# GERMAN

Paper 7159/12
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

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

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

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

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

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

## General comments

This listening examination was entirely multiple choice. It was noted that almost all candidates gave answers to all the questions. The paper gets gradually more challenging as it progresses, from the first set of questions that test isolated common vocabulary to the final sections where understanding the whole gist of conversations is required. This was reflected in the candidates' performance.

**Cambridge Assessment**
International Education

**Comments on specific questions**

**Questions 1–8**

Overall, candidates with a sound basic vocabulary performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. Vocabulary areas included numbers, people, holidays, leisure activities and jobs. Candidates were clearly well prepared for this part of the examination.

**Questions 9–14**

Candidates heard a longer extract containing short local news items. Again, identification of common vocabulary was required and there were no deliberate distractors. However the words were embedded within longer sections of text. Vocabulary included numbers, times, places in the town, common household items, means of transport, jobs and parts of the body. Almost all candidates got the answer to the first question correct, which involved recognition of a time. The word most frequently not known was *Fahrräder* in **Question 12***,* with several candidates thinking it was a car or a lawn mower, and *Schulter* in **Question 14** where about 30% of candidates put the answer **D***.*

**Questions 15–19**

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation describing five people in a wedding photograph. In general the majority of candidates were able to find the correct answer but a number of candidates put the answer **C** for **Question 19**. There is always a distractor in this task and this time it was recognising that looking like a film star is not the same as being one. In fact the answer was **A:** *ist extrem gut aussehend.*

**Questions 20–28**

In this exercise, candidates heard quite an unusual interview, in two parts, about training and riding cows in Switzerland. Vocabulary used was clearly familiar to the majority of candidates. However here a more global understanding of the situation and views were required which made the task more demanding. It was not possible to guess the correct answer. For example, are cows in fact less intelligent than horses? There were tempting distractors in the choices that discriminated well between candidates. In **Question 21**, for example, more than half the candidates were distracted by **C:** *alte Häuser am liebsten*, whereas the correct answer was **A:** *das Leben in der Schweiz.*

**Questions 29–34**

Candidates heard an interview with a former pop singer. This was an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper, as candidates are required to demonstrate the ability to understand specific details within a context and to be aware of attitudes and opinions. In **Question 33** very few candidates chose the correct option, **D,** with many choosing **B**, presumably because they were distracted by the word *Enkelkinder* that they heard in the recording. **Question 34** was also found to be difficult, with many being distracted by **D**, the option mentioning *Golf.*

Questions discriminated appropriately for this stage in the examination.

**Questions 35–37**

Here candidates heard three dialogues on a related topic (Germans and tourism). For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five.

In general, many candidates found all three passages accessible. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper.

# GERMAN

<div style="border:1px solid black">

**Paper 7159/22**
**Reading**

</div>

## Key messages

**Question group 1**

Candidates match a series of short statements with the correct pictures.

**Question group 2**

Candidates match a series of short notices or signs commonly found in public places with an explanatory statement. The texts are all set in the same context.

**Question group 3**

Candidates answer multiple-choice questions with three options on a short text.

**Question group 4**

Candidates demonstrate understanding of a text, by answering straightforward, open questions. The emphasis is on answer location, and not on precise lifting; however, the subject, personal pronouns and possessives need to be unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct.

**Question group 5**

Candidates match a series of descriptions of the requirements, interests or skills of different people with the correct description of places, events, services, or activities. All texts are on a common theme.

**Question group 6**

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

## General comments

The Paper was tackled very well by many of the candidates. Candidates should be aware that in the case of **Question groups 4 and 6**, the subject needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answer unambiguous. 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.

## Comments on specific questions

**Question group 1**

Many candidates performed well in matching pictures and sentences. Some did not seem to know the nouns and made random matches. *Kasse* was seemingly not known by a significant number of candidates.

**Question group 2**

Most candidates matched sentences and weather pictures correctly. A significant number did not seem to understand *Gewitter*. A few candidates seemed to have no knowledge of this topic.

**Question group 3**

Accomplishment for this Question group was mixed. The most frequent errors were for **3(a)** and **3(b)**: in the case of **3(a)**, candidates opting for the pupils wanting to learn to cook, perhaps not understanding *schauspielern*. For **3(b)**, candidates sometimes deemed the project to be expensive.

**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 lose marks through unsuccessful manipulation. There were not many who failed completely to locate the answer, and there was a significant number who gained full, or nearly full marks. However, there was a large number who successfully located the answer but lost marks chiefly through faulty manipulation. Most mistakes occurred where students did not know that Marion was female and erroneously used *er* in otherwise correct answers. The use of possessive adjectives was often wrong; in some scripts, Marion was correctly identified as female, but then instead of *ihr* the possessive *sein* was used.

**(a)** This was mostly very well answered, but for those who failed to answer correctly, the most common error was to use a present tense verb when the question required an answer in the past tense.

**(b)** This was mostly very well answered, but some candidates lacked precision in their answers and simply answered *Englisch zu lernen* rather than *mehr Englisch zu lernen*.

**(c)** Here, only the adjective was required but overall, candidates struggle to use reflexive verbs, so very often reflexive pronouns were omitted.

**(d)** There were many good answers.

**(e) (i)(ii)** Most candidates supplied correct answers.

**(f)** This was generally well answered.

**(g)** Some candidates only answered *über das Leben in England* or just *das Leben in England* and did not explain that Marion had learnt a lot about this.

**(h)** This was generally well answered.

**(i)** The answer was generally well located, but some candidates' answers could not be credited because of incorrect word order after *weil* or incorrect verb form.

**(j)** This was correctly answered by many.

**(k)** Many candidates opted here for the possessive pronoun *seine*.

**Question group 5**

Some candidates achieved full marks on this question, but there were quite a few with more incorrect than correct. Where errors occurred, there was no particularly perceivable pattern to the incorrectly selected answers, except for **5(e)**. Many candidates offered option 1 here.

**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.

Word order and lack of knowledge of personal and possessive pronouns were the biggest issues. Many candidates did not grasp the need to manipulate from first person to second person and answered many of the questions in first person.

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

**(b)** Most candidates could identify the correct answer but did not manage the manipulation. The word order was incorrect in many cases.

**(c)** This was generally well answered.

**(d)** Most candidates could identify the correct answer but did not manage the manipulation. The word order was incorrect in many cases.

**(e)** Manipulation and/or tense was often incorrect here.

**(f) (i)(ii)** Candidates located the information correctly, but structure and / or the wrong possessive meant the answer could not be credited.

**(g)** There were some correct answers, but sometimes the verb was erroneously placed at the end of the sentence.

**(h) (i)(ii)** Answers were generally correct, as this was just a straight lift.

**(i)** There were many correct answers.

# GERMAN

Paper 7159/03
Speaking 03

## Key messages

* The emphasis of this syllabus is on successful communication within familiar situations.
* All tasks in this Speaking exam now are genuine communication exercises, in which candidates can show that they can understand and produce the target language.
* The structure of the Role Plays and Topic Conversations requires good understanding of the spoken language and an ability to respond appropriately.
* Successful communication is often achieved even without absolute grammatical accuracy, as long as the language employed is appropriate to the situation and clear enough to be understood.
* In the role plays successful communication can be achieved in relatively short responses, but for higher marks in the conversations the language offered must be more expansive. Throughout the topic conversations, ideas and opinions should be expressed, developed and justified.
* Candidates should be able to converse on familiar topics, to be expansive and to describe events, experiences and ambitions. They should be able to give reasons, evaluations and explanations for their ideas and plans. They should also be able to relate a brief story.

## General comments

These comments should be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for October/November 2023.

The overwhelming number of centres conducted this Speaking Test very well indeed. Most candidates seemed very well prepared for the demands set in this exam and the large majority of examiners conducted the exam in the spirit in which it was intended. Most displayed an efficient yet friendly manner and confident awareness of the structure and timing of the various sections of the examination. They were patient, allowed time for the candidates to think, and prompted them to give fuller responses and to develop their ideas further.

In the Role Plays most complied with the instructions as to how many times a question can be repeated; and in the Topic Conversations, as to when the alternative questions provided should be used. Most examiners had mastered the technique of encouraging fuller responses by asking extension questions, either using the example extension questions, such as 'Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr', or providing appropriate alternatives of their own. Any question that will encourage a candidate to be more expansive on a topic question in the paper is welcome, especially if it looks as if the candidate will provide only brief answers and rush though the topic.

It could also be a very good strategy when preparing students for the exam to get them to talk about situations that might occur to them in connection with topics listed in the syllabus (like in Topic 7 in this paper: a situation when their mobile phone was important to them). Similarly, candidates can be trained to talk about events in the past or future plans in some detail, and situations set in the papers of the last few years can certainly serve as examples as to what type of questions will be asked. Teaching subject-specific vocabulary is also a really useful teaching tool, which would help candidates greatly.

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

Further questions should encourage candidates to elaborate, expand, narrate and/or explain.

Although the role plays are not timed, they should ideally be completed in two to three minutes and the whole test should not be longer than ten or eleven minutes. Most centres achieved this successfully. Unfortunately, a number of centres did not stick to the recommended timings at all and exams became far too long for the candidates' comfort.

## Comments on specific questions

### Role Pays

The format of the role plays, with candidates seeing only the scenario during their preparation period, without any outline of the planned questions, encourages spontaneous interaction. There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners followed instructions and asked the questions exactly as they were printed. The first two questions are designed to elicit straightforward (often very brief, possibly even just one-word) answers within a present tense time frame. The remaining three questions are intended to produce responses that are either in a past or future time frame and/ or requiring an opinion or justification of a statement. Here also, the length of the answer is not important. Full marks are given for all full and appropriate answers, where the meaning is clear and unambiguous. The best responses in the role play are often brief, but in a natural spoken idiom.

It is important for examiners to stick exactly to the script as given, as this ensures equality of opportunity for all candidates. If a candidate does not understand (or comprehend) a question the first time it is asked, it can be repeated once. Most examiners did this very well and very few either failed to repeat the question or, at the other extreme, repeated it several times.

Mostly, the marking of the role plays was commendably accurate. Occasionally, examiners were slightly harsh in their interpretation as to what constitutes a 'minor error'. Thus, an incorrect auxiliary ('ich habe geschwommen) or an incorrect verb ending ('wir möchte ins Kino gehen') will often be part of a clearly understandable response, where 'the information is communicated', as the mark scheme descriptor for two marks states. The important criterion for awarding a mark of one is: 'Errors impede communication'. An incorrect time frame usually obscures meaning (Question: 'Was hast du gemacht, als du zuletzt in der Küche geholfen hast?' Response: 'Ich habe einen Kuchen backen'), as does an incomplete answer. For example, in the question 'Wie oft in der Woche sind Sie normalerweise sportlich aktiv?', the 'wie oft' component of the question must be answered, as otherwise the response can, at best, be partial.

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

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

It is also worth mentioning at this point that two-part role play tasks are marked globally: this means that candidates do not automatically get a mark, if they answer the first part of a closed question (for example: 'Ist es wichtig, Fremdsprachen zu lernen?') with 'ja' or 'nein', but cannot give a reason to the following 'warum?' question.

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

It is also worth mentioning that the role play task becomes much easier for the candidate if an examiner genuinely enters into the spirit of a role play and conducts it like a spontaneous conversation on a given subject. It certainly does not put candidates at ease if it is conducted like a series of unrelated questions, starting the role play with 'erste Frage' and continuing it more like an interrogation than a role play. Fortunately, only very few examiners conducted the role plays in such a fashion.

## Comments on the individual Role Plays

### Card 1: (Familie und Freunde)

As there were many centres in this session who entered just a single candidate, this was the role play which was heard most often. It proved straightforward and, for the large majority of candidates, caused very few problems. Most candidates had no difficulty describing a friend in simple phrases. The question 'Wie oft siehst du ihn/ sie normalerweise?' drew a number of interesting responses and got full marks as long as they were clear. Responses like 'alles Tag' were, however, deemed ambiguous and only rewarded with 1 mark. Similarly, the one-word response 'manchmal' was regarded as not fully answering the question. The main reason for awarding just 1 mark in the question 'Was habt ihr denn gemacht, als ihr das letzte Mal zusammen wart?' was an incorrect time frame. Several candidates answered the question 'Und was möchtest du mit deiner Familie machen, wenn du nach deinem Austausch wieder nach Hause kommst?' with 'Ich weiß nicht.', which, in this particular context, is a perfectly appropriate response and was credited with full marks. The last question asking candidates why they preferred to go on holiday with either family or friends drew a range of really interesting and, at times, funny responses, which showed that the responses were genuinely spontaneous. It was really good to see that the present format of the role plays, which allows candidates to be creative and come up with personalised responses, encourages candidates to think on their feet and even to use their sense of humour.

### Card 2: (Jobs im Haus/ Garten)

Similarly, this role play caused few problems. Again, the first two questions mostly elicited brief answers, like 'meine Mutter' (to the question 'Wer arbeitet den bei dir zu Hause am meisten im Haushalt?'), or 'jeden Tag' (to the question 'Und wie oft hilfst du bei dir zu Hause?'). **Question 2** was a very good example of the importance of responding to the key question word (in this case was 'wie oft'). Responses were only credited with full marks if they contained a reference to frequency ('manchmal', 'einmal in der Woche', 'jeden Tag', 'fast nie' and many other expressions showing frequency were accepted). Unfortunately, an ambiguous answer like 'drei Zeit' could not be credited with full marks, though. Particularly **Question 4** in this role play ('Gibt es einen Job im Haus oder im Garten, den du nicht gern machst?') elicited many very creative – and sometimes very funny – responses, as did **Question 5**.

### Card 3: (Sportzentrum)

This role play was also generally done well. The first question, 'An welchen Tagen in der Woche arbeiten Sie eigentlich?' drew mainly clear and brief responses like 'am Montag und Dienstag', or „jeden Tag, aber nur am Vormittag'. A very small minority of candidates had difficulties with answering 'wie oft' in **Question 2**, but most answers were adequate, from giving a simple answer like 'drei Mal die Woche' to more complex ones like 'immer am Abend, wenn ich Zeit habe'. **Question 4** ('Und warum möchten Sie hier im Fitnesszentrum mit einem Trainer/ einer Trainerin arbeiten?') brought the largest variety of responses in this role play, ranging from 'weil ich meine Fitness verbessern möchte' and 'weil ich lernen möchte, wie ich am besten fit bleiben kann' to the simple response 'weil ich Sport mag'. The last question 'wie oft und wie lange möchten Sie nächste Woche hier trainieren?' was answered well by most candidates. However, responses that did not give at least one clear response to 'wie oft' or 'wie lange' could not be credited fully. Thus a response like 'ein Monat' was deemed to be an inappropriate response.

### Card 4: (Sport in der Schule)

Again, this role play encouraged creative answers and was generally done very well. Brief responses were the order of the day for **Question 1** ('Welche Sportarten kann man in deiner Schule treiben?'), but responses like 'Ich spiele in meiner Schule Fußball und Basketball' were also fully accepted. The second question ('Und wie oft hast du in deiner Schule pro Woche Sport?') targeted frequency in the response, so responses ranging from 'jeden Tag' to 'überhaupt nicht' were fully accepted. However, the one-word response 'Montag' was not deemed to be an appropriate response for full marks. The most creative responses in this role play situation were given to **Question 3** ('Findest du Teamsport oder Einzelsport interessanter? [Pause] Warum meinst du das?'). On the whole, candidates coped well with this question. The last two questions in this role play situation did not cause any major problems.

**Card 5: (Lesen)**

This again proved to be straightforward, candidates coped well with the situation of answering questions on the topic of reading. **Question 1** ('Was lesen deine Eltern zu Hause?') caused few difficulties. Candidates then managed the switch to their own reading preferences in **Questions 2** and **3** without major difficulties. Responses to **Question 4** ('Wie glaubst du werden wir uns in Zukunft informieren?') displayed a good amount of creativity and a large variety of answers, most of which were referring to online information of some kind. However, even slightly unexpected responses like 'wir werden Bücher lesen' were fully credited, as, no doubt, books will continue to play a part in the way we gather information.

**As there were fewer centres with more than five candidates, the following role plays were not heard so frequently, so the notes on them will be briefer.**

**Card 6: (die Umwelt)**

It was obvious that candidates who were given this role play situation had prepared the topic of 'Umwelt' and 'Umweltschutz' very well and, on the whole, showed themselves knowledgeable and well prepared, being able to give relevant examples of what their respective families and schools could do to protect the environment.

**Card 7: (Fremdsprachen)**

Similarly, there were few problems and candidates coped well with the demands of this situation. Referring again to the importance of responding to the main question word, in **Question 1** ('Woher kommen Sie den?') a country, a region or a town/city could be accepted as a correct answer, provided it was preceded by a correct preposition, like 'aus' or 'von'. We heard particularly interesting responses to **Question 4** ('Waren Sie schon einmal in einer Situation, zum Beispiel in einem Restaurant oder einem Geschäft, wo eine Fremdsprache nützlich war? [Pause] Was ist passiert?'). **Question 5** asked for other languages the candidate might want to learn in future. Obviously, no credit could be given here if the responses were in English (or indeed any other language apart from German).

**Card 8: (München und das Oktoberfest)**

Similarly, this role play proved straightforward to candidates. They were able to communicate about the Oktoberfest, traditions in their own home country and celebrations they had had.

**Card 9: (Soziale Medien und das Internet)**

The topic of this role play very clearly is close to the everyday experience of many candidates, and, accordingly, it did not cause any major problems.

*Topic Conversations*

As with the Role Plays, both candidates and examiners coped well with the requirements for the Topic Conversations, and a lot of complex and meaningful conversations were developed. The fact that questions to the conversations are now scripted offers several advantages, as closed questions, which in the previous syllabus often prevented even good candidates from developing their answers and expanding on a topic, are not asked any more. Also, as every candidate is asked the same questions, there is genuine comparability of standards and an increased level of fairness.

Most examiners asked questions exactly as printed, the majority also repeated questions when required and continued to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were forthcoming to the original questions. Also, examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like 'Kannst du mehr darüber sagen?', with the effect that most candidates managed to produce sufficiently long and meaningful conversations by answering the five questions in some detail. Good use was also made of the fact that examiners can ask up to two further questions, if the conversation was too short or insubstantial, and, again, the majority of centres did this very well. Only a very small minority of examiners asked closed further questions, which did not help candidates to use expansive language and thus hindered rather than helped them.

It was very pleasing to hear that in nearly all cases a similar standard was maintained for the further questions, as had been evident in the responses to the set questions and there was no evidence of memorising or over-rehearsal in the further questions asked by examiners.

Many exams were a pleasure to listen to, with candidates producing interesting content and ambitious language. It was very good to hear candidates use subordinating conjunctions (for example, obwohl, weil, bevor, indem, nachdem, damit, sobald) which helped them develop, justify and/or explain their statements. The best candidates also used structures like passives and subjunctives with confidence. Similarly, words and phrases like 'auβerdem' 'eigentlich' and 'aus diesem Grund' were used by candidates who ended up being marked at the top of the range for Quality of language. It is also worth pointing out again, (already mentioned above in the Key messages), that candidates are encouraged in this format of the exam to be expansive, to tell stories, to give evaluations and to describe events.

It is also worth remembering that a candidate is no longer restricted to the top of the 'poor' box in the mark scheme if they do not produce completely correct past and future tenses. Instead, a candidate's use of tenses is now marked as part of the general impression for Quality of language, using the descriptors provided in the mark scheme. Accurate use of tenses is only one aspect of the 'range of structures listed in the syllabus' that the final Quality of language mark will be based on. The Quality of language mark also takes into account other aspects of language use, like the range of vocabulary used and the intonation and fluency of a candidate.

On the whole, the descriptors in the mark scheme for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of language' were used very accurately by examiners in deciding on the mark bands and marks they awarded. It was interesting to note that more centres were marking too severely than too leniently. However, if the marks awarded by a centre are consistent, then appropriate scaling is not a problem. There were, thankfully, only a very few centres, where marking was clearly inconsistent and the descriptors in the mark scheme were not used appropriately.

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

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

After hearing a great variety of responses from candidates from different educational and cultural backgrounds, it is safe to say that there was not a single question in any of the seven topics that caused any particular difficulties. It was particularly fascinating to listen to the responses to the questions asking for opinions and evaluations (**Question 3** in Topics 1 to 4, **Question 4** in Topic 5, and **Question 5** in Topics 6 and 7), where the candidates' creativity and spontaneity was at its very best. Again, hearing those imaginative responses was a further indication that encouraging candidates to answer spontaneously to questions that are of genuine interest to them is very much appreciated within this syllabus.

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

**Randomisation:**

The large majority of centres followed the randomisation guidelines given in the Teachers' Notes exactly. This is very important both for reasons of fairness and confidentiality (in centres with many candidates), but the pairings of role plays and topics given in the Randomisation sheet also makes sure that candidates are given the opportunity to show what they are capable of in a variety of topic areas.

**Recordings/audio files:**

It was good to see that the new system of uploading both audio files and exam paperwork to Submit for Assessment worked well. Most centres uploaded their files straight after the exam had taken place and thus enabled a speedy completion of the moderation process. Unfortunately, some centres had still not uploaded work quite some time after the exam season had well and truly passed. It is sincerely hoped that the good practice of uploading all necessary files straight after completion of the exam and internal moderation will become the norm for all centres in future.

Before recordings are uploaded, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. Fortunately, this year there appeared to be far fewer problems with poor recordings. Even though the majority of recordings were of a good quality, a small minority of centres continue to place the microphone too far from the candidates, so that it is difficult to hear them.

**Administration:**

Administration in centres was generally good and, in this session, very few centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheet (WMS). Assessment was deemed to be more accurate than in the past, and the order of merit was generally correct.

**Marking by centres:**

It is interesting to note that there were roughly as many centres where the marking was too severe, as there were centres that marked too leniently.

Most centres made very good use of the excellent mark descriptors in the mark schemes for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language' and thus managed to mark their candidates accurately. Reasons for excessive generosity included awarding high marks for Communication, when candidates had not offered ideas and opinions, as answers had been too factual. The fact that the Language mark is now given globally also clearly makes it easier to give accurate marks for Quality of language.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

```
Paper 7159/42
Writing
```

## Key messages

A thorough knowledge of the question words in German is essential to be able to answer all the questions in this paper. Candidates should read each question or part-question carefully and respond to the exact task set. Full Task Completion marks can only be awarded if every part-question is answered in German. Candidates should also ensure that they are using the appropriate tense for each task. In **Question 2**, candidates will usually be required to demonstrate the use of present and future tenses, and in **Question 3**, they will often need to use past, present and future tenses in different tasks. In both questions, candidates will need to express opinions and give reasons for their choices.

## General comments

There was evidence this series that centres have communicated to candidates the importance of reading the questions carefully and responding to the tasks set. There was no evidence of candidates being short of time. The correct number of questions was answered by almost all candidates and most answers were of an appropriate length.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

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

An electronic form had to be completed in order to reserve a hotel room for the candidates' parents.

***Task 1*** required the date of their arrival at the hotel. Candidates had to supply a month in German. It is expected that candidates will write the month in full and not use any abbreviations. The majority were able to do this correctly and there were few spelling errors.

***Task 2*** asked how long they would be staying. The expected answer was a short period of time (e.g. *eine Woche, zwei Tage, eine Nacht*) but credit was given to answers which demonstrated an understanding of *Wie lange?*

***Tasks 3 and 4*** asked about the type of room required. The expected answers were *Doppelzimmer* for **task 3** and *Dusche* or *Balkon* for **task 4** but words relating to a hotel room were accepted. *Zimmer* on its own gained no credit because it is provided in the question, but a qualifier (e.g. *groß)* was sufficient to gain a mark. "TV" was not awarded a mark because *Fernseher* should have been used.

***Task 5*** required a meal and the majority of candidates were able to write *Frühstück* at least well enough for it to be recognised easily. *Mittagessen* was also credited*.*

### Question 2

The topic of this writing task was Music and Free-time. Five points had to be made in response to four bullet points. The first three points referred to candidates' music preferences. The fourth and fifth points asked about free time activities the following weekend. The fourth point had to be expressed in the future tense.

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

**Task 1** asked candidates to describe their favourite musician. A wide range of responses was accepted including physical description or nationality, being a member of a particular band or writing songs. A number of candidates misunderstood *Musiker* as "music" and so did not describe a person. An account of the type of music preferred by the candidate did not answer the question set and so the task was not considered complete. Candidates described hair and eye colour well, but many did not know how to say that someone was "tall" or "short".

**Task 2** gave candidates the opportunity to express their opinions on the music of their chosen musician. Most did this well and had sufficient vocabulary to personalise their answer but there was some difficulty in choosing the correct way to say "his" or "her".

**Task 3** required candidates to explain when they usually listened to music. This was well done with *wenn* regularly used correctly. Some tried to say "all day" but few were confident to use *den ganzen Tag*.

**Task 4** gave the opportunity to use the future tense to say what sport or music activities were anticipated the following week. On the whole, the future tense was well known, but there were examples of *werden* being used with a past participle. This meant that the future was not readily identifiable and so was not accepted. An activity needed to be named (e.g. football, choir, concert) for the completion of the task.

**Task 5** was an explanation for the choice of the activity mentioned in **task 4.** Candidates were well able to express reasons for their decisions.

**Question 3**

In **Question 3**, there was a choice between writing an email about camping **3(a)** and a magazine article about school closure **3(b).** There was a fairly even distribution between **3(a)** and **3(b).**

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

**(a)**     Candidates generally had the vocabulary and structures to complete all the tasks.

**Task 1** asked where the candidate and friends had camped. *Campingplatz* was provided in the title and most candidates were able to supply an additional place (e.g. mountain, riverside, castle) and to give details about the site chosen.

**Task 2** required a response in the past tense detailing activities at the camp-site (e.g. *wir haben das Essen gekocht, wir sind gewandert*). There were many excellent and imaginative answers which showed confident and correct formation of the past tense. The use of *wir haben/sind* with an infinitive (e.g. *kochen, gehen*) did not indicate a clear past tense and so did not gain full credit. Candidates who were able to form some of the most commonly used past tenses achieved high marks in all three categories.

**Task 3** gave the opportunity to express a preference between sleeping at home or in a tent. There were many good ideas and candidates drew on vocabulary and structures learnt for other topics. *Lieber* was regularly thought to be the verb "prefer" (*ich lieber zu Hause schlafen*) and there were few examples of *ich schlafe lieber zu Hause*.

**Task 4** asked about the advantages of camping. Almost all the answers showed that candidates understood *Vorteil.* Ideas included spending time in nature and getting to know friends better.

**Task 5** required the use of the future tense to describe the next excursion. *Ausflug* appeared to be known by most candidates and so interesting ideas were presented in the future tense with detailed descriptions of the places to be visited. The future tense was generally well known, but, as in question 2, there were examples of *werden* being used with a past participle.

**(b)**     Candidates were able to use their own experiences of remote learning to produce thoughtful and interesting answers about school being closed, and had the vocabulary to achieve this.

**Task 1** asked how long the school was shut. Most candidates were able to write a sentence in the past tense about this. The attempted use of *seit* and the present tense that it requires was often problematic.

*Task 2* asked how learning took place during the school closure. There were many detailed, factual accounts of e-learning including the use of different platforms, finding out information from websites, and the use of email. Candidates generally had the vocabulary, structures and knowledge to give full answers.

*Task 3* gave the opportunity to express an opinion about the best way to learn. There were many references to the difficulty of using computers and mobile phones including low quality signal, having to share with parents or siblings, and finding concentration hard. Most drew the conclusion that learning in school was more productive, largely because of the help and support that teachers gave.

*Task 4* concentrated on individual learning preferences: alone or with friends. This was well answered with many examples of helpful, and not so helpful friends. *Lieber* was regularly thought to be the verb "prefer" (*ich lieber mit Freunden lernen*) and there were few examples of *ich lerne lieber.*

*Task 5* asked specifically what candidates were going to do in school the following week. The future tense was generally well known and candidates had plenty of examples. There were a few responses which were general and vague and did not refer to school and they could not be credited for completing the task set.

## Question 3 Range

Many candidates opted for short clauses and used a small number of conjunctions, usually *weil* or *und.* In order to access the top bands for Range, sentences should be of different lengths and linked using various conjunctions such as *dass, denn, wenn, obwohl* and the relative pronouns. Word order could be changed as in: *nächste Woche werde ich …* or *leider war ich ….* Variety was introduced successfully with expressions such as: *entweder …oder, sowohl …. als auch, meiner Meinung nach,* and there was an attempt to vary vocabulary, although there was a fair amount of repetition. Interest was added with the use of adjectives (e.g. *meine nette Freundin, das Essen war lecker*).

## Question 3 Accuracy

There was evidence of careful preparation, and basic structures were generally sound, although there was some poor spelling and lack of appropriate German vocabulary. The use of capital letters was patchy and inconsistent. Candidates would benefit from learning to use a simple possessive (e.g. *das Zimmer <u>von</u> meiner Schwester*). Although verbs are not now assessed separately, the way they are formed and used does influence the Accuracy mark. The mismatch between the subject and the verb (as in *ich gehen, ich hat gespielt*) and the inaccurate formation of the past participle (*gebakt, gegeht*) frequently impeded communication. As mentioned in **3(a) Task 2**, candidates would be able to access the higher descriptor levels if they were able to form and use the most common verbs correctly in the past, present and future tenses. While they no longer need to count the number of verbs used, candidates are advised to ensure they can use a range of verbs as this will increase their mark in all three assessment categories.