

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/03
Speaking

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for May/June 2017.

Most Centres conducted the Speaking Test well and most Examiners had prepared themselves thoroughly before the examination. Candidates were usually examined with sympathy and friendliness, and were encouraged by their Examiners to achieve their best. However, some Centres do not follow correct procedures with the role play cards: it is essential that they are used at random during each session. Each candidate should be given one card containing two role play situations, and a *different* one should be handed to the next candidate to prepare while the previous candidate is being examined. Additionally, 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. Some Examiners do not respect the instruction to "pause" in role play B, thus not giving candidates a chance to react, as required. This can cost two marks, as if only one of two parts to a task is completed, the maximum mark is one (out of three).

In the Topic/General Conversation it is important to ask appropriate questions to bring out the best in the candidates. Open questions achieve this more successfully than closed ones. A few Examiners tend to talk too much instead of allowing the candidates to show what they can do. Some Examiners ask for points of general knowledge which is inappropriate in this type of exam.

Teacher/examiners must ensure that they always ask past **and** future questions in **both** conversations and they should keep on trying if they do not elicit a past/future construction straight away. Otherwise candidates may not be awarded a mark in the satisfactory band or above for Language. It is quite possible and permissible to re-phrase questions, such as by changing *Was wirst du machen?* to *Was möchtest du machen?*

Some centres train their candidates to open their presentation with a sentence similar to e.g. „*Ich habe meine Stadt als Thema gewählt und heute möchte ich zuerst über unsere Umweltprobleme sprechen.*“ This formula gives both tenses in the very first sentence and ensures that there are no worries, at least in the Topic Conversation, that one of the tenses might be missed out and access to the higher marks for Language denied. It should be remembered that *ich möchte* provides a perfectly acceptable "future tense", or indeed *ich würde*, *ich könnte* or *ich habe vor*. Using *seit* correctly constitutes a "past", for example „*Ich wohne seit drei Jahren in meiner Stadt.*“ Of course, more than one example of each tense is ideally required for a good, very good or outstanding mark for Language to be justifiable.

Most Centres kept to the stipulated timings, which are one to two minutes for the Presentation and approximately 5 minutes on each of the conversations. The role plays are not timed but should also take about 5 minutes.

Some Examiners allowed or even encouraged candidates to elaborate and expand on the required utterances in the role plays. This is counter-productive, as essential points may be missed out or changed and thus not counted, and there are no marks for anything extra. Some Examiners did not stop candidates from continuing beyond 2 minutes in the Topic Presentation and did not observe the correct timings in either conversation. If they are too short the mark for Communication is unlikely to be high and if they are too long the candidate may tire and their performance deteriorate. A small number of Examiners did 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 is clearly audible. This year again Moderators

encountered problems with CDs that did not play on some computers, and where either a 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 candidates making it difficult to hear them.

Administration in Centres was generally good 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 usually correct. It was necessary to scale some Centres' marks however, and it was more common for marking to be too generous rather than too severe. This over-generosity of marking was usually because it was not realised that Role Play tasks had not been adequately completed or that past or future tenses were missing from one of the conversations.

Internal moderation was usually carried out satisfactorily, but some Centres did not follow the correct procedure. It is essential that the marks for **each marking category** on the **Working Mark Sheet** are the **final internally moderated marks**, even if this means re-writing the whole of the WMS. The total marks on the WMS are then transferred to the MS1 and both totals must be identical. In case of discrepancy Moderators accept the WMS marks as correct and amend the MS1 marks.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays

Full guidance on the conduct of role plays is given on page 8 of the Teachers' Notes. Most Examiners had prepared well, enabling candidates to deal successfully with the tasks, especially in the first situation, Role Play A. The role plays were often performed in a realistic and lively manner. Good Examiners kept to the rubric, did not elaborate the role plays or miss out tasks and were willing to prompt candidates by repeating or slightly rephrasing the question, if they were struggling. The Examiner should read the introduction to the situation, not the candidate. However, candidates should be encouraged to look carefully at the information in the introduction during their preparation period. In general, candidates performed strongly in this section, as all the tasks were accessible. On occasion a loss of marks for a reaction (whether a negative reaction or one of pleasure) was caused by the Examiner not pausing before asking the question in the second part of the task. Most candidates managed to use accurate pronunciation as well as the correct register, and the past tense responses were on the whole very successful, though the ones in the future tense perhaps less so. Question formation again proved challenging to some candidates and this is an area that could profitably be practised by Centres for future tests.

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 penalized 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

A1 (Page 16, cards 1, 2, 3)

This role play seemed very straightforward and was done well by a large majority of candidates. Not everyone could pronounce *treiben* correctly and there were some pronunciation problems with *Kanu* also.

A2 (Page 17, cards 4, 5, 6)

The information required was again quite straightforward and this role play was also well done. The pronunciation problems that occurred, notably with *Himbeertorte* and *belegtes Brot* occasionally made full marks difficult to justify. It was permissible for full marks to ask „Wo ist die Toilette?“ rather than having to use *dürfen* correctly.

A3 (Page 18, cards 7, 8, 9)

This role play proved slightly more tricky than A1 and A2. Correct prepositions were required for full marks: the preposition for *ins Ausland* did not cause many problems, but many candidates did not realise that the question „In welches Land?“ required an answer that usually did not begin with *in*, for example *nach*

Deutschland. The vocabulary item *Ausland* did not seem familiar to all candidates however. *Kugelschreiber* and *Quittung* caused major pronunciation problems.

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 advisable for the Examiner to make a clear pause in the middle of the two-part question, otherwise the candidate may fail to “react”.

B1 (Page 19, cards 1, 4, 7)

Although *liegenlassen* was offered in the introduction, it was not always used correctly. *Verlassen* was not accepted as an alternative. *Köln* tended to be mispronounced. When asked if they had their passport with them, candidates really ought to have begun their answer with *Nein*, but this was not insisted on. There was real difficulty for many candidates in asking when the lost property office was open, probably because of the phrasing of the instruction, „Fragen Sie nach den Öffnungszeiten.“

B2 (Page 20, cards 2, 5, 8)

This role play proved somewhat more straightforward for most candidates. „*Ich bin krank*“ was the expected response to the question as to why the candidate had come to the chemist's. In the preparation period it should have been clear that some specific symptoms were required in the next response. Most candidates were able to think of two symptoms with little difficulty, and similarly to say how long they had been ill. *Für zwei Wochen* was not accepted for full marks however, nor as an alternative to *vor* when answering the question as to their most recent visit to the doctor's.

B3 (Page 21, cards 3, 6, 9)

The situation was unusual, but most candidates coped well, even though vast quantities of fish were sometimes ordered. *Forellen* proved surprisingly difficult to pronounce, it seemed that “I haven't got enough money on me” was hard to convey, and thinking of two things to do before returning to the market proved very problematical for many candidates, especially as two future tenses seemed to be required. However, an answer in the present tense using adverbs like *gleich*, *jetzt* or *dann*, such as „*ich gehe jetzt nach Hause und komme in ein paar Stunden wieder*“ would have been acceptable.

Topic Presentation/Conversation

Topic choice was in general appropriate and most 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, perhaps with the formula suggested in the **General Comments**. Candidates are recommended to choose something specific, such as ‘Music’ rather than ‘Hobbies’. In a small number of Centres the candidates all spoke on the same topic, which is not to be recommended, nor is the topic of “Myself” or “My life”.

It is important that the Topic Conversation does not sound rehearsed. Some Centres clearly over-prepared their candidates for this section, as well as for the Topic Presentation. The conversation should sound natural and a listener should not be aware that obvious preparation has been done. A high number of candidates lost marks for Language because they did not manage to produce correct past and future tenses. This was usually either a result of the teacher not asking the appropriate questions or not persevering when initially no correct tenses seemed to be forthcoming.

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, then responding to candidates by asking them to give more detail. This often led to a more natural discussion. Sensitive and thorough questioning helps candidates achieve well and enables them to give opinions and justifications using a wide range of structures and tenses. A good Examiner, of which there are many, shows genuine interest in what a candidate has to say.

If Examiners ask closed questions this does not encourage candidates to expand, and limits their performance. It is best not to repeat the same questions from candidate to candidate as this does not sound at all spontaneous and shows a lack of interest in each specific candidate. Please avoid difficult and

inappropriate questions or questions requiring general knowledge, which candidates might not be informed about. Please ensure that questions requiring answers in past and future tenses are not left to the end of either conversation, or indeed omitted altogether. Some really good candidates had to be penalised this year, even though they were fluent, as the whole of a particular conversation was in the present tense, and thus their mark for Language was capped at six.

Mark for General Impression

The impression mark was appropriately assessed for the most part, although some Examiners were rather severe on candidates who made a lot of grammar mistakes but nevertheless had a good level of fluency and a good accent. Conversely, some candidates whose grammatical accuracy is good may not be fluent or have good pronunciation or intonation.

GERMAN

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

General comments

The majority of candidates demonstrated sound comprehension of spoken German. The first part of the examination proved accessible to almost all, whilst the third section provided a challenge for the most capable candidates.

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. Candidates do not need to write in full sentences provided they have responded to the question. Familiarity with the question words is essential. 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.

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 distinct pattern to the occasionally incorrect answers.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task was based on publicity for a festival in the town of Warnstein. Most candidates managed to give the correct number (750) in **Question 9** but in **Question 11** some had difficulty in providing the answer *Rennen*. The visual multiple choice questions were generally well done, although *Birne* in **Question 13** did not seem to be known by a good number of candidates.

Section 2

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

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify six correct statements from a choice of twelve by listening to four interviews with young people on the subject of where they live or would like to live. Many candidates could identify three or four correct statements, but only the most able managed six. There was no discernible pattern to the incorrect answers.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured young people talking about how they travel. Candidates have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect, word or number. In **Question 17** a surprising number of candidates failed to replace *Ferienhaus* with *Zelt*. In **Question 18** it was less straightforward to replace *Spielen* and required genuine comprehension to achieve a satisfactory answer. The date change in **Question 19** was generally competently done. **Question 20** required candidates to produce an adjective to replace *schön*. *Stressig* was in the text but those candidates who chose to replace it with *Angst* did not gain the mark, because it made no sense in the context of the sentence. **Question 21** was well done.

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. **Question 22** and **Question 25** were generally successfully answered. There were a few possible answers to both **Question 23** and **Question 24** which seemed to cause difficulties for weaker candidates.

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 Jost Müller about his experiences leading tour groups. The most competent candidates generally managed to choose six correct answers. **Question 29** was the question most often answered incorrectly.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between Julia and her uncle. Julia was complaining about her mother who had joined Facebook. The text required detailed understanding to answer the questions satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding those candidates who feel that **Section 3** is beyond their competence and who do not even attempt to provide answers, that they will not be penalized for a wrong answer any more than for a blank line. It is always possible to pick up one or two marks in this section in the factual questions. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully and provide the information they are asked for.

Question 32 required straightforward listening as *blöd*, the key word in the question, was followed in quick succession by the answer, which many candidates correctly transcribed.

Many candidates found **Question 33** challenging.

Candidates had to work out whether Julia had said yes or no to avoid an argument in **Question 34**. The less competent candidates who had heard both options in Julia's explanation opted for the wrong one.

In **Question 35** there was some confusion about the pictures on Facebook and some candidates invalidated their answer by indicating that they were the mother's photographs.

Candidates also found **Question 36** challenging, but for those candidates who understood the question itself, the answer was straightforwardly expressed by Julia.

In **Question 37** most candidates who had followed the gist of the conversation so far were able to understand *sauer* and reproduce it to provide a successful response.

Question 38 (i)(ii) required two items of information in no particular order. The less competent candidates usually managed to convey at least one.

It was possible to lift the answer to **Question 39** directly from Julia's final utterance but the question was general and the actual words were not spoken, so it was a test of comprehension rather than of transcription.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 0525/12 Listening</p>

General comments

This listening examination produced the full range of marks from candidates. The first part of the examination proved accessible to almost all, whilst the third section provided a sufficient challenge for the most proficient candidates.

The format of the examination is familiar to candidates by now, but there are still a very few who do not put the correct number of responses in **Question 16**. In the written responses candidates are only required 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 create full sentences to be credited, but they do have to read the question words carefully in order to provide the correct information. 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. **Question 1** and **Question 4** were occasionally answered incorrectly.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task consisted of advertising for a Fitness Week. In **Question 9** most but not all candidates gave the correct answer *Mai*. The month was the required information but those who attempted to include the dates as well were not penalised. In **Question 11** most but by no means all candidates wrote the correct answer *24*. In the visual multiple choice questions, some did not know the fruit in **Question 14**, and many candidates chose the wrong option in **Question 15**, possibly because they were unfamiliar with the word *Burg*.

Section 2

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

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify six correct statements from a choice of twelve by listening to four interviews with young people on the subject of their pastimes. The majority of candidates could identify at least four correct statements, but few managed six. There was no observable pattern to the incorrect boxes ticked.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured two young people talking about their families. Candidates have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or number. Their answer has also to make sense in the context of the sentence. **Question 17** was well done. **Question 18** required careful listening to calculate Anita's siblings. There were a few possible correct answers (*eine Schwester, einen Bruder, zwei Geschwister*) which could not be lifted directly from Anita's description and therefore tested comprehension on the part of the candidate. In **Question 19** and **Question 20** candidates who were not familiar with *Streit* and *ruhig* as items of vocabulary had difficulty achieving a successful transcription. In **Question 21** a surprising number of candidates answered *mit dem Rad*.

Task 2 Second Part Questions 22 – 25

This is the first task where candidates are unsupported in their answers. It is vital that candidates are familiar with the question words and read the questions carefully, as inappropriate information will not be credited. In **Question 22** a pleasing number of candidates were familiar with *geschieden* as an item of vocabulary. Some candidates thought **Question 23** required a knowledge of geography and wrote down the names of countries not mentioned in the text. In **Question 24** many candidates were either unfamiliar with *wen* as a question word or failed to read the question carefully enough and interpreted *wen* as meaning 'when'. In **Question 25** it was simply necessary to write *toll* to gain the mark. Those candidates who wrote *genauso toll* did not 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 Herr Pritsch, a long distance HGV driver. Very few candidates gave six correct answers. There was no particular pattern to the incorrect choices. It is worth recommending to candidates that they tick a box even when they are not sure. There is no penalty for an incorrect answer.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between two school friends. Jörn was reporting back to Katja on a studies skills session. It required detailed understanding to answer some of 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 was generally correctly answered

In **Question 33** there were some problems with *ununterbrochen* as candidates interpreted it as *pro Woche*. A wide range of answers were acceptable as long as the candidate conveyed the notion of concentration.

Question 34 simply required the candidate to write *45 Minuten* but candidates rarely came up with the correct figure. A sound knowledge of numbers is essential at this level.

Question 35 was the most challenging question in this year's examination but it was nevertheless surprising that more candidates were not familiar with *Nachricht* as a message on a mobile phone.

In **Question 36** many candidates were unfamiliar with *stören* as an item of vocabulary but nevertheless got the gist of Jörn's music preferences when studying.

There a choice of answers to **Question 37**. Many answered correctly but some interpreted *fremdsprachig* as French and *japanisch* as Spanish.

In **Question 38** candidates mostly understood that early morning was the best time to learn. It was important to distinguish between 'mornings' and 'tomorrow' in the answer.

Question 39 was generally well answered as candidates found different ways of expressing Katja's difference of opinion with the learning expert.

Even candidates who had lost the thread of this conversation managed to convey that Jörn had the best marks in the class in **Question 40**.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/13
Listening

General comments

The majority of candidates demonstrated sound comprehension of spoken German. The first part of the examination proved accessible to almost all, whilst the third section provided a challenge for the most capable candidates.

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. Candidates do not need to write in full sentences provided they have responded to the question. Familiarity with the question words is essential. 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.

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 distinct pattern to the occasionally incorrect answers.

Task 2 Questions 9 – 15

This task was based on publicity for a festival in the town of Warnstein. Most candidates managed to give the correct number (750) in **Question 9** but in **Question 11** some had difficulty in providing the answer *Rennen*. The visual multiple choice questions were generally well done, although *Birne* in **Question 13** did not seem to be known by a good number of candidates.

Section 2

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

Task 1 Question 16

Candidates were required to identify six correct statements from a choice of twelve by listening to four interviews with young people on the subject of where they live or would like to live. Many candidates could identify three or four correct statements, but only the most able managed six. There was no discernible pattern to the incorrect answers.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17 – 21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this examination featured young people talking about how they travel. Candidates have to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect, word or number. In **Question 17** a surprising number of candidates failed to replace *Ferienhaus* with *Zelt*. In **Question 18** it was less straightforward to replace *Spielen* and required genuine comprehension to achieve a satisfactory answer. The date change in **Question 19** was generally competently done. **Question 20** required candidates to produce an adjective to replace *schön*. *Stressig* was in the text but those candidates who chose to replace it with *Angst* did not gain the mark, because it made no sense in the context of the sentence. **Question 21** was well done.

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. **Question 22** and **Question 25** were generally successfully answered. There were a few possible answers to both **Question 23** and **Question 24** which seemed to cause difficulties for weaker candidates.

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 Jost Müller about his experiences leading tour groups. The most competent candidates generally managed to choose six correct answers. **Question 29** was the question most often answered incorrectly.

Task 2 Questions 32 – 39

In the final task the conversation was between Julia and her uncle. Julia was complaining about her mother who had joined Facebook. The text required detailed understanding to answer the questions satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding those candidates who feel that **Section 3** is beyond their competence and who do not even attempt to provide answers, that they will not be penalized for a wrong answer any more than for a blank line. It is always possible to pick up one or two marks in this section in the factual questions. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully and provide the information they are asked for.

Question 32 required straightforward listening as *blöd*, the key word in the question, was followed in quick succession by the answer, which many candidates correctly transcribed.

Many candidates found **Question 33** challenging.

Candidates had to work out whether Julia had said yes or no to avoid an argument in **Question 34**. The less competent candidates who had heard both options in Julia's explanation opted for the wrong one.

In **Question 35** there was some confusion about the pictures on Facebook and some candidates invalidated their answer by indicating that they were the mother's photographs.

Candidates also found **Question 36** challenging, but for those candidates who understood the question itself, the answer was straightforwardly expressed by Julia.

In **Question 37** most candidates who had followed the gist of the conversation so far were able to understand *sauer* and reproduce it to provide a successful response.

Question 38 (i)(ii) required two items of information in no particular order. The less competent candidates usually managed to convey at least one.

It was possible to lift the answer to **Question 39** directly from Julia's final utterance but the question was general and the actual words were not spoken, so it was a test of comprehension rather than of transcription.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/21
Reading

Key messages

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 comments

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

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done.

Questions 6–10

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

Questions 11–15

Question 12 many candidates wrote **A**, describing Katie as cross rather than unhappy suggesting that they did not understand *traurig* or *böse* or *unglücklich*. For **Question 13**, some candidates chose **B** stating that Phillippa used to speak good French. Closer reading of the questions and text is recommended. Other questions were well done.

Questions 16–20

Overall, candidates acquitted themselves well. A few candidates seemed to select words randomly, so that the sentences were both grammatically and factually incorrect. One or two number of candidates used words not on the list to fill the gaps. **Question 17** was sometimes answered with *über*. In **Question 19** *Bergen* was popular as an answer.

This element of the **Zweiter Teil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner. Most candidates scored well on this exercise.

Questions 21–29

For **Question 21** some candidates wrote *Prag*, either not having read the question carefully to see that a country was required, or not realising that this is a town.

Questions 22–24 were generally well answered.

Question 25 This was mostly well answered, but some candidates wrote only about the girls talking together and failed to mention the lateness of the hour and so did not score a mark.

Question 26 was unproblematic.

Question 27(i) and (ii) Most scored at least one mark here. Marks were lost by candidates who did not read the text closely enough and listed variously museums, bridges rather than a bridge, the ice-cream parlour and ice-cream.

Question 28 Most candidates copied the text, which did not make perfect sense as written, but could be awarded the mark as it referred to *the Eiscafé*.

Question 29 Many just wrote the original question, with or without the inverted commas, but some also tried to put it into indirect speech.

Questions 30–34

As in previous years, a very few candidates ticked either all of the ‘Ja’ boxes or all ‘Nein’.

Most coped well with the True/False element of this exercise. There was no obviously discernible pattern for those who chose incorrect answers. When providing corrections to the incorrect assertions, a few 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.

Some candidates still tend to correct True sentences.

Question 30 Virtually all candidates gave a correct justification.

Question 31 Again, most responses were correct, although a few wrote that Clara was offered a job in Denmark.

Question 33 This was done reasonably well by most, but some used *durfte* in their answer, stating that Clara was allowed to rather than had to speak German at work.

Questions 35–41

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 focussed on them. Some copied out chunks of the text regardless; candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

Question 35 There were many correct answers, but some candidates lifted a chunk of text or else stated that the boys got off the bus at the park, rather than at the last bus stop.

Question 36 Most understood that the boys were investigating a noise, but some referred to the eyes of the animals.

Question 37 was correct in many cases, but some lifted from the text and said that the animal was *aus dem Schatten*.

Question 38 Almost all candidates answered correctly.

Question 39 This proved challenging for a large number of candidates.

Question 40 Many candidates got this right.

Question 41 Candidates often lifted a large chunk from the text or else attempted to paraphrase at length the last sentence or even the last two sentences, rather than just saying the man felt surprised.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/22
Reading

Key messages

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 comments

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

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done by candidates, except for **Question 3** where some candidates did not understand *Schach* and opted for the card game image.

Questions 6–10

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

Questions 11–15

Question 12 Many candidates wrote **B**, possibly because *Deutschland* preceded *Schweiz* in the text, which they did not read carefully enough, and they just wrote down the first word in the sentence. The same may be true for **Question 14**, where money appears before comfort. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of reading the whole sentence before answering the question. All other questions were well done.

Questions 16–20

Overall, candidates seemed to find this exercise more challenging than has been the case in previous years. Some candidates seemed to select words randomly, so that the sentences were both grammatically and factually incorrect. A number of candidates used words which were not on the list to fill the gaps. **Questions 16** and **17** were done well by most, although some 20% said *preiswert* for **Question 16**. For **Question 18**, only a noun could really fit in and make sense, but there were many variations. In **Question 19** *organisieren* was popular as an answer, and many in **Question 20** used *Abendessen* instead of *Abend*.

Questions 21–29

This element of the **ZweiterTeil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner. Most candidates scored well on this exercise, although few were able to provide the correct person of the verb. **Question 21** was a good example of this, with many writing *Tierarzt machen*.

Question 22 There was an easy answer (*er mag Tiere*) or the more complex one about it being the perfect job for Hakan in his eyes. Many transferred that statement to his parents.

Question 23 had a variety of answers, from the correct one, to his school and even his parents.

Questions 24(i) and (ii) caused candidates the most difficulty, but mainly for those who copied directly from the text with no attempt at manipulation, because this raised confusion as to who was who. There were many options to gain the two marks, but often not writing enough meant the mark was not scored (e.g. forgetting to add 'the neighbour said' with Hakan maybe finding a job at the vet's). Many thought that being invited for interview was an answer, and there were a few candidates who had the neighbour and Hakan getting on well, and some others who conveyed that Hakan and the vet were going out with each other.

Questions 25 and 26 were completed well by almost all candidates.

Question 27 Most scored the mark in **Question 27**, and those that did not tended either just to say that Hakan worked at the reception, or forgot to add either the customers or the telephone in the answer.

Question 28 Most candidates copied the text, which began with *als eine Frau...* which although did not make perfect sense as written was still awarded the mark. Some candidates forgot the verb, which suggested that Hakan was afraid of the woman as well as the dog.

Question 29 Many transcribed the original question, with or without the inverted commas; quite a few tried to put it into indirect speech, with a selection of subordinating conjunctions

Questions 30–34

As in previous years, a very few candidates ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all 'Nein'.

Most coped well with the True/False element of this exercise, although those who did not get 5/5 tended to either get **Questions 33 and 34** the wrong way round, or **Questions 30 and 34** the wrong way round. 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.

Some candidates still tend to correct True sentences.

Question 30 The majority justified the answer completely although a good number wrote out the whole sentence about asking Frank if he had any books to give Karin.

Question 31 Not many candidates realised the simplicity of the answer to this question, namely of correcting *einfach* to *schwer* or *schwierig*. Many mentioned the distance of the library from Karin's, but there were many also who worked out the correct reason, even if it took several lines to explain it.

Question 33 The justification was done reasonably well by most, although a large number wrote *Karin hat als 20 Bücher bekommen*, missing out the crucial word *mehr*.

Questions 35–41

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 focussed on them. Some copied out chunks of the text regardless; candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

Question 35 was a prime example of indiscriminate lifting, as many candidates just copied out the first sentence. Many did not appear to understand the word *verpasst*.

Question 36 Some candidates did not appear to have read the first two words of the question carefully enough. If they did, then the answer was easy.

Question 37 was correct in many cases.

Question 38 needed good understanding, and the knowledge of the difference between *als* and *weil*.

Question 39 had candidates writing large chunks of unnecessary text, in the hope that the right material was in there somewhere. The difference between *konnte* and *könnte* proved problematic for some.

Question 40 Many candidates got this wrong: *er war krank*, or *wegen Ohrenschmerzen* were the most frequent wrong answers.

Question 41 worked if candidates understood the first three words of the question. Those candidates scored the mark, but others did not, as they either did not relate to the right time factor, or the right person, referring to Leon's friends instead.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/23
Reading

Key messages

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 comments

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

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–5

These were generally well done.

Questions 6–10

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

Questions 11–15

Question 12 many candidates wrote **A**, describing Katie as cross rather than unhappy suggesting that they did not understand *traurig* or *böse* or *unglücklich*. For **Question 13**, some candidates chose **B** stating that Phillippa used to speak good French. Closer reading of the questions and text is recommended. Other questions were well done.

Questions 16–20

Overall, candidates acquitted themselves well. A few candidates seemed to select words randomly, so that the sentences were both grammatically and factually incorrect. One or two number of candidates used words not on the list to fill the gaps. **Question 17** was sometimes answered with *über*. In **Question 19** *Bergen* was popular as an answer.

This element of the **Zweiter Teil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner. Most candidates scored well on this exercise.

Questions 21–29

For **Question 21** some candidates wrote *Prag*, either not having read the question carefully to see that a country was required, or not realising that this is a town.

Questions 22–24 were generally well answered.

Question 25 This was mostly well answered, but some candidates wrote only about the girls talking together and failed to mention the lateness of the hour and so did not score a mark.

Question 26 was unproblematic.

Question 27(i) and (ii) Most scored at least one mark here. Marks were lost by candidates who did not read the text closely enough and listed variously museums, bridges rather than a bridge, the ice-cream parlour and ice-cream.

Question 28 Most candidates copied the text, which did not make perfect sense as written, but could be awarded the mark as it referred to *the Eiscafé*.

Question 29 Many just wrote the original question, with or without the inverted commas, but some also tried to put it into indirect speech.

Questions 30–34

As in previous years, a very few candidates ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all 'Nein'.

Most coped well with the True/False element of this exercise. There was no obviously discernible pattern for those who chose incorrect answers. When providing corrections to the incorrect assertions, a few 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.

Some candidates still tend to correct True sentences.

Question 30 Virtually all candidates gave a correct justification.

Question 31 Again, most responses were correct, although a few wrote that Clara was offered a job in Denmark.

Question 33 This was done reasonably well by most, but some used *durfte* in their answer, stating that Clara was allowed to rather than had to speak German at work.

Questions 35–41

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 focussed on them. Some copied out chunks of the text regardless; candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of genuine comprehension.

Question 35 There were many correct answers, but some candidates lifted a chunk of text or else stated that the boys got off the bus at the park, rather than at the last bus stop.

Question 36 Most understood that the boys were investigating a noise, but some referred to the eyes of the animals.

Question 37 was correct in many cases, but some lifted from the text and said that the animal was *aus dem Schatten*.

Question 38 Almost all candidates answered correctly.

Question 39 This proved challenging for a large number of candidates.

Question 40 Many candidates got this right.

Question 41 Candidates often lifted a large chunk from the text or else attempted to paraphrase at length the last sentence or even the last two sentences, rather than just saying the man felt surprised.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/41
Writing

Key messages

Centres should encourage their candidates to work through the tasks in each question in an ordered fashion and to be sure to fulfil the specific demands of each task set. Candidates must spot the difference between stating an opinion and giving an explanation for an opinion. Candidates should be trained to read a question word and to respond with a specific answer to that question word, and to look at the tense of the question and ensure that the answer is given in the same time frame. In **Q3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

Overall, most Centres had prepared their candidates well, and had made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the examination specifications. 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.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 buildings, which might be found in town. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary of 5 such items. Many candidates completed this task easily, most achieved the full 5 marks and, indeed, there were a good number who wrote all 8 items correctly. A few candidates had not understood the word *Gebäude* and produced vocabulary for items which were not buildings (e.g. *Leute*, *Auto*, etc.) and therefore could not score for these words. There were also many incorrect spellings and some were too far removed to be understood (e.g. *Kirsche* for *Kirche*, etc.). A surprising number of candidates seemed to struggle with some vocabulary items, which on first reading might have been considered as straightforward (e.g. *Krankenhaus*, *Stadion*, etc.). Weaker candidates do, however, continue to benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items are accepted, in spite of poor spellings. The pictures evidently help prompt candidates' responses, and most sets of answers were comprised of more or less the same list, following the picture prompts given. However, Centres should be reminded that these pictures are intended to act merely as ideas, to help the candidate. A few candidates felt the need to list the specific items in the pictures and probably lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items with which they may have been more familiar, and which would have been entirely appropriate, despite not appearing in any of the picture prompts.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about the topic of their school friend. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their chosen person, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing the specific tasks which had been set. This is an example of where candidates need to take care to read the particulars of each question, rather than simply writing generally on a given topic area. The question was marked out of a maximum of 10 Communication marks and 5 marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question and the majority were able to score 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. Generally the language used was very pleasing, with most candidates scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say what their school friend is called and what he/she looks like. There were many good answers, with detail. Some failed, however, to understand or take note of the verb 'aussieht', and gave an account of the person's age/character/family/etc., instead of describing the person's physical appearance. To be sure of gaining the communication marks, it is imperative that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the task set; communication credit cannot be given for information that is not part of the question asked.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe which school subjects their friend likes. Some candidates had misunderstood and wrote about their own preferences, thus failing to score, but the majority answered well. Many avoided the temptation to give a list, and instead gave clear and well-reasoned responses.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain why they and their school friend get on well together. Many used predictable adjectives as reasons (*weil er lustig/freundlich ist*, etc.). Others described activities which they enjoyed doing together with their friend. Some answers failed to gain credit because the candidates merely stated whether or not they liked their friend, rather than giving a reason for their opinion. Again, candidates should be reminded to read the task carefully, before embarking on their answer.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what they will do with their school friend in school next week. Unfortunately some did not read the task carefully enough and went on to describe plans for going out/holidays/etc together but, without reference to the link with school, they were unable to score. However, there were many pleasing responses to the task, ranging from revising for/writing exams together, to performing in a school production/playing football/etc.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a trip to the zoo last weekend. Out of the 3 choices for **Q3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates. This may partly have been due to it being the first **Question 3** option listed on the paper but also probably due to the topic being on a trip out, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which most were well-prepared to write about.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain what he/she saw at the zoo last weekend. The majority responded very well, with lists of animals seen, and some pleasing descriptions/opinions given too. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded, and most candidates were successful in this.

Part (b)

Candidates were asked to describe what they did at lunchtime, and so the answer required a past time frame for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Some candidates wrote about their usual lunchtimes activities in the present tense, rather than give specific reference in the past tense to last weekend's visit to the zoo. However, there were plenty of successful responses, often describing where the candidate ate/what they ate/ what other activities they did in their lunch break, etc.

Part (c)

This task asked why the candidate likes/doesn't like going to the zoo. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific reasons in the present tense. Some candidates merely stated their opinion rather than giving reasons. Others failed to recognise that, whilst the previous two tasks referred to last weekend, this task was a more general question in the present. Most, however, were able to score at least one tick and there were some impressive efforts by candidates expressing their opinions on the way zoos care for animals, whether animals should remain in the wild, etc.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to give their opinions about animal programmes on the television. It was rewarding to see many candidates rising to the challenge with a good range of vocabulary and ideas at their disposal. Most candidates made an attempt and expressed a simple opinion, even if they didn't feel able to manipulate more sophisticated ideas/language.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what he/she will 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 another trip out, some wanting to return to the zoo, or needing to stay at home and revise for exams, etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future, and this was a pleasure to see. Overall, the future tense seems to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates continue to struggle in their use of *ich möchte*, rendering the time frame ambiguous and preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of modern technology. The topic of technology is a popular one at this level, though candidates are not always so well equipped with the language/vocabulary needed to deal with it as successfully as some of the other topics. Hence perhaps why this question was the least popular option on this paper, and it may be that Centres have done well in reminding their candidates to check the requirements of each task before embarking on a question which, whilst seeming to appeal, may be ambitious at the expense of language accuracy.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe their internet use last week. Candidates referred to needing the internet for games/schoolwork, using it for films/communication, etc. Some incorrect past participles were used, where candidates could no doubt have succeeded with more familiar verbs. Attention to accuracy is important to ensure that verb forms and time frames are accurate and that two Communication ticks are achieved.

Part (b)

This task asked the candidate for an explanation as to why he/she likes playing computer games. A present tense was required and candidates attempting this task made good efforts, but again their verb use was not always accurate enough to achieve both Communication ticks.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what mobile phones used to be like a few years ago. This task was probably the most challenging in this question. Some did not attempt this task, whilst others made a decent attempt at an answer, though accuracy was an issue.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to explain why technology is important and were generally able to put forward a reasonable answer with correct language use and accurate present tense, allowing two Communication ticks.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to explain what role technology will play in the future when they have their own children. Again good attempts were made, though candidates were perhaps a little limited with ideas here and perhaps at the expense of their accuracy in language use.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account of what happened, having recently received a large sum of money from a grandmother. The candidates were given the first sentence, which set the scene of the account to follow. This was the second most popular of the 3 options in Q3, with candidates perhaps relating well to the idea of receiving a large gift and imagining ways to spend it. This is the narrative option, and hence the more creative option on the paper. Most candidates were well enough equipped with the necessary language, and even the weaker candidates made some praiseworthy efforts here.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain their reaction on receiving the money and most were able to say that they were happy/surprised/thankful/etc. Some however, were confused with their knowledge of adjectives, choosing for example *müde*, amongst others. A past tense reaction was required for this task, so those expressing their feelings in the present tense were limited to one Communication tick out of a possible two.

Part (b)

This task asked why the candidate received the money. There were some impressive explanations given, and most achieved this part of the question very well, referring, for example, to a recent birthday or to the death of a grandmother, or to having deserved the money as a result of hard work.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe the reactions of family and friends to their receiving the money. Overall these reactions were less well expressed to those in part (a) perhaps because candidates found the challenge of a past reaction in the 3rd person harder to get right. Centres would do well to remind their candidates that the use of *er/sie war, sie waren* + adjective is as effective as *ich war* + adjective.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe what they have already done with the money. Most did this with ease, usually explaining what they had bought with the money. Language use was almost always successful in this task, meaning that both Communication ticks were usually gained here.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what they will do with the money in the future. Again, this task was generally carried out successfully, usually including hopes to save the money for their studies or to buy a large house/car/holiday for them/their family, and some even expressing their wish to buy some gifts for their grandmother! Good efforts were made in the use of the future and this was pleasing to see.

Language

Many candidates demonstrate a confident command of the German language. Others continue to struggle more with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. This year many candidates showed good examples of future tenses but fewer accurate past tenses. Often the auxiliary verb is missing or incorrect, and there are still many incorrect past participles used, even of very common verbs (*spielen, treiben*, etc). Modal verbs again posed problems, with few candidates able to differentiate between *mochte* and *möchte, konnte* and *könnte* or *wurde, würde* and *werde*. Candidates also frequently treated *lieben* as a modal verb. This session many candidates needed to distinguish between the verbs *bekommen* and *werden*. Nouns (genders, cases and especially plurals) continue to be a challenge for candidates and, as a result, even the most able of

candidates can lose out on their Verb mark. Pronouns can also present a problem for the awarding of verb ticks, where candidates use, for example, *du* for *man* or spell *man* as *mann*.

Centres have become 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. That said, there are still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who fail to do so without demonstrating their use of a wide enough range of different verbs. Only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a Verb tick. Many candidates need training in recognising the tense of a set task and in responding accordingly with their own verb use. Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded mark scheme. This session, there were many candidates scoring very highly here with some excellent language used. It was pleasing to see some progress in improved word order amongst candidates, and candidates using subordinating clauses effectively. However, word order remains an area where many Centres would do well to train their candidates further. Candidates still need to take care over spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Errors in capitalisation can have a significant effect on the marks awarded in OLF. Candidates must write legibly, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/42
Writing

Key messages

Centres should encourage their candidates to work through the tasks in each question in an ordered fashion and to be sure to fulfil the specific demands of each task set. Candidates must spot the difference between stating an opinion and giving an explanation for an opinion. Candidates should be trained to read a question word and to respond with a specific answer to that question word, and to look at the tense of the question and ensure that the answer is given in the same time frame. In **Q3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

Overall, most Centres had prepared their candidates well, and had made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the examination specifications. 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.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 items, which might be taken on a picnic. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary of 5 such items. The majority of candidates completed this task easily, almost all achieved the full 5 marks and, indeed, there were many who wrote all 8 items correctly. Most candidates chose to list food items which, generally, are well known and popular vocabulary items. Some candidates chose picnic vocabulary that was not food specific (e.g. mobile phone, bag, chair, football, etc.), but these were generally accepted, since they were all items which could be used at a picnic). Overall, spellings were generally good, though there were some particular vocab items which featured many variations (e.g. *Brot*, often with umlaut or with *d* in place of *t*, also many variations on spelling of *Schokolade*, etc). Weaker candidates continue to benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items are accepted, in spite of poor spellings. Plurals, however, continue to be a challenge for candidates across the ability range.

The pictures evidently help prompt candidates' responses, and most sets of answers consisted of more or less the same list, following the picture prompts given. There were, however, some who were more imaginative in their answers; strawberries seemed a popular alternative, for example! Centres should remember that the pictures are intended to act merely as ideas, to help the candidate, and are not prescriptive.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about a famous person. Unfortunately, despite the fact that '*berühmt*' features on the Minimum Core Vocabulary list, some candidates seemed unfamiliar with, or unsure of, its meaning. Centres would do well to note that any vocabulary item listed on the Minimum Core Vocabulary list may be tested on the paper, and candidates must learn the vocabulary and expect to see it used. Some candidates misread *berühmt* for *beliebt* and so wrote about a beloved/favourite person. Others made no reference to the meaning of the word at all and just wrote about a friend/family member or even about themselves. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their chosen person, giving

the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing the specific tasks which had been set. This is an example of where candidates need to take care to read the particulars of each question, rather than simply writing generally on a given topic area. The question was marked out of 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 a reasonable number of marks, in spite of the issues mentioned above, and many candidates in fact scored 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. Generally the language used was very pleasing, with the majority of candidates scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say what the famous person is called and what he/she looks like. From candidates who had understood the question, there were many good answers, with detail. However, a number of candidates wrote a description about themselves (in the first person), instead of a description of someone else, and a significant number of candidates wrote about a family member or friend, with no reference to their being famous. Many failed to understand or take note of the verb *'aussieht'*, and gave an account of the person's age/character/family/etc., instead of describing the person's physical appearance. To be sure of gaining the communication marks, it is imperative that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the task set; communication credit cannot be given for information that is not part of the question asked.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe the person's profession. From those who had understood the question, there was a pleasing spread of famous people described. The majority worked as pop singers/film stars/football players/etc., but there were also scientists, politicians and historical figures, amongst others. Those candidates who had misunderstood and who wrote about a school friend did not generally achieve on this task, as there was no profession given.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain why they like the person. Many gave good answers, and some even attempted sophisticated reasons with reference, for example, to the person's concern for the underprivileged or to their work on women's rights, etc. Others used predictable adjectives as reasons (*weil er lustig/freundlich ist*, etc.). Some answers failed to gain credit because the candidates merely stated whether or not they liked their chosen person, rather than giving a reason for their opinion. Again, candidates should be reminded to read the task carefully, before embarking on their answer.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what the person will do in the future. There were many imaginative responses to this task and even those who had written about historical figures managed well with an appropriate response. Unfortunately many candidates misread the question and wrote their answer in the first person about their own plans for the future, rather than in the 3rd person about their chosen person. Hence they failed to score on this task

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a trip to the sports centre last weekend. Out of the 3 choices for **Q3**, this option was by far 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 sport/healthy living, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which most were well-prepared to write about.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain what he/she did at the sport centre last weekend and the majority responded very well. There were many successful answers with reference to having done sport, played football, been swimming etc. in the sport centre, though unfortunately there were frequent references to *'Sport spielen'* rather than *'Sport treiben'* and, when used, *'treiben'* was also often incorrectly formed, most notably in the past tense. Similarly, there were frequent appearances of the incorrect past participle *'gespielen'*. Surprisingly, the word *'Sportzentrum'* was understood by some to be a sports shop or a stadium for watching matches or even a place to go fishing! A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded, but unfortunately some candidates wrote in the present tense, (and this, despite the rubric making clear that the visit was last weekend). A significant number of candidates did write in the past tense about going to the sports centre last weekend but without explaining what they did there. To have the highest chance

of scoring, candidates do need to take great care to read the tasks sets and to respond directly to them.

Part (b)

This task asked why the candidate likes/doesn't like going to the sport centre. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific reasons in the present tense. A significant number of candidates merely stated their opinion rather than giving reasons. Others failed to recognise that, whilst the first task referred to last weekend, this task was a more general question in the present. Most, however, were able to score at least one Communication tick and many answered very favourably, referring to their love of sport, the health merits of doing sport, the friendly people at the sport centre, the inexpensive entrance fee, etc.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what they did at lunchtime, and so the answer required a past time frame for both Communication ticks to be awarded. This presented some challenges, as some candidates wrote about their usual lunchtimes activities in the present tense, rather than give specific reference in the past tense to last weekend's visit to the sport centre. However, there were plenty of successful responses, often describing where the candidate ate/what they ate/ what sporting activity they did in their lunch break, etc.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe how to live healthily. Many candidates successfully used a modal verb (e.g. *man muss/soll...*) in their answer and this was pleasing to see, though sadly '*man*' was all too often spelt as '*mann/Mann*'. The topic of healthy living/eating had clearly been covered well in many Centres, and candidates had a good range of vocabulary and ideas at their disposal. A few candidates (who perhaps didn't feel equipped to answer this task?) simply left it out.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what he/she will 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 another trip out, some wanting to return to the sports centre, or needing to stay at home and revise for exams, etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future, and this was a pleasure to see. Overall, the future tense seems to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates continue to struggle in their use of *ich möchte*, rendering the time frame ambiguous and preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of pocket money. Out of the 3 choices for **Q3**, this option was probably the least successful amongst candidates, perhaps surprising given the topic. It seems that whilst candidates are able to write well about buying/wanting to buy, they are less well equipped to deal with more general opinions on the significance of money.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe what they did with their pocket money last month. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Most candidates were successful here, describing what they bought/did with their money, often citing recent shopping trips/visits to the cinema/etc. 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 could be awarded in these instances. Some candidates appeared to write more generally in the present tense about their use of money, rather than specifically about what happened last month. Centres should be reminded that candidates' ability to demonstrate accurate use of the past tense is essential at this level.

Part (b)

This task required the candidate to explain why he/she thinks they do/do not receive enough pocket money. A surprising number of candidates missed this out, or simply stated an opinion without giving the reason. Even the more able candidates seemed unsure as to how to tackle this task. As a result, this Communication point was the one which most often did not score or gained only one out of the 2 possible ticks.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to explain why it is important to have their own money. There were some very good attempts at this task with references to needing to buy presents/clothes/wanting cinema trips/etc, though, as with the previous task, it was surprising that more candidates did not rise to the challenge as imaginatively as they might have done.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe what they have already done to earn money. Most candidates made a good effort here, describing part time jobs/babysitting/etc. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded and, although many were successful, a significant number continue to struggle in their verb use, such that the time frame is ambiguous (e.g. lack of auxiliary or inappropriate past participle etc.) and a maximum of one Communication mark can be awarded in these instances.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked what sort of job they would like to have in the future. Most made very good efforts with this task and were able to express clearly and accurately their ideas/hopes for the future. It is pleasing to see candidates coping well with their use of the future time frame.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account about a recent party at his/her house, to which many uninvited guests turned up. The candidate was given the first sentences, which set the scene of the account to follow. Candidates seemed to enjoy tackling this option, perhaps because they could easily relate to the subject matter! Of those who did, the more successful were the able candidates who had at their disposal the language and grammar to produce some more original and entertaining stories and still to score well overall. A number of weaker candidates also chose this question but were less successful in their scores and should perhaps have chosen a more straightforward option, where they may have had greater chance of a higher mark.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain their reaction to so many people arriving and most were able to say that they were unhappy/afraid/etc. A past tense reaction was required for this task, so those expressing their feelings in the present tense were limited to one Communication tick out of a possible two.

Part (b)

This task asked what the young people did at the party. Most referred to dancing, drinking, breaking items in the house etc., though when candidates became more ambitious in their account, this was often at the expense of language accuracy.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what they did to bring the situation under control. The more able candidates had no problems here and there was a wide range of suggestions given, from calling the police, to sending everyone away/turning the music down/etc. However, those candidates with a smaller vocabulary struggled to explain accurately.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe their parents' reaction on arriving home. Overall these reactions were less well expressed to those in part (a) perhaps because candidates found the challenge of a past reaction in the 3rd person harder to get right. Centres would do well to remind their candidates that the use of *er/sie war, sie waren* + adjective is as effective as *ich war* + adjective.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what they will do at home next weekend. This task was generally carried out successfully, usually with reference to a quiet weekend at home, either because the parents had ordered it (*Hausarrest* was referred to a number of times) or because the candidate wanted it. Some candidates did not score because they failed to read the question properly and talked about going out/going away rather than explaining what they would do at home. Overall, good efforts were made at the use of the future and this was pleasing to see.

Language

Many candidates demonstrate a confident command of the German language. Others continue to struggle more with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. This year many candidates showed good examples of future tenses but fewer accurate past tenses. Often the auxiliary verb is missing or incorrect and there are still many incorrect past participles used, even of very common verbs (*spielen, treiben*, etc). Modal verbs again posed problems, with few candidates able to differentiate between *mochte* and *möchte*, *konnte* and *könnte* or *wurde*, *würde* and *werde*. Candidates also frequently treated *lieben* as a modal verb. This session many candidates needed to distinguish between the verbs *bekommen* and *werden*. Nouns (genders, cases and especially plurals) continue to be a challenge for candidates and, as a result, even the most able of candidates can lose out on their Verb mark. Pronouns can also present a problem for the awarding of verb ticks, where candidates use *du* for *man* or spell *man* as *mann*. Centres have become 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. That said, there are still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who fail to do so without demonstrating their use of a wide enough range of different verbs. Only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a Verb tick. Many candidates need training in recognising the tense of a set task and in responding accordingly.

Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded markscheme. This session, there were many candidates scoring very highly here with some excellent language used. It was pleasing to see some progress in improved word order amongst candidates, and candidates using subordinating clauses effectively. However, word order remains an area where many Centres would do well to train their candidates further. Candidates still need to take care over spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Errors in capitalisation can have a significant effect on the marks awarded in OLF. Candidates must write legibly, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/43
Writing

Key messages

Centres should encourage their candidates to work through the tasks in each question in an ordered fashion and to be sure to fulfil the specific demands of each task set. Candidates must spot the difference between stating an opinion and giving an explanation for an opinion. Candidates should be trained to read a question word and to respond with a specific answer to that question word, and to look at the tense of the question and ensure that the answer is given in the same time frame. In **Q3** candidates will often need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks.

General comments

Overall, most Centres had prepared their candidates well, and had made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the examination specifications. 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.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of 8 buildings, which might be found in town. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary of 5 such items. Many candidates completed this task easily, most achieved the full 5 marks and, indeed, there were a good number who wrote all 8 items correctly. A few candidates had not understood the word *Gebäude* and produced vocabulary for items which were not buildings (e.g. *Leute*, *Auto*, etc.) and therefore could not score for these words. There were also many incorrect spellings and some were too far removed to be understood (e.g. *Kirsche* for *Kirche*, etc.). A surprising number of candidates seemed to struggle with some vocabulary items, which on first reading might have been considered as straightforward (e.g. *Krankenhaus*, *Stadion*, etc.). Weaker candidates do, however, continue to benefit from the 'if in doubt, sound it out' rule, meaning that some vocabulary items are accepted, in spite of poor spellings. The pictures evidently help prompt candidates' responses, and most sets of answers were comprised of more or less the same list, following the picture prompts given. However, Centres should be reminded that these pictures are intended to act merely as ideas, to help the candidate. A few candidates felt the need to list the specific items in the pictures and probably lost marks trying to list these words, rather than make use of vocabulary items with which they may have been more familiar, and which would have been entirely appropriate, despite not appearing in any of the picture prompts.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer 4 sub-questions about the topic of their school friend. Some candidates were tempted to write in length about their chosen person, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing the specific tasks which had been set. This is an example of where candidates need to take care to read the particulars of each question, rather than simply writing generally on a given topic area. The question was marked out of a maximum of 10 Communication marks and 5 marks for Language, the latter from a banded mark scheme.

Almost all candidates attempted the question and the majority were able to score 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. Generally the language used was very pleasing, with most candidates scoring 5 out of 5 for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say what their school friend is called and what he/she looks like. There were many good answers, with detail. Some failed, however, to understand or take note of the verb 'aussieht', and gave an account of the person's age/character/family/etc., instead of describing the person's physical appearance. To be sure of gaining the communication marks, it is imperative that candidates focus on the specific requirements of the task set; communication credit cannot be given for information that is not part of the question asked.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe which school subjects their friend likes. Some candidates had misunderstood and wrote about their own preferences, thus failing to score, but the majority answered well. Many avoided the temptation to give a list, and instead gave clear and well-reasoned responses.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain why they and their school friend get on well together. Many used predictable adjectives as reasons (*weil er lustig/freundlich ist*, etc.). Others described activities which they enjoyed doing together with their friend. Some answers failed to gain credit because the candidates merely stated whether or not they liked their friend, rather than giving a reason for their opinion. Again, candidates should be reminded to read the task carefully, before embarking on their answer.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe what they will do with their school friend in school next week. Unfortunately some did not read the task carefully enough and went on to describe plans for going out/holidays/etc together but, without reference to the link with school, they were unable to score. However, there were many pleasing responses to the task, ranging from revising for/writing exams together, to performing in a school production/playing football/etc.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were required to write a letter to their penfriend about a trip to the zoo last weekend. Out of the 3 choices for **Q3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates. This may partly have been due to it being the first **Question 3** option listed on the paper but also probably due to the topic being on a trip out, a popular topic amongst candidates and one which most were well-prepared to write about.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain what he/she saw at the zoo last weekend. The majority responded very well, with lists of animals seen, and some pleasing descriptions/opinions given too. A past time frame was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded, and most candidates were successful in this.

Part (b)

Candidates were asked to describe what they did at lunchtime, and so the answer required a past time frame for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Some candidates wrote about their usual lunchtimes activities in the present tense, rather than give specific reference in the past tense to last weekend's visit to the zoo. However, there were plenty of successful responses, often describing where the candidate ate/what they ate/ what other activities they did in their lunch break, etc.

Part (c)

This task asked why the candidate likes/doesn't like going to the zoo. For Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers giving specific reasons in the present tense. Some candidates merely stated their opinion rather than giving reasons. Others failed to recognise that, whilst the previous two tasks referred to last weekend, this task was a more general question in the present. Most, however, were able to score at least one tick and there were some impressive efforts by candidates expressing their opinions on the way zoos care for animals, whether animals should remain in the wild, etc.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to give their opinions about animal programmes on the television. It was rewarding to see many candidates rising to the challenge with a good range of vocabulary and ideas at their disposal. Most candidates made an attempt and expressed a simple opinion, even if they didn't feel able to manipulate more sophisticated ideas/language.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what he/she will 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 another trip out, some wanting to return to the zoo, or needing to stay at home and revise for exams, etc. The majority of candidates were able to refer successfully to the future, and this was a pleasure to see. Overall, the future tense seems to present fewer problems than the past. However, some candidates continue to struggle in their use of *ich möchte*, rendering the time frame ambiguous and preventing both Communication ticks from being awarded.

- (b) Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of modern technology. The topic of technology is a popular one at this level, though candidates are not always so well equipped with the language/vocabulary needed to deal with it as successfully as some of the other topics. Hence perhaps why this question was the least popular option on this paper, and it may be that Centres have done well in reminding their candidates to check the requirements of each task before embarking on a question which, whilst seeming to appeal, may be ambitious at the expense of language accuracy.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe their internet use last week. Candidates referred to needing the internet for games/schoolwork, using it for films/communication, etc. Some incorrect past participles were used, where candidates could no doubt have succeeded with more familiar verbs. Attention to accuracy is important to ensure that verb forms and time frames are accurate and that two Communication ticks are achieved.

Part (b)

This task asked the candidate for an explanation as to why he/she likes playing computer games. A present tense was required and candidates attempting this task made good efforts, but again their verb use was not always accurate enough to achieve both Communication ticks.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe what mobile phones used to be like a few years ago. This task was probably the most challenging in this question. Some did not attempt this task, whilst others made a decent attempt at an answer, though accuracy was an issue.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to explain why technology is important and were generally able to put forward a reasonable answer with correct language use and accurate present tense, allowing two Communication ticks.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to explain what role technology will play in the future when they have their own children. Again good attempts were made, though candidates were perhaps a little limited with ideas here and perhaps at the expense of their accuracy in language use.

- (c) In this question, the candidate was required to write an account of what happened, having recently received a large sum of money from a grandmother. The candidates were given the first sentence, which set the scene of the account to follow. This was the second most popular of the 3 options in Q3, with candidates perhaps relating well to the idea of receiving a large gift and imagining ways to spend it. This is the narrative option, and hence the more creative option on the paper. Most candidates were well enough equipped with the necessary language, and even the weaker candidates made some praiseworthy efforts here.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain their reaction on receiving the money and most were able to say that they were happy/surprised/thankful/etc. Some however, were confused with their knowledge of adjectives, choosing for example *müde*, amongst others. A past tense reaction was required for this task, so those expressing their feelings in the present tense were limited to one Communication tick out of a possible two.

Part (b)

This task asked why the candidate received the money. There were some impressive explanations given, and most achieved this part of the question very well, referring, for example, to a recent birthday or to the death of a grandmother, or to having deserved the money as a result of hard work.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe the reactions of family and friends to their receiving the money. Overall these reactions were less well expressed to those in part (a) perhaps because candidates found the challenge of a past reaction in the 3rd person harder to get right. Centres would do well to remind their candidates that the use of *er/sie war, sie waren* + adjective is as effective as *ich war* + adjective.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe what they have already done with the money. Most did this with ease, usually explaining what they had bought with the money. Language use was almost always successful in this task, meaning that both Communication ticks were usually gained here.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what they will do with the money in the future. Again, this task was generally carried out successfully, usually including hopes to save the money for their studies or to buy a large house/car/holiday for them/their family, and some even expressing their wish to buy some gifts for their grandmother! Good efforts were made in the use of the future and this was pleasing to see.

Language

Many candidates demonstrate a confident command of the German language. Others continue to struggle more with accuracy, particularly with verbs and tenses. This year many candidates showed good examples of future tenses but fewer accurate past tenses. Often the auxiliary verb is missing or incorrect, and there are still many incorrect past participles used, even of very common verbs (*spielen, treiben*, etc). Modal verbs again posed problems, with few candidates able to differentiate between *mochte* and *möchte, konnte* and *könnte* or *wurde, würde* and *werde*. Candidates also frequently treated *lieben* as a modal verb. This session many candidates needed to distinguish between the verbs *bekommen* and *werden*. Nouns (genders, cases and especially plurals) continue to be a challenge for candidates and, as a result, even the most able of

candidates can lose out on their Verb mark. Pronouns can also present a problem for the awarding of verb ticks, where candidates use, for example, *du* for *man* or spell *man* as *mann*.

Centres have become 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. That said, there are still some able candidates capable of reaching full marks on verb ticks but who fail to do so without demonstrating their use of a wide enough range of different verbs. Only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a Verb tick. Many candidates need training in recognising the tense of a set task and in responding accordingly with their own verb use. Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded mark scheme. This session, there were many candidates scoring very highly here with some excellent language used. It was pleasing to see some progress in improved word order amongst candidates, and candidates using subordinating clauses effectively. However, word order remains an area where many Centres would do well to train their candidates further. Candidates still need to take care over spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Errors in capitalisation can have a significant effect on the marks awarded in OLF. Candidates must write legibly, as poor writing can hinder both language accuracy and communication.