

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/12
Listening

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

The German extracts heard by candidates gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The 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. **Question 2** produced a few incorrect answers. Telling the time always causes problems for a minority of candidates and those who chose the incorrect option **D** were clearly confused between quarter past and quarter to.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a radio programme encouraging listeners to attend the 2025 National Garden Show. Candidates performed well in all questions except in **Question 10** where the selection of creatures seems to have been too challenging for some; if they were not familiar with *Schmetterling* they could not get to the answer by a process of elimination. In **Question 11** *Rasen* seemed to be an unfamiliar item of vocabulary for some candidates.

Questions 15–19

This matching exercise was the point at which the examination became a little more challenging. Candidates heard a conversation between a couple discussing plans for Christmas. Some candidates incorrectly chose option **F** in **Question 15** which had the knock-on effect that they chose the incorrect option **D** in **Question 17**. **B** was the distractor for all questions but was especially effective in **Question 16** as it required the candidates to distinguish between a spoken sentence involving *in der Küche helfen* and the written statement *Kuchen mitbringen*. Candidates did well on **Questions 18** and **19**.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard interviews with two people talking about their experiences of neighbours. Candidates found this task quite challenging. All three options in **Question 20** were targeted by candidates which suggests that *sich ausruhen* is not a familiar item of vocabulary. In **Question 22**, **B** proved to be an effective distractor. **B** was also effective as a distractor in **Question 24**, which was probably due to word spotting the vocabulary item *Uni*. In the second conversation on the theme of neighbours, **Question 27** caused the most problems for candidates: the vocabulary was straightforward but it needed attentive listening to work out who was visiting *Oma*. Nearly all candidates finished the task on a high note by choosing the correct option **C**.

Questions 29–34

This interview was with a German cyclist who shares his experience of taking part in a cycle race in Kenya. The most successfully answered question was **Question 32**. In all the questions relating to this task, the three incorrect options attracted answers in almost equal measure.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a conversation between Jens and Gaby about various aspects of learning foreign languages. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. The most frequently identified correct statement was option **D** in the first section. Option **E** in the final section was a distractor but attracted a significant number of candidates to choose it.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 7159/22

Reading

Key messages

For **Question Groups 1 and 2** candidates need to be familiar with a range of basic vocabulary in particular nouns.

For **Question Group 3** candidates should read the text and multiple questions carefully and avoid simply 'word-spotting'. Word-spotting should likewise be avoided in the matching task required by **Question Group 5**.

For **Question Groups 4 and 6** careful reading of the text and the questions is required, and candidates should be aware that what they write should be a precise answer to the question including using the correct person of the verb and possessive adjective. They should be aware that the inclusion of extraneous material might invalidate their answer.

General comments

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 performed well in this task.

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

Many candidates performed well in matching pictures and sentences. Occasionally candidates did not seem to know the nouns. *Ich frühstücke* did not seem to be understood by some candidates.

Question group 2

Most candidates matched correctly. Some did not seem to understand *Feuerwehr* and *Fundbüro* which resulted in some mismatching.

Question group 3

Accomplishment for this Question group was mixed. The most frequent error was for **Question 3(d)** where candidates selected **(b) sucht**. Other incorrect choices did not show any recognisable pattern.

Question group 4

There was a wide range of success with this question. The most successful candidates gave short, succinct answers and did not therefore show unsuccessful manipulation. There was a large number who successfully located the answer but demonstrated incorrect manipulation. Most mistakes occurred where candidates used the incorrect possessive or failed to manipulate the verb from the first to the third person.

- (a)** This was mostly very well answered.
- (b)** This was mostly very well answered, although a notable number of candidates wrote *is* instead of *ist*.

- (c) There were many good answers.
- (d) (i)(ii) Many candidates could not be credited for their responses. Most of these responses were phrases such as *einen Blog macht* or *selbst Videoclips editiert* which were not direct answers to the question.
- (e) Many candidates supplied correct answers, but some wrote *Daniel/Er findet es wichtiger zu wissen* which could not be credited.
- (f) This was generally well answered.
- (g) In many cases candidates located the answer in the text and referenced his / Daniel's (5th) birthday but very few use a correct preposition.
- (h) This was generally well answered.
- (i) The responses were generally correct.
- (j) Many candidates wrote *zweihundertmal* rather than the required *mehr als zweihundertmal*.
- (k) In many cases candidates located the correct information in the text but did not use the correct part of the verb.

Question group 5

Many candidates achieved full marks on this question. Where errors occurred, there was no particular pattern to the incorrectly selected answers, except for **Question 5(d)**. Many candidates offered option 7 here.

Question group 6

There were some very good responses with correct, accurately formulated answers 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 was incorrect.

Word order, in particular incorrect position of the verb and lack of knowledge of personal and possessive pronouns were the most common incorrect answers. Many candidates did not manipulate from first person to third person and answered some questions in the first person.

- (a) There were many completely correct answers to this question.
- (b) (i)(ii) This was generally well answered. Some candidates wrote *Nicht so toll für ältere Kinder* and this could not be credited without a verb.
- (c) There were many correct answers here, but some candidates wrote *Einigen deutschen Städten* or similar.
- (d) (i)(ii) There were many completely correct answers to this question.
- (e) There were a good number of completely correct answers to this question, but some copied *habe alleine gegessen* which could not be credited.
- (f) The majority answered correctly.
- (g) There were some correct answers, but sometimes the verb was not changed from the first to the third person and some candidates wrote *das* instead of *dass*.
- (h) Responses were generally correct.
- (i) There were many correct answers.

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 2025

Most candidates appeared well prepared. They usually coped confidently with both the role-plays and the topic conversations, and some fluent performances were in evidence at a great variety of centres. Many examiners conducted the examinations in a lively, efficient and friendly fashion and it appeared to have been a positive experience for a large majority of candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays

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. 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. The advice given by one examiner: 'Bitte nicht vergessen – kurze Antworten!', is usually appropriate. However, this should not be taken too far: extremely brief answers to every question were heard from some candidates, who did not address every point adequately.

There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners conducted the role plays well. 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. 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. It is however essential, if it is a two-part role-play question, for examiners 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 and not to alter any of the questions in any way, 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 did not repeat the question or repeated it several times.

It is important to read out the scenario, in order to set the scene, though 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 accurate. Some examiners were slightly harsh in their interpretation of what constitutes a ‘minor error’, but fewer than in previous years. 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 would also exist if the examiner asked, or really needed to say *Wie bitte?* Marks of zero, for no creditable response, were quite rare.

Some performances were very lively and realistic-sounding. Teachers preparing the role plays should ensure that candidates realise that nothing in a role play needs to be ‘true’, and responses do not necessarily always have to be totally appropriate: for example, it would be permissible for full marks to answer ‘Fine’ when asked ‘How are you?’, even in a freezing holiday home! However, ‘8 years’ as an answer to ‘How long have you been here?’ would not communicate the correct information, if referring to a current holiday.

It is also a good idea to make clear to candidates that they should use the 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-play Performance

- *Ich verstehe mich am besten mit* seems not to be well-known, or known accurately enough, and this expression could profitably be practised
- A question with *wir* should be replied to with *wir* not *ich*
- *Ich bin gut* is not really appropriate as a reply to *wie geht's?*
- Listening to questions with *ihr* or *euch* should be practised, and responses should usually include *wir* or *uns*
- The response to *seit wann?* should normally be a short answer, also beginning with *seit*
- A question with *letztes Jahr*, or similar, requires a past time-frame to the response
- *Wer* and *wo*, though basic, are not always correctly recognised in conversation and *wer* is very frequently misinterpreted
- Responding to *wo lebst/lebt* should be practised, as an alternative to *wohnst/wohnt*; examiners should not re-phrase to change *leben* to *wohnen*
- *Wie (wollen wir fahren)* was sometimes misunderstood
- Future-indicators in questions could profitably be practised for recognition, such as *Pläne; später; nach der Schule; für den Rest des Tages; in der Zukunft, könnten/möchtest*, etc.

Topic Conversations

Many examiners were able to conduct successful conversations – lasting approximately 4 minutes – on each individual topic. Although conversations at some centres tended to be too short, at three or even two minutes, many examiners held interesting and detailed four-minute conversations by using only the five questions provided in the Teachers’ Instructions. Others ensured that there was enough material for a good Communication mark by asking up to two further questions of their own choice. This is particularly important in cases where candidates have been rather brief in their answers to the five scripted questions and 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.

In the Topic Conversations examiners mostly seemed aware of when and how the alternative questions provided should be used: However, not all have 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, but it could be equally or more effective simply to say *und...* or *warum?* Picking up on any word or idea raised by the candidate is also a good method of encouraging conversation. As an example, if a candidate discussing where they might like to live in the future replies *In Deutschland*, legitimate extension questions might be *Warum?* or *Wo genau in Deutschland?* Examiners can also add occasional words of encouragement, such as *das ist interessant, erzähl mir mehr!*

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 the stronger candidates. There were many good answers to the alternative questions, by candidates who had not understood the original question. Some examiners use English to link the three sections of the examination, which should be avoided if possible. Also, some candidates ask in their native language for a question to be repeated. It is a good idea to ensure they know how to ask for this in German.

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. This mark 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. Some centres spent longer on the second conversation than on the first, but it is recommended that all conversations should be of a similar length at around four minutes each.

Comments on the Topic Conversations

- As in the role-plays, *wer / wo?* need to be distinguished between
- Questions with *wie oft* or *was für?* occur frequently
- *In nächster Zeit* is another possible future-indicator
- *Wochentage* or *Wochenende* needed on this occasion to be carefully distinguished
- *Etwas Tolles* did not seem to be well-known, nor the verb *feiern*
- Word order after *weil* was rather erratic, and it also would be a good idea to practise separable verbs
- *Stehen* and *bleiben* were sometimes muddled, and *ausprobieren* was not always known
- Practising answers referring to other people, as well as those in the first person, would be profitable, in order to respond to questions such as '*was hat er/sie gemacht?*'
- It was interesting to hear of festivals and traditions from a variety of different countries, but when a German one was chosen it was nearly always *Oktoberfest*, with *Karneval/Fasching* second
- It is permissible for examiners to amend questions in the following way: If a candidate answers, say, 'Englisch', when asked for 'a useful language', it is permissible, to amend the follow-up question from '*diese Sprache*' to '*Englisch*'.
- However this should not really apply to the word *dort*, which ought to be known and should not be altered by an examiner to *da*
- *Vorteile/Nachteile* continue to cause confusion, as do *Land* and *auf dem Lande*
- If it appears helpful to a particular candidate, examiners can omit the **Pause** and ask both parts of a question as one

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 or good quality. However, a small minority of centres do not ensure that the candidates can be heard at least as well as the examiner, and at some all the recordings were too quiet to hear comfortably.

When preparation commences, and again before the exam itself, spot checks should be made to ensure the audibility of both examiner and candidate.

Administration

Administration in centres was generally good, and 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 consistent. Many centres' marks did not need to be scaled at all or were scaled by 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 quite 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

In **Question 1**, candidates should avoid copying vocabulary on the form-fill task. They should also be careful not to use the same item of vocabulary twice within **Question 1**.

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

In both **Question 2** and **Question 3**, candidates should ideally structure their answers in the same order as the bullet points, as this helps the candidates to avoid omissions.

Candidates should check each task for the tenses required and should ensure that each answer is written in the appropriate time frame.

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

General comments

Most candidates this session were well-prepared for the specific requirements of the examination. Many candidates were able to produce clear answers which demonstrated understanding and showed their ability to use a range of good language and structures, including opinions and reasons.

Overall, the candidates made good attempts to tackle all the set tasks. There were many interesting and thoughtful responses which were a pleasure to read, and many candidates had clearly been well-prepared for how best to approach each section of the paper.

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 form requesting a pet from an animal home. Candidates were asked to complete this, giving details of their chosen animal, their preferred colour of the pet, details of the home receiving the pet, saying where the pet would sleep and giving preferred characteristics of the pet. Overall, candidates completed the tasks well and most candidates attempted to answer at least 4 of the 5 tasks. Spellings were not always correct but were accepted if communication was achieved.

In **Question 1**, the first vocabulary item (a pet/an animal) was achieved by many candidates, with the majority responding with *Katze* or *Hund*. However, some candidates misinterpreted *Was für...?* (What sort of...?) as meaning 'Who for...?' or 'What for...?' and these misunderstandings led to answers that were generally unsuccessful.

For the second vocabulary item (a colour), most candidates clearly understood *Farbe* and were usually successful, often with *schwarz* or *braun* as their colour of choice.

In the third vocabulary item (description of house), many candidates answered *groß/schön/gemütlich/bequem*, amongst others.

The fourth vocabulary item (the pet's place to sleep) was usually successful, with many candidates choosing *Schlafzimmer/Wohnzimmer/Garten/Küche*. However, those who intended to convey *Küche* often did not achieve, due to confusion with incorrect spellings such as *Kuchen*, which conveyed a different, incorrect meaning.

The fifth vocabulary item sought a characteristic of the pet and was the most challenging for candidates, with a number struggling to understand what was required. Some candidates left blank or gave incorrect answers, such as descriptions of the rooms/house (as in **Task 3**).

Overall, however, **Question 1** was well tackled by most candidates, with many appropriate vocabulary items being chosen to complete the form.

Question 2

Question 2 required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of 'my local area'. The sub-questions were expressed in 4 bullet points. Candidates need to address the aspects of each task set, for success with the specific bullet points. A generic paragraph relating to the general topic area presented by the question will not be successful.

In **Question 2** the majority of candidates completed all tasks, giving information and opinions. The best answers demonstrated good knowledge of a wide range of topic vocab, an ability to link phrases with a range of varied connectives, and examples of extended opinions with reasons. Weaker candidates were successful when they communicated their answers clearly, even if their German vocabulary and grammar were more limited.

The language used for **Question 2** was overall good, 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 clear opinions. 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 continues to remain a challenge, especially for the less able candidates.

Task 1 asked for a description of where the candidate lives. Many candidates achieved well here with detailed descriptions of their local area, but there were some candidates who had not understood the vocabulary item: *Gegend*, and who answered with reference to their house/home, rather than giving information about the area in which their home is situated. There were others who referred, in a brief statement, to where they live (e.g.: *ich wohne in Berlin*) but did not give any more detail.

Task 2 asked candidates for an account of the weather in the local area. This point was generally well-answered, with most candidates giving a range of detail about the weather at different times of year. Weather vocabulary was generally well-known and there were many detailed and accurate descriptions given of weather in different seasons. There were, however, some difficulties encountered with the spellings *scheint/schneit*.

Task 3 asked for a description of the candidate's preferred aspect(s) in the local area. The vocabulary item: *gefallen* seemed to present some difficulty for a minority of candidates, with some wrongly identifying the prefix: *ge-* as a part of a past participle, and so resulting in an attempt at a past tense answer (such as, for example, a reference to what they did last weekend in their town/village).

Task 4 asked where the candidate will live in the future, and **Task 5** asked for a reason. Many candidates showed that they could use the future tense correctly with *werden* in the last bullet point. Others used *ich möchte* to express their answer, while still others used future time phrases to make it clear that they were referring to the future. However, those who used an incorrect conjugation of *werden/mögen*, such as *wurde/mochte + infinitive* could not have their attempts credited because the incorrect spellings conveyed a different, incorrect time frame.

Question 3

The best responses in **Question 3(a)** and **Question 3(b)** were from candidates who responded to the specific tasks in order and who wrote a clear, focused paragraph for each task. Candidates scoring the highest marks for linguistic range used the required range of tenses/time frames and included constructions

that required the manipulation of word order, such as: *weil, um...zu...*, etc, as well as use of language such as modal verbs, connectives, and a wide range of topic specific vocabulary.

Task Completion

This session most candidates answered the question as set and most addressed each bullet point. A minority of candidates used long introductory paragraphs that could be written at the beginning of any **Question 3** response. These do not address the specifics of the task set and so should be avoided.

The best answers included a good range of topic specific vocabulary, gave careful attention to the time frames which were required by the specific bullet points, and included higher level language structures as well as clear opinions with justification.

Range

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3(a)** required use of a range of vocabulary on the topic of shopping, and spending/saving money, while **Question 3(b)** sought vocabulary on the topic school/future plans. Many candidates demonstrated a good range of task-specific vocabulary, along with firm opinions and reasons expressed on particular aspects of the specific topics.

In general, candidates showed the ability to vary their sentences and vocabulary. This session many candidates had used a range of language, including adjectives and adverbs, and some sophisticated verb structures. Many candidates used negatives and even the weaker candidates made efforts to include connectives, such as: *wenn, aber, oder, außerdem, weil, denn, entweder ... oder, und, sowohl ... als auch*. A few candidates used relative clauses successfully.

The most successful responses showed clear use of a variety of 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 more unusual structures, such as *weder... noch* and *je... desto*. Successful use of such constructions allows candidates to move up the markscheme and score more highly for range of language.

However, some candidates this session had difficulty expressing specific concepts, such as the idea of spending time or spending money or saving money. This resulted in confusion over vocabulary items such as *verpassen/spenden/vermissen/verbringen/sparen*. Confusion also remains over the use of *wenn/als/wann*.

Accuracy

Poor spellings remain a challenge for many. However, this session capital letters were being used more widely. Subject/verb agreements were often good, and many candidates introduced another subject pronoun, thereby demonstrating their ability with a different form of the verb. Word order, particularly in subordinate clauses, was good. This session there was less interference reported from non-German languages.

Candidates continue to be challenged in their use of verbs and tenses. This session past participles were often accurate, but confusion amongst candidates continues over whether to use *haben* or *sein* as the auxiliary. Modal verb use is often inaccurate, and word order remains a challenge for many. Less able candidates still need reminding about verb positions, especially when using the common connectives *obwohl* and *weil*. Other candidates using more complex structures continue to struggle with accurate word order. Some candidates tried to use adjectives but agreement with the noun was often problematic. Confusion between *das* and *daß* continues to be an issue for many.

Despite such challenges, many candidates accurately communicated the messages of the tasks set. The best candidates were highly accurate and demonstrated an impressive ability to use a wide range of language structures, including relative clauses, a variety of negatives and, at times, more advanced language still, such as the subjunctive form.

Question 3

(a) Candidates were required to write an email to their friend on the topic of shopping. They were to give and explain likes/dislikes about shopping, describe online/in-person shopping habits and include reasoned explanations, talking about recent purchases, saying what they are currently

saving for and speculating on potential ways of shopping in the future. The best answers included a good range of topic specific vocabulary, gave careful attention to the time frames which were required by the specific bullet points, and included higher level language structures as well as clear opinions with justification.

Task Completion

Most candidates who chose this option responded to the bullet points well; they could say why they liked shopping and explain whether they preferred to go into town or to shop online. Many candidates used a past tense successfully to describe what they bought recently, often using *ich habe...gekauft*, or attempting another past tense construction. They often stated what they were saving up for, but some did not understand the vocab item *sparen*. *Sparen* was sometimes wrongly understood by the candidate as 'spending' instead of 'saving'. The last bullet point (how people will shop in the future) was perhaps the trickiest, with some candidates writing about what they planned to buy in the future, rather than about how shopping habits might change in the future. However, there were some impressive and creative answers to this final bullet point, referring to new technologies, the environment and how older people might benefit from new ways of doing things.

Task 1 required candidates to give an explanation as to why they like shopping or not, and most were able to respond to it well. Some candidates, however, struggled with their use of *gern* and this sometimes rendered their answers confusing.

Task 2 asked the candidate to give their reason for preferring shopping online or in-person, and this produced some interesting responses. There were some heroic attempts to explain distortions of colour and sizing when shopping online, or to emphasise the importance of in-person shopping for trying on clothes. For the latter, most candidates knew they had to use a verb containing *probieren*, but many used *ausprobieren*, rather than *anprobieren*, resulting in some confusing responses.

Task 3 asked the candidate for a description of an item that the candidate bought recently. This was usually completed well, with many having bought clothes, tech items, food or snacks. Many candidates used a past tense successfully to describe what they bought recently, often using *ich habe...gekauft* or attempting another past tense construction. However, some were challenged in their use of plural nouns and so described having bought a single shoe, for example.

Task 4 asked the candidate to describe what they are currently saving up for. Many were able to explain this clearly, but others had not understood the verb *sparen* and or had misunderstood it as spending rather than saving, which caused some confusion in their answers. Those who had understood and responded appropriately were often saving for a new mobile phone, a car or even a future house.

Task 5 asked how people are going to shop in the future. This was perhaps the most challenging task, with some candidates misreading it and simply describing their next planned purchases. Others gave straightforward responses, with many referring to buying online in the future. Some were more adventurous and mentioned future purchases via drones and robots or other potential new technologies, and others took a different angle, explaining how, in the future, we should be buying less because of our environmental concerns.

(b) Candidates were required to write a blog for a school website to encourage more students to choose their school. They were to describe what was positive about their school, say how they reacted when they first came to the school, explain how a teacher has helped them with their learning, give their opinions of their school clubs/activities, and describe their own plans for the future, after leaving school.

Task Completion

Most candidates who chose this option made good efforts with the bullet points. The vast majority were able to describe several positive aspects of their school but many more struggled with describing their reaction on their initial arrival at the school. There were many and varied accounts of how a teacher had helped them, with correct past tenses used, but there were also many students who seemed unable to give a clear account in the past tense. A wide range of clubs were described for task four, but some candidates simply listed these clubs and activities without expressing their opinion on them. Most candidates were able to describe future plans, in the last

bullet point, although some misunderstood the question and wrote about going shopping with friends at the end of a school day, rather than referring to future plans after leaving school.

Task 1 required candidates to explain what is positive at their school. This resulted in many descriptions of a school, but it was not always clear which aspects the candidates considered positive, or why. Answers here were often quite simple in terms of language content.

Task 2 asked the candidate to describe the reaction they had when they first arrived at their school. Some candidates did give a reaction but did not answer using the past tense.

Task 3 required the candidate to explain how a teacher has helped them with their learning. For many candidates this proved challenging, especially if they tried to manipulate the use of *helfen* followed by the dative.

Task 4 required the candidate to give their opinion of the school's clubs/sports activities. Many candidates gave lists of the clubs/activities or even described them but did not give clear opinions.

Task 5 asked the candidate to explain what they will do in the future, when they leave school. This was generally well answered, though some candidates seemed fixated on the evening/week after exams and immediate post-exam celebrations, rather than future study/career plans.