

GERMAN

Paper 0525/12
Listening

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

The 2021 November session was only the second time that the format of the Listening test was entirely multiple-choice. The candidature overall performed well and there is no evidence that candidates failed to respond to any 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 factual information contained in short conversational extracts, 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

Overall, candidates performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. In **Question 3** some candidates had difficulty distinguishing between skating and skiing.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured short news items. Overall, candidates performed well in this exercise. However, in **Question 10** *Dach* was not well known and more candidates opted for the incorrect answer **C** than the correct answer **B**. In **Question 14** not all candidates chose the correct option **A**, presumably because they were distracted by other types of weather mentioned in the weather forecast. There was no clear pattern of incorrect answers for the other questions.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends planning who they should invite on a camping holiday. This is a new task and quite a challenging matching exercise. A number of candidates struggled to identify the correct answers for **Questions 15, 16** and **17**. The incorrect answers were distributed evenly amongst the distracters. **Questions 18** and **19** were answered well by candidates.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews with Franziska about her life in the circus. The exercise represents a step up in the incline of difficulty because there is a greater element of deliberate distraction in the choices.

In **Question 21** **A** proved to be a successful distracter, as did **B** in **Questions 22, 23** and **26**. **Questions 24** and **25** were generally answered well. Both incorrect options in **Question 27** attracted a number of candidate responses.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Benni Zander, a young man involved with charity work in Uganda. 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 be aware of attitudes and opinions.

In **Question 29** fewer than half the candidates chose the correct option **D**. Almost as many candidates chose **C** presumably because they made the assumption that an English teacher had to come from England, although it is clearly stated that she comes from Taiwan. In **Question 31** as many candidates opted for the incorrect option **D** as for the correct option **B**. **B** required understanding Benni's attitude rather than listening out for vocabulary, whilst the word *Hilfsorganisation* appears in option **D** and in the listening text and proved an effective distracter. **Question 33** caused difficulties as all four choices were almost equally popular, which might indicate a lack of understanding of the question. The other questions discriminated appropriately for this stage in the examination.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Bea and Thomas about the police. 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 points of view.

In each of the three sections many candidates identified the two correct statements correctly. However, statement **E** in **Question 35** proved to be an effective distracter, as did statement **B** in **Question 37**.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/22 Reading
--

Key messages

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** close reading of the text is required.

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1 (a)–(e)

Just a very few candidates selected incorrect answers in this initial Question group. There was no discernible pattern to explain this.

Question group 2 (a)–(e)

This was completed well by many candidates but a few supplied incorrect answers for **2(b)** and **2(e)** suggesting that *Erdbeeren*, *Lebensmittel* and *Schlussverkauf* may not have been known.

Question group 3 (a)–(g)

Accomplishment for this Question group was mainly good with a significant number of candidates selecting all correct answers. Errors were most frequent in the case in **3(e)** with candidates suggesting that Verena ate without her mother.

Question group 4 (a)–(k)

- (a) This was answered well by many but some weaker scripts contained the answer *Fabian wollte einer Gartenparty eingeladen*, which could not be credited.
- (b) and (c) These questions were answered well by most.
- (d) Some candidates mentioned only a DJ without stating that a well-known DJ would be responsible for the music, and this was insufficient to be credited.
- (e) Almost all candidates supplied an appropriate answer for 4(e).
- (f) This revealed that few candidates could manipulate the language to supply an appropriate answer as required here. A number lifted the sentence in the text *Alle haben ja zur besten Party des Jahres gesagt*, which was not an answer the question asked and so was not credited.
- (g), (h) and (i) These questions were appropriately answered by the majority.
- (j) Answers varied with some candidates explaining correctly that everything being wet was a problem and/or that the fireworks would not start. Some answers were not credited as the language had not been correctly manipulated.
- (k) The greater majority answered this appropriately. Some, however, did not appear to understand the question and answered that it was a great catastrophe.

Question group 5 (a)–(e)

Some candidates acquitted themselves well here and gained full marks. There were some who matched 3 or 4 of the 5 correctly but gave a wrong response for the remainder. 5(b) seemed to be problematic for some. Some candidates scored 0 or 1 and it seemed that they had not grasped that close reading rather than word-spotting was required.

Question group 6 (a)–(i)

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 focussed 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.

- (a) Some candidates lifted the whole of the first sentence, which did not answer the precise question asked and so could not be credited.
- (b) Most candidates clearly understood the question but many included the word *zwar* in their answer and so this was not credited.
- (c) Candidates did not seem to understand that they were being asked about what Tanja did on the project and merely reiterated that she had been involved in an EU sports project.
- (d)(i) Candidates often located the correct part of the text but included the word *trotzdem*, which meant their answer could not be credited.
- (ii) This was generally answered correctly.
- (e) This revealed the inability of many candidates to use the present tense of *sprechen*, and indeed in some cases *gehen* accurately, which meant that the answers were not deemed acceptable.
- (f) This was answered correctly by most candidates.
- (g) Most candidates found the right answer but some added superfluous information which invalidated their answer.

- (h) This was answered well by many. Some candidates wrote *Naturshutz hat für sich (absolute) Priorität* which was not credited.
- (i) This was answered well by most candidates.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/03 Speaking

Key messages

- The emphasis of the new syllabus is firmly on successful communication within familiar situations.
- The new Speaking exam genuinely tests communication, as all tasks now are genuine communication exercises, in which candidates can show that they can understand and produce the target language.
- The new 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, be expansive, 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 October/November 2021.

It was very good to see that, like in the June examination, the large majority of centres conducted this new Speaking Test very well. Most candidates seemed very well prepared for the new demands set in this exam and the large majority of examiners conducted the exam exactly in the spirit in which it was intended. A different approach is required for this new syllabus both from teachers preparing their candidates and from those conducting the examination. Most examiners had clearly adapted very quickly to the changed requirements and displayed an efficient yet friendly manner and confident awareness of the structure and timing of the various sections of the examination. They were patient, allowed time for the candidates to think, and prompted 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. Not all examiners had mastered the technique of encouraging fuller responses by asking extension questions. However, others used the example extension questions, such as 'Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr', extremely well or provided appropriate alternatives of their own.

Many examiners were able to conduct successful conversations – lasting approximately four minutes – on each individual topic by using only the five questions provided in the Teachers' Instructions. Others ensured that the topic conversations provided enough material for accurate marking 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 thus not provided enough evidence of the quality of their communication and language. There were, fortunately, only a few centres, where up to seven further questions were asked, but as these often were closed questions which did not encourage candidates to expand in their answers, they did not really serve the candidates well.

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, is potentially quite demanding, but proved to be a great success. There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners coped very well with the changed requirements. The first two questions are designed to elicit straightforward (often very brief, possibly even just one word) answers within a present tense time frame. 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.

Mostly the marking of the role plays was commendably accurate. Occasionally, examiners were slightly harsh in their interpretation as to what constitutes a 'minor error'. Thus, an incorrect auxiliary ('ich habe in die Stadt gegangen) or an incorrect verb ending ('wir könnte in einem Restaurant essen gehen') 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 usually does obscure meaning (Question: 'Was willst du denn zum Frühstück essen?' Response: 'Ich habe Toast und Marmelade essen'), as does an incomplete answer. For example, in the question 'Wie viele Schüler gibt es in deiner Klasse?', the 'wie viele' component of the question must be answered, as otherwise the response can, at best, be partial.

A good guideline for awarding one mark for an utterance would be: In a real-life situation, would you feel you need to ask a further question for clarification?

There were relatively few marks of zero, (no creditable response), as all the role plays proved to be accessible to most candidates.

There certainly was no appreciable difference in difficulty between the nine role plays. A great effort had been made to avoid setting questions where knowledge of one particular item of vocabulary might determine as to whether a candidate could answer a question. Consequently, it was felt that all role plays were equally accessible and were asking for linguistically similar types of responses.

Comments on the individual Role Plays

Card 1: (Kinobesuch)

As there were many centres in this session who entered just a single candidate, this was the role play which was used most often. It proved fairly straightforward and, for the large majority of candidates, caused very few problems. Some candidates stated that the film started 'zu Mittag' or 'um 3 Uhr', and as this is not a completely clear and correct answer to the question 'Wann beginnt der Film heute Abend?', only a mark of one could be given for answers of this kind. All credible answers were accepted as appropriate answers for 'Was möchtest du denn vor dem Film machen?', including 'Ich will das Popcorn kaufen'. For **Question 4**, a reason for why they liked a particular type of film was needed for a full mark of two.

This role play typified the standard pattern for role plays in the new syllabus, as detailed above: two questions where a brief answer would suffice, two encouraging a response using a past or future time-frame, and one requiring a justification or an opinion (perhaps a 'double question' as on this occasion).

Card 2: (Soziale Medien)

Similarly, this role play caused few problems. A variety of answers were offered to the 'Wie viel Zeit verbringst du...?' question which begins this role play. Possible valid answers that were heard included 'Nicht lange', '2 Stunden, oder so' or 'zu lange'. As in previous years 'zwei Uhr' was not accepted for 'zwei Stunden' and in this case the examiner should repeat the question to encourage the candidate to think again. Candidates were very creative in their answers for **Question 4** ('Was für Probleme, meinst du, gibt es mit Facebook und anderen sozialen Medien?'). Accepted responses included: 'Ich verschwende ganz einfach zu viel Zeit', 'es ist gefährlich, zu viel persönliche Information auf Facebook zu posten', and 'Ich kann das nicht sagen, weil ich Facebook nicht benutze'. The new format of the role plays, which allows candidates to be creative and come up with personalised responses, encourages candidates to think on their feet and even to use their sense of humour.

Card 3: (Bei der Passkontrolle)

Again, there were very few problems with this role play. Similar to the previous role play, '2 Uhr' was not a fully acceptable response to **Question 2**. Candidates realised that it was not required to refer specifically to sights in Hamburg for **Question 3**, ('Was haben Sie denn in Hamburg so gemacht?'), and responses like 'ich bin einkaufen gegangen' and 'ich habe das Schloss gesehen' were fully acceptable. In this, as in other role plays that refer to particular places or cities in a German-speaking country, specific knowledge of the place in question is not required. **Question 5** again encouraged creative responses. While the most common response was 'ich werde schlafen', responses like 'ich werde natürlich meinen Eltern alles über Hamburg erzählen' were also offered.

Card 4: (Der Frankfurter Weihnachtsmarkt)

This again proved to be fairly straightforward, although there were some candidates who maybe had no clear idea as to what exactly a 'Weihnachtsmarkt' is. Therefore, there were some interesting items that candidates proposed to buy at the Christmas market (**Question 2**: 'Und was möchtest du auf dem Weihnachtsmarkt kaufen?') but even the answer 'Kartoffel und Süßigkeiten' was fully accepted. Interesting responses to **Question 4** ('Wo kauft man deiner Meinung nach am besten ein?') ranged from 'natürlich im Internet' to 'ich finde unseren lokalen Markt am besten', and good reasons were given for both kinds of answers. **Question 5**, ('Was hast du denn in den letzten Tagen in Frankfurt noch so gemacht?') like in the previous role play, did not require any specific reference to the German city in question.

Card 5: (ein Sportunfall)

Again, this role play encouraged creative answers. Putting themselves into the situation of having had a minor sporting accident, candidates' responses to **Question 1** ('Hallo! Wo bist du denn jetzt?') included straightforward responses like 'In der Schule' as well as more specific ones like 'auf dem Fußballplatz'. Responses like 'beim Arzt' or 'im Krankenhaus' were obviously also accepted. Responses to **Question 2** ('Und wer ist bei dir?') included creative answers like 'nur meine Mitspieler' (which, interestingly, was not credited with full marks by the centre marker). Similarly creative answers were given to **Question 4** ('Warum hast du nicht früher angerufen?'): 'Die Batterie in meinem Handy war leer' was as acceptable as 'ich hatte so starke Schmerzen'.

As there were very few centres with more than five candidates, the following role plays were only heard a couple of times.

Card 6: (Geburtstag während des Austauschbesuchs)

Similarly, this caused no major difficulties and most candidates were familiar with the type of situation presented here. Again, creativity came to the fore with **Question 5** ('Was ist das beste Geburtstagsgeschenk für einen Teenager? Und warum?'). By far the most common response was 'ein Handy', but there was huge variation in the kinds of reasons that were given – from the more obvious 'weil ich dann besser mit meinen Freunden/mit meiner Familie, etc. kommunizieren kann' to 'weil es dann leichter für mich ist, Videospiele zu spielen', a good variety of answers were given.

Card 7: (Ein Geschenk für die Schwester)

Again, there were few problems. The candidates' generosity towards their sister, as expressed in **Question 1** (Wie viel Geld wirst du denn ausgeben für das Geschenk?) varied considerably between 'ein paar Euro' and '300 Euro'. The name of a specific currency was needed here to make the answer completely relevant, so just a number would have been regarded as an incomplete response.

Not all candidates linked **Questions 3** and **4** as both attempting to find out what the student's sister might be interested in, but all answers that made linguistic sense were accepted.

Card 8: (Dialog beim Skifahren)

Similarly, this role play proved straightforward to all candidates we heard doing it.

Card 9: (Eine Stadtführung in München)

And exactly the same can be said of this role play.

Topic Conversations

As with the Role Plays, both candidates and examiners coped well with the new requirements, and a lot of 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 an increased level of fairness.

Most examiners asked questions exactly as printed, the majority also repeated questions when required and continued to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were forthcoming to the original questions. 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 five questions in some detail. Good use was also made of the fact that examiners can ask up to two 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 as had been evident in the responses to the set questions and there was no 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 them develop, justify and/or explain their statements. Similarly, words and phrases like '*außerdem*' and '*aus diesem Grund*' were often used by candidates who ended up being marked at the top of the range for Quality of language. It is also worth pointing out again, (already mentioned above in the **Key messages**), that candidates are encouraged in this new format to be expansive, to tell stories, to give evaluations and to describe events.

It is also worth remembering that a candidate is 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. The Quality of language mark also takes into account other aspects of language use, like 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. Far fewer adjustments to the marks had to be made than with the old syllabus and mark scheme.

The 'Alternative Frage(n)' for **Questions 3, 4** and **5** of the topics proved a very useful tool, as those alternative questions, which were formulated using more accessible language and linguistic concepts, made it possible even for weaker candidates to have a relevant attempt at answering the respective questions. Thus, these questions also proved to be a very good differentiating tool.

Like in the role play situations, there was no appreciable difference in difficulty between the seven topics. A great effort had been made to avoid setting questions where knowledge of one particular item of vocabulary might determine as to whether a candidate could answer a question. The setters of the exam also made sure all questions covered accessible topic areas, which are part of the 0525 syllabus, and which were expected to be covered by the textbook materials candidates might have used. Consequently, it was felt that all topics were equally accessible and were asking for linguistically similar types of responses.

After hearing a great variety of responses from candidates from different educational and cultural backgrounds, it is safe to say that there was not a single question in any of the 7 topics that caused any particular difficulties. The responses to the questions asking for opinions and evaluations (**Question 4** in **Topic 1**, **Question 3** in **Topics 2, 3**, and **4**, and **Question 5** in **Topics 5, 6** and **7**) showed the candidates' creativity and spontaneity at its very best.

No comments on the individual topics are included in this report due to the reasons given above and the fact that overall marks achieved in all the topics also were totally comparable.

Randomisation

The large majority of centres followed the randomisation guidelines given in the Teachers' Notes exactly. This is very important both for reasons of fairness and confidentiality (in centres with many candidates), but 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. Unfortunately, a small number of centres limited this opportunity for the candidates by pairing topics with similar subject content.

Recordings

Most centres forwarded an appropriate size of sample, on labelled CDs or memory sticks, with each candidate's digital file saved individually. Please name the files according to the centre and candidate numbers rather than the teacher or examiner's name. Before recordings are despatched, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. Fortunately, this year there appeared to be fewer problems with faulty CDs, or 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.

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 sheet (WMS). Assessment seemed to be much more consistent than in the old syllabus, and the order of merit was usually correct.

Marking by centres

Scaling was required in far fewer centres than with the old syllabus. Although the slight tendency was still for marking to be too generous rather than too severe, this was much less evident than in the past. Centres obviously had made good use of the excellent mark descriptors in the mark schemes for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language' and thus managed to mark their candidates accurately. Reasons for excessive generosity included awarding high marks for Communication, when candidates had not offered ideas and opinions, as answers had been too factual. The fact that the Language mark is now given globally means that very good candidates no longer needed to be marked down, just because they have not managed to produce correct past or future tenses. Most centres realised this and marked accordingly.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/42 Writing
--

Key messages

Candidates should be encouraged to read the questions carefully and respond to the exact tasks set. Writing on the topic area in general terms is unlikely to gain much credit. Full Task Completion marks can only be gained by addressing the specifics of every part-question. A thorough knowledge of the question words in German is helpful in achieving this. Candidates should also ensure that they are answering each task in the appropriate tense. In **Question 2**, candidates will usually be required to demonstrate the use of present and future tenses, and in **Question 3**, they will often need to use past, present and future tenses in different tasks. In both questions, candidates will need to express opinions and give reasons for their choices.

General comments

There was no evidence of candidates being short of time. The correct number of questions was answered by almost all candidates and most answers were of an appropriate length.

In **Question 2**, there were many good responses on the topic of technology and communication.

In **Question 3**, whichever essay was chosen, higher marks were gained for Task Completion when candidates worked through the bullet points systematically and used the tense indicated by the question. Most candidates had sufficient appropriate vocabulary for the essay that had been chosen.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates have to complete an electronic form by filling in the answers to five questions. A confident knowledge of the basic question words is essential for this task.

An application to a sports centre for a friend had to be completed.

Tasks 1 and 2 gave the opportunity to list two sporting activities. Almost all candidates were able to achieve this and there was a wide variety of sports including *Rugby*, *Cricket*, *Fußball*, *Federball*, *Turnen* and *Schwimmen*.

Task 3 required a day of the week. Candidates should be encouraged to write the day they are most confident that they can spell to avoid errors such as *Mittwoch* written as *Mittwog*.

Task 4 needed a month, and most were written correctly.

Task 5: *Wie kommen Sie zum Sportzentrum?* required a means of transport, including on foot, used to access the sports centre. As this is **Question 1**, there is no necessity to include *mit*, but it was encouraging that many candidates did so correctly. A few answers referred to a person, which would answer the question *mit wem?* not *wie?*

Question 2

The topic of this writing task was Technology, referring specifically to communication. Five points had to be made in response to four bullet points. The first three points referred to candidates' mobile phone usage while the fourth asked about the use of computers in school. The fifth point required a specific answer to a question about keeping in contact with friends during the next holidays and so had to be expressed in the future tense.

This question was assessed out of a maximum of 12 marks, using a single set of grade descriptors.

Bullet point 1 asked for two pieces of information: how often candidates use their mobile phones and what they use them for. Both items of information were needed for a complete response to the task. Because the question was 'how often', the simple *oft* was not sufficient to gain full credit. Most candidates realised this and provided clear answers such as how many hours per day or which days of the week. The uses for mobile phones were many and varied, ranging from making calls to listening to music, and candidates had sufficient vocabulary to explain them in detail.

Bullet point 2 asked what candidates do when they are unable to find their mobile phones. The most common answer was that they asked someone else to ring the mobile. There was some difficulty with the possessive (*meine Mutters Handy* occurred all too often). Many candidates were confident in the use of *anrufen*.

Bullet point 3 asked about school computer usage and the majority of responses gave information about writing projects, looking up information and playing games. There was mention of the pandemic and using computers for home-schooling, which was accepted as a full response to this part-question.

Bullet point 4 required a future tense to explain how candidates intended to keep in contact with friends during the next holiday. A general reference to holidays or to future holiday activities did not constitute a full answer. Candidates were generally confident in their use of the future tense and many answers were detailed.

Question 3

In **Question 3**, there was a choice between writing an email about being late for school (**3a**) and a blog about buying clothes (**3b**). Approximately two thirds of candidates chose (**3a**).

Question 3 is assessed in banded mark schemes under three headings: Task Completion, Range and Accuracy.

- (a) A slight anomaly in this question was that some candidates had learnt an elaborate introduction to the email which they ended *jetzt sind Ferien* after which they moved on to writing about being late for school the previous day and how they intended to be on time the following day. This did not affect the number of marks awarded but it did suggest that these candidates were not adapting the introduction they had prepared to the task set.

Bullet point 1 asked for an explanation for a recent late arrival at school. Most often the reason was a car breakdown or missing the bus and there were also some detailed and imaginative descriptions of a morning in which nothing went right. *Kaputt* was used frequently and well, but there were surprisingly few references to *Panne*. *Alarm* and *Wecker* were used as though they were interchangeable and there was some difficulty with expressing 'switching on the alarm'. In this part-question as in **Question 2**, the possessive was often not used correctly giving *mein Vaters Auto* instead of *das Auto von meinem Vater*. *Gehen* was often used when *fahren* was needed for vehicles, and there was difficulty with *gegangen*.

Bullet point 2 required a statement in the past tense about what had been missed in school. Not all candidates understood *verpaßt* and there was some confusion about the difference in meaning between *verpassen* and *vermissen*. There were detailed answers expressing opinions about the subjects missed. Both *Unterricht* and *Stunden* were used appropriately.

Bullet point 3 offered the opportunity to extend beyond school and to explain why it was generally important or otherwise to be punctual. However, the vast majority of candidates restricted themselves to giving reasons for being on time to school, such as not missing explanations of new

work, getting a good education, or not missing tests they had worked for, which answered the question.

Bullet point 4 anticipated a general comment about the school day using the present tense, but many candidates gave their reaction to the day on which they were late for school and used the past tense. Most gave opinions and lengthy explanations.

Bullet point 5 needed the future tense to explain what actions candidates intended to take to avoid being late the following day. Answers were varied and well expressed. The use of *ich werde* with the infinitive was generally good with word order mainly correct. Although it does indicate a future event, *ich möchte* was not appropriate here. A description of the morning routine, even if expressed in the future tense, could not be considered full Task Completion.

- (b) **Bullet point 1** required a description of recently bought clothing. While a few candidates omitted this, many used the opportunity to describe different items and adjectival endings were often used correctly.

Bullet point 2 gave scope for an explanation as to why the new clothes were liked and candidates had the vocabulary and structures for this, although there was difficulty in changing *Ihnen gefallen* from the rubric to *sie gefallen mir*.

Bullet point 3 needed the future tense to explain when candidates next intended to wear the clothes. There were some excellent answers in which the future tense was well constructed but some candidates found it hard to think of an occasion on which to wear the new clothes. This may have been a lack of appropriate vocabulary but could have been linked to the lack of recent opportunities due to pandemic restrictions. *Ich möchte* was used accurately.

Bullet point 4 asked where clothes are usually bought and candidates took the opportunity to discuss the different merits of shopping in small shops, in stores in the town centre or on the internet.

Bullet point 5 asked why fashion is important or otherwise and there were many thoughtful responses ranging from being comfortable and looking good, to the expense of fashion and its detrimental effect on the environment. Some complex ideas were expressed competently.

Question 3 Range

Many candidates opted for short clauses and used a small number of conjunctions, usually *weil* or *und*. In order to access the top bands for Range, sentences should be of different lengths and linked using various conjunctions such as *daß*, *denn*, *wenn*, *obwohl* and the relative pronouns. Word order could be changed so that a sentence begins with an adverb: as in *morgen werde ich ...* or *leider war ich* Variety was introduced successfully with expressions such as: *entweder ...oder, sowohl als auch, meiner Meinung nach, auf der einen Seite* and there was an attempt to vary vocabulary although there was a fair amount of repetition. Interest was added with adjectives as in: *meine nette Lehrerin, meine neuen blauen Schuhe*.

Question 3 Accuracy

There was evidence of careful preparation, and basic structures were generally sound, although there was some poor spelling and choice of vocabulary. Candidates would benefit from learning to use a simple possessive (e.g. *das Handy von meiner Schwester, das Auto von meinem Vater*). Although verbs are not now assessed separately, the way they are formed and used does influence the Accuracy mark. The mismatch between the subject and the verb (as in *ich kommen, wir hat gekauft*) and the inaccurate formation of the past participle (*gekauften, gegeht*) frequently impeded communication. While they no longer need to count the number of verbs used, candidates are advised to ensure they have a thorough knowledge of a wide range of verbs in past, present and future tenses as this will increase their mark in all three assessment categories.