

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/12

Listening

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

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

| Question Number | Key |
|-----------------|-----|
| 15 | E |
| 16 | D |
| 17 | A |
| 18 | F |
| 19 | C |

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

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

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

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 questions begin by targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual dialogues and move on to testing their ability to understand specific

information in longer pieces. As the examination progresses they are required to understand opinions, emotions and explanations in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

The extracts were short, straightforward 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. In **Question 1** option **A** was an effective distractor as the destination for an outing. A few candidates seemed unfamiliar with *Wald* in **Question 4**. In **Question 6** some candidates had difficulty distinguishing between *wolkig* and *windig*.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a radio programme where listeners ask for help with practical problems. Candidates performed well in this task. The only question which caused any difficulty was **Question 11** where *Hut* seemed to be unfamiliar and candidates chose from the other accessories shown.

Questions 15–19

This matching exercise was the point at which the examination became more challenging. Candidates heard a conversation between a couple discussing their meals for the coming week. Most candidates coped well with this task. A few candidates failed to distinguish between heating up a ready meal which happened on two different days but under different circumstances: **Question 15** Monday and **Question 18** Thursday. Option **B** proved to be an effective distractor for all questions.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard interviews with two people describing their dream holidays. There is a greater element of distraction even though there are only three options to choose from.

Question 22 caused quite a few candidates to opt for the incorrect answer **C** rather than the correct option **B**, anticipating perhaps that holidays with friends are always fun. In **Question 23** candidates opted for distractor **B** rather than the correct option **C**, as a result of hearing *Luxushotel*. At this point in the examination understanding single words and not the context is unlikely to be a successful tactic. This was also demonstrated in the responses to Questions **27** and **28** where the vocabulary appeared in the interview but the candidate had to understand the context in order to choose the correct option.

Questions 29–34

Candidates found this interview with Herr Seidel about his hobby, beekeeping, challenging. The four options in each answer represent an increase in the level of difficulty and the content of the dialogue is more sophisticated.

The most successfully answered question was **Question 31**. Some candidates have difficulties with *Vorteil* and *Nachteil* and this proved to be the case in **Question 32** when option **D** was an effective distractor. In **Question 33** option **D** proved effective as a distractor, although in the interview the same sentence was used with *Insekten* not *Menschen*. The final question **Question 34** required the candidates to assess attitude which caused problems for many, as all the options attracted answers.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a conversation between Georg and Maren who are catching up with one another's current status: jobs and family life. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. It also required listening for detail and assessing opinions and attitudes and proved to be a suitably challenging final task. There was again evidence of word spotting as option **E** in **Questions 35** and option **B** in **36** attracted a significant number of answers. Option **D** in **Question 37** was a distractor but attracted a significant number of answers, as Maren's attitude was inferred rather than stated clearly in her reply to Georg.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/22

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 observations

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. 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-spot perform well in this task.

Question group 1

Most candidates performed very well in matching pictures and sentences. Some candidates struggled with **1(c)** and did not seem to be familiar with the word *Fähre*.

Question group 2

This was completed well for the most part. For **2(c)** many candidates incorrectly selected F instead of E, assigning *Erbsen* wrongly to the fruit category, instead of to the vegetables.

Question group 3

Most candidates seemed to cope well in this section. For **3(f)** a significant number of candidates chose option B instead of C. There was no obvious pattern when other errors occurred.

Question group 4

This question was handled with varying degrees of success. The most successful candidates gave short, succinct answers and did not therefore lose marks through unsuccessful manipulation. Most located the answer, and there were many who gained full, or nearly full marks. However, there was a large number who successfully located the answer but did not gain full marks chiefly through faulty manipulation.

- (a) (i)** Many candidates coped well and answered correctly. Some candidates missed out *keine* or omitted *zu* before *kaufen*. Candidates sometimes copied endings imprecisely and some answers showed incorrect adjectival endings.
- (ii)** Most candidates answered correctly and for those that did not, the most frequent error was the omission of *um* at the start of the phrase.
- (b)** The vast majority answered correctly. Some candidates omitted the subject of the verb.
- (c)** Most candidates answered this question correctly, although there was a significant number who copied too much directly from the text, invalidating their answer. Some candidates simply wrote *ein Picknick* and omitted *am Strand*.
- (d)** The vast majority of candidates answered correctly; however, some candidates wrote *Freund* or *Freunde(n)* instead of *Freundin*, and these responses could not be credited. Some candidates also used *seine* instead of *ihre*, which invalidated their response.
- (e)** Most candidates successfully answered this question. Some candidates invalidated their response by omitting *zu* before the infinitive.
- (f)** This seemed to cause a problem for some candidates. Both the word order and the use of too many verbs backed up at the end of the sentence were some of the main issues. Some candidates wrote only of celebrating differently but did not mention Christmas.
- (g)** The vast majority of candidates answered this correctly.
- (h)** Many candidates answered this correctly, however, there were some incorrect responses including *Thermosflaschen* and phrases in the present tense.
- (i)** Most candidates answered this well using *weil* at the beginning of the clause. Some candidates used incorrect word order thereafter and wrote *weil Eva kann....* which invalidated their response.
- (j)** Most candidates simply wrote *Jacken* or *Decken* which was all that was needed to answer the question. Some candidates tried to write a more complex response and generally invalidated their response by doing so incorrectly.
- (k)** The majority of candidates accessed this point, however, there was a significant number of responses with a plural form of the verb for the singular idea of *Familie*.

Question group 5

Many candidates achieved full marks on this question and there were very few completely incorrect sets of responses. A significant number of candidates chose 7 for **5(c)** instead of 6. It may be that they picked out the word *Schmuck* in Mira's account and had seen the list of jewellery items in 7 and have simply selected that, rather than connecting the idea of the Romans with the idea of ancient civilisations in number 6. Where other errors occurred, there was no particularly perceivable pattern to the incorrectly selected answers.

Question group 6

There were some very good scripts 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. Some candidates wrote, *an* at the end or omitted the subject, which invalidated their response.
- (b) Most candidates provided a correct answer. Some answered *das Klarsicht-Magazin*, suggesting that they had not understood the question or the relevant part of the text.
- (c) This proved tricky for a significant number of candidates answering *Seine Uni ist allerdings sehr weit entfernt*.
- (d) (i) A significant number of candidates seemed to find this question difficult. A frequent error was the incorrect formation of the verb *werden* e.g., *Er werde/er werdet* occurred quite often. Many used the verb *kaufen* rather than *einkaufen*.
(ii) Again, many candidates struggled with the formation of *er wird* and many omitted the first *auf* from the phrase.
- (e) Very few candidates managed to answer this correctly. There were many answers relating to living in the *Studentenwohnheim*. Others wrote: *Es ist sehr weit von Zuhause* and those who did realise that the question related to IT, simply wrote *Computertechnologie* which did not properly answer the question.
- (f) This appeared to be challenging for many candidates. The use of accurate word order was problematic, as was the manipulation of *werden* from the first to the third person. There were numerous versions including *sie werde*, *sie werdet* and *sie werdt*.
- (g) Most candidates answered this well. There was occasional omission of the subject of the sentence.
- (h) This was generally well answered.
- (i) (i) This caused issues for many candidates. Candidates incorrectly used *ihren* or *meinen* instead of *seinen*.
(ii) Many candidates accessed this point. For those who did not, the most common error was the omission of the word *in* from the start of the phrase.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/03

Speaking

Key messages

- The Speaking component is a communication exercise, based within familiar situations.
- The emphasis is firmly upon natural, spontaneous conversation.
- The mark-scheme reinforces the aim of promoting more effective communication.
- The structure of the Role Plays and Topic Conversations requires good understanding of the spoken language and spontaneity of response.
- Communication can be achieved even without strict grammatical accuracy, as long as the language employed is appropriate to the situation and clear enough to be understood.
- In the Role Plays successful communication can be achieved in relatively short responses, but for higher marks in the conversations the language offered must be more expansive.
- 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 2024

Most centres have adapted very well to the requirements of this still fairly new syllabus, with its emphasis placed firmly on communication and spontaneity. Many examiners conducted the examinations in a lively, efficient yet friendly fashion and most candidates appeared well prepared. They usually coped confidently with the role-plays and topic conversations, with some fluent performances in evidence from candidates at a great variety of centres.

In the Role Plays examiners usually complied with instructions, and in the Topic Conversations most seemed aware of when and how the alternative questions provided should be used, only after the original **Question 3, 4 or 5** has been repeated but not successfully answered. Some have not yet mastered the technique of encouraging fuller responses in the conversations by asking appropriate extension questions. It is perfectly acceptable to use the example extension questions, such as *Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr*. Alternatively, it could be equally effective simply to ask *warum?* Any point raised by the candidate may be converted into an extension question. As an example, if a candidate discussing *Freizeit* replies *Mein Hobby ist Sport*, legitimate extension questions might be *Was für Sport?* or *Bist du in einer Mannschaft?* for example. A few examiners changed the wording of some of the role play questions, which is not permissible. Some centres had clearly advised candidates always to give extended answers, even to the more basic opening questions in the role plays. This is not necessarily a good idea and often becomes counter-productive. Two marks may be awarded for a brief but clear response, whereas the main point required by the question might be obscured within a more elaborate and complicated answer.

Many examiners were able to conduct successful conversations lasting approximately 4 minutes on each individual topic by using only the five questions provided in the Teachers' Instructions. Others ensured that there was enough material for a good Communication mark by asking up to two further questions of their own choice. This is particularly important in cases where candidates have been rather brief in their answers to the 5 scripted questions and thus have not provided enough evidence of the quality of their communication and language. There were a few centres where too many further questions were asked. 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. There were a few centres where the topic conversations, especially the first one, 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 should be brief, although longer answers can also be acceptable, as long as the main point of the question is clearly addressed. The remaining three questions are intended to give candidates the opportunity to produce responses that are either in a past or future time frame, or they require 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, and it is not always essential to use the expected tense, as marking can be fairly generous in this respect. It is however essential, if it is a two-part role-play question, for examiners not to forget to ask the second question, in order to give the candidate the chance of 2 marks, rather than one.

It is important 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, repeated it several times.

It is important to read out the scenario, in order to set the scene, but not all examiners did so. It is not a good idea to list the questions in a role-play: Frage 1, Frage 2, etc., as this detracts from the atmosphere. It also goes counter to the whole idea that this is a natural conversation with the ‘character’ that the examiner is playing in this particular scenario.

The marking of the role plays was in most cases commendably accurate. As in previous years though, some 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 again relatively few marks of zero, (for no creditable response), as most questions in the role plays proved to be accessible to the majority of 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, this year, in talking about a long car journey, candidates may or may not have participated in the journey they talk about. It is also a good idea to make clear to candidates that they should use the 10-minute preparation period to think of possible questions that may crop up, based on the scenario given. They should think about the country they are in, the person they are talking to and the role they are meant to play. If the role play is about sport, an obvious ‘past tense’ question might well be about the sports they have played, and a frequently occurring ‘future’ question might well ask for their plans for that particular day, or for their holidays if the scenario points in that direction.

Comments on the Role Plays

Card 1: (Discussing sport)

The most challenging question required candidates to give reasons why chess and computer games are, or are not, forms of sport. The most frequent responses claimed that participants were not ‘active’ enough for ‘sport’ to be the correct description, but some conceded that you do have to practise and that these activities encourage teamwork: all these responses are possible while using fairly accessible vocabulary. Most participants preferred *not* to watch the football match with their partner, as the vocabulary for ‘Yes, I will too’ was possibly trickier. Only a few ‘friendlier’ people responded with *dann schau’ ich mit*, or *das möchte ich auch*, or similar.

Card 2: (Cars and the environment)

There were some good answers to the question about fast driving on motorways, usually involving danger, accidents and environmental damage, all well within most candidates' vocabulary range. The vocabulary items *längste* and *je* appeared confusing for some in the fourth question however, whilst many candidates did not quite pick up on *unser Auto/unsere Familie* in the final question. In general, the use of *ihr/euch/euer* probably needs more practice, though they were not actually essential in order to respond to this question, as *wir/Sie* were accepted.

Card 3: (In hospital after volleyball)

The only question causing a few problems was number three, possibly because *gemerkt* was not well known. Both ways of interpreting the question were accepted: either 'What were you doing when you noticed the symptoms?' or 'What did you do when you noticed the symptoms?' There were no problems in listing well-known symptoms and *Pläne* no longer causes many problems, after featuring most years in either role plays or conversations.

Card 4: (Partner visiting your new flat)

Again, there were few problems, apart occasionally from question 3. An answer with *wir* to the question including *ihr* was expected and usually forthcoming, although looking for a flat was not something most candidates had actually ever done. So, answers involving the internet, looking in the paper or visiting lots of flats were all very commendable. *In der Nähe* seemed to cause a few problems in question five.

Card 5: (Stolen mobile – police interview witness)

Most candidates coped very well in this situation. Some were perhaps not used to being addressed in the *Sie* form, as in *Wie heißen Sie?* though this should be practised for role plays. Some misunderstood that they were being asked for their holiday address, not their home address. *'In einem Hotel'* or similar was acceptable. The thief was described well, and present tense was accepted here. Question four had two parts to it, though both the future tense elements were actually quite accessible if they were picked up on. As in Role Play 2 not everyone heard *unsere Stadt* in the final question and a few incorrect answers were heard as a result. There were also some excellent ones, involving complex ideas, such as for example: 'despite the incident' or 'your town is actually very peaceful.'

Card 6: (Discussing birthday and party)

Very few difficulties were encountered here and *ein Handy* was certainly *Geschenk des Jahres!*

Card 7: (Environmental problems in towns)

As with Role Play 2 nearly all candidates were aware of environmental issues and thus coped well. Not everyone had considered the possibility of having to pay to drive into town, and answers varied greatly according to where in the world they were living, but anything sensible was accepted as a valid response. Some mentioned problems in **Question 4**, instead of solutions, whilst not all examiners asked the second part of **Question 5**: 'What do you want to do in town?' This occurred especially if the answer to the first part had been more substantial, such as 'We'll cycle there, as it's good for the environment'. As a reminder, the Mark Scheme only allows one mark for partial communication, which includes only covering one part of a two-part question such as this one.

Card 8: (Buying fruit at a market)

The only real difficulty here appeared to be relating in the past tense what the candidate had done previously at another market in their homeland. This was possibly due to the very colloquial introduction to the question, which frequently needed to be repeated. Colloquialisms such as *auch schon mal* should be practised for recognition or possible use. Everybody could talk about fast food, but not everyone knew *Obst*, or could tell *Obst* from *Gemüse*.

Card 9: (Discussing holidays while waiting for a train)

Nothing specific about Vienna was required for answer number 4, as will be the case for any other city used in future: 'See the sights' would be perfectly acceptable, in whatever tense the question may require.

Topic Conversations

Both candidates and examiners coped well with the requirements of the syllabus and many lively 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 inappropriate answers were forthcoming to the original questions. It should be emphasised again though, that these are not additional questions for some candidates. There were many good answers to the alternative questions. Also, examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like *Kannst du mehr darüber sagen?* so most managed to produce sufficiently long and meaningful conversations by answering the 5 questions in some detail. It was very pleasing to hear that 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 again some evidence that use of the past tense, and particularly of past participles, could profitably be practised, but accurate use of tenses is only one aspect of the range of structures listed in the syllabus that the final Quality of Language mark should be based on. This mark also takes into account other aspects of language use, such as the range of vocabulary employed 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 final marks they awarded.

As with the role play situations, there was little difference in difficulty between the topics, each of which however offered at least one challenging question. As usual, there were three alternative topics on the randomisation instructions for the first conversation (numbers one to three), with the remaining four allocated to the second conversation. Some centres spent a lot longer on the second conversation than on the first, possibly as they felt the slightly more demanding topics might show their candidates at their best, but it is actually recommended that all conversations should be of a similar length at around four minutes each.

Comments on the Topic Conversations

Topic Conversation 1: Family and friends

As with the role plays, questions in the *ihr* form sometimes cause problems in the conversations. A large number of candidates required the alternative question to be employed for question three but the alternative *Wie oft seht ihr euch?* seemed to be better understood. It is possible therefore that it was the verb *verbringen* that had actually caused the lack of understanding and this verb occurred again in past and future tense forms in the remaining questions.

Topic Conversation 2: Clothing and the environment

Kleidung and *Umwelt* together proved to be a successful combination for most candidates, who knew quite a lot about both. The main vocabulary difficulty was with *ziehst du dich an.*, which needs more practice. Some candidates missed out either *wie* or *wo?* in their response to question three, and examiners should be alert to such a possibility in future. There were many unusual and creative ideas as to how we might be more environmentally aware when buying, or making, clothing in the future.

Topic Conversation 3: Family

Superficially, this topic might have appeared to be slightly easier, but there were sufficient challenges to actually bring it in line with the others in terms of difficulty and performance. *Verbringen* is core vocabulary which is expected to be known at this level. Too many candidates failed to understand *verbracht* first time but did so when it was repeated or in the alternative question. There were interesting responses as to whether a holiday with family or with friends would be preferable, sometimes based on who would have to pay for it all.

Topic Conversation 4: Talking about the place where you live

Either interpretation of *Wohnort* was accepted: their hometown/area or their house or flat. There were many interesting responses to the question as to where they lived as a small child and what life had been like for them then, quite frequently in a totally different area or even country. The use of *damals* in part of that question seemed to cause difficulty for some. There are still candidates who misunderstand *Land*, as in **Question 4**, or confuse it with *auf dem Lande*, and this was evident again in responses this year, as it was last year. More surprisingly *Dorf* in the last question caused difficulty and was answered by some as if it meant town or city. This vocabulary item is so basic however, that it was also used in the alternative question, so no help could be given to those who did not know it.

Topic Conversation 5: Homeland and other countries

No verb was required for the first response and not necessarily a passive, as in the question. There were very interesting descriptions of a wide variety of *Heimatländer* and of a wide range of countries to possibly work in in the future, with some detailed reasons for the particular choice. Again, *Land* caused some confusion in **Question 4**, which was not about the *Stadt/Land* issue, as some assumed.

Topic Conversation 6: Technology and the digital world

Candidates had plenty of ideas, even in response to the trickier questions. In question three some problems occurred for those who did not know *Alter*, as in *das ideale Alter*, or *in welchem Alter?* (The age for people to get their first phone.) This is a core vocabulary item, which should be familiar to everybody. There were very interesting and varied responses to this question however, as there were to the question on robots, which caused few difficulties of comprehension. It was good to hear some rather cheeky responses given by candidates to relieve the rather stressful examination situation. Two examples were as follows: What modern technology do you use at school? TikTok, if the lesson is boring! What will robots do for us in the future? Our homework, hopefully!

Topic Conversation 7: German and German-speaking countries

There were many lively responses to this topic. *Austausch* seemed to be the most difficult vocabulary item. A wide variety of foreign languages had clearly been spoken by candidates during their last holidays, and certainly not always German.

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'. Fortunately, there were very few candidates whose speaking test was totally or partially inaudible, and recordings were generally of acceptable quality. However, a small minority of centres continue to place the microphone too far from the candidates, so that it is difficult to hear them, and at some centres all the recordings were too quiet to hear comfortably. Before recording commences, and again before the recordings are uploaded, spot checks should be made to ensure the audibility of both examiner and candidate.

Administration

Administration in centres was generally good, and in this session very few centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks, if still using the paper working mark sheets (WMS). The WMS are far

clearer on screen if the electronic version is used, as well as it totalling the marks correctly for you. Please write the examining teacher's name as clearly as possible, if scanning in a paper copy, or type it on the electronic version.

Marking by centres

Assessment seemed to be quite consistent. Many centres' marks did not need to be scaled by moderators at all, or were scaled by consistent small amounts, either plus or minus, in approximately equal measure. The centre order of merit was usually correct.

As mentioned above, there was occasional severity in marking the role plays, but most centres had made good use of the clear descriptors in the mark schemes for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language', and thus 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, or had poor intonation or pronunciation.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/42

Writing

Key messages

Centres should remind candidates to complete every gap in **Question 1**, without leaving blanks.

In **Question 1**, candidates should take care to avoid copying vocabulary already used on the form-fill task.

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

For both **Question 2** and **Question 3**, it is helpful if candidates structure their answers in the same order as the bullet points, 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.

Candidates should include clear opinions and justifications in their writing tasks.

General comments

Overall, this session, candidates were well-prepared for the requirements of the examination. A good number of candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding, demonstrating good language, and including opinions and reasons.

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, the candidates were required to fill in a booking form for a holiday house, with details of chosen month, their means of transport, an electrical appliance required at the property, a desired sports activity and where they would like to go in the evening. Many candidates completed all tasks well 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).

In **Question 1**, the first vocabulary item (a month) was achieved by many but there were also those candidates who misinterpreted ‘*für welchen Monat*’ as a plural and gave more than one month or who wrote a general length of time or simply a number; others seemed not to be sure and so left it blank. Candidates would be advised to choose a month that they can spell correctly in German. This would avoid spelling errors such as *Abril*, *December*, *Marzt*.

For the second vocabulary item, most candidates successfully scored the mark with an item of transport, although there were many misspellings, such as *Flugzug*.

The third vocabulary item was the most challenging this session, with many candidates seeming not to understand *elektrische Geräte*. Others understood but were not able to communicate (the mark scheme did not accept, for example *Handy*, *Laptop*, *TV*, *fern*).

The fourth vocabulary item (a sports activity) was usually successful, with a variety of sports being chosen by candidates and usually spelt correctly.

For the fifth vocabulary item, a wide range of places were chosen (e.g. *Strand, Bar, Disko, Kino, Konzert, Einkaufszentrum*)

Overall, **Question 1** task was tackled well by the majority of candidates, and the more able candidates used a wide range of appropriate vocabulary to complete the form.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of pocket money. The sub-questions were expressed in 4 bullet points. This is a straightforward exercise, where candidates are required to read and respond directly to each sub-question (as opposed to writing generally on a given topic area). Candidates therefore need to address the specifics of the task set, to achieve the specific bullet points.

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 **Question 2** and did so successfully. Many candidates wrote sound answers to the tasks, were successful in their use of a variety of structures and vocabulary and were able to extend their responses by giving opinions and reasons. Weaker candidates were able to achieve, by communicating their answers to the tasks successfully, even when their German vocabulary or grammar was limited. However, candidates should be reminded to read the bullet points carefully, rather than writing a generic paragraph about the general theme.

The language used was good overall, with many candidates reaching the higher bands. A range of vocabulary was appropriately used, and most candidates were able to use linking words and include opinion. The most successful answers showed a wide range of vocabulary particular to the topic and a variety of connectives with correct word order. However, verb and tense accuracy remains a challenge, especially for less able candidates.

Task 1 asked when the candidate usually receives pocket money. Many candidates achieved well here, but there were a significant number who gave detailed, accurate answers about who gave them their pocket money and why, but failed to say when this happened, as stipulated by the bullet point. Others may not have given details of regular pocket money but referred to receiving money at times such as birthday or when good grades were achieved, and this was accepted. Some referred to earning money, rather than receiving pocket money and this was not usually successful. The verb *bekommen* was often conjugated incorrectly.

Task 2 asked candidates to describe what like they do with their money. Many candidates ignored *gern* and simply said what they did with the money, but this was generally accepted. There were many examples of how candidates spend their money (often on food, clothes, etc.). However, some candidates wrote in detail about chores they did to get pocket money, rather than addressing the task to explain what they subsequently did with the money. The verb *to spend (money)* was often mis-translated as *spenden* or *verbringen*. Candidates should be encouraged to think of alternative vocabulary, if they are not sure of a particular vocabulary item. Here, it would have been much simpler and more effective to use *kaufen*, for example.

Task 3 asked the candidate whether, or not, it's important to save money. There were some well-reasoned ideas about the importance of saving money, usually expressed in good German. It seems that this is a topic that centres have focused on; many candidates were able to explain why saving money is important, often with reference to future costs, such as for university or a house. Others referred to wanting to save for a particular item, such as a new mobile phone or a car.

Task 4 asked what the candidate will buy next time they have money, and **Task 5** asked for a reason. Most candidates were able to give their shopping plans and a reasoned explanation (with many generously buying presents for family/friends). In their attempts to refer to the future, a number of candidates used an incorrect conjugation of *werden*, such as *wurde + infinitive* and this could not be credited. However, many were successful in using the future tense, or a future time phrase with present tense, to convey their plans.

A few candidates did not spot that the final bullet point had 2 components and did not go on to give the reason required in **Task 5**. Candidates should be reminded to go back and check the task requirements at the end of their writing.

Question 3

There were 2 options for **Question 3**. Most candidates opted for **Question 3a** over **Question 3b**. It is unclear whether this was because the topic was preferred by candidates, or simply because of the order in which the questions appeared on the paper.

Most candidates answered the question as set and only a few candidates wrote off topic or merely copied out the rubric. There were some very short answers from a few candidates. As in previous sessions, it seems that some centres have been teaching long introductory paragraphs that could feasibly be written at the beginning of any response; these are not a productive use of candidates' time and were largely irrelevant to the specific question. Centres are advised not to encourage this.

Task Completion:

Marks gained by candidates for their Task Completion depended on how well they understood and responded to the specific demands of the tasks set. The banded mark scheme focuses on successful completion of the tasks, the information that is conveyed and the relevant details given.

Candidates who did not address the precise requirements of a particular bullet point, were prevented from moving up the banded mark scheme, either because they omitted part of a task, or because their lack of comprehension prevented an adequate answer.

This session there were very few candidates who did not complete the precise demands of the tasks or who simply wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic. Most candidates responded to most bullet points.

Range:

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

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3a** encouraged use of a range of vocabulary on the topics of holiday camps and summer work, while **Question 3b** offered the chance for vocabulary on the topic of smartphones. Many candidates had a good range of task-specific vocabulary at their disposal and there were clear opinions and reasons expressed.

Centres are continuing to work hard to equip candidates with the ability to vary their sentences and vocabulary. Even the weaker candidates made efforts to include use of *und* and *weil*, and more able candidates used *dass*, *deshalb*, *dennoch*, *außerdem*, *da*, *danach* etc. as effective connectors. As this use of connectors has developed in many centres, the understanding of German word order in subordinate clauses has also improved, and it was pleasing this session to read so many correctly formulated structures. This session more candidates also tried to use relative pronouns to link their clauses, but not all were successful and *wer* was often the word chosen. Similarly, there was confusion between *das* and *daß* which made statements unclear in places. Many candidates had clearly been well-trained in the need for adjectives and adverbs, and many also used sophisticated verb structures. The best responses showed accurate use of three time frames, the inclusion of conjunctions that require the manipulation of word order, *wenn* clauses with conditional constructions, modal verbs used correctly, *um...zu...* and very occasionally *weder... noch* and *je... desto*. Successful use of such constructions helped the candidates to move up the mark scheme and score highly for range of language.

A number of candidates this session had difficulty expressing specific concepts, such as the idea of having fun, or spending time, and there were a number of examples of *verpassen/spenden/vermissen* being used instead of *verbringen*.

Accuracy:

The banded mark scheme for Accuracy covers spelling and grammar and considers the impact of grammatical error on overall communication. When selecting the mark from this band, Examiners consider,

for example: accuracy of verb forms and tenses, gender, case agreement, adjective endings, and word order.

Poor spelling remains an issue and the use of capital letters on nouns seemed more erratic this session.

Given the complexity of their writing, it would seem that accurate use of capital letters should not be so problematic for the candidates. Centres would do well to encourage their candidates to check more carefully for this.

Verbs and tenses continue to present challenges for candidates. Many candidates do have a sound knowledge of basic verbs in past, present and future tenses, but there remain many examples of candidates not checking their verb use. This session there were also many examples of hybrid tenses (e.g.: *ich werde gefahren*) which rendered communication unclear. Past participles were mostly good, but there was often confusion over agreement with *haben* or *sein*. Modal verbs were not always used with the infinitive.

Many candidates were successful in their communication of the tasks, and much of the German produced was accurate enough to convey meaning adequately. The best candidates were highly accurate and showed an impressive ability to use a range of language structures, including relative clauses, a variety of negatives and occasionally even the subjunctive form.

Question 3

(a) Candidates were required to write an email to their friend, about a holiday camp last summer, giving an account of the holiday camp, including opinions with reasoned explanations, then discussion of plans for future summer work and the next summer holidays. The best answers gave careful attention to the time frames required by the specific bullet points, included higher level language to describe events and gave opinions with justification.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to give the location of last year's holiday camp. This was a straightforward introduction to the question, and so it was surprising that some candidates missed out this answer and went straight to the next bullet point. Those who did tackle the task gave a range of answers, describing a variety of places and types of camp. Locations were not always correctly expressed in German (*Italia, California, etc.*) and there were geographical anomalies which placed, for example, the pyramids in Berlin and Berlin by the sea. However, answers generally showed that the task had been understood and there were examples of pleasing descriptions such as *im Wald, in den Bergen, in der Nähe von...*, as well as specific names for countries and towns. Some candidates understood a *Feriencamp* as a summer school for study, some answered about a camping holiday with friends or family members, while others described a week of varied outdoor activities. Unfortunately, there were a few who did not understand *Ferien* and this inevitably impacted on their success.

Task 2 asked what the candidate did each day in the holiday camp. This task required use of the past tense and was often well-completed with, for example, plenty of information about playing football or doing different sports and accounts of how enjoyable these activities were. However, there were many candidates who missed out on success with this task because their answers were expressed in the present tense, without any sort of attempt at a past time frame. If they had been written in the past tense, they would have been excellent answers. Candidates who did use the perfect tense often seemed to struggle forming the perfect tense with the appropriate auxiliary verb *sein* for the verbs *gehen/fahren*.

Task 3 asked the candidate for an explanation as to why they prefer spending holidays at home or on holiday camp. The best candidates gave clear opinion with reasoned explanation. The concept of preferring (*lieber*) was often not specifically addressed and, when it was addressed, *lieber* was often wrongly treated as a verb. This meant that candidates who did tackle the idea of preference did not always produce particularly good German in their responses.

Task 4 asked the candidate to explain whether, or not, they themselves would like to work in a holiday camp in the future. Candidates had many good ideas about why they would or would not like to work in a holiday camp later, giving insight into their own personalities. On the whole, *ich möchte* was used correctly here.

Task 5 asked for a description of the candidate's plans for the next summer holidays. Most candidates gave their answers with well-formed future tenses or references to their future plans. It is pleasing to see that this is a skill that many candidates have practised thoroughly – and it shows in the confidence which they bring to their answers.

(b) Candidates were required to write a blog for a school website on the topic of a lost smartphone. Very few candidates chose to answer **Question 3b**. Those who did were, in the most part, either very strong candidates who had fully understood the stimulus and were able to write accurate and detailed responses to the bullet points, or less able candidates who had latched on to the smartphone idea and wrote a generic paragraph about mobile phones.

Task Completion:

Task 1 required candidates to describe how they lost their phone. A simple sentence in an attempt at a past tense would have been sufficient (e.g. *I left it on the bus*) but most candidates who attempted this question opted for a more complex explanation. The able candidates managed this well, with detailed and sometimes humorous accounts, but the less able candidates were often without the necessary structures or vocabulary to complete their answer well.

Task 2 required candidates to describe how they reacted to losing their phone. Candidates, on the whole, have been well trained to provide reactions and many were able to explain that they were anxious or unhappy, for example. Others found this more challenging, with some trying to provide reactions that they could not describe in German, whilst others simply did not address the task.

Task 3 asked candidates to describe what happened next. The task was intended to allow candidates to take their account in the direction that their language permitted, and there some sound responses given. Others, however, chose to give an account that was beyond their language ability, and these candidates were much less successful.

Task 4 asked candidates to explain why they could/could not live without a smartphone. This was a concept that most candidates had thought about and many were able to give thoughtful responses.

Task 5 required candidates to explain what they planned to do in the future, to avoid losing anything else. Those with the required vocabulary were able to provide relevant answers in the future tense, but the task overall demanded a little more thought than some tasks might, and some candidates struggled to find suggestions as to how they might avoid losing items in the future.