunity to include vocabulary on the topic of health, whilst **Question 3(b)** offered the chance for vocabulary on the topic of technology and communication. Many candidates had a good range of task-specific vocabulary at their disposal and there were clear opinions and reasons expressed.

This session there were some responses with very simple structures, as well a number of candidates attempting longer sentences and using a range of conjunctions and more complex language. Many candidates had a large active vocabulary and a range of language structures at their disposal.

The most used conjunctions were *und* and *weil*, but stronger candidates expanded their range and introduced others including *deshalb*, *außerdem*, etc.. Accurate use of *wenn/weil/dass* clauses was seen, as well as a range of adjectives and other structures.

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, accuracy of verb forms and tenses, gender, case agreement, adjective endings, word order and capital/lower-case letters in nouns are all considered.

Poor spelling was an issue for many candidates and the use of capital letters on nouns was also a challenge.

Verbs, including some of the most common verbs (e.g. *mögen*), presented a challenge for candidates, and many candidates were unsure of their use of tenses. Present tense verb endings were frequently incorrect and past participles were often incorrectly formed. Awareness of auxiliary verb use was also limited for many candidates.

Despite these challenges, many candidates were successful in conveying information without impeding communication, and much of the German produced was accurate. Word order, for example, was generally good. The strongest candidates were highly accurate and showed an impressive ability to use a range of language structures, such as relative clauses, and use of negatives apart from *nicht*, (e.g. *nicht nur.sondern auch*).

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write an email to their friend, about a visit last week to a new café in town. The strongest candidates answered this task with a detailed description of the café, paying attention to the time frames required by the specific bullet points, including higher level language to give and justify opinions and describe events.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to describe the new café. This was a straightforward introduction to the question, with the majority of candidates writing successfully about the new café and describing its size, décor, location, etc., with many going on to include personal opinions, too.

Task 2 asked candidates to state what they ate in the café. Candidates generally gave clear answers, with most able to convey their accounts in the past tense. However, there were some candidates who gave their answers in the present tense to describe food options available, rather being specific about what they ate/drank during their recent visit. This meant that they were unsuccessful on this task, which required use of the past time frame.

In **Task 3**, candidates were asked to explain why people like spending so much time in cafés. A significant number of candidates understood this as asking why people like spending time in this particular café. Therefore, it depended on what information was given, and how it was expressed, as to whether the task was successfully answered or not.

Task 4 asked whether or not it is important that cafés offer healthy food. The vast majority of candidates were able to state and to justify their preferences. Candidates were fairly evenly split between those who felt that healthy food was unnecessary in cafés and those who felt that it was absolutely essential. A number of candidates attempted to use the comparative, but many were unable to do so accurately. Some candidates used this task as an opportunity to show their knowledge of language for the topic of health, with a good range of health-related vocabulary being used, as well as use of higher level language taught as part of the health topic (*um gesund zu bleiben*, etc.).

Task 5 asked when candidates would next go out to eat. Many answered well, saying they were going out to eat next weekend/on an upcoming birthday/etc.. However, a number responded with where they would go or what they planned to eat but omitted to say when this would be, and so they could not succeed. However, most candidates were successful in using the future time frame for this task.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of communication and technology. The strongest candidates wrote extensively on the topic, paying close attention to the detailed requirements of the bullet points and the time frames required for each part. Those who chose this question related well to the topic, and mostly had the language with which to communicate the details.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to describe, in the past tense, how their grandparents used to communicate in the past. Most answered this clearly, often giving details about how their grandparents used to write letters to one another, or make visits to one another, and explaining why.

Task 2 required candidates to describe what their family uses the computer for today. This was usually well done, with plenty of references to needing the computer for homework purposes, parents' work, writing emails, doing online shopping or playing games etc..

Task 3 asked candidates to describe what sort of problems there can be in the family, as a result of technology. Many candidates related well to this issue and the majority were able to explain, but some perhaps tried to describe situations which they did not quite have the breadth of vocabulary or language to convey accurately. However, there were plenty of references to arguments over sharing the use of the family computer or parents being unhappy about the length of time their children were spending on the computer. Others wrote about parents not having enough technical knowledge to fix the computer when it would not work, and some explained how it was the children who came to the rescue of the parents when there were technical difficulties with the computer.

Task 4 asked candidates to explain why young people today need a mobile telephone. Most expressed opinions about needing the phone to communicate with friends, or for school, whilst others referred to needing to access the internet for leisure purposes.

Task 5 required candidates to describe what sort of technological appliances they would purchase in the future. The majority of candidates were successful in the task, with many referring to plans for a new mobile phone or an updated computer. Many went on to give reasons for their choices.