

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/11

Listening

General comments

This examination generated a full range of responses: providing a suitable challenge to the most able candidates whilst containing elements accessible to almost all. It is pleasing to note that the majority of candidates showed evidence of good understanding of spoken German. It is only necessary for candidates to demonstrate by their answer that they have understood what is being said, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. Where a written answer to a question is required, the candidates must ensure that they provide a direct answer. It is also essential that candidates make an effort to write legibly and, in the tasks where they are required to tick boxes, to make their intentions clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Task 1 Questions 1 - 8

All material in this section is drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary which is readily available to Centres and candidates.

Most candidates performed well in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. In **Question 2** *Pralinen* was not known by all candidates, nor was *Klavier* in **Question 3**. A few candidates failed to identify D in **Question 7** as *Reitkurs*. *Gegenüber*, the preposition tested in **Question 5**, was widely known.

Task 2 Questions 9 - 15

This task was based on advertising for an open air cinema. The multiple choice answers with visual options proved to be accessible to almost all the candidates, although some had difficulties associating *Anfang September* with 1. September. The two questions requiring a word or figure as an answer were less commonly correct. In **Question 10** an attempt at the superlative *neuesten* was necessary to gain the mark. Some candidates failed to read the full sentence and put *Lieblings* in the gap. In **Question 14** some candidates put the wrong amount of money because they had not read the question sufficiently carefully.

Section 2

All material in this section is also drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary.

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify 6 correct statements from a choice of 12 by listening to four interviews about young people talking about their plans for the future. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements. The incorrect statement most commonly ticked was **(h)**. A very few candidates inserted either too many ticks or only four which meant that they could not obtain full marks.

Task 2, First Part, Questions 17 – 21

Almost all candidates understood that they had to replace the crossed out incorrect word or phrase with a correct one and did not attempt to write out the whole sentence again. *Die Hälfte* in **Question 19** caused candidates the most problems. 50%, 1/2 or *halb* were acceptable answers but this item of vocabulary seemed little known. In **Question 21** quite a few candidates demonstrated their comprehension by inserting *selten*, *manchmal*, or *ab und zu* instead of *Karten* which was the exact replacement.

Task 2, Second Part, Questions 22 – 25

This is the first task where candidates are unsupported in their answers. It is vital that candidates are familiar with the question words and read the questions carefully, as inappropriate information will not be credited. In **Question 23** the Mark Scheme allowed for *Freunden* as well as *Freundin* as the two words sound so similar. In **Question 24** many candidates used their initiative and transcribed what they heard successfully. Some hedged their bets and put both possible answers, even though the question asked for *ein Problem*. This strategy can backfire if the first option is incorrect. Many candidates were not familiar with *angenehmer* in **Question 25** but most gained a mark because they had understood from the context that it was positive and simply wrote *gut* or made a successful attempt to transcribe what they had heard.

Section 3

The vocabulary for the tasks in **Section 3** is drawn from the Defined Content List but the content of the Listening texts may include words that do not appear there.

Task 1 Questions 26 – 31

Although it is a multiple choice task, the complexity of the text in this last section combined with the four option format makes it challenging. The candidate is required to listen for details which are often quite subtle so it was pleasing that many candidates scored well. This year's interview was a food artist explaining his work. Most candidates demonstrated understanding and many obtained at least half marks in this task: **Question 28**, **Question 29** and **Question 30** were the most accessible.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

This final interview was with a girl called Sonja who has an unusual attitude towards holidays. It required detailed understanding to answer the questions satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding those candidates who feel that **Section 3** is beyond their competence and who do not even attempt to provide answers, that they will not be penalized for a wrong answer any more than for a blank line. It is always possible to pick up one or two marks in this section in the factual questions. Again candidates should make sure they are responding to the question. There is generally no need to write in full sentences but at this stage in the examination some detail is usually required.

In **Question 32** there were several options to choose from. Most candidates chose *exotische Insel* as it was the first element in the description of the typical dream holiday.

In **Question 33** *langweilig* was a sufficient answer to gain credit. Some candidates were distracted by *schnell*. Some demonstrated their comprehension by explaining that *Aktivurlaub* was preferable to Sonja.

Zelt seemed less widely known than anticipated in **Question 34**. Many candidates did not hear *keine Lust* and incorrectly opted for *Luxushotels*.

Question 35 and **Question 36a** were generally well answered but **Question 36ii** was challenging for all but the most able candidates: many were confused by hearing two different times and thought that it took Sonja half an hour to get to the beach, despite gaining credit for a correct answer in the previous question.

Again there were two possible answers for **Question 37** but most candidates opted for *gefährlich*. Transcriptions are acceptable as long as they sound or look like the actual word. *Schiffe* was an acceptable alternative but did not seem to be widely known which also caused a problem in **Question 38** as it was a necessary part of the answer.

Most candidates seemed to understand the gist of Sonja's final statement but not all were capable of successfully expressing the notion of homesickness in answer to **Question 39**.

The general standard of comprehension of spoken German and the ability of candidates to respond appropriately in this GCSE examination was pleasing.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/12

Listening

General comments

This examination generated a full range of responses: providing a suitable challenge to the most able candidates whilst containing elements accessible to almost all. It is pleasing to note that the majority of candidates showed evidence of good understanding of spoken German. It is only necessary for candidates to demonstrate by their answer that they have understood what is being said, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. Where a written answer to a question is required, the candidates must ensure that they provide a direct answer. It is also essential that candidates make an effort to write legibly and, in the tasks where they are required to tick boxes, to make their intentions clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Task 1 Questions 1 - 8

All material in this section is drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary which is readily available to Centres and candidates.

Most candidates performed well in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. In **Question 2** *Pralinen* was not known by all candidates, nor was *Klavier* in **Question 3**. A few candidates failed to identify D in **Question 7** as *Reitkurs*. *Gegenüber*, the preposition tested in **Question 5**, was widely known.

Task 2 Questions 9 - 15

This task was based on advertising for an open air cinema. The multiple choice answers with visual options proved to be accessible to almost all the candidates, although some had difficulties associating *Anfang September* with 1. September. The two questions requiring a word or figure as an answer were less commonly correct. In **Question 10** an attempt at the superlative *neuesten* was necessary to gain the mark. Some candidates failed to read the full sentence and put *Lieblings* in the gap. In **Question 14** some candidates put the wrong amount of money because they had not read the question sufficiently carefully.

Section 2

All material in this section is also drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary.

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify 6 correct statements from a choice of 12 by listening to four interviews about young people talking about their plans for the future. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements. The incorrect statement most commonly ticked was **(h)**. A very few candidates inserted either too many ticks or only four which meant that they could not obtain full marks.

Task 2, First Part, Questions 17 – 21

Almost all candidates understood that they had to replace the crossed out incorrect word or phrase with a correct one and did not attempt to write out the whole sentence again. *Die Hälfte* in **Question 19** caused candidates the most problems. 50%, 1/2 or *halb* were acceptable answers but this item of vocabulary seemed little known. In **Question 21** quite a few candidates demonstrated their comprehension by inserting *selten*, *manchmal*, or *ab und zu* instead of *Karten* which was the exact replacement.

Task 2, Second Part, Questions 22 – 25

This is the first task where candidates are unsupported in their answers. It is vital that candidates are familiar with the question words and read the questions carefully, as inappropriate information will not be credited. In **Question 23** the Mark Scheme allowed for *Freunden* as well as *Freundin* as the two words sound so similar. In **Question 24** many candidates used their initiative and transcribed what they heard successfully. Some hedged their bets and put both possible answers, even though the question asked for *ein Problem*. This strategy can backfire if the first option is incorrect. Many candidates were not familiar with *angenehmer* in **Question 25** but most gained a mark because they had understood from the context that it was positive and simply wrote *gut* or made a successful attempt to transcribe what they had heard.

Section 3

The vocabulary for the tasks in **Section 3** is drawn from the Defined Content List but the content of the Listening texts may include words that do not appear there.

Task 1 Questions 26 – 31

Although it is a multiple choice task, the complexity of the text in this last section combined with the four option format makes it challenging. The candidate is required to listen for details which are often quite subtle so it was pleasing that many candidates scored well. This year's interview was a food artist explaining his work. Most candidates demonstrated understanding and many obtained at least half marks in this task: **Question 28**, **Question 29** and **Question 30** were the most accessible.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

This final interview was with a girl called Sonja who has an unusual attitude towards holidays. It required detailed understanding to answer the questions satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding those candidates who feel that **Section 3** is beyond their competence and who do not even attempt to provide answers, that they will not be penalized for a wrong answer any more than for a blank line. It is always possible to pick up one or two marks in this section in the factual questions. Again candidates should make sure they are responding to the question. There is generally no need to write in full sentences but at this stage in the examination some detail is usually required.

In **Question 32** there were several options to choose from. Most candidates chose *exotische Insel* as it was the first element in the description of the typical dream holiday.

In **Question 33** *langweilig* was a sufficient answer to gain credit. Some candidates were distracted by *schnell*. Some demonstrated their comprehension by explaining that *Aktivurlaub* was preferable to Sonja.

Zelt seemed less widely known than anticipated in **Question 34**. Many candidates did not hear *keine Lust* and incorrectly opted for *Luxushotels*.

Question 35 and **Question 36a** were generally well answered but **Question 36ii** was challenging for all but the most able candidates: many were confused by hearing two different times and thought that it took Sonja half an hour to get to the beach, despite gaining credit for a correct answer in the previous question.

Again there were two possible answers for **Question 37** but most candidates opted for *gefährlich*. Transcriptions are acceptable as long as they sound or look like the actual word. *Schiffe* was an acceptable alternative but did not seem to be widely known which also caused a problem in **Question 38** as it was a necessary part of the answer.

Most candidates seemed to understand the gist of Sonja's final statement but not all were capable of successfully expressing the notion of homesickness in answer to **Question 39**.

The general standard of comprehension of spoken German and the ability of candidates to respond appropriately in this GCSE examination was pleasing.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/13

Listening

General comments

This examination generated a full range of responses: providing a suitable challenge to the most able candidates whilst containing elements accessible to almost all. It is pleasing to note that the majority of candidates showed evidence of good understanding of spoken German. It is only necessary for candidates to demonstrate by their answer that they have understood what is being said, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. Where a written answer to a question is required, the candidates must ensure that they provide a direct answer. It is also essential that candidates make an effort to write legibly and, in the tasks where they are required to tick boxes, to make their intentions clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Task 1 Questions 1 - 8

All material in this section is drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary which is readily available to Centres and candidates.

Most candidates performed well in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. In **Question 2** *Pralinen* was not known by all candidates, nor was *Klavier* in **Question 3**. A few candidates failed to identify D in **Question 7** as *Reitkurs*. *Gegenüber*, the preposition tested in **Question 5**, was widely known.

Task 2 Questions 9 - 15

This task was based on advertising for an open air cinema. The multiple choice answers with visual options proved to be accessible to almost all the candidates, although some had difficulties associating *Anfang September* with 1. September. The two questions requiring a word or figure as an answer were less commonly correct. In **Question 10** an attempt at the superlative *neuesten* was necessary to gain the mark. Some candidates failed to read the full sentence and put *Lieblings* in the gap. In **Question 14** some candidates put the wrong amount of money because they had not read the question sufficiently carefully.

Section 2

All material in this section is also drawn from the Defined Content vocabulary.

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify 6 correct statements from a choice of 12 by listening to four interviews about young people talking about their plans for the future. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements. The incorrect statement most commonly ticked was **(h)**. A very few candidates inserted either too many ticks or only four which meant that they could not obtain full marks.

Task 2, First Part, Questions 17 – 21

Almost all candidates understood that they had to replace the crossed out incorrect word or phrase with a correct one and did not attempt to write out the whole sentence again. *Die Hälfte* in **Question 19** caused candidates the most problems. 50%, 1/2 or *halb* were acceptable answers but this item of vocabulary seemed little known. In **Question 21** quite a few candidates demonstrated their comprehension by inserting *selten*, *manchmal*, or *ab und zu* instead of *Karten* which was the exact replacement.

Task 2, Second Part, Questions 22 – 25

This is the first task where candidates are unsupported in their answers. It is vital that candidates are familiar with the question words and read the questions carefully, as inappropriate information will not be credited. In **Question 23** the Mark Scheme allowed for *Freunden* as well as *Freundin* as the two words sound so similar. In **Question 24** many candidates used their initiative and transcribed what they heard successfully. Some hedged their bets and put both possible answers, even though the question asked for *ein Problem*. This strategy can backfire if the first option is incorrect. Many candidates were not familiar with *angenehmer* in **Question 25** but most gained a mark because they had understood from the context that it was positive and simply wrote *gut* or made a successful attempt to transcribe what they had heard.

Section 3

The vocabulary for the tasks in **Section 3** is drawn from the Defined Content List but the content of the Listening texts may include words that do not appear there.

Task 1 Questions 26 – 31

Although it is a multiple choice task, the complexity of the text in this last section combined with the four option format makes it challenging. The candidate is required to listen for details which are often quite subtle so it was pleasing that many candidates scored well. This year's interview was a food artist explaining his work. Most candidates demonstrated understanding and many obtained at least half marks in this task: **Question 28**, **Question 29** and **Question 30** were the most accessible.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

This final interview was with a girl called Sonja who has an unusual attitude towards holidays. It required detailed understanding to answer the questions satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding those candidates who feel that **Section 3** is beyond their competence and who do not even attempt to provide answers, that they will not be penalized for a wrong answer any more than for a blank line. It is always possible to pick up one or two marks in this section in the factual questions. Again candidates should make sure they are responding to the question. There is generally no need to write in full sentences but at this stage in the examination some detail is usually required.

In **Question 32** there were several options to choose from. Most candidates chose *exotische Insel* as it was the first element in the description of the typical dream holiday.

In **Question 33** *langweilig* was a sufficient answer to gain credit. Some candidates were distracted by *schnell*. Some demonstrated their comprehension by explaining that *Aktivurlaub* was preferable to Sonja.

Zelt seemed less widely known than anticipated in **Question 34**. Many candidates did not hear *keine Lust* and incorrectly opted for *Luxushotels*.

Question 35 and **Question 36a** were generally well answered but **Question 36ii** was challenging for all but the most able candidates: many were confused by hearing two different times and thought that it took Sonja half an hour to get to the beach, despite gaining credit for a correct answer in the previous question.

Again there were two possible answers for **Question 37** but most candidates opted for *gefährlich*. Transcriptions are acceptable as long as they sound or look like the actual word. *Schiffe* was an acceptable alternative but did not seem to be widely known which also caused a problem in **Question 38** as it was a necessary part of the answer.

Most candidates seemed to understand the gist of Sonja's final statement but not all were capable of successfully expressing the notion of homesickness in answer to **Question 39**.

The general standard of comprehension of spoken German and the ability of candidates to respond appropriately in this GCSE examination was pleasing.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/21

Reading

Key message:

In **Section 1** the candidate needs to understand simple messages, signs advertisements and a short text all dealing with everyday life.

In **Section 2**, Exercise 1 the candidate needs to demonstrate understanding of a short text, by filling in gaps in five statements about it. The five words are selected from ten, which are provided. In Exercise 2 the candidate is required to locate information in a straightforward passage. Text rephrasing is not required, but the answer should be unambiguous. The topics of these exercises relate to everyday life.

In **Section 3** the candidate is 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. Exercise 1 requires candidates to decide whether statements are true or false and to justify the false ones. In **Section 2** the candidate is required to answer open questions.

General observations:

The Paper was tackled very well by the candidature, and few difficulties were encountered.

Question 1-5

Most candidates performed very well on these early questions.

Question 6-10

Candidates generally had no problems at all with this second exercise, and scored full marks.

Question 11-15

This third exercise generally did not cause many problems to candidates.

Question 16-20

These were done very well on the whole. Some candidates invented new words, not on the list, to fill the gaps. Closer reading of the rubric is recommended.

Question 21-29

This element of the **ZweiterTeil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner.

Question 26: Some candidates lifted the sentence from the text referring to the mother running to the door, presumably because they misread *Was machten sie...?* as *Was machte sie...?*

Question 30-34

Candidates tackled this exercise very well, and had little difficulty in correcting the false statements.

Question 35-40

There were some very good responses to questions in this exercise. Candidates seemed well aware that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/22

Reading

Key message:

In **Section 1** the candidate needs to understand simple messages, signs advertisements and a short text all dealing with everyday life.

In **Section 2**, Exercise 1 the candidate needs to demonstrate understanding of a short text, by filling in gaps in five statements about it. The five words are selected from ten, which are provided. In Exercise 2 the candidate is required to locate information in a straightforward passage. Text rephrasing is not required, but the answer should be unambiguous. The topics of these exercises relate to everyday life.

In **Section 3** the candidate is 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. Exercise 1 requires candidates to decide whether statements are true or false and to justify the false ones. In **Section 2** the candidate is required to answer open questions.

General observations:

The Paper was tackled very well by many of the candidates. In some cases poor handwriting and crossing out made the tasks difficult to read and candidates should be aware that this may be to their disadvantage.

Question 1-5

Most candidates performed very well on these early questions.

Those who did not recognise *Pferde* often chose **A**, birds or **C**, the rabbits in **Question 3**.

Question 6-10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many scored full marks. **Question 7** was sometimes wrong. For *Erdkunde* less able candidates often chose **C**, art/painting.

Question 7: It may be that *stolz* and *froh* were not well known, as a notable number of candidates selected the wrong answer **B**.

Question 11-15

This third exercise generally did not cause many problems to candidates.

Question 16-20

These were either done very well or poorly. In the case of the latter, candidates seemed to select words randomly, so that the sentences were both grammatically and factually incorrect. Some candidates invented new words, not on the list, to fill the gaps. For **Question 17** *nur* was often given, and **Question 19** *geöffnet*, probably because they were used in the text.

Question 21-30

This element of the **ZweiterTeil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner. **Question 23** was answered appropriately by almost all candidates. Those who failed to score for this **Question** did not seem to understand *Seit wann*, as their answers had nothing to do with the length of time or date.

Question 26: Candidates often answered why rather than who, e.g. some wrote *sie ist nicht sehr sportlich* without even mentioning the mother.

Question 28: Some replied that Hannah would wear her leather jacket and boots to school.

Question 31-35

As in previous years, a very few candidates seemed to take a statistical gamble and ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all 'Nein'. When providing corrections to the incorrect assertions, some candidates were not attentive to the rubric and the need to avoid the use of *nicht* in their answers. Candidates occasionally disadvantaged themselves by invalidating their answers with extraneous information from the passage which ended up appearing to give an impression of alternative answers or else lifted, so that the answer did not make sense. A number of candidates said that both **Questions 31** and **34** were false.

Candidates who had correctly identified the false statements sometimes gave justifications, which were incomplete.

Question 32Ju: Often too much information was given, thereby invalidating the answer.

Question 35 Ju: Often too little information was given, or *werden* used without a Past Participle, or *kostenlos verkauft*, which made no sense.

Question 36-42

Although there were many good responses to questions in this exercise, some candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the interrogative, so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates often gave the wrong information, i.e. facts which were in the text but did not answer the question, suggesting they had not really understood the question words or had not focused on them. Some copied out chunks of the text regardless; candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

Question 36: some candidates did not supply *Österreich*, but instead lifted *in einem österreichischen Hotel*. This was not credited, and candidates are advised to look at questions more closely. Some erroneously answered *Russland* or *Andernach*.

Question 37: Some candidates said that Lisa worked *mit einer/ihrer Freundin*, which was not accepted as a correct response.

Question 38: Some candidates said what she did rather than why she enjoyed the work. The most frequent wrong answer was, *Sie waren für alle Zimmer im ersten Stock verantwortlich*.

Question 39: This question discriminated well between stronger and weaker candidates. The answer was frequently wrong, with the opposite answer given: *dann mussten sie die Bettwäsche wechseln, und das mochte Lisa überhaupt nicht*.

Question 40: In their responses a significant number of candidates used the pronoun *sie* instead of identifying *die Chefin* when stating who was not satisfied with the standard of work.

Question 41: Candidates often supplied answers which stated when Lisa felt alone or what she did when she felt alone, rather than the reason for feeling alone. This suggested that they may not have understood *Aus welchem Grund*.

Question 42: Often the last two sentences were copied out verbatim, rather than trying to work out the answer.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/23

Reading

Key message:

In **Section 1** the candidate needs to understand simple messages, signs advertisements and a short text all dealing with everyday life.

In **Section 2**, Exercise 1 the candidate needs to demonstrate understanding of a short text, by filling in gaps in five statements about it. The five words are selected from ten, which are provided.

In Exercise 2 the candidate is required to locate information in a straightforward passage. Text rephrasing is not required, but the answer should be unambiguous. The topics of these exercises relate to everyday life.

In **Section 3** the candidate is 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. Exercise 1 requires candidates to decide whether statements are true or false and to justify the false ones. In **Section 2** the candidate is required to answer open questions.

General observations:

The paper was tackled very well by many of the candidates. In some cases poor handwriting and crossing out made the tasks difficult to read and candidates should be aware that this may be to their disadvantage.

Question

Question 1-5

Most candidates performed very well on these early questions.

Question 6-10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and most scored full marks. This third exercise generally did not cause many problems to candidates.

Question 11-15

Question 13: A few candidates selected **C** *ziemlich interessant*.

Question 15: Some candidates misunderstood and selected **A**, seemingly believing that Maria was going to stay in a hotel.

Question 16-20

These were either done very well or poorly. In the case of the latter, candidates seemed to select words randomly, so that the sentences were both grammatically and factually incorrect. A few candidates invented new words, not on the list, to fill the gaps. For **Question 16** *Karneval* was often chosen.

Question 21-29

This element of **Zweiter Teil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner.

Question 27 was answered appropriately by the majority of candidates. Those who failed to score for this merely stated that it was expensive without any mention of the parents or that it was expensive to buy new clothes for such a large family.

Question 30-34

As in previous years, a very few candidates seemed to take a statistical gamble and ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all 'Nein'. When providing corrections to the incorrect assertions, some candidates were not attentive to the rubric and the need to avoid the use of *nicht* in their answers. Candidates occasionally disadvantaged themselves by invalidating their answers with extraneous information from the passage which ended up appearing to give an impression of alternative answers or else lifted, so that the answer did not make sense.

Question 32 Ju: Some candidates lifted from the text and wrote about Peter wanting to listen to the weather forecast, which was not a justification of the statement given. Candidates are advised to read texts and **Questions** more closely. Often too much information was given, thereby invalidating the answer.

Question 33 Ju: Some candidates did not recognise this as a false statement. Some who did, wrote that the receptionist gave the couple Room 252. It may be that some candidates did not understand *Erfahrung*.

Question 34 Ju: The majority of candidates answered appropriately.

Question 36-39

Although there were many good responses to questions in this exercise, some candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the question, in particular the interrogative, so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates often gave the wrong information, i.e. facts which were in the text but did not answer the question, suggesting they had not really understood the question words or had not focused on them. Some copied out chunks of the text regardless; candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

Question 35: Very few candidates answered appropriately. Rather than explaining, as the question demands, what Sandra wanted to find out, they wrote that the object of the survey was simply to find out which leisure pursuits older people enjoy. Some lifted the last sentence of the paragraph perhaps believing that they had to describe how the class carried out the survey.

Question 36: some candidates mentioned one or two activities from the text rather than explaining that the people had a lot of hobbies.

Question 37: This posed no problems, and was appropriately answered.

Question 38: Some candidates lifted from the text and wrote *Ohne Handy auszugehen, wäre für mich undenkbar*. Others lifted the question at the end of the paragraph, whilst others copied out both of these. None of these were acceptable responses.

Question 39: Most candidates wrote correctly that being with friends is important. Some mentioned using sites such as Facebook. One or two mentioned having a mobile phone. However, a number wrote that being fit is important. Whilst this is indisputable, candidates were asked to refer to examples in the text, and this is only mentioned in respect of older people. There is no mention in the text of fitness being important for younger people. Again, candidates are advised to study the questions more closely.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/03
Speaking

General Comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for 1 March – April 2015.

It was a pleasure to moderate the work of candidates from around the world and to listen to the many outstanding performances. The general standard was comparable to that heard in previous years with the inevitable wide range of performances.

Centres generally conducted the Speaking Test very professionally and most Examiners had prepared themselves thoroughly before the examination. A high number of Centres must be congratulated on their accurate application of the assessment criteria and excellent administration. However there are still a small number of Examiners, who do not seem to have prepared themselves carefully and in the Role Play situations this resulted in the candidates not being fully able to demonstrate their ability. It is also essential that thorough preparation for the Topic and General Conversation sections takes place so that candidates can produce their best under examination conditions. Examiners must ensure that they ask appropriate questions enabling candidates to use the full range of time frames (present, past and future time) in BOTH conversations as otherwise marks in Table C (Language) will be limited. Examiners also need to ask questions which allow the candidates to produce well-developed answers showing they can competently handle a variety of complex structures and use varied vocabulary.

Similarly, it is important that the conversation sections are kept to the timings as set out in the Teachers' Notes. Candidates whose Topic or General conversation is significantly shortened cannot be awarded full marks, if they do not have enough time to demonstrate a wide range of language structures and do themselves justice. Quite a few Examiners still do not appear to use a stopwatch or alarm to guide them with timings and there remain many tests, which are simply far too short or alternatively longer than the recommended times.

Centres also need reminding that the Topic Conversation and General Conversation are assessed separately and it is therefore vital that Examiners make a distinction between the two conversation sections. Sometimes again this year it was one lengthy conversation which makes it difficult to award marks appropriately for the two different sections.

Most Centres sent the appropriate sample size for the Centre (outlined on page 4 of the **Teachers' Notes**) with clear recordings on CDs or USB sticks with recorded files. A few recordings remain of a poor quality with distracting traffic noise or other extraneous noises which must make it difficult for the candidates to concentrate. Centres must make sure that recordings are always clearly audible. MS1 copies and Working Mark Sheets for all candidates should be sent to the Moderator with the recordings, but some Centres failed to do this. The cover sheet was also not always included. It is very helpful if centres provide a list of the candidates included in the sample. Occasionally centres sent the complete set of recordings of all candidates, rather than a sample, as is instructed on p 4. Where centres had requested permission from the Board to use more than one Examiner to conduct and assess the Speaking examination for their candidates, extensive and helpful notes on **Internal Moderation** (as detailed on p7 of the notes) were usually submitted.

Administrative work in centres was generally good again this year, but clerical errors of addition on the working mark sheets (WMS) still occur far too often. Most centres had however completed a signed cover sheet, stating that these additions and transfers had been checked at the centre and were correct. In order to avoid such clerical errors in the future, we recommend using the electronic version of the Working Mark Sheet which adds up the marks automatically and may be downloaded from www.cie.org.uk/samples.

The mark scheme was generally applied fairly consistently and the order of merit within the Centre was usually accurate. Nevertheless scaling of some Centres was necessary and these were often the result of lack of tenses in the conversation sections or failure to complete Role Play tasks adequately. While centres

which were over generous in their marking were in the majority, quite a number of centres assessed too severely. Some were generous over part of the mark range and severe over other parts.

Comments on Specific Questions

Role Plays

Overall the Role Plays were completed well by most candidates. Many candidates made extremely good efforts with them, and almost all candidates managed to attempt at least some of the tasks; there were very few who struggled to find some answers.

Overall this year, Examiners seemed to have prepared the Role Plays well and there were fewer examples of Examiners failing to conduct them properly (e.g. by creating their own additional tasks within the Role Play and hence confusing the candidates, or in a few cases missing out entire tasks). Yet there were still some Examiners who did not prompt candidates to attempt tasks again if their responses were ambiguous. Another common problem with the Role Plays was where candidates missed out one of the two elements in a task. This was often as a result of Examiners failing to insist on both elements of a task being completed by a candidate. In Role Play B, the lack of **reaction** demanded of the candidate was however less apparent than in previous years, showing that the candidates had generally been well trained by their teachers. A few teachers however still do not pause to allow a reaction.

Examiners are again reminded that they should adhere to the rubrics and printed stimuli of the Role Plays and not attempt to add to or extend the set tasks, nor develop them into mini-conversations. Equally importantly, Examiners should be wary of feeding information to the candidates by giving them a choice of vocabulary, which cannot then be credited. Full guidance is given on p8 of the booklet, under **Structure of the Examination: Role Plays**.

Some Centres marked the Role Plays too leniently; candidates can only be awarded 3 marks for a correct and appropriate answer, if any errors are only minor. Candidates are not required to use full sentences but if a verb is used, it must be correct for 3 marks. When the answer is clear but it contains a major error, candidates can be awarded 2 marks. If an inappropriate register is used the maximum mark is 2, but the candidates are only penalized once in the whole Role Play. When the answer is ambiguous or only addresses part of the task, 1 mark should be awarded.

Role Plays A

Page 16, A1, 2, 3

Most candidates performed well as the situation was quite straightforward but some struggled with the pronunciation of 'Stadtrundgang'. Surprisingly in the final task quite a few candidates were unable to manipulate the phrase into a question.

Page 17, A4, 5, 6

This Role Play was generally unproblematic for candidates and the tasks were well attempted.

Page 18, A7, 8, 9

The information required was also straightforward and candidates had no major problems successfully achieving the task of communication.

Role Plays B

These tasks require the ability to use a range of time frames, to give explanations and justifications, and a **reaction**. It is expected that candidates are aware of the *Sie* form of address. It is quite acceptable for the two-part task to be split by the Examiner.

Page 19, B1, 4, 7

For many candidates this task was quite straightforward although a few struggled with the contextualization of this role play. In particular some struggled to complete the first task successfully, often getting into difficulties with *'anrufen'*. Similarly, K5 posed problems for some candidates and they failed to ask about the family's holiday, often confusing *'schon'* and *'schön'*.

Page 20, B2, 5, 8

Most candidates coped well with this scenario although the pronunciation of *'Ski'* was a problem for a number of Examiners as well as candidates! For L2 the candidates sometimes did not understand *'seit wann'* and gave an inappropriate time frame or did not use *'seit'* in their answer. Some also failed to understand *'Waren Sie schon einmal in Österreich?'* and as always, too many lost marks by saying *'kostas'* or similar in K5.

Page 21, B3, 6, 9

This Role Play was generally well answered although quite a few candidates struggled with K5 and many candidates and even some Examiners, had difficulties with the *'du/Sie'* issue.

Topic Presentation/Conversation

Candidates from many centres did this well and there was a good variety of interesting and imaginative topics at most centres. As usual some candidates were over prepared and so could recite their presentations far too quickly. Examiners are reminded to intervene if the candidate is obviously struggling. Most centres adhered to the recommended timing for the Topic presentation but some Examiners failed to stop the candidates if they continued well beyond 2 minutes. The Topic Conversation that followed was then sometimes too short with the Examiner attempting to keep within the nominal 5 minutes for this section.

When preparing their candidates, Examiners should attach more importance to the Topic Conversation as the main assessment depends on this, in terms of their comprehension of the Examiner, the immediacy of their response and the successful transmission of messages.

Presentations were usually well discussed in the conversation with the Examiner showing real interest in the candidate's presentation. There were, however, still some Examiners who asked candidates questions which had been covered in the presentation and struggled to ask questions that enabled candidates to express themselves in good German. Regrettably, as has already been said in the General Comments section, too frequently Examiners omitted to ask questions in either or both past and future tenses and this severely disadvantaged their candidates; many deserving marks well above 6 for Language were limited to the 'weak' band, amongst them some native and near native speakers. Marks of above 6 can only be awarded by Examiners when there were correct past and future tenses.

However, many Examiners and candidates must be congratulated on doing an excellent job; they produce a natural and not too over-rehearsed presentation and subsequent discussion, with spontaneous exchanges in a variety of time frames and a full range of vocabulary and structure.

General Conversation

Many conversations were a pleasure to listen to and candidates were clearly aware that they should develop their answers with plenty of opinions. Most Examiners guided the candidates well to display their language skills. As with the Topic Conversation there was however a significant number of Examiners who omitted to ask questions in either or both past and future tenses and as a result candidates were not given the chance to show their full ability. Examiners also should not wait until the end of the conversation to ask the only future/past question, as this does not give the candidates enough opportunity to prove they can respond accurately.

Most centres followed the CIE recommendation to examine 2 or 3 topics in depth but a minority of Examiners still seemed ill-prepared and covered too many topics rather superficially.

The use of 'closed questions' by Examiners is occasionally a problem as it offers candidates little opportunity to speak at length, producing as full a response as is possible, in order to qualify for the marks in the higher bands in this part of the test.

General Impression

The impression mark was generally well awarded by the majority of Examiners, although occasionally the award of a particular mark seemed rather random, particularly in small Centres of one or two candidates.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/41

Writing

Key Messages

Candidates should be reminded to read each question carefully and to respond to the exact questions being asked, rather than responding simply to the topic being covered by a particular question. Failure to address the specifics of the question will result in vital Communication points not being achieved. In this session some of the most able and fluent candidates needlessly lost communication marks in this way. As well as covering all aspects in each question, candidates need to ensure that they are answering each part in the appropriate time frame. This is essential for both Communication and Language. Candidates should read the question carefully to check the time frame that is required. It is worth noting that **Question 3** will often require the use of past, present and future time frames in different subheadings.

General Comments

In this session many candidates produced answers using German of a high standard and demonstrating a clear knowledge of the language and an excellent understanding of the complexities of German grammar. Many Centres had prepared their candidates well for the new format of the exam and were clearly aware of the demands of the new mark scheme. This was evident, for example, from the many candidates striving to make use of a good range of different verbs in **Question 3**.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of eight clothes items which they like (and might buy). They could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary for five clothes items. Candidates managed this task with ease, even writing all eight clothes items correctly. If candidates wrote the clothes items in their plural forms, this could be accepted. However, vocabulary from the example, in this case 'Krawatte', could not be credited. Weaker candidates benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items are accepted, despite poor spelling. However, Centres should be reminded that the pictures are intended to act as prompts, rather than being prescriptive. Candidates may sometimes think they have to list the specific items in the pictures and could lose marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items that they know.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer four questions about their family. It was marked for a maximum of ten Communication marks and five marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme. All candidates attempted the question and were able to gain a good number of marks. Centres should note, however, that in order to gain all ten Communication marks, candidates should be sure to cover all four Communication points.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say how many people were in their family and whether they had any pets. There were good answers, with detail. General statements about family were not able to gain the marks because they failed to refer to the specifics of the candidate's own family.
- (b) Candidates were asked to say how they get on with their family. Candidates gave clear opinions with specific reasons and were awarded well.

- (c) Candidates were asked what they do with their family in the evening. Candidates were familiar with the language required to talk about evening activities and answered well, giving information about the activities they do, where/when/with whom, etc. Able candidates demonstrated their ability to manipulate verbs and some also gave description about the activities. Mere reference to activities that others do was not accepted by the mark scheme; the candidate had to include himself/herself, e.g. with the use of *wir*.
- (d) Candidates were asked to say what they would like to do with their family next weekend, and to give reasons for their choice. Candidates were successful in conveying this message, with some clear references to next weekend and activity choices supported by clear reasons.

In **Question 2**, candidates generally scored well on the Language, most scoring four or five out of five on the banded mark scheme.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a visit to the restaurant yesterday evening.

Part (a)

This question required candidates to explain whether they like going to the restaurant and why. Candidates omitting to address this task and launching straight into an account of yesterday's visit could not gain the marks. This question was asking for a general opinion and reason. Hence, for both Communication ticks to be achieved, this task required a general answer in the present tense. Candidates should look carefully at the specific question asked and ensure that they give a clear answer to that particular question. For example:

Q: Sagen Sie, ob Sie gern im Restaurant essen und warum
A: Ich esse (nicht) gern im Restaurant, weil...

Part (b)

This question asked why the candidate had gone to the restaurant yesterday. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks. If a candidate wrote in the present tense, as if they were still in the restaurant, they could not achieve the mark. Candidates generally answered well, e.g. giving a birthday celebration as the reason. Those who did not give a reason and went straight to Part (c) could not gain the marks. Again, candidates should be reminded to give a specific answer to each part question. For example:

Q: Erklären Sie, warum Sie gestern ins Restaurant gegangen sind
A: Ich bin/wir sind gestern ins Restaurant gegangen, weil...

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered in the restaurant. Candidates addressed this task successfully, with detailed accounts of what went wrong/what problems there were, etc. Answers referred to table not being reserved/lack of food on the menu/unpleasant food/length of waiting time, etc. This question was again asked in the past tense and the answer therefore required a past time frame for both Communication ticks to be awarded.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say how they planned to celebrate their birthday next year and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Candidates answered well. Candidates should take care with the use of *ich möchte* which, if inaccurate, renders answers ambiguous and prevents both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) No candidates chose this option, so the question cannot be commented on.

- (c) Candidates were required to write an account about meeting an old friend, whilst on holiday last year. The topic of holidays is a popular one amongst candidates and this question was appealing in its subject matter.

Part (a)

The question required candidates to explain where/how he/she saw their old friend. Holiday scenarios were relatively straightforward to describe and use of the past time frame was usually successful here.

Part (b)

This question asked what the candidate did with his old friend, after meeting him/her. Activities were frequently well-expressed, with accurate use of a past time frame, allowing both Communication ticks. If a candidate wrote in the present tense, describing current activities, then he/she could not gain both Communication ticks. Candidates should take care over the use of the nouns *Freund/Freundin* and be sure to choose the appropriate noun with the appropriate pronouns *er/sie*, etc.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what their parents thought of their old friend and why. Both present and past time frames were accepted here. Candidates who were successful in this task resisted the temptation simply to give their own opinion of their friend and referred specifically to their parents' opinions. Reasons can sometimes be complex to explain and candidates are advised to communicate in language with which they are familiar and at an appropriate level for their linguistic capabilities, in order to have the greatest chance of achieving the highest scores.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe their plans for their holiday next year. The answer therefore required a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Candidates answered well with interesting references to where they might go/what they might do, etc. Most included accurate future references.

Language

Many candidates have an excellent command of the German language, as evidenced by fluent, accurate responses using a wide range of language structures. Others struggle with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. Generally, candidates provided good examples of future tenses, including the use of modal verbs and infinitives. Candidates tend to have more trouble with past tenses, especially with the use of *sein* as an auxiliary. Modal verbs can pose problems in the past tense. Nouns (both genders and cases) present difficulties for many and, as a result, even some very able candidates can lose out on their Verb mark. Candidates should be reminded that only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a Verb tick. For example: '**Das Wetter war nicht gut. Das Restaurant war groß. Das Essen war kalt.**', etc. would gain more Verb ticks if phrased differently, using a range of different verbs, e.g.: '**Es regnete. Das Restaurant hatte viel Platz. Es gab kein warmes Essen.**'. Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded mark scheme. Again, there were many candidates scoring very highly here with some excellent language used. Candidates should be sure to take care over their spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Errors in capitalisation can have a significant effect on the marks awarded in OLF. Similarly, candidates should take care over their handwriting, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/42

Writing

Key Messages

Candidates should be reminded to read each question carefully and to respond to the exact questions being asked, rather than responding simply to the topic being covered by a particular question. Failure to address the specifics of the question will result in vital Communication points not being achieved. In this session some of the most able and fluent candidates needlessly lost communication marks in this way. As well as covering all aspects in each question, candidates need to ensure that they are answering each part in the appropriate time frame. This is essential for both Communication and Language. Candidates should read the question carefully to check the time frame that is required. It is worth noting that **Question 3** will often require the use of past, present and future time frames in different subheadings.

General Comments

In this session many candidates produced answers using German of a high standard and demonstrating a clear knowledge of the language and an excellent understanding of the complexities of German grammar. Many centres had prepared their candidates well for the new format of the exam and were clearly aware of the demands of the new mark scheme. This was evident, for example, from the many candidates striving to make use of a good range of different verbs in **Question 3**.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of eight pets which they like (and might buy). They could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary for five animals. Most candidates managed this task with ease and many wrote all eight animals correctly. Some candidates wrote the animals in their plural forms, but this was accepted. Some candidates used the vocabulary from the example, in this case '*Meerschweinchen*', and this could not be credited. Weaker candidates benefitted from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items were accepted, despite poor spelling. There were many different animals listed, including some rather unusual pets (e.g. *Elefant*).

However, centres should be reminded that the pictures are intended to act as prompts, rather than being prescriptive. Some candidates seemed to think they had to list the specific animals in the pictures and probably lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items that they knew.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer four questions about their house/flat and where they live. It was marked for a maximum of ten Communication marks and five marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question and most were able to gain a decent number of marks. However, centres should note that in order to gain all ten Communication marks, candidates should be sure to cover all four Communication points.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say where they live and what their house/flat was like. There were many good answers, with detail. Although the question was primarily focussed on the candidate's home, some candidates were tempted to write in length about their town/local area and did not address

the details of their house/flat. This is an example of where candidates need to take care to read the particulars of each question, rather than writing generally on a given topic area.

- (b) Candidates were asked to say what they found good or bad about their house/flat. Many candidates gave clear opinions with specific reasons. Others made general comments about liking/disliking where they live and were not able to gain the marks because they failed to refer to the specifics.
- (c) Candidates were asked how they help at home. Most candidates were familiar with the language required to talk about jobs which they do in the home and many answered well and at length, giving information about the tasks they do, where/when/with whom, etc. More able candidates demonstrated their ability to manipulate separable verbs by referring to washing up, drying up and tidying. Some also gave description about the activities. Descriptions were accepted but any opinions on the household tasks did not gain the marks; it was the tasks themselves (rather than opinions on them) which were being asked about in this question.
- (d) Candidates were asked to say what sort of house/flat they would like to have in the future and to give reasons for their choice. Though many were successful in conveying this message, this was also the part which was most often left out by candidates, meaning that they could achieve a maximum of nine out of ten Communication points. Others failed to gain the marks because they referred only to items they would like to have in their home/garden (e.g. television, swimming pool, etc.), without saying what sort of home they would like. Often they were referring to their current home rather than a future home but the time frame required here was a future one. Some candidates referred merely to the country/town/(island!) they would like to live in/on. Marks were awarded to a description of future place, only if the specifics of a future house/flat were included.

In **Question 2**, most candidates scored well on the Language, with the majority scoring four or five out of five. Very few scored below three. Examples of language presenting frequent difficulties for candidates included use of the verbs *helfen* and *kochen* and the noun *die Küche*. Use of *ich möchte* was often incorrect, with candidates frequently omitting the umlaut. Some candidates had difficulties with the future reference in part (d).

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a visit to a hotel last month. Out of the three choices for **Question 3**, this option was by far the most popular amongst candidates, probably due to the topic being on holidays, a favourite topic amongst candidates and one which many were clearly well-prepared for. However, unfortunately many candidates wrote an essay about a past holiday, without taking care to cover each of the particular questions asked here. As a result there were many candidates, some of whom were clearly very able, who did not cover the specific material being asked for and, as a result, could not achieve full Communication marks.

Part (a)

This question required candidates to explain whether they like going on holiday and why. Unfortunately many candidates omitted to address this task and launched straight into an account of a past holiday. Others referred to why they liked going on their last holiday. However, this question was asking for a general opinion and reason about holidays. Hence, for both Communication ticks to be achieved, this task required a general answer in the present tense. Candidates should look carefully at the specific question asked and ensure that they give a clear answer to that particular question. For example:

Q: *Sagen Sie, ob Sie gern in den Urlaub fahren und warum*

A: *Ich fahre (nicht) gern in den Urlaub, weil...*

Part (b)

This question asked what the candidate had done in the hotel. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks but unfortunately some candidates wrote in the present tense, as if they were still in the hotel (and despite the rubric making clear that the visit was last month). Although many candidates answered well, there were many others who did not refer to what they had done specifically in the hotel, describing instead what activities they had done in town/at the museum,

etc. Others omitted to address the task entirely and went straight to part (c). Again, candidates should be reminded to give a specific answer to each part question. For example:

Q: Erzählen Sie, was Sie in diesem Hotel gemacht haben

A: Jeden Abend habe ich mit meiner Familie im Hotel ferngesehen.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered in the hotel. Most candidates addressed this task and many did so very well, giving detailed accounts of what went wrong/what problems there were, etc. Answers usually referred to broken beds/showers not working/unpleasant food/impolite staff, etc. This question was again asked in the past tense and the answer therefore required a past time frame for both Communication ticks to be awarded.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say where they planned to spend their next holiday and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Many candidates answered well. However, the verb *verbringen* was misunderstood by many candidates as meaning 'to bring' rather than 'to spend' and, as a result, a significant number of candidates described what they would bring on their next holiday, rather than where they would go. The candidates' use of *ich möchte* was also frequently inaccurate, rendering many answers ambiguous and preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine about their part-time job. Out of the three choices for **Question 3**, this option was the second most popular amongst candidates and was often well answered, with a variety of interesting and detailed responses.

Part (a)

This question required candidates to explain why they find it important to have a part-time job. Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates failed to address this task and instead began with a description of their job. This question was asking for a specific reason for their opinion (their job being important). Hence for both Communication ticks to be achieved, the answer had to be expressed in the present tense. Candidates should look carefully at the specific question asked and ensure that they give a clear answer to that particular question. For example:

Q: Erklären Sie, warum es für Sie so wichtig ist, einen Teilzeitjob zu haben

A: Ich finde es wichtig einen Teilzeitjob zu haben, weil...

Part (b)

This question asked what the candidate had done at work last week. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded in each point. Although many candidates answered well, a significant number described only one activity they had done. The question was looking for a more detailed account with two Communication points (four ticks) available, so those who limited themselves to one past activity were only able to cover one of the two Communication points. Candidates should be reminded to use a range of verbs where possible and to give detailed information.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to say what their friend thinks of his (or her) own part-time job. Candidates who read the question properly were usually able to provide a good answer, often adding reasons and explanation to the opinion. However, many candidates did not read it carefully enough and a significant proportion of responses included the friend's opinion of the candidate's job. Words for 'friend' also presented difficulty for the less able candidates, many of whom were unsure of the number or gender of their friends, and frequently associated the wrong possessive pronouns with them, producing phrases such as '*Meine Freund sagen, daß ihr Job...*'

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say what sort of career they would like to have in the future and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Most candidates were able to refer to a job they would like to do in the future and there were some clear responses to the task. However, vocabulary for jobs, and particularly the accurate use of the verb *werden*, posed problems for many candidates. Some candidates even resorted to using the verb *bekommen* when they should have used *werden*. This rendered their answers confusing or meaningless. Again, the candidates' use of *ich möchte* was also frequently inaccurate.

- (c) Candidates were required to write an account about a new head teacher coming to their school. Out of the three choices for **Question 3**, this option was the least popular amongst candidates. However, those candidates who chose to answer this question were usually very successful in their responses. There were fewer problems on this question with misinterpretations of the rubric. Perhaps because the subject matter was slightly less familiar than in the other options, candidates read the questions more carefully and answered them more accurately.

Part (a)

The question required candidates to explain why a new head teacher had come to the school. There were some excellent answers, with many and varied explanations for the departure of the previous head teacher. These were frequently either amusing or tragic. Use of the past time frame was usually successful here. There was some confusion over the gender of the head teacher and the use of the noun *Direktorin*. This sometimes resulted in candidates failing to achieve two Communication ticks for a given Communication point.

Part (b)

This question asked what the head teacher had already done in the school. The achievements of the new head teacher were frequently well-expressed, with accurate use of a past time frame, allowing both Communication ticks. However, some candidates wrote in the present tense, describing the current state of the school (e.g. new buildings, cleaner canteen, better food, etc.) but without stating what the head teacher herself had actually done to achieve this. Others failed to address this question and went straight to part (c). Candidates should be reminded to give a specific answer to each part question. For example:

Q: *Erzählen Sie, was die neue Direktorin schon gemacht hat*

A: *Die neue Direktorin hat schon...*

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what their classmates thought of their new head teacher and why. Both present and past time frames were accepted here. However, these were the Communication points which presented the most difficulties to students tackling this question. Candidates who were successful in this task resisted the temptation simply to give their own verdict on the new headmistress and referred specifically to their friends or used *wir*. However, some referred simply to their own opinions without mentioning the opinions of their classmates. Others attempted to explain the reasons for their friends' opinions but did not have the language at their disposal for the complex reasons they wished to convey. Candidates are advised to communicate in language with which they are familiar and at an appropriate level for their linguistic capabilities, in order to have the greatest chance of achieving the highest scores.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say what the head teacher should do next year to improve their school. The answer therefore required a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Many candidates answered well with ideas for future improvements almost always including an accurate future reference, often using a modal verb, and displaying a range of interesting ideas. However, some candidates were confused in their use of modal verbs, confusing *soll/sollte* with *will*.

Language

Many candidates have an excellent command of the German language, as evidenced by fluent, accurate responses using a wide range of language structures. Others struggle with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. Generally, candidates provided good examples of future tenses, including the use of modal verbs and infinitives. They had more trouble with past tenses, however, especially with the use of *sein* as an auxiliary. Modal verbs also posed problems in the past tense, with few candidates able to differentiate between *mochte* and *möchte*, *konnte* and *könnte* or *wurde*, *würde* and *werde*. Some specific verbs presented particular difficulties, for example many candidates needed to distinguish the difference between the verbs *Spaß haben* and *Spaß machen*. Nouns (both genders and cases) presented difficulties for many and, as a result, even some very able candidates lost out on their Verb mark. For example in **Question 3(a)**, many candidates would have gained more verb ticks, had they known/used the correct genders for *Urlaub* and *Zimmer*. An alarming number of students tried to use accusative nouns as nominatives, often because they had taken them directly from the rubric, for example in **Question 3(b)**: '*einen Teilzeitjob ist wichtig, weil*'. A number of able candidates would clearly have been capable of reaching full marks on verbs, but were prevented from doing so simply because they failed to use enough of a range of different verbs. Candidates should be reminded that only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a Verb tick. For example: "**Das Wetter war nicht gut. Das Hotel war groß. Das Wasser war kalt.**", etc, would gain more Verb ticks if phrased differently, using a range of different verbs, eg: "**Es regnete. Das Hotel hatte viele Zimmer. Es gab kein heißes Wasser.**". Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded mark scheme. Again, there were many candidates scoring very highly here with some excellent language used, for example: *um...zu...*, *weder...noch...*, the use of relative clauses, comparatives, some impressive conditional sentences ('*wenn ich reich wäre, würde ich...*'), etc. Candidates do need to be reminded about word order, for example after *weil* and other similar conjunctions which send the verb to the end of the clause (though, in fact, there was often too much use of *weil* and it would be good to see a wider range of conjunctions being used), the use/position of the infinitive after modal verb, etc. Many candidates seemed unaware of the difference between *das* and *dass* and even between *gibt* and *sind*. The words *Fernsehen/Fernseher/fern/sehen* were often used interchangeably. More able candidates attempted to use multiple adjectives with nouns, but fell down on their adjectival endings, producing phrases such as *viele anderen Sportarten*. It is worth pointing out that quality should take precedence over quantity. Some candidates wrote very long essays, where length in the end became counterproductive, and a shorter, more accurate and better structured version could have earned more marks in OLF. Repetition also became an issue, particularly in the longer essays, with some candidates repeating structures such as *...ist, es gibt, ich liebe, etc.* Candidates should be sure to take care over their spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Errors in capitalisation can have a significant effect on the marks awarded in OLF. Similarly, candidates should take care over their handwriting, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/43

Writing

Key Messages

Candidates need to remember at all times that it is essential to read the questions carefully and to respond to all parts of the questions as fully as possible. It is very unfortunate to see a lengthy response, containing good German, which does not score well as it does not fully answer the question.

General Comments

It was impressive to see the high level of German illustrated by many candidates, including a clear knowledge of German grammar and structures. Nearly all candidates were able to attempt all the questions required, with, as is to be expected, varying degrees of success. Some candidates were able to write in an extremely confident manner showing a firm grasp of, and feeling for, the language.

Verbs pose a great difficulty for many candidates. It is very important to use verbs in an appropriate tense e.g.: if the question asks where the candidate went on holiday, it is not appropriate to answer in the present tense. This affects both Communication and Language marks and candidates should therefore be trained to look out for the time frame in which the question is phrased, which will indicate which tense is required in the candidate's answer. Essay questions (i.e. **Question 3**) will require the use of past, present and future time frames in different questions.

Repetition of verbs is also to be avoided, where possible, as only the first instance will gain a Language mark for example: "*Das Wetter war nicht gut. Das Hotel war gross. Das Wasser war kalt*" etc., would gain more marks if phrased differently e.g.: "*Es regnete. Das Hotel hatte viele Zimmer. Es gab kein heißes Wasser*".

German spellings always prove to be difficult for candidates and so great emphasis should be placed on accuracy in this respect in order to gain more marks.

Poor handwriting is another aspect where some candidates can lose marks if the Examiner cannot read what has been written.

Also candidates can be reassured that what they write does not always have to be truthful e.g.: if they are asked what they would like to do in the future and they do not know the necessary vocabulary, it is perfectly acceptable to make something up, as long as it answers the question.

Finally, candidates should be encouraged to focus on the requirements of the question e.g.: if asked about what they did in the hotel, writing about a visit to a museum will not gain Communication marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 items which they might buy in a stationery shop. Most candidates found this well within their ability with 77% scoring full marks. There were some unexpectedly good answers such as *Schere*, *Taschenrechner*, *Wörterbuch* and *Klebstift*. The most common incorrect answer was: *Brief*. Repeating vocabulary given in the question e.g.: *Schreibwaren* cannot be credited but this was a rare occurrence.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 questions about their hobbies.

Most candidates scored well on this question with 79% scoring full marks for Communication.

For Language 71% gained full marks and, where marks were lost, it was usually due to poor verb usage and general lack of accuracy.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say what they liked doing in their free time. There was a good range of correct answers. Where Communication marks were lost it was usually because the candidate made very general comments e.g.: *ich habe viel Freizeit* or *ich liebe meine Freizeit*, - which can gain Language marks but not Communication marks - rather than writing about specific activities.
- (b) Candidates were asked to say which specific sports they found good. Again Communication marks tended to be lost mainly because of general comments rather than specific information but many candidates scored well by also including reasons and opinions.
- (c) Candidates were asked what they do with their families at the weekend. Candidates were generally able to answer this well with a good knowledge of the necessary vocabulary as well as additional information such as where the activities took place, how often they undertook the activities and their opinions on them. Again it was necessary to write about specific activities in order to gain Communication marks.
- (d) Candidates were asked to say which new hobby they would like to have in future and to give reasons for their choice. This proved to be more problematic although many candidates scored well. Some candidates misunderstood what was required and wrote about a hobby which they already pursue or wrote in general about the future without linking it to a new hobby.

On the whole candidates are advised to always:

- answer the question – to be specific and make sure that they have included in their answer the particular points which the question asked for
- make sure that all aspects of the question have been answered
- use the appropriate tense or time frame.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a visit on the previous evening to the cinema. Of the 3 options, this was by far the most popular (84% of candidates chose this option).

Question 3(a) part (a)

The question required candidates to explain whether they like going to the cinema and why. As this is a general question, candidates are expected to use the present tense. Unfortunately many candidates did not address this as a general point but wrote about why they liked or did not like seeing this particular film. Unfortunately many candidates lost marks here by not realising what the question required. It is helpful to candidates if they can start their answer by re-wording the question e.g.:

Q: Sagen Sie, ob Sie gern ins Kino gehen und warum

A: Ich gehe (nicht) gern ins Kino, weil...

This shows their ability to manipulate the language as well as ensuring that each question is addressed correctly and fully.

Question 3(a) part (b)

This question asked why they had gone to the cinema and was answered well by most candidates. The question used the past tense and therefore candidates needed to use a past time frame in their answer. Reasons included: because they wanted to see that particular film, because it was their friend's birthday,

because they wanted to go cycling but it was raining hard etc. Again, a helpful routine for candidates would be to turn the question around e.g.:

Q: Erzählen Sie, warum Sie gestern Abend ins Kino gegangen sind.

A: Gestern Abend bin ich ins Kino gegangen, weil.....

Question 3(a) part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered in the cinema. Answers usually centred around noisy children or there being no popcorn etc. Unfortunately some candidates described an event which happened on their way to the cinema or afterwards, which is not what the question asked for and so they could not gain Communication points for this answer. Again, the question was asked in the past tense and the answer therefore required a past time frame.

Question 3(a) part (d)

Candidates were asked to say what plans they had for the following weekend and therefore required an answer using a future time frame. This question was generally well answered with a wide variety of good responses.

Question 3(b)

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

Question 3(c)

Candidates were asked to write about a street festival, which they had attended the previous weekend, where they had made a new friend.

Question 3(c) part (a)

Candidates were asked to describe where or how they had met their new friend. This proved to be quite difficult for some candidates and many overlooked the mention of a street festival altogether. However there were also some very good answers describing particular events at which they had met their new friend. This question clearly required the use of a past time frame.

Question 3(c) part (b)

Candidates were asked to describe what they had done next and this produced some very imaginative answers, such as the new friend accidentally pouring a drink over the candidate, as well as more expected ones e.g.: they went to a cafe or bought some goods at the festival etc. This question was generally answered well.

Question 3(c) part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe their friend's opinion on the music at the festival and his/her reasons for their opinions. This question was generally answered well and candidates had plenty to say about music and opinions on different genres.

Question 3(c) part (d)

This question asked candidates to say what he/she and his/her new friend's future plans were and therefore required the use of a future time frame. This did not produce any particular problems and there was a variety of good answers.

Language

Some candidates have an excellent grasp of German and produced commendable responses. Where errors were made they were predominantly in the use of verbs - incorrect tenses, auxiliary verbs and past participles.

To score well for language, answers should show secure use of verbs in the correct tenses as well as good vocabulary and structures.

On the whole candidates are advised to always:

- answer the question – to be specific and make sure that they have included in their answer the particular points which the question asked for
- make sure that all aspects of the question have been answered
- use the appropriate tense or time frame.