

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

<p><b>Paper 0525/11</b> <b>Listening</b></p>
--

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

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

**Paper 0525/12**  
**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 0525/13**  
**Listening**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## General comments

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

The German extracts heard by candidates gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual dialogue, to testing their ability to pick out

specific items of information from longer utterances, as well as opinions and explanations, in longer interviews and discussions.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Questions 1–8**

The extracts were straightforward and short and tested pictorially. This task is designed to reassure candidates of all abilities at the start of the examination rather than to discriminate. In this it was successful, as most candidates answered all questions correctly. Some candidates seemed unsure of the vocabulary item *Neffen* in **Question 2** and chose an incorrect option. Unusually, the question with numbers, **Question 6**, had the most correct answers.

#### **Questions 9–14**

Candidates listened to items of local news. The numbers of correct responses continued to be high. Once again the question containing numbers – **Question 13** - enjoyed the highest success rate. A few candidates were not sure of *Briefkasten* in **Question 10** and chose option **B**.

#### **Questions 15–19**

Candidates heard a conversation between two friends discussing their classmates' plans for the future. This matching exercise was the point at which the examination became more challenging. **Question 19** caused the most problems for candidates who chose the distractor sentence **B** rather than the correct option **A**, presumably word spotting *Flugticket*. In **Question 15** a number of candidates connected enjoying the summer with travelling abroad and opted for **A** rather than the correct answer **D**. **Question 18** received the highest proportion of correct answers.

#### **Questions 20–28**

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

In **Question 20** a number of candidates had difficulty distinguishing between *achtzig* and *achtzehn* and chose the distractor **A** instead of the correct option **B**. Some candidates heard *Wald* in **Question 20** and chose the incorrect answer **B** rather than the correct option **A**. **Question 25** was most successfully answered. In **Question 26** a number of candidates overlooked *Vorteil* in the question and opted for distractor **B**. In **Questions 27** and **28** the distractor options (**A** in both cases) proved effective with those candidates who were word spotting.

#### **Questions 29–34**

Candidates heard an interview with a man conducting an experiment in living without natural light. The four options in each answer represent an increase in the level of difficulty and the content of the dialogue is more sophisticated. It targets candidates who are aware of inference and opinions and have the ability to listen for and pick out specific details.

In general candidates understood this interview well but at this point in the examination there was no particular pattern to the incorrect answers. Candidates seemed to find **Question 34** the most challenging as it tested understanding of an emotion rather than a fact.

#### **Questions 35–37**

Candidates heard a conversation between Julia and Marius about the experience of taking part in a TV quiz show. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. It required listening for detail as well as assessing opinions and discriminated very effectively between candidates. The incorrect answers revealed a tendency to word spot rather than to understand the content.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

**Paper 0525/21**  
**Reading**

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

# GERMAN

---

<p><b>Paper 0525/22</b> <b>Reading</b></p>
--

## 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, 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 most appropriate description of places, events, services or activities. All texts are on a common theme.

### **Question group 6**

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

## General comments

The paper was tackled very well by many candidates. Candidates should be aware that when responding to **Question groups 4 and 6**, the subject of each answer needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answers unambiguous. Attention should be paid to the position and form of verbs. Manipulations must be correct, including when a candidate adds extra material that is not needed to answer the question. When tackling **Question group 5**, the candidates who take care to read the texts thoroughly tend to perform better than those who just try to word-spot.

### **Question group 1**

Most candidates matched the pictures and sentences correctly. Some candidates did not seem to be familiar with the word *Fähre* and therefore struggled to find the right answer to **Question 1(c)**.

## Question group 2

Overall, this was tackled well. In response to **Question 2(c)** many candidates selected option F (*Obst*) instead of option E (*Gemüse*), incorrectly assigning *Erbesen* to the category of fruits rather than vegetables.

## Question group 3

Most candidates coped well here. In response to **Question 3(f)** a number of candidates chose option B (*Bahnkarten*) instead of option C (*Getränke*).

## Question group 4

There was a mixed response here. The most successful candidates gave short, succinct answers and did not therefore make errors with unsuccessful manipulation. Most located the answers, and there were many candidates who gained full or nearly full marks. However, many candidates who successfully located the answers could not be awarded the marks because of faulty manipulation.

- (a) (1) Many candidates coped well with this question and answered appropriately. Some candidates did not include the word *keine*, or omitted *zu* before *kaufen*. Candidates sometimes copied endings imprecisely. Some answers included incorrect adjectival endings.
- (2) Most candidates answered appropriately. The most frequent error was the omission of *um* at the start of the phrase.
- (b) The majority of candidates answered this question 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 and therefore invalidated their answer. Some candidates simply wrote *ein Picknick* and omitted *am Strand*.
- (d) The majority of candidates answered this question well. Some candidates wrote *Freund* or *Freunde(n)* instead of *Freundin*, and these responses could not be credited. Some candidates used *seine* instead of *ihre*, which invalidated the response.
- (e) Most candidates answered this question well. Some candidates invalidated their response by omitting *zu* before the infinitive.
- (f) Some candidates encountered difficulty here and produced answers where the word order was inaccurate. Other answers included too many verbs all together at the end of the sentence for the answer to be meaningful. Some candidates wrote only of celebrating differently, but did not mention Christmas.
- (g) The majority of candidates had no problems here.
- (h) Many candidates answered this question correctly. There were some incorrect responses that included *Thermosflaschen* and some phrases in the present tense.
- (i) Most candidates answered this question well, using *weil* at the beginning of the phrase. Word order was a problem for some candidates, who wrote *weil Eva kann...*; this invalidated the response.
- (j) Most candidates simply wrote *Jacken* or *Decken*, which was all that was needed to answer this question. Some candidates tried to write a more complex response and usually invalidated their answer by doing so incorrectly.
- (k) Many candidates gained the mark here. There were also many 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 candidates who scored no marks at all. Many candidates chose option 7 instead of option 6 for **Question 5(c)**, perhaps having seen the word *Schmuck* in Mira's statement and also the list of jewellery items in option 7, rather than reading

carefully and connecting the idea of the Romans with the idea of ancient civilisations mentioned in option 6. Where other errors occurred, there was no obvious pattern to the incorrectly selected answers.

### Question group 6

There were some very good answers here with correct, accurately formulated responses to the questions. In some cases, candidates did not read the question carefully enough and lifted a piece of text that did not address the precise question that had been asked. Inaccurate tense, grammar and syntax sometimes meant that answers could not be credited.

- (a) There were many correct answers to this question. Some candidates wrote *an* at the end or omitted the subject, which invalidated the response.
- (b) Most candidates produced a correct answer here. Some wrote *das Klarsicht-Magazin*, suggesting that they had not understood the question or the relevant part of the text.
- (c) Many candidates struggled here, with a number writing *Seine Uni ist allerdings sehr weit entfernt*.
- (d)(1) A number of candidates encountered difficulty here. A common error was the incorrect formation of the verb *warden*; the formations *er werde/er werdet* occurred frequently. Many used the verb *kaufen* rather than *einkaufen*.
- (2) Many candidates struggled with the formation of *er wird*. Many omitted the first *auf* from their answer.
- (e) Very few candidates answered this question correctly. There were many answers relating to living in the *Studentenwohnheim*. Others wrote *es ist sehr weit von Zuhause*. Those candidates who did realise that the question related to IT often just wrote *Computertechnologie*, which did not answer the question fully.
- (f) Many candidates encountered difficulty here. Word order was problematic for a number of candidates, 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 question well. A few candidates omitted the subject of the answer.
- (h) This question was generally answered well.
- (i) (1) Only a few candidates answered this question appropriately. Many used *ihren* or *meinen* instead of *seinen*.
- (2) Many candidates gained the mark here. In cases where the mark was not awarded, this was most commonly because the word *in* was omitted from the start of the phrase.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

<p><b>Paper 0525/23</b> <b>Reading</b></p>
--

## 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 well in matching pictures and sentences.

### **Question group 2**

This was completed well for the most part, but some candidates may not have read the text closely enough and made incorrect choices.

### Question group 3

Accomplishment for this Question group was mixed. The most frequent error was for **3(b)** where candidates selected traveling by bus rather than plane as the correct answer. In some cases, there was no pattern to the incorrect answers.

### Question group 4

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

- (a) This was answered correctly by almost all candidates.
- (b) This was mostly very well answered.
- (c) (i)(ii) Candidates generally located the right part of the text to answer this question, but there were frequent incomplete answers which could not be credited. These included *viel möglich draussen (zu) sein* and *mit jungen Menschen (zu) verbringen* which demonstrated that the candidate had not fully understood the text.
- (d) This was mostly well answered.
- (e) Many candidates supplied correct answers. Those whose answers could not be credited omitted the preposition *in* and simply wrote *(ein) Altenheim*.
- (f) This was generally well answered.
- (g) There were many correct responses. The responses *eine (alte) Dame* and *eine alte Dame kennengelernt* occurred frequently and could not be credited.
- (h) This was generally well answered, although some candidates stated that there were boys and girls in the group which did not explain Leo's choice.
- (i) Most candidates provided a correct answer here.
- (j) There were many correct responses, but some candidates wrote: *Sie brauchten viel Geld für ihre Reisekasse* suggesting a lack of understanding of the text.
- (k) Most candidates provided an appropriate answer.

### Question group 5

Some candidates achieved full marks on this question, but there were quite a few with more incorrect than correct answers. Where 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. Occasionally a singular verb was provided instead of the third person plural.
- (b) This was generally well answered.
- (c) This was generally well answered. Sometimes candidates simply wrote in *Österreich* and failed to put *in den Bergen*.

- (d) Most candidates answered correctly, but there were some who invalidated their response by using the incorrect possessive: (*mit*) *seinen*... rather than *ihren*...
- (e) Almost all candidates seemed to understand the question, and many provided an accurate response. Some invalidated their answer by using incorrect verb endings e.g., *Sie probiere*...
- (f) Some candidates used the incorrect possessive adjective here i.e., *ihre* instead of *seine*.
- (g) There were many correct answers, but also evidence of word-spotting when candidates wrote that Konrad had never tried wakeboarding before which did not answer the question asked.
- (h)(i)(ii) These were answered well by many candidates.
- (i) This was generally well answered. Some answers were not credited as the candidate had written *seine Verwandte* instead of *seine Verwandten*. This could not be accepted as the meaning is different.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

**Paper 0525/03**  
**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 0525/41**  
**Writing**

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

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

<p><b>Paper 0525/42</b> <b>Writing</b></p>
--

## 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 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.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

Paper 0525/43  
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, candidates were required to fill in their details for attending a meal at a wedding party, with information on means of transport, food they cannot eat, gift purchased from a wish list, accommodation requirements and length of stay. 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 (means of transport) was achieved by most candidates.

For the second vocabulary item, most candidates successfully scored the mark with an item of food that cannot be eaten, with many referring to *Nüsse*, *Milchprodukte*, *Fleisch*, etc. Others understood but were not able to communicate.

The third vocabulary item was usually well answered with an appropriate gift item, but some candidates seemed not to understand *Geschenke* and left blanks.

The fourth vocabulary item (accommodation need) was usually successful, with a variety of requirements being chosen by candidates ranging from *Balkon* to *Sofa*. However, those who mentioned food items were not usually successful.

For the fifth vocabulary item, most candidates gave numbers of days or nights, while others gave precise dates or longer stays.

Overall, **Question 1** task was tackled well by most candidates, and many scored 4 or 5 out of 5.

## Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 5 sub-questions on the topic of free time. 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.

Most candidates gave good responses to the tasks, were successful in their use of structures and vocabulary and were able to extend their responses by giving opinions and reasons. Weaker candidates generally communicated their answers to most tasks successfully, even if 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 generally 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 opinion. Successful answers included 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 the less able candidates.

**Task 1** asked how much free time the candidate has in a typical week. The majority of candidates achieved well here, with many simply saying they had *viel/nicht viel Freizeit*, while others gave more precise details about how many hours/on which days etc.

**Task 2** asked candidates to describe what they do at home in the evening. This task was well tackled by almost all candidates, with many describing homework tasks or talking about TV they watch with their family.

**Task 3** asked the candidate how they spend their free time at the weekend. Most candidates achieved this task, giving details of spending time with family/friends, going into town for shopping or cinema, or going to church on Sundays, etc.

**Task 4** asked the candidate to explain why they like to do sport at the weekend, or not. Most candidates were able to express their reasons successfully, with a range of answers, varying from how sport is good for health, is fun with friends. Others gave a reasoned explanation of how they are not sporty or it's too tiring.

**Task 5** asked what plans they have with friends or family for the summer holidays. Most candidates were able to give their summer plans, with many giving details of travel and adding reasons. The majority were successful in using the future tense, or a future time phrase with present tense, to convey their plans, though some of the less able did not give any future indication and so were unable to gain the mark.

## Question 3

There were 2 options for **Question 3**. By far the most candidates opted for **Question 3a** and very few chose **Question 3b**.

Most candidates answered the question as set and only a few candidates wrote off topic or merely copied out the rubric. There were, however, some very short answers from a few candidates. As in previous sessions, it seems that a minority of centres have been teaching long introductory paragraphs that could be written at the beginning of any **Question 3** 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.

The question was marked out of a maximum of 28 marks from 3 banded mark schemes, with a maximum of 10 marks for Task Completion, 10 for Range and 8 for Accuracy.

### Task Completion:

Marks gained by candidates for their Task Completion depended on how well 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 examples of those who ignored the precise demands of the tasks or who simply wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic. Almost all candidates responded to the precise 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 school exchanges, while **Question 3b** offered the chance for vocabulary on the topic of a well-known person. 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 in equipping candidates to vary their sentence structures and vocabulary range. Even the weaker candidates made efforts to include use of *und* and *weil*, and more able candidates used *dass*, *deshalb*, *außerdem*, *danach* etc. as effective connectors. Along with the use of connectors, the understanding of German word order in subordinate clauses has also improved, and it was pleasing this session to read a good number of correctly formulated structures. 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 time frames, the inclusion of conjunctions that require the manipulation of word order, *wenn* clauses with conditional constructions, modal verbs, the use of *um...zu...* etc. Examples of these constructions helped the candidates to move up the mark scheme and to score more highly in their range of language.

### **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, including the use of capital letters. Centres should encourage their candidates to check more carefully for these inaccuracies.

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, in present tense (especially irregular forms), in perfect tense (with word order issues and incorrect auxiliary use, for example). Modal verbs were not always used with the infinitive.

Overall, though, it was good to see many candidates being successful in responding to the tasks, and much of the German produced was accurate enough to convey meaning adequately. The best candidates were, as in previous years, highly accurate and many demonstrated an impressive ability to use a range of language structures, including relative clauses, a variety of negatives, etc.

### **Question 3**

- (a) Candidates were required to write an email to their friend, about a recent school exchange, with an account of the journey, description of a typical day in the host's family, preferences as to school being better in their home country or in Germany, opinions/reasons on whether young people should travel abroad and a description of plans for the exchange partner's return visit next year. 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 an account of the journey to Germany. This was a straightforward introduction to the question, with most candidates successfully conveying the details and many adding opinions and reasons, too. Some wrote specifically about the journey itself, whilst others chose to write more generally on the topic, but both options were accepted.

**Task 2** asked the candidate to describe a typical day in the exchange partner's home. This task required use of the past tense and was often well-completed with details about daily routine, often including descriptions of food eaten/activities undertaken, as well as reactions/opinions.

**Task 3** asked the candidate for an explanation as to why they prefer school in their own country or in Germany. Most had firm opinions on this, with many mentioning school subjects, food, levels of discipline, amount of homework set, etc.

**Task 4** asked the candidate to explain whether, or not, young people should travel abroad. Candidates had many good ideas, and the vast majority of candidates gave clear opinion with reasoned explanation. Many suggested that it was important/essential/necessary to experience other cultures, etc. The weaker candidates were usually able to give an opinion, with some simply saying it was good to make friends, etc.

**Task 5** asked for a description of the candidate's plans for their exchange partner's return visit. Most candidates gave their answers with well-formed future tenses/clear references to future plans, and many candidates mentioned trips they were planning, such as possible visits to museums/towns/places to eat.

It was pleasing to see that, overall, most candidates are being well-prepared to express themselves in a range of tenses.

- (b) Candidates were required to write a blog for a school website on the topic of encountering a well-known personality. A very small minority of candidates chose to answer **Question 3b**.

**Task Completion:**

**Task 1** required candidates to describe the situation when they encountered the famous person. A simple account in the past tense was sufficient, but those who did not attempt a past time frame were not successful on this task.

**Task 2** required candidates to describe the well-known personality. A range of descriptions was possible here, from details about looks and personality to past achievements, reasons for fame.

**Task 3** asked candidates to explain why life is easier or not, when one is famous. A simple explanation was sufficient and a danger for candidates here was choosing to give an account that was beyond their language ability, where a more straightforward answer would have been more successful in terms of outcome.

**Task 4** asked candidates to explain why famous people are good examples, or not, for young people. This was a more challenging task, possibly because the vocabulary item *Vorbild*, was less well known by candidates, and may possibly have been one of the reasons for fewer candidates selecting **Question 3b**.

**Task 5** required candidates to describe which famous person they might like to meet in the future. Those with imagination as well as the required vocabulary were able to provide successful answers with reference to the future, but the task overall demanded some thought, and some candidates perhaps struggled more with this task.