

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/11
Listening

General comments

The performance in this examination covered the full range but the vast majority of candidates demonstrated sound comprehension of spoken German. The earlier part of the examination proved accessible to almost all whilst the final phase provided a sufficient challenge for the most capable candidates.

The format of the examination is generally familiar to candidates by now, but there are still a few who do not put the correct number of responses in **Question 16**. For the written responses it is only necessary for candidates to provide the information they have been asked for in a recognisable way, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. They do not need to reproduce the questions in order to create full sentences: indeed, given the space available for candidates to write in, it is undesirable, as it becomes quite difficult for the Examiner to decipher the answer. As always, it is helpful if candidates write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer.

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.

The vast majority of candidates proved to be very competent at giving the correct responses in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. There was no pattern to the occasionally incorrect answers.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task was based on five items of sport news. Most candidates managed to produce an acceptable rendering of *gewonnen* in **Question 9** but in **Question 13** they attempted the figure 36 with varying degrees of success. In the visual multiple choice questions some had difficulties with parts of the body in **Question 12** and many candidates put **A** the guitar as the correct answer to **Question 15**. The Examiners can only assume that having heard that *Renzo* was a rock musician the candidates assumed the answer would be an electric guitar, as *Trompete* and *Gitarre* are neither similar nor obscure vocabulary items.

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 with young people on the subject of food. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements, but few managed 6. A pleasing majority managed to identify *Bauchschmerzen* in **(e)** with *Ich hatte Probleme mit meinem Magen* which they heard in the interview. An incorrect statement commonly ticked was **(j)** at which point candidates seemed to feel they had only one tick available for the final interview and consequently missed the final statement **(l)** which was correct.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured young people talking about their film watching habits. Candidates by now understand that they have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or expression. **Question 17** and **Question 18** were well done. In **Question 19** those candidates who were unfamiliar with *Abenteuer* could transcribe what they heard. For the corrected sentence to make sense it was necessary to repeat *–filme*. Similarly in **Question 20** candidates had to produce *Amerika* and in **Question 21** *mit* for the amended sentences to be meaningful. Quite a few candidates thought Jonas preferred going to the cinema with girls in **Question 21**.

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. There were several pieces of information for candidates to choose from to answer **Question 22**, the most popular of which was *Sie kann Pause machen*. Most candidates seemed to identify *traurig* as the key word for the answer to **Question 23** and make a recognisable attempt at spelling it. Most also managed to express the idea that Mia was unable to sleep in **Question 24**. In **Question 25** it was necessary to provide the superlative *neuesten* to gain the mark.

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. The interview was with Shafiqa who had just won a best teacher award. Few candidates managed to choose 6 correct answers but most were successful in choosing the correct option in **Question 27**, **Question 28** and **Question 30**. Otherwise there was no particular pattern to the incorrect choices.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between two School friends discussing their reaction to a proposed new housing development in their town. 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 penalised 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. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully and provide the information they are asked for.

Question 32 required a straightforward number, either as a figure or a word, in order to gain the mark. By no means all candidates could provide the correct number.

In **Question 33** there were three possible options to describe the location of the new housing and many candidates managed to provide an acceptable answer. *Bahnlinie* caused some difficulties but a phonetic equivalent for *-linie* was acceptable.

Most candidates understood that there was a traffic problem in **Question 34** but some overlooked the *jetzt* in the question and invalidated their answer by referring to *200 Autos*.

There were two possible answers for **Question 35** but candidates opted almost universally for the problem of primary School places. The vocabulary was familiar but some candidates failed to gain the mark because they only mentioned that there would be more children and made no reference to School places. *Mehr Kinder* does not qualify as a problem.

In **Question 36** some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with *Vorschlag* as an item of vocabulary and gave no response or thought it required the information about the difficulty of getting a doctor's appointment, which would have been an acceptable alternative problem in **Question 35**. Many however answered correctly.

In **Question 37** surprisingly few candidates seemed to recognise the term *soziale Netzwerke*. Some who had failed to answer **Question 36** and interpreted *informieren* in its widest sense wrote *Protestaktion organisieren*. Under these circumstances they were credited for this answer.

To gain the mark in **Question 38** it was necessary to make it clear that there were no jobs in the vicinity, not merely that there were no jobs.

The essence of Max's motivation was *die Umwelt*, which was an acceptable answer to **Question 39**.

Question 40 was rarely answered fully but 'because of their youth' or 'because of their protest' were deemed acceptable responses. Many candidates thought Max and Bettina wanted to become famous.

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

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/12
Listening

General comments

The performance in this examination covered the full range but the vast majority of candidates demonstrated sound comprehension of spoken German. The earlier part of the examination proved accessible to almost all whilst the final phase provided a sufficient challenge for the most capable candidates.

The format of the examination is generally familiar to candidates by now, but there are still a few who do not put the correct number of responses in **Question 16**. For the written responses it is only necessary for candidates to provide the information they have been asked for in a recognisable way, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. They do not need to reproduce the questions in order to create full sentences: indeed, given the space available for candidates to write in, it is undesirable, as it becomes quite difficult for the Examiner to decipher the answer. As always, it is helpful if candidates write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer.

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.

The vast majority of candidates proved to be very competent at giving the correct responses in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. There was no pattern to the occasionally incorrect answers.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task was based on five items of sport news. Most candidates managed to produce an acceptable rendering of *gewonnen* in **Question 9** but in **Question 13** they attempted the figure 36 with varying degrees of success. In the visual multiple choice questions some had difficulties with parts of the body in **Question 12** and many candidates put **A** the guitar as the correct answer to **Question 15**. The Examiners can only assume that having heard that *Renzo* was a rock musician the candidates assumed the answer would be an electric guitar, as *Trompete* and *Gitarre* are neither similar nor obscure vocabulary items.

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 with young people on the subject of food. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements, but few managed 6. A pleasing majority managed to identify *Bauchschmerzen* in **(e)** with *Ich hatte Probleme mit meinem Magen* which they heard in the interview. An incorrect statement commonly ticked was **(j)** at which point candidates seemed to feel they had only one tick available for the final interview and consequently missed the final statement **(l)** which was correct.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured young people talking about their film watching habits. Candidates by now understand that they have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or expression. **Question 17** and **Question 18** were well done. In **Question 19** those candidates who were unfamiliar with *Abenteuer* could transcribe what they heard. For the corrected sentence to make sense it was necessary to repeat *–filme*. Similarly in **Question 20** candidates had to produce *Amerika* and in **Question 21** *mit* for the amended sentences to be meaningful. Quite a few candidates thought Jonas preferred going to the cinema with girls in **Question 21**.

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. There were several pieces of information for candidates to choose from to answer **Question 22**, the most popular of which was *Sie kann Pause machen*. Most candidates seemed to identify *traurig* as the key word for the answer to **Question 23** and make a recognisable attempt at spelling it. Most also managed to express the idea that Mia was unable to sleep in **Question 24**. In **Question 25** it was necessary to provide the superlative *neuesten* to gain the mark.

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. The interview was with Shafiqah who had just won a best teacher award. Few candidates managed to choose 6 correct answers but most were successful in choosing the correct option in **Question 27**, **Question 28** and **Question 30**. Otherwise there was no particular pattern to the incorrect choices.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between two School friends discussing their reaction to a proposed new housing development in their town. 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 penalised 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. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully and provide the information they are asked for.

Question 32 required a straightforward number, either as a figure or a word, in order to gain the mark. By no means all candidates could provide the correct number.

In **Question 33** there were three possible options to describe the location of the new housing and many candidates managed to provide an acceptable answer. *Bahnlinie* caused some difficulties but a phonetic equivalent for *-linie* was acceptable.

Most candidates understood that there was a traffic problem in **Question 34** but some overlooked the *jetzt* in the question and invalidated their answer by referring to *200 Autos*.

There were two possible answers for **Question 35** but candidates opted almost universally for the problem of primary School places. The vocabulary was familiar but some candidates failed to gain the mark because they only mentioned that there would be more children and made no reference to School places. *Mehr Kinder* does not qualify as a problem.

In **Question 36** some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with *Vorschlag* as an item of vocabulary and gave no response or thought it required the information about the difficulty of getting a doctor's appointment, which would have been an acceptable alternative problem in **Question 35**. Many however answered correctly.

In **Question 37** surprisingly few candidates seemed to recognise the term *soziale Netzwerke*. Some who had failed to answer **Question 36** and interpreted *informieren* in its widest sense wrote *Protestaktion organisieren*. Under these circumstances they were credited for this answer.

To gain the mark in **Question 38** it was necessary to make it clear that there were no jobs in the vicinity, not merely that there were no jobs.

The essence of Max's motivation was *die Umwelt*, which was an acceptable answer to **Question 39**.

Question 40 was rarely answered fully but 'because of their youth' or 'because of their protest' were deemed acceptable responses. Many candidates thought Max and Bettina wanted to become famous.

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



FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/13
Listening

General comments

The performance in this examination covered the full range but the vast majority of candidates demonstrated sound comprehension of spoken German. The earlier part of the examination proved accessible to almost all whilst the final phase provided a sufficient challenge for the most capable candidates.

The format of the examination is generally familiar to candidates by now, but there are still a few who do not put the correct number of responses in **Question 16**. For the written responses it is only necessary for candidates to provide the information they have been asked for in a recognisable way, as their written German does not have to be grammatically accurate. They do not need to reproduce the questions in order to create full sentences: indeed, given the space available for candidates to write in, it is undesirable, as it becomes quite difficult for the Examiner to decipher the answer. As always, it is helpful if candidates write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer.

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.

The vast majority of candidates proved to be very competent at giving the correct responses in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. There was no pattern to the occasionally incorrect answers.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task was based on five items of sport news. Most candidates managed to produce an acceptable rendering of *gewonnen* in **Question 9** but in **Question 13** they attempted the figure 36 with varying degrees of success. In the visual multiple choice questions some had difficulties with parts of the body in **Question 12** and many candidates put **A** the guitar as the correct answer to **Question 15**. The Examiners can only assume that having heard that *Renzo* was a rock musician the candidates assumed the answer would be an electric guitar, as *Trompete* and *Gitarre* are neither similar nor obscure vocabulary items.

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 with young people on the subject of food. The vast majority of candidates could identify at least 4 correct statements, but few managed 6. A pleasing majority managed to identify *Bauchschmerzen* in **(e)** with *Ich hatte Probleme mit meinem Magen* which they heard in the interview. An incorrect statement commonly ticked was **(j)** at which point candidates seemed to feel they had only one tick available for the final interview and consequently missed the final statement **(l)** which was correct.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured young people talking about their film watching habits. Candidates by now understand that they have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or expression. **Question 17** and **Question 18** were well done. In **Question 19** those candidates who were unfamiliar with *Abenteuer* could transcribe what they heard. For the corrected sentence to make sense it was necessary to repeat *–filme*. Similarly in **Question 20** candidates had to produce *Amerika* and in **Question 21** *mit* for the amended sentences to be meaningful. Quite a few candidates thought Jonas preferred going to the cinema with girls in **Question 21**.

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. There were several pieces of information for candidates to choose from to answer **Question 22**, the most popular of which was *Sie kann Pause machen*. Most candidates seemed to identify *traurig* as the key word for the answer to **Question 23** and make a recognisable attempt at spelling it. Most also managed to express the idea that Mia was unable to sleep in **Question 24**. In **Question 25** it was necessary to provide the superlative *neuesten* to gain the mark.

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. The interview was with Shafiqah who had just won a best teacher award. Few candidates managed to choose 6 correct answers but most were successful in choosing the correct option in **Question 27**, **Question 28** and **Question 30**. Otherwise there was no particular pattern to the incorrect choices.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between two School friends discussing their reaction to a proposed new housing development in their town. 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 penalised 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. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully and provide the information they are asked for.

Question 32 required a straightforward number, either as a figure or a word, in order to gain the mark. By no means all candidates could provide the correct number.

In **Question 33** there were three possible options to describe the location of the new housing and many candidates managed to provide an acceptable answer. *Bahnlinie* caused some difficulties but a phonetic equivalent for *-linie* was acceptable.

Most candidates understood that there was a traffic problem in **Question 34** but some overlooked the *jetzt* in the question and invalidated their answer by referring to *200 Autos*.

There were two possible answers for **Question 35** but candidates opted almost universally for the problem of primary School places. The vocabulary was familiar but some candidates failed to gain the mark because they only mentioned that there would be more children and made no reference to School places. *Mehr Kinder* does not qualify as a problem.

In **Question 36** some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with *Vorschlag* as an item of vocabulary and gave no response or thought it required the information about the difficulty of getting a doctor's appointment, which would have been an acceptable alternative problem in **Question 35**. Many however answered correctly.

In **Question 37** surprisingly few candidates seemed to recognise the term *soziale Netzwerke*. Some who had failed to answer **Question 36** and interpreted *informieren* in its widest sense wrote *Protestaktion organisieren*. Under these circumstances they were credited for this answer.

To gain the mark in **Question 38** it was necessary to make it clear that there were no jobs in the vicinity, not merely that there were no jobs.

The essence of Max's motivation was *die Umwelt*, which was an acceptable answer to **Question 39**.

Question 40 was rarely answered fully but 'because of their youth' or 'because of their protest' were deemed acceptable responses. Many candidates thought Max and Bettina wanted to become famous.

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



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 many of the candidates.

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done by candidates, except for **Question 2**, where a significant number of candidates failed to understand *Durst*.

Questions 6–10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many scored full marks.

Questions 11–15

Questions 11, 14 and 15 were answered very well by candidates. There were problems for some candidates with **Question 12**, and they answered **C** for where the candidates ate, suggesting that *Schulkantine* was not understood. **Question 13** was answered incorrectly by many candidates, who did not understand either the second sentence in the second paragraph of the text, or did not understand *ab vier Uhr*.

Questions 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 number of candidates wrote words not on the list to fill the gaps. The vast majority of candidates performed very well in this section. For **Question 16**, some used the wrong verb and put *endet* instead of *beginnt*.

Questions 21–30

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

Question 21 Often *Das war komisch* was supplied as the answer or added to the answer.

Question 22 Many candidates failed to add a verb in this sentence and wrote *Fernseher nicht mehr da*.

Question 23 was done well by most candidates as they got both pieces of necessary information, but the sentence construction was often very poor. Some answered with *Der Computer stand*.

In answer to **Question 25** some candidates said that the question asked was: "Where are the computer and television?", but most candidates correctly referred to the exact questions in the text.

Question 26 This was done well by the vast majority of candidates, and those that did not tended to quote the *dort schrieb ein Journalist* sentence verbatim.

Question 27 This was answered correctly by nearly all candidates, as was **Question 28**.

Question 29 Those who understood the question managed to score a mark, but the use of the present tense of 'sein' with the right pronoun was very poor. Some focused on the *die neuesten Handys* idea or the *einfachen Fernseher* idea.

Question 30 was successfully managed by most candidates. Those who did not understand tended to say that Phillip was just visiting Alex.

Questions 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. The answers to **Questions 31** and **32** were often the wrong way round.

Question 31 When a justification was offered this was generally correct.

Question 33 was difficult for a number of candidates, but many used the text to copy out the sentence, which was acceptable.

Question 35 was hard for many candidates, and they ended up writing too much. Often they talked about other candidates living closer, without adding that Deniz did not. Some changed the *Am Anfang* and talked about Deniz being happy there now because it was quiet, and then a significant number talked about Wolfgang's book, or about Deniz being a good translator.

Questions 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.

In answering **Question 36** many seemed to move away from the simplicity of the real answer to make it more complicated and copied out a chunk of text.

For **Question 37**, there seemed to be a misunderstanding by a significant number of candidates that the idea stemmed from the visit of her niece and her liking for honey.

Question 38 The main problem for candidates with this question was understanding the word *worüber*. Those who did, scored the mark. The rest answered a *warum* question.

Question 39 The Principal Examiner was surprised by the number of candidates who could not transpose *dreitägig* into *drei Tage*.

In answer to **Question 40**, many candidates still used the *um zu* construction in their responses, simply lifting the phrase directly from the text.

Question 41 was answered very well by the vast majority of candidates.

Question 42 Many candidates failed to score a mark for their answer. Some candidates confused Hanna and Rosa, and wrote that it was Hanna opening the shop or copied the *dort* from the text, when it was not clear what *dort* referred to.

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.

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done by candidates, except for **Question 2**, where a significant number of candidates failed to understand *Durst*.

Questions 6–10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many scored full marks.

Questions 11–15

Questions 11, 14 and 15 were answered very well by candidates. There were problems for some candidates with **Question 12**, and they answered **C** for where the candidates ate, suggesting that *Schulkantine* was not understood. **Question 13** was answered incorrectly by many candidates, who did not understand either the second sentence in the second paragraph of the text, or did not understand *ab vier Uhr*.

Questions 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 number of candidates wrote words not on the list to fill the gaps. The vast majority of candidates performed very well in this section. For **Question 16**, some used the wrong verb and put *endet* instead of *beginnt*.

Questions 21–30

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

Question 21 Often *Das war komisch* was supplied as the answer or added to the answer.

Question 22 Many candidates failed to add a verb in this sentence and wrote *Fernseher nicht mehr da*.

Question 23 was done well by most candidates as they got both pieces of necessary information, but the sentence construction was often very poor. Some answered with *Der Computer stand*.

In answer to **Question 25** some candidates said that the question asked was: "Where are the computer and television?", but most candidates correctly referred to the exact questions in the text.

Question 26 This was done well by the vast majority of candidates, and those that did not tended to quote the *dort schrieb ein Journalist* sentence verbatim.

Question 27 This was answered correctly by nearly all candidates, as was **Question 28**.

Question 29 Those who understood the question managed to score a mark, but the use of the present tense of 'sein' with the right pronoun was very poor. Some focused on the *die neuesten Handys* idea or the *einfachen Fernseher* idea.

Question 30 was successfully managed by most candidates. Those who did not understand tended to say that Phillip was just visiting Alex.

Questions 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. The answers to **Questions 31** and **32** were often the wrong way round.

Question 31 When a justification was offered this was generally correct.

Question 33 was difficult for a number of candidates, but many used the text to copy out the sentence, which was acceptable.

Question 35 was hard for many candidates, and they ended up writing too much. Often they talked about other candidates living closer, without adding that Deniz did not. Some changed the *Am Anfang* and talked about Deniz being happy there now because it was quiet, and then a significant number talked about Wolfgang's book, or about Deniz being a good translator.

Questions 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.

In answering **Question 36** many seemed to move away from the simplicity of the real answer to make it more complicated and copied out a chunk of text.

For **Question 37**, there seemed to be a misunderstanding by a significant number of candidates that the idea stemmed from the visit of her niece and her liking for honey.

Question 38 The main problem for candidates with this question was understanding the word *worüber*. Those who did, scored the mark. The rest answered a *warum* question.

Question 39 The Principal Examiner was surprised by the number of candidates who could not transpose *dreitägig* into *drei Tage*.

In answer to **Question 40**, many candidates still used the *um zu* construction in their responses, simply lifting the phrase directly from the text.

Question 41 was answered very well by the vast majority of candidates.

Question 42 Many candidates failed to score a mark for their answer. Some candidates confused Hanna and Rosa, and wrote that it was Hanna opening the shop or copied the *dort* from the text, when it was not clear what *dort* referred to.

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.

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done by candidates, except for **Question 2**, where a significant number of candidates failed to understand *Durst*.

Questions 6–10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many scored full marks.

Questions 11–15

Questions 11, 14 and 15 were answered very well by candidates. There were problems for some candidates with **Question 12**, and they answered **C** for where the candidates ate, suggesting that *Schulkantine* was not understood. **Question 13** was answered incorrectly by many candidates, who did not understand either the second sentence in the second paragraph of the text, or did not understand *ab vier Uhr*.

Questions 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 number of candidates wrote words not on the list to fill the gaps. The vast majority of candidates performed very well in this section. For **Question 16**, some used the wrong verb and put *endet* instead of *beginnt*.

Questions 21–30

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

Question 21 Often *Das war komisch* was supplied as the answer or added to the answer.

Question 22 Many candidates failed to add a verb in this sentence and wrote *Fernseher nicht mehr da*.

Question 23 was done well by most candidates as they got both pieces of necessary information, but the sentence construction was often very poor. Some answered with *Der Computer stand*.

In answer to **Question 25** some candidates said that the question asked was: "Where are the computer and television?", but most candidates correctly referred to the exact questions in the text.

Question 26 This was done well by the vast majority of candidates, and those that did not tended to quote the *dort schrieb ein Journalist* sentence verbatim.

Question 27 This was answered correctly by nearly all candidates, as was **Question 28**.

Question 29 Those who understood the question managed to score a mark, but the use of the present tense of 'sein' with the right pronoun was very poor. Some focused on the *die neuesten Handys* idea or the *einfachen Fernseher* idea.

Question 30 was successfully managed by most candidates. Those who did not understand tended to say that Phillip was just visiting Alex.

Questions 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. The answers to **Questions 31** and **32** were often the wrong way round.

Question 31 When a justification was offered this was generally correct.

Question 33 was difficult for a number of candidates, but many used the text to copy out the sentence, which was acceptable.

Question 35 was hard for many candidates, and they ended up writing too much. Often they talked about other candidates living closer, without adding that Deniz did not. Some changed the *Am Anfang* and talked about Deniz being happy there now because it was quiet, and then a significant number talked about Wolfgang's book, or about Deniz being a good translator.

Questions 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.

In answering **Question 36** many seemed to move away from the simplicity of the real answer to make it more complicated and copied out a chunk of text.

For **Question 37**, there seemed to be a misunderstanding by a significant number of candidates that the idea stemmed from the visit of her niece and her liking for honey.

Question 38 The main problem for candidates with this question was understanding the word *worüber*. Those who did, scored the mark. The rest answered a *warum* question.

Question 39 The Principal Examiner was surprised by the number of candidates who could not transpose *dreitägig* into *drei Tage*.

In answer to **Question 40**, many candidates still used the *um zu* construction in their responses, simply lifting the phrase directly from the text.

Question 41 was answered very well by the vast majority of candidates.

Question 42 Many candidates failed to score a mark for their answer. Some candidates confused Hanna and Rosa, and wrote that it was Hanna opening the shop or copied the *dort* from the text, when it was not clear what *dort* referred to.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/03
Speaking

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for May/June 2016.

Centres generally conducted the Speaking Test well and most examiners had prepared themselves thoroughly before the examination. Some examiners however do not follow correct procedures with the role play cards. It is essential that they are used at random during each session and each candidate is given one card containing two role play situations and a different one is handed to the next candidate to prepare while the other candidate is being examined. In a small number of centres examiners still disadvantage their candidates in the Role Play situations by missing out tasks and not querying wrong or incomplete answers.

In the Topic/General Conversation there are still examiners who do not ask appropriate questions to bring out the best in their candidates or even talk too much themselves instead of allowing the candidate to show what they can do. Some examiners ask for points of general knowledge which is not relevant in this type of exam.

Examiners must ensure that they always ask past **and** future questions in both conversations and persevere if they do not elicit a past/future construction straight away. Successful examiners were skilled and flexible in the way they managed to get the candidate to use a past/future sentence, e.g. if they found that a question beginning with '*Was hast du...?*' or '*Hast du...?*' did not produce a correct response, they turned to other questions such as '*Wo/wann warst du...?*' or '*Hattest du...?*' which then led to a correct response. Similarly with the future, if the candidate mispronounced '*Ich möchte...*' some examiners recognised this and changed to other verbs e.g. '*Was würdest du...?*' or '*Planst du...?*' which helped the candidate to produce a correct reference to the future. Some examiners omitted to ask any questions in the past/future tenses; some of their questions may well have opened with a perfect tense statement but were quite lengthy at times and then merely ended with a simple closed question in the past tense which then led to a restricted answer. It is essential that examiners carefully consult the instructions on page 9 of the Teachers' Notes as some examiners incorrectly awarded a mark in the Satisfactory band or above for Language to candidates who did not convey past and future meanings.

Most centres kept to the stipulated timings but some examiners did not stop candidates from continuing beyond 2 minutes in the Topic Presentation and did not observe the correct timings. Unfortunately, there are still a small number of examiners who do not indicate a transition from the Topic Conversation to the General Conversation which makes it difficult to award marks separately for the two different conversations.

Most centres forwarded the appropriate sample size for the centre (specified on page 4 of the Teachers' Notes) on labelled CDs with each candidate's digital file saved individually. Before CDs are despatched, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate's recording is clear. This year moderators encountered many more problems with CDs that did not play on some computers, and either part or the whole of the recording was inaudible. 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 candidate so that it is difficult to hear them.

Administration in centres was generally good again this year but far too many centres still made errors in addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheet (WMS). Also some centres did not fill in the lozenges correctly for the candidates' marks on the MS1 forms.

Assessment was generally consistent and the order of merit was correct. Scaling of some centres was however necessary, and it was more common for marking to be too generous than too severe. This was often due to inadequate completion of the Role Play tasks or the lack of past and future tenses in the conversations.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays

Most candidates successfully handled the tasks in the Role Plays when the examiners had prepared well, kept to the rubric and were willing to prompt the candidate by repeating or slightly rephrasing the question, if the candidate was struggling. In general, candidates performed strongly in this section as all the tasks were accessible. Some examiners unfortunately fed a choice of answers to the candidate where this was not demanded by the role play task, with the result that no mark could be awarded. On occasions, but less so than in previous years, it was the lack of reaction (approval/gratitude/disappointment, etc.) which resulted in a loss of marks and this was often caused by the teacher not pausing before asking the question in the second part of the task. Full guidance on conduct of the Role Plays is given on page 8 of the Teachers' Notes. Most candidates managed to use accurate pronunciation as well as the correct register, and the past tense responses were on the whole very successful. Question formation did however prove challenging to some candidates. A lot of centres really entered into the spirit of the Role Play and played out the roles in a realistic way.

Some centres marked the Role Plays too generously; candidates can only be awarded 3 marks for a correct answer if any errors are minor. If a verb is used, it has to be correct for 3 marks. A clear answer but with a verb error or other major mistake, can only be awarded 2 marks. The maximum mark is also 2 if an inappropriate register is used but the candidate is only penalised once in the whole Role Play. If the answer is ambiguous or only addresses part of the task, 1 mark should be awarded.

Role Plays A

Page 16: A1, A2, A3

Most candidates performed well but some candidates lost a mark by not being able to include the umlaut in their pronunciation of 'Nächte'. 'Einzelzimmer' also caused some pronunciation problems and a number of candidates used the incorrect preposition with the time in task 4.

Page 17: A4, A5, A6

The information required was straightforward and consequently this Role Play was generally well answered but some candidates struggled to ask the question in the final task.

Page 18: A7, A8, A9

The majority of candidates did not find this Role Play problematic but some did not know vocabulary for different types of sausages and 'schließt' was quite regularly mispronounced.

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 assumed that candidates are aware of the *Sie* form of address. It is quite acceptable for the two-part question to be split by the examiner.

Page 19: B1, B4, B7

For most candidates this task was quite straightforward although a few tied themselves up in knots when describing why they were telephoning and the pronunciation of 'Jugendherberge' was sometimes rather garbled. There were quite a few candidates who did not know the word 'Aufgaben' but then managed to produce an acceptable response when the examiner rephrased the question. In addition many candidates failed to express a reaction 'mit Freude'.

Page 20: B2, B5, B8

There was a wide variation in responses for the first task but most candidates coped well with this Role Play overall. Those candidates who attempted to make their situation as clear as possible were unfortunately more likely to then make a verb error. Some candidates clearly did not understand 'enttäuscht' when giving an action and the inclusion of 'hierher' in the examiner's question confused a lot of candidates.

Page 21: B3, B6, B9

The contextualisation presented little difficulty, yet some candidates had experienced the problems in the holiday home for as long as 2 weeks before complaining. Both examiners and moderators were tolerant of this! Candidates did not always include 'seit' in their answer in Task 3 so they lost a mark and surprisingly quite a few candidates struggled with the phrasing for the question in Task 5.

Topic Presentation/Conversation

Topic choice was in general appropriate and candidates appeared interested in what they were talking about. It is helpful if a candidate starts their presentation by saying what their chosen topic is. A few chose to speak on 'my life' which tends to deteriorate into general conversation and candidates were generally more successful if they chose a more specific topic e.g. 'Music' rather than 'Hobbies'. In a small number of centres the candidates all spoke on the same topic which is not to be recommended at all; individual candidate's performances are less impressive because of the repetition of replies in the Topic Conversation. It is also important that the Topic Conversation does not sound rehearsed because centres have over-prepared the candidates for this section, as well as for the Topic Presentation. A high number of candidates still lost marks heavily for Language because they did not manage to produce a correct combination of past and future tenses. This was often a result of the teacher either not asking the appropriate questions or he/she did not persevere in getting the candidate to give an answer in both the past and future tenses.

General Conversation

Many candidates performed well in this part of the test and a good range of topics were usually covered, with most centres choosing different topics for different candidates. The most effective conversations were when examiners used a mix of questioning styles with simpler questions to build confidence and then responding to candidates by asking them to tell them even more about something. This often led to a more natural discussion and played to candidates' strengths. Sensitive and thorough questioning helped candidates to achieve well, enabling good candidates to give opinions and justifications using a wide range of tenses and structures and showing genuine interest in what the candidate had to say. By contrast, where examiners asked closed questions and did not encourage candidates to expand, this limited their performance. Some teachers unfortunately also repeated the same questions from candidate to candidate. Moreover, some examiners asked rather difficult and very complex questions which candidates did not manage to answer at length and accurately. When marking, many examiners also forgot that a mark of above 6 for Language cannot be awarded in this section of the exam if the candidates do not use past and future tenses accurately. Some examiners fell into the trap of leaving the only question in the past/future tense to the end and candidates did not answer it correctly. This was a great shame, particularly if the candidate was clearly able and used good past/future tense structures in the Topic Conversation, but not in the General Conversation, or vice versa.

General Impression

In general the impression mark was appropriately assessed although some examiners were rather strict with weaker candidates whose fluency and intonation were good even though they made more errors in terms of accuracy.

Internal Moderation

Internal moderation was usually carried out in an appropriate way.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/41
Writing

Key messages

Candidates should be reminded to read the particulars of each question carefully and to respond to the exact questions being asked, rather than writing more generally on the topic area being covered in the question. Those who do not address the specifics of the question will not be awarded Communication points for that task. Candidates should also ensure that they are answering each task in the appropriate time frame. This is essential for achieving marks in both Communication and Language. Candidates must read the question to check the time frame that is required. In **Question 3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

In this session many candidates produced very pleasing answers using high levels of German and demonstrating good language use as well as showing accurate understanding. Many Centres had prepared their candidates successfully for the exam and had clearly made efforts to respond to the challenges of the exam and mark scheme in their current format.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 items which they might pack to take on holiday. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary for 5 such items. Many candidates completed this task easily and, indeed, there were a good number who wrote all 8 items correctly. A few candidates produced vocabulary for items which could evidently not be packed for a holiday (e.g. *Flugzeug*, *Schwimmbad*, etc.) and therefore could not score. There were frequent challenges in spellings, with *Camera*, and *Shue* being the most popular examples, and a surprising number of candidates struggled with the spellings for vocabulary such as sunglasses, sandals and swimming costume. Plurals caused problems, especially for weaker candidates. Some weaker candidates did benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items were accepted, despite poor spelling. However it was perhaps surprising how many candidates failed to find 5 items which they could convey accurately enough to achieve the 5 marks. Very poor candidates wrote in English or invented words. Marks were lost when one German word morphed into another, as in *Buche* and *Zahnbrust*.

The pictures clearly help inspire candidates' answers and most sets of answers comprised more or less the same list. However, Centres should be reminded that these pictures are intended to act as prompts, rather than being prescriptive. Some candidates still seemed to think they had to list the specific items in the pictures and lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items which would have been more familiar to them, personally.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about the topic of school. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their school, giving details they wanted to mention but without addressing the specific tasks which they had been given. 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. The question was marked for a maximum of 10 Communication marks and 5 marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question, most were able to achieve well and many candidates scored very highly on this question. Most candidates worked through the 4 tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence about each. However, Centres should note that in order to gain all ten Communication marks, candidates should be sure to cover all 4 Communication points. Many candidates wrote in good, straightforward language with the majority scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say where their school is and what sort of school it is. There were many good answers, with detail. However, with this question, a significant number of candidates were tempted to give their personal opinions of their school, rather than describing it. Others went into detail which was not asked for, such as the specifics of the school day. Again it is important that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the question.
- (b) Candidates were asked to say what they learnt in school and how they find their school subjects. The majority of candidates had no trouble in listing their school subjects and this provided a straightforward way of gaining Communication marks. Many also gave a good number of clear opinions with specific reasons. Some described how they physically find their way to their lessons, rather than how they feel about them.
- (c) Candidates were asked what they do with their school friends at lunchtime. Many gave clear answers, describing how they ate with their friends in the canteen, did sport/homework/etc. with their friends. Most candidates answered in the third person plural or included the phrase *mit meinen Freunden* and this qualified for the Communication marks. However, a significant number ignored the reference to friends, writing simply in the first person singular about what they did (apparently on their own) in the lunch break. Unfortunately, without reference to friends or appropriate use of *wir*, these answers could not score. Centres should be sure to remind their candidates to answer with careful reference to the question itself.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what they would like to do in the future, after leaving School. The majority referred to wanting to go to university for further study and many added appropriate reasons for their choices. Some referred to choice of future career. Some candidates interpreted the rubric as a description of free time activities after school (each day) rather than a reference to the future, once they are no longer at school, and therefore they failed to score.

In **Question 2**, most candidates scored well on the Language, with the majority scoring 5 out of 5. Very few scored below 3. Examples of language presenting frequent difficulties for candidates included *Lieblingsfächer* which many candidates thought was a singular noun, and *verlassen* which was not always known. In part (d) there were frequent examples of candidates using *bekommen* instead of *werden* for 'become'.

Question 3

Candidates were required to write a letter to their pen friend about a shopping trip last Saturday to buy presents. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates, possibly partly due to it being the first listed on the paper but also probably due to the topic being on shopping, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which many were clearly well-prepared for.

- (a) **Part (a)** This task required candidates to explain whether they usually like going shopping and why. Unfortunately some candidates omitted to address this task and launched straight into their account about last weekend's shopping trip. Some gave an opinion about going into town but omitted reference to shopping and failed to give a reason. These were costly omissions in terms of Communication points since the task was asking both for a general opinion and also for a reason about liking shopping. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific opinions/reasons in the present tense. Candidates do need to take great care to read the questions and to respond directly to them.

Part (b) This task asked why the candidate went into town last Saturday. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded but unfortunately some candidates wrote in the present tense, as if they were going into town (and despite the rubric making clear that the visit was last Saturday). Although many candidates answered well, there were many others who ignored the rubric (where it was explained that the candidate had gone into town to buy presents) and instead gave another reason for going into town. Others omitted to address the task entirely

and went straight to Part (c). Before answering the question, candidates should take care to refer to the rubric.

A number of candidates confused the words *das Geschenk* and *das Geschäft*, and some ambiguity was created by candidates' pluralisation of *Geschenk* (lifted from the rubric) but then used by candidates with a singular article/verb form. Many candidates also appear to think that *lieben* is a modal verb and this caused further inaccuracies in their grammar use.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered on the shopping trip. Most candidates addressed this task and many did so very well. Although a few candidates produced imaginative and well-expressed descriptions of what went wrong on the shopping trip, usually involving accidents and/or injury, most opted for straightforward examples like bad weather, transport problems, bad food or closed shops.

Less able candidates did not know the gender of *Wetter* or *Geschäft*, or the plural of *Laden*. Candidates who chose to talk about leaving something behind or losing something (usually their mobile phone or their money), frequently produced *verlassen* instead of *gelassen* and *verlosen* instead of *verloren*. There were sometimes long and complex descriptions of what went wrong and, on occasions, the intricate detail led to inaccurate German which would have been avoided with a more straightforward account. 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 describe what they planned to do next weekend and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Most candidates answered well, with many planning a shopping trip to buy whatever gift they failed to purchase last weekend, or celebrating the birthday, hoping for better weather next weekend etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future with many now able to use *ich habe vor, . . . zu . . .* which often made this section a pleasure to mark. Overall, the future tense seemed to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates struggled in their use of *ich möchte*, and this rendered the time frame of the answers ambiguous, thus preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of hobbies. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the second most popular amongst candidates and was generally answered successfully. The topic of free time/leisure is a popular one at this level and candidates are usually well prepared on the topic, as was evident here. However, perhaps an over-familiarity with the topic or a tendency to overlook the specifics of the tasks meant that a number of candidates sometimes failed to gain Communication marks due to carelessness or oversight. A small number of candidates ignored the bullet points in the question and simply wrote in general about free time.

Part (a) This task required candidates to describe what hobbies young people have and why. Most candidates started by talking about *junge Leute* or included themselves as being among the young people and so used *wir*. Some, however, unfortunately referred simply to their own hobbies/free time activities and so were unable to gain the Communication marks. It was surprising, also, that difficulties often seemed to arise for candidates attempting to articulate what young people do. Candidates often used poorly formed infinitive/noun constructions where they could no doubt have succeeded with more straightforward verb use. Attention to accuracy is important to ensure that verb forms and time frames are accurate. Most candidates gave reasons for the young people's opinions, though not all which was also unusual, given that this was a fairly straightforward task. Centres would do well to remind their candidates to check the requirements of each task to prevent valuable marks being lost.

Part (b) This task asked what the candidate had done in their free time last summer. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Although this was a straightforward task and, as expected, many candidates answered well, a significant number struggled in their verb use, such that the time frame was ambiguous (e.g. lack of auxiliary or inappropriate past participle etc.) and a maximum of one Communication mark was awarded in these instances. Centres should be reminded that candidates' ability to demonstrate accurate use of the past tense is essential at this level.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what hobbies their parents had when they were children. As such, this task presented the most challenges in **Question 3(b)**. Candidates who

understood the question properly were usually able to provide a decent attempt at an answer, though many were clearly struggling to imagine the types of hobbies their parents might have had. Sometimes their answers were over ambitious in detail, at the expense of accurate language use. However, many had not understood the task or had read it too quickly and instead gave comparisons between hobbies that parents and children have now, or they simply described their parents' current hobbies. As a result, this Communication point was the one which most often did not score and, where it did score, often only one out of the 2 possible ticks was awarded.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe how the generation of the future will spend their free time. A good number made reasonable efforts with this task. However, the use of the collective noun *die nächste Generation* presented a challenge for many candidates who found it hard to use accurately with an appropriate verb form. Most candidates attempted to refer to the dominance of technology in future leisure interests but many were again over-ambitious in their efforts, again at the expense of their accuracy in language use.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account about a recent trip to the mountains where the candidate lost his/her friend as it became dark. The candidate was given the first sentences which set the scene of the account to follow. This was the most challenging of the 3 options in **Question 3** and very few candidates chose it. Of those who did, however, the majority were very able candidates who apparently seemed to tackle it with ease, producing original and entertaining stories in near-fluent German and scoring very highly. This was the essay which allowed the best candidates to shine and, as an Examiner, it was refreshing to read such excellent German at this level, with candidates often exhibiting an impressive array of vocabulary, structure, idiom and accuracy. The question rarely appealed to the weaker candidates who perhaps had difficulty in understanding the question and probably did not have at their disposal the use of language needed to attempt it successfully.

Part (a) This task required candidates to explain their reaction on no longer being able to see their friend. Most expressed some form of shock/upset. A few omitted to address the task entirely.

Part (b) This task asked how the candidate found the friend again. There were many elaborate and impressive accounts given and most achieved this part of the question very well. It was noticeable and very pleasing that most candidates who tackled **Question 3(c)** were able to demonstrate accurate use of the past tenses.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what they did on getting home and why. Some candidates strayed away from the task here but those who tackled it generally did so successfully, usually referring to having a hot bath, warm cups of tea etc. Some omitted to give the reason, but those who did usually came up with some intricate explanations of what was needed and why.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe their plans for their next outing. Most did this with ease, usually referring to how they would ensure a happier trip next time. Use of the future was almost always successful, meaning that both Communication ticks were usually gained here.

Language

Many candidates have an impressive command of the German language. Others struggle with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. Generally, candidates this year seemed to provide good examples of future tenses but continued to be more challenged in their use of accurate past tenses. The weaker answers were generally only written in one tense and this meant that some sentences made little sense. Modal verbs again posed problems, often incorrectly used with *zu* and frequently inaccurate 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 still need to distinguish the difference between the verbs *Spaß haben* and *Spaß machen*. The verb *verbringen* continues to be a challenge, both in terms of understanding and use. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) continue to present difficulties and, hence, even the most able of candidates can lose out on their Verb mark.

This year Centres seemed more aware of the need for a range of verbs in order to have the highest possible chance of achieving full marks on the verb ticks. Many candidates have been prepared for the Verb mark and many underline or tick the verbs as they use them. There were instances of candidates getting to the end of the essay, realising they had too few verbs and filling up by listing several activities after *werden* in the last paragraph. However, there were still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who 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.

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, adjectives, comparatives, adverbial phrases, some impressive conditional sentences, etc. Candidates do need to be reminded about word order, however. Care should be taken for example after *weil* and other similar conjunctions which send the verb to the end of the clause, the use/position of the infinitive after modal verb, etc. The weaker answers tended to show hypercorrection of word order where *all* verbs were either sent to the end or to second place. The best answers showed a clear awareness of how to use subordinate clauses with *wenn*, *als*, etc. and were also able to demonstrate accurate use of relative clauses.

Candidates still need encouraging to take care over their spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Centres should be reminded that errors in capitalisation can have a significant affect on the marks awarded in OLF. Similarly, candidates must take care to write legibly, 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 the particulars of each question carefully and to respond to the exact questions being asked, rather than writing more generally on the topic area being covered in the question. Those who do not address the specifics of the question will not be awarded Communication points for that task. Candidates should also ensure that they are answering each task in the appropriate time frame. This is essential for achieving marks in both Communication and Language. Candidates must read the question to check the time frame that is required. In **Question 3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

In this session many candidates produced very pleasing answers using high levels of German and demonstrating good language use as well as showing accurate understanding. Many Centres had prepared their candidates successfully for the exam and had clearly made efforts to respond to the challenges of the exam and mark scheme in their current format.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 items which they might pack to take on holiday. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary for 5 such items. Many candidates completed this task easily and, indeed, there were a good number who wrote all 8 items correctly. A few candidates produced vocabulary for items which could evidently not be packed for a holiday (e.g. *Flugzeug*, *Schwimmbad*, etc.) and therefore could not score. There were frequent challenges in spellings, with *Camera*, and *Shue* being the most popular examples, and a surprising number of candidates struggled with the spellings for vocabulary such as sunglasses, sandals and swimming costume. Plurals caused problems, especially for weaker candidates. Some weaker candidates did benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items were accepted, despite poor spelling. However it was perhaps surprising how many candidates failed to find 5 items which they could convey accurately enough to achieve the 5 marks. Very poor candidates wrote in English or invented words. Marks were lost when one German word morphed into another, as in *Buche* and *Zahnbrust*.

The pictures clearly help inspire candidates' answers and most sets of answers comprised more or less the same list. However, Centres should be reminded that these pictures are intended to act as prompts, rather than being prescriptive. Some candidates still seemed to think they had to list the specific items in the pictures and lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items which would have been more familiar to them, personally.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about the topic of school. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their school, giving details they wanted to mention but without addressing the specific tasks which they had been given. 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. The question was marked for a maximum of 10 Communication marks and 5 marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question, most were able to achieve well and many candidates scored very highly on this question. Most candidates worked through the 4 tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence about each. However, Centres should note that in order to gain all ten Communication marks, candidates should be sure to cover all 4 Communication points. Many candidates wrote in good, straightforward language with the majority scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say where their school is and what sort of school it is. There were many good answers, with detail. However, with this question, a significant number of candidates were tempted to give their personal opinions of their school, rather than describing it. Others went into detail which was not asked for, such as the specifics of the school day. Again it is important that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the question.
- (b) Candidates were asked to say what they learnt in school and how they find their school subjects. The majority of candidates had no trouble in listing their school subjects and this provided a straightforward way of gaining Communication marks. Many also gave a good number of clear opinions with specific reasons. Some described how they physically find their way to their lessons, rather than how they feel about them.
- (c) Candidates were asked what they do with their school friends at lunchtime. Many gave clear answers, describing how they ate with their friends in the canteen, did sport/homework/etc. with their friends. Most candidates answered in the third person plural or included the phrase *mit meinen Freunden* and this qualified for the Communication marks. However, a significant number ignored the reference to friends, writing simply in the first person singular about what they did (apparently on their own) in the lunch break. Unfortunately, without reference to friends or appropriate use of *wir*, these answers could not score. Centres should be sure to remind their candidates to answer with careful reference to the question itself.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what they would like to do in the future, after leaving School. The majority referred to wanting to go to university for further study and many added appropriate reasons for their choices. Some referred to choice of future career. Some candidates interpreted the rubric as a description of free time activities after school (each day) rather than a reference to the future, once they are no longer at school, and therefore they failed to score.

In **Question 2**, most candidates scored well on the Language, with the majority scoring 5 out of 5. Very few scored below 3. Examples of language presenting frequent difficulties for candidates included *Lieblingsfächer* which many candidates thought was a singular noun, and *verlassen* which was not always known. In part (d) there were frequent examples of candidates using *bekommen* instead of *werden* for 'become'.

Question 3

Candidates were required to write a letter to their pen friend about a shopping trip last Saturday to buy presents. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates, possibly partly due to it being the first listed on the paper but also probably due to the topic being on shopping, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which many were clearly well-prepared for.

- (a) **Part (a)** This task required candidates to explain whether they usually like going shopping and why. Unfortunately some candidates omitted to address this task and launched straight into their account about last weekend's shopping trip. Some gave an opinion about going into town but omitted reference to shopping and failed to give a reason. These were costly omissions in terms of Communication points since the task was asking both for a general opinion and also for a reason about liking shopping. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific opinions/reasons in the present tense. Candidates do need to take great care to read the questions and to respond directly to them.

Part (b) This task asked why the candidate went into town last Saturday. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded but unfortunately some candidates wrote in the present tense, as if they were going into town (and despite the rubric making clear that the visit was last Saturday). Although many candidates answered well, there were many others who ignored the rubric (where it was explained that the candidate had gone into town to buy presents) and instead gave another reason for going into town. Others omitted to address the task entirely

and went straight to Part (c). Before answering the question, candidates should take care to refer to the rubric.

A number of candidates confused the words *das Geschenk* and *das Geschäft*, and some ambiguity was created by candidates' pluralisation of *Geschenk* (lifted from the rubric) but then used by candidates with a singular article/verb form. Many candidates also appear to think that *lieben* is a modal verb and this caused further inaccuracies in their grammar use.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered on the shopping trip. Most candidates addressed this task and many did so very well. Although a few candidates produced imaginative and well-expressed descriptions of what went wrong on the shopping trip, usually involving accidents and/or injury, most opted for straightforward examples like bad weather, transport problems, bad food or closed shops.

Less able candidates did not know the gender of *Wetter* or *Geschäft*, or the plural of *Laden*. Candidates who chose to talk about leaving something behind or losing something (usually their mobile phone or their money), frequently produced *verlassen* instead of *gelassen* and *verlosen* instead of *verloren*. There were sometimes long and complex descriptions of what went wrong and, on occasions, the intricate detail led to inaccurate German which would have been avoided with a more straightforward account. 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 describe what they planned to do next weekend and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Most candidates answered well, with many planning a shopping trip to buy whatever gift they failed to purchase last weekend, or celebrating the birthday, hoping for better weather next weekend etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future with many now able to use *ich habe vor, . . . zu . . .* which often made this section a pleasure to mark. Overall, the future tense seemed to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates struggled in their use of *ich möchte*, and this rendered the time frame of the answers ambiguous, thus preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of hobbies. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the second most popular amongst candidates and was generally answered successfully. The topic of free time/leisure is a popular one at this level and candidates are usually well prepared on the topic, as was evident here. However, perhaps an over-familiarity with the topic or a tendency to overlook the specifics of the tasks meant that a number of candidates sometimes failed to gain Communication marks due to carelessness or oversight. A small number of candidates ignored the bullet points in the question and simply wrote in general about free time.

Part (a) This task required candidates to describe what hobbies young people have and why. Most candidates started by talking about *junge Leute* or included themselves as being among the young people and so used *wir*. Some, however, unfortunately referred simply to their own hobbies/free time activities and so were unable to gain the Communication marks. It was surprising, also, that difficulties often seemed to arise for candidates attempting to articulate what young people do. Candidates often used poorly formed infinitive/noun constructions where they could no doubt have succeeded with more straightforward verb use. Attention to accuracy is important to ensure that verb forms and time frames are accurate. Most candidates gave reasons for the young people's opinions, though not all which was also unusual, given that this was a fairly straightforward task. Centres would do well to remind their candidates to check the requirements of each task to prevent valuable marks being lost.

Part (b) This task asked what the candidate had done in their free time last summer. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Although this was a straightforward task and, as expected, many candidates answered well, a significant number struggled in their verb use, such that the time frame was ambiguous (e.g. lack of auxiliary or inappropriate past participle etc.) and a maximum of one Communication mark was awarded in these instances. Centres should be reminded that candidates' ability to demonstrate accurate use of the past tense is essential at this level.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what hobbies their parents had when they were children. As such, this task presented the most challenges in **Question 3(b)**. Candidates who

understood the question properly were usually able to provide a decent attempt at an answer, though many were clearly struggling to imagine the types of hobbies their parents might have had. Sometimes their answers were over ambitious in detail, at the expense of accurate language use. However, many had not understood the task or had read it too quickly and instead gave comparisons between hobbies that parents and children have now, or they simply described their parents' current hobbies. As a result, this Communication point was the one which most often did not score and, where it did score, often only one out of the 2 possible ticks was awarded.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe how the generation of the future will spend their free time. A good number made reasonable efforts with this task. However, the use of the collective noun *die nächste Generation* presented a challenge for many candidates who found it hard to use accurately with an appropriate verb form. Most candidates attempted to refer to the dominance of technology in future leisure interests but many were again over-ambitious in their efforts, again at the expense of their accuracy in language use.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account about a recent trip to the mountains where the candidate lost his/her friend as it became dark. The candidate was given the first sentences which set the scene of the account to follow. This was the most challenging of the 3 options in **Question 3** and very few candidates chose it. Of those who did, however, the majority were very able candidates who apparently seemed to tackle it with ease, producing original and entertaining stories in near-fluent German and scoring very highly. This was the essay which allowed the best candidates to shine and, as an Examiner, it was refreshing to read such excellent German at this level, with candidates often exhibiting an impressive array of vocabulary, structure, idiom and accuracy. The question rarely appealed to the weaker candidates who perhaps had difficulty in understanding the question and probably did not have at their disposal the use of language needed to attempt it successfully.

Part (a) This task required candidates to explain their reaction on no longer being able to see their friend. Most expressed some form of shock/upset. A few omitted to address the task entirely.

Part (b) This task asked how the candidate found the friend again. There were many elaborate and impressive accounts given and most achieved this part of the question very well. It was noticeable and very pleasing that most candidates who tackled **Question 3(c)** were able to demonstrate accurate use of the past tenses.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what they did on getting home and why. Some candidates strayed away from the task here but those who tackled it generally did so successfully, usually referring to having a hot bath, warm cups of tea etc. Some omitted to give the reason, but those who did usually came up with some intricate explanations of what was needed and why.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe their plans for their next outing. Most did this with ease, usually referring to how they would ensure a happier trip next time. Use of the future was almost always successful, meaning that both Communication ticks were usually gained here.

Language

Many candidates have an impressive command of the German language. Others struggle with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. Generally, candidates this year seemed to provide good examples of future tenses but continued to be more challenged in their use of accurate past tenses. The weaker answers were generally only written in one tense and this meant that some sentences made little sense. Modal verbs again posed problems, often incorrectly used with *zu* and frequently inaccurate 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 still need to distinguish the difference between the verbs *Spaß haben* and *Spaß machen*. The verb *verbringen* continues to be a challenge, both in terms of understanding and use. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) continue to present difficulties and, hence, even the most able of candidates can lose out on their Verb mark.

This year Centres seemed more aware of the need for a range of verbs in order to have the highest possible chance of achieving full marks on the verb ticks. Many candidates have been prepared for the Verb mark and many underline or tick the verbs as they use them. There were instances of candidates getting to the end of the essay, realising they had too few verbs and filling up by listing several activities after *werden* in the last paragraph. However, there were still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who 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.

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, adjectives, comparatives, adverbial phrases, some impressive conditional sentences, etc. Candidates do need to be reminded about word order, however. Care should be taken for example after *weil* and other similar conjunctions which send the verb to the end of the clause, the use/position of the infinitive after modal verb, etc. The weaker answers tended to show hypercorrection of word order where *all* verbs were either sent to the end or to second place. The best answers showed a clear awareness of how to use subordinate clauses with *wenn*, *als*, etc. and were also able to demonstrate accurate use of relative clauses.

Candidates still need encouraging to take care over their spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Centres should be reminded that errors in capitalisation can have a significant affect on the marks awarded in OLF. Similarly, candidates must take care to write legibly, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/43
Writing

Key messages

Candidates should be reminded to read the particulars of each question carefully and to respond to the exact questions being asked, rather than writing more generally on the topic area being covered in the question. Those who do not address the specifics of the question will not be awarded Communication points for that task. Candidates should also ensure that they are answering each task in the appropriate time frame. This is essential for achieving marks in both Communication and Language. Candidates must read the question to check the time frame that is required. In **Question 3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

In this session many candidates produced very pleasing answers using high levels of German and demonstrating good language use as well as showing accurate understanding. Many Centres had prepared their candidates successfully for the exam and had clearly made efforts to respond to the challenges of the exam and mark scheme in their current format.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 items which they might pack to take on holiday. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary for 5 such items. Many candidates completed this task easily and, indeed, there were a good number who wrote all 8 items correctly. A few candidates produced vocabulary for items which could evidently not be packed for a holiday (e.g. *Flugzeug*, *Schwimmbad*, etc.) and therefore could not score. There were frequent challenges in spellings, with *Camera*, and *Shue* being the most popular examples, and a surprising number of candidates struggled with the spellings for vocabulary such as sunglasses, sandals and swimming costume. Plurals caused problems, especially for weaker candidates. Some weaker candidates did benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items were accepted, despite poor spelling. However it was perhaps surprising how many candidates failed to find 5 items which they could convey accurately enough to achieve the 5 marks. Very poor candidates wrote in English or invented words. Marks were lost when one German word morphed into another, as in *Buche* and *Zahnbrust*.

The pictures clearly help inspire candidates' answers and most sets of answers comprised more or less the same list. However, Centres should be reminded that these pictures are intended to act as prompts, rather than being prescriptive. Some candidates still seemed to think they had to list the specific items in the pictures and lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items which would have been more familiar to them, personally.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about the topic of school. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their school, giving details they wanted to mention but without addressing the specific tasks which they had been given. 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. The question was marked for a maximum of 10 Communication marks and 5 marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question, most were able to achieve well and many candidates scored very highly on this question. Most candidates worked through the 4 tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence about each. However, Centres should note that in order to gain all ten Communication marks, candidates should be sure to cover all 4 Communication points. Many candidates wrote in good, straightforward language with the majority scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say where their school is and what sort of school it is. There were many good answers, with detail. However, with this question, a significant number of candidates were tempted to give their personal opinions of their school, rather than describing it. Others went into detail which was not asked for, such as the specifics of the school day. Again it is important that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the question.
- (b) Candidates were asked to say what they learnt in school and how they find their school subjects. The majority of candidates had no trouble in listing their school subjects and this provided a straightforward way of gaining Communication marks. Many also gave a good number of clear opinions with specific reasons. Some described how they physically find their way to their lessons, rather than how they feel about them.
- (c) Candidates were asked what they do with their school friends at lunchtime. Many gave clear answers, describing how they ate with their friends in the canteen, did sport/homework/etc. with their friends. Most candidates answered in the third person plural or included the phrase *mit meinen Freunden* and this qualified for the Communication marks. However, a significant number ignored the reference to friends, writing simply in the first person singular about what they did (apparently on their own) in the lunch break. Unfortunately, without reference to friends or appropriate use of *wir*, these answers could not score. Centres should be sure to remind their candidates to answer with careful reference to the question itself.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what they would like to do in the future, after leaving School. The majority referred to wanting to go to university for further study and many added appropriate reasons for their choices. Some referred to choice of future career. Some candidates interpreted the rubric as a description of free time activities after school (each day) rather than a reference to the future, once they are no longer at school, and therefore they failed to score.

In **Question 2**, most candidates scored well on the Language, with the majority scoring 5 out of 5. Very few scored below 3. Examples of language presenting frequent difficulties for candidates included *Lieblingsfächer* which many candidates thought was a singular noun, and *verlassen* which was not always known. In part (d) there were frequent examples of candidates using *bekommen* instead of *werden* for 'become'.

Question 3

Candidates were required to write a letter to their pen friend about a shopping trip last Saturday to buy presents. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates, possibly partly due to it being the first listed on the paper but also probably due to the topic being on shopping, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which many were clearly well-prepared for.

- (a) **Part (a)** This task required candidates to explain whether they usually like going shopping and why. Unfortunately some candidates omitted to address this task and launched straight into their account about last weekend's shopping trip. Some gave an opinion about going into town but omitted reference to shopping and failed to give a reason. These were costly omissions in terms of Communication points since the task was asking both for a general opinion and also for a reason about liking shopping. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific opinions/reasons in the present tense. Candidates do need to take great care to read the questions and to respond directly to them.

Part (b) This task asked why the candidate went into town last Saturday. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded but unfortunately some candidates wrote in the present tense, as if they were going into town (and despite the rubric making clear that the visit was last Saturday). Although many candidates answered well, there were many others who ignored the rubric (where it was explained that the candidate had gone into town to buy presents) and instead gave another reason for going into town. Others omitted to address the task entirely

and went straight to Part (c). Before answering the question, candidates should take care to refer to the rubric.

A number of candidates confused the words *das Geschenk* and *das Geschäft*, and some ambiguity was created by candidates' pluralisation of *Geschenk* (lifted from the rubric) but then used by candidates with a singular article/verb form. Many candidates also appear to think that *lieben* is a modal verb and this caused further inaccuracies in their grammar use.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe problems which they encountered on the shopping trip. Most candidates addressed this task and many did so very well. Although a few candidates produced imaginative and well-expressed descriptions of what went wrong on the shopping trip, usually involving accidents and/or injury, most opted for straightforward examples like bad weather, transport problems, bad food or closed shops.

Less able candidates did not know the gender of *Wetter* or *Geschäft*, or the plural of *Laden*. Candidates who chose to talk about leaving something behind or losing something (usually their mobile phone or their money), frequently produced *verlassen* instead of *gelassen* and *verlosen* instead of *verloren*. There were sometimes long and complex descriptions of what went wrong and, on occasions, the intricate detail led to inaccurate German which would have been avoided with a more straightforward account. 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 describe what they planned to do next weekend and were therefore required to give an answer using a future time frame, in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Most candidates answered well, with many planning a shopping trip to buy whatever gift they failed to purchase last weekend, or celebrating the birthday, hoping for better weather next weekend etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future with many now able to use *ich habe vor, . . . zu . . .* which often made this section a pleasure to mark. Overall, the future tense seemed to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates struggled in their use of *ich möchte*, and this rendered the time frame of the answers ambiguous, thus preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of hobbies. Out of the 3 choices for **Question 3**, this option was the second most popular amongst candidates and was generally answered successfully. The topic of free time/leisure is a popular one at this level and candidates are usually well prepared on the topic, as was evident here. However, perhaps an over-familiarity with the topic or a tendency to overlook the specifics of the tasks meant that a number of candidates sometimes failed to gain Communication marks due to carelessness or oversight. A small number of candidates ignored the bullet points in the question and simply wrote in general about free time.

Part (a) This task required candidates to describe what hobbies young people have and why. Most candidates started by talking about *junge Leute* or included themselves as being among the young people and so used *wir*. Some, however, unfortunately referred simply to their own hobbies/free time activities and so were unable to gain the Communication marks. It was surprising, also, that difficulties often seemed to arise for candidates attempting to articulate what young people do. Candidates often used poorly formed infinitive/noun constructions where they could no doubt have succeeded with more straightforward verb use. Attention to accuracy is important to ensure that verb forms and time frames are accurate. Most candidates gave reasons for the young people's opinions, though not all which was also unusual, given that this was a fairly straightforward task. Centres would do well to remind their candidates to check the requirements of each task to prevent valuable marks being lost.

Part (b) This task asked what the candidate had done in their free time last summer. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Although this was a straightforward task and, as expected, many candidates answered well, a significant number struggled in their verb use, such that the time frame was ambiguous (e.g. lack of auxiliary or inappropriate past participle etc.) and a maximum of one Communication mark was awarded in these instances. Centres should be reminded that candidates' ability to demonstrate accurate use of the past tense is essential at this level.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what hobbies their parents had when they were children. As such, this task presented the most challenges in **Question 3(b)**. Candidates who

understood the question properly were usually able to provide a decent attempt at an answer, though many were clearly struggling to imagine the types of hobbies their parents might have had. Sometimes their answers were over ambitious in detail, at the expense of accurate language use. However, many had not understood the task or had read it too quickly and instead gave comparisons between hobbies that parents and children have now, or they simply described their parents' current hobbies. As a result, this Communication point was the one which most often did not score and, where it did score, often only one out of the 2 possible ticks was awarded.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe how the generation of the future will spend their free time. A good number made reasonable efforts with this task. However, the use of the collective noun *die nächste Generation* presented a challenge for many candidates who found it hard to use accurately with an appropriate verb form. Most candidates attempted to refer to the dominance of technology in future leisure interests but many were again over-ambitious in their efforts, again at the expense of their accuracy in language use.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account about a recent trip to the mountains where the candidate lost his/her friend as it became dark. The candidate was given the first sentences which set the scene of the account to follow. This was the most challenging of the 3 options in **Question 3** and very few candidates chose it. Of those who did, however, the majority were very able candidates who apparently seemed to tackle it with ease, producing original and entertaining stories in near-fluent German and scoring very highly. This was the essay which allowed the best candidates to shine and, as an Examiner, it was refreshing to read such excellent German at this level, with candidates often exhibiting an impressive array of vocabulary, structure, idiom and accuracy. The question rarely appealed to the weaker candidates who perhaps had difficulty in understanding the question and probably did not have at their disposal the use of language needed to attempt it successfully.

Part (a) This task required candidates to explain their reaction on no longer being able to see their friend. Most expressed some form of shock/upset. A few omitted to address the task entirely.

Part (b) This task asked how the candidate found the friend again. There were many elaborate and impressive accounts given and most achieved this part of the question very well. It was noticeable and very pleasing that most candidates who tackled **Question 3(c)** were able to demonstrate accurate use of the past tenses.

Part (c) Candidates were asked to describe what they did on getting home and why. Some candidates strayed away from the task here but those who tackled it generally did so successfully, usually referring to having a hot bath, warm cups of tea etc. Some omitted to give the reason, but those who did usually came up with some intricate explanations of what was needed and why.

Part (d) Candidates were asked to describe their plans for their next outing. Most did this with ease, usually referring to how they would ensure a happier trip next time. Use of the future was almost always successful, meaning that both Communication ticks were usually gained here.

Language

Many candidates have an impressive command of the German language. Others struggle with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. Generally, candidates this year seemed to provide good examples of future tenses but continued to be more challenged in their use of accurate past tenses. The weaker answers were generally only written in one tense and this meant that some sentences made little sense. Modal verbs again posed problems, often incorrectly used with *zu* and frequently inaccurate 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 still need to distinguish the difference between the verbs *Spaß haben* and *Spaß machen*. The verb *verbringen* continues to be a challenge, both in terms of understanding and use. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) continue to present difficulties and, hence, even the most able of candidates can lose out on their Verb mark.

This year Centres seemed more aware of the need for a range of verbs in order to have the highest possible chance of achieving full marks on the verb ticks. Many candidates have been prepared for the Verb mark and many underline or tick the verbs as they use them. There were instances of candidates getting to the end of the essay, realising they had too few verbs and filling up by listing several activities after *werden* in the last paragraph. However, there were still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who 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.

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, adjectives, comparatives, adverbial phrases, some impressive conditional sentences, etc. Candidates do need to be reminded about word order, however. Care should be taken for example after *weil* and other similar conjunctions which send the verb to the end of the clause, the use/position of the infinitive after modal verb, etc. The weaker answers tended to show hypercorrection of word order where *all* verbs were either sent to the end or to second place. The best answers showed a clear awareness of how to use subordinate clauses with *wenn*, *als*, etc. and were also able to demonstrate accurate use of relative clauses.

Candidates still need encouraging to take care over their spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Centres should be reminded that errors in capitalisation can have a significant affect on the marks awarded in OLF. Similarly, candidates must take care to write legibly, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.