

GERMAN

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

Key messages

It is not necessary for candidates to write full sentences in answer to the questions.

Candidates should make sure they are familiar with the question words used in the exam.

Candidates should be reminded that the task for **Questions 17–21** requires only the word(s) in bold to be replaced.

General comments

This listening examination produced a full range of marks. The first part of the examination proved accessible to almost all, whilst the third section provided a sufficient challenge for the most proficient candidates. However, strong and weak candidates alike seem to struggle with numbers, which obviously affects their ability to understand the time.

Most candidates followed the instructions given in the rubric. In the written responses candidates are only required to communicate in a recognisable way, as it is their comprehension that is being tested. They do not need to create full sentences to be credited, but they should read the question words carefully in order to provide the correct information.

Candidates should write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer. If the candidate is using pencil when he or she is not sure of the answer, this should be rubbed out carefully so that their final answer in pen is clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Task 1 Questions 1–8

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

The vast majority of candidates were very competent at giving the correct responses in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. Some candidates had difficulty identifying the correct time in **Question 1** but otherwise there was very little observable pattern in the incorrect responses.

Task 2 Questions 9–15

This task consisted of advertising for the Hotel Adler. Those candidates who did not obtain full credit in **Task 2** failed to transcribe the date in **Question 9** correctly, were unfamiliar with *Forelle* in **Question 11** or did not know the word *ruhig* in **Question 12**.

Section 2

All material in this section also comes 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 talking about their neighbours. This task was accessible to most candidates with many identifying all six correct statements.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17–21

The two associated tasks in the second section featured Erich and his mother talking about the problems caused by the early start necessitated by the school day. Candidates needed to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or number. Their answer also needed to make sense in the context of the sentence. Candidates performed well in this task apart from **Question 20** which involved correcting a time, and seemed to cause more difficulties than expected at this level.

Task 2 Second Part Questions 22–24

Candidates seemed familiar with the question words even if the information they supplied was not always correct. **Question 23** caused difficulties for many candidates probably because they were trying to identify a more precise piece of information than *zur richtigen Zeit*. **Question 24** was not presented as a question but as a sentence completion. Candidates were credited for providing the correct answer even if it did not fit into the structure given. Some candidates got the answers the wrong way round.

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 25–30

The interview was with Paul Onyango who had won a marathon in exceptional circumstances. The majority of candidates seem to have followed the gist of the story and a pleasing number gave five or six correct answers. The questions most frequently answered correctly were **Questions 27, 29, 30**.

Task 2 Questions 31–38

The final task consisted of a conversation during which Iris questioned Philipp about a recent sailing accident. Most candidates gained at least partial credit with stronger candidates answering well on most questions. Those with a good vocabulary of weather were able to show this.

Question 31 only required some mention of *Blitz* to be credited.

Question 32 was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Question 33 was a challenging question, and many candidates seemed unfamiliar with the vocabulary item *Wettbewerb*.

In **Question 34** credit was given for any mention of rain. There were also a number of equally correct alternative weather-related responses.

Question 35 was generally well answered.

In **Question 36** most candidates understood that Philipp was having problems keeping the boat under control. Every recognisable rendering of “control” was credited.

Question 37 required two pieces of information. As the question asked what the man on the motor boat did, the answer had to have a verb. Candidates seem less familiar with *Notdienst* as an item of vocabulary than expected.

Question 39 required a more specific answer than *nicht gut*. The vast majority seemed to understand *verbrannt* and attempted to transcribe what they had heard. All remotely recognisable versions were credited.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 0525/13 Listening</p>

Key messages

It is not necessary for candidates to write full sentences in answer to the questions.

Candidates should make sure they are familiar with the question words used in the exam.

Candidates should be reminded that the task for **Questions 17–21** requires only the word(s) in bold to be replaced.

General comments

The standard of comprehension of spoken German in this GCSE examination was generally good but candidates were sometimes let down by their inability to express themselves in written German. Candidates showed a lack of confidence with numbers which obviously affected their ability to tell the time. This listening examination produced a full range of marks. The first part of the examination proved accessible to almost all, whilst the third section provided a sufficient challenge for the most proficient candidates.

Most candidates followed the instructions given in the rubric. In the written responses candidates are only required to communicate in a recognisable way, as it is their comprehension that is being tested. They do not need to create full sentences to be credited, but they should read the question words carefully in order to provide the correct information.

Candidates should write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer. If the candidate is using pencil when he or she is not sure of the answer, this should be rubbed out carefully so that their final answer in pen is clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Task 1 Questions 1–8

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

The vast majority of candidates were very competent at giving the correct responses in this introductory series of questions with multiple choice pictorial answers. A few candidates did not recognise that *meine kleine Kusine* was feminine in **Question 3** and chose **D** as their answer. **Question 4** required the ability to recognise a time and was occasionally answered incorrectly. *Teller* in **Question 7** was not recognised by a few candidates.

Task 2 Questions 9–15

This task consisted of advertising for a cruise ship. Very many candidates answered all multiple choice questions correctly, could transcribe *Italien* in **Question 9** in a recognisable way but failed to get the correct number of passengers in **Question 10**.

Section 2

All material in this section also comes 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 talking about their attitudes to fashion. Many candidates could identify at least four correct statements, but few managed six. Many ticked **(e)** as a correct option although the *immer* ruled this out. Quite often **(l)** was ticked even though Thomas had made his dislike of English school uniform clear.

Task 2 First Part Questions 17–21

The two associated tasks in the second section featured two young people talking about their attitudes to sport. Candidates needed to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or number. Their answer also needed to make sense in the context of the sentence. **Question 17** and **Question 18** were answered well. In **Question 19** *Angst* was sufficient to gain credit as it demonstrated comprehension. In **Question 20** most candidates opted for the correct number. **Question 21** was generally answered correctly.

Task 2 Second Part Questions 22–25

Candidates seemed familiar with the question words even if the information they supplied was not always correct. Most candidates answered well and there seemed to be no particular pattern to the incorrect answers.

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

The interview was with Melanie who had swapped her flat for a railcard. Few candidates gave six correct answers. **Question 28** was the most accessible. It appears that *wiegen* is not a familiar piece of vocabulary: having heard mention of *Fastfood*, many candidates opted for option **(b)**.

Task 2 Questions 32–39

The final task consisted of an interview with Ulrike about a school project which involved living without a mobile phone for a week. It required detailed understanding to answer some of the questions satisfactorily. Candidates should ensure that they read the questions carefully and provide the information they are asked for. Candidates are reminded that there is no penalty for an incorrect answer.

Question 32 required some mention of *Leben* as well as *Handy*.

Question 33 was generally satisfactorily answered.

In **Question 34** *leicht* was not very well understood.

Question 35 was usually correctly answered.

For those that understood *Vorteil*, **Question 36** was straightforward.

Question 37 required a one word answer but some candidates could not decide whether Ulrike was stressed or not stressed.

Question 38 required two pieces of information. Many recognised boredom as a disadvantage but did not gain full credit as they left out *nicht* before *chatten* and *spielen*.

Question 39 was generally satisfactorily answered by those candidates who recognised *möglich*.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/22
Reading

Key messages

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

In **Section 2, Exercise 1** candidates need 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** candidates are 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** candidate are asked to respond to questions requiring both gist and detailed understanding. Whilst selective lifting may be appropriate to answer some questions, mere location and transcription indicating vague understanding is not. **Exercise 1** requires candidates to decide whether statements are true or false and to correct the false ones. In **Section 2** candidates are required to answer open questions.

General comments

The questions were answered 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 questions were not always answered correctly, mainly because some basic vocabulary seemed unknown.

Question 1 *Schnellimbiss*, **Question 3** *Gewitter* and **Question 4** *Nachspeise* were all problematic. These are words in the MCVL, and in each question, they could have been worked out through a process of elimination.

Questions 6–10

Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many answered fully correctly, although some candidates mixed up **Question 6** *Pilze* and **Question 10** *Knoblauch*.

Questions 11–15

This exercise was handled well by most candidates with the majority gaining full credit. There was no question which candidates found harder than any other in this exercise.

Questions 16–20

Most candidates seemed to understand the concept of looking for the right part of speech and then the appropriate alternatives. Those who did not, relied on guesswork. A few candidates decided not to use the given words and added their own variations. If answers were mixed up, then these tended to be **Questions 18–20**, where *Dorf* was used in **Question 18**, *Bus* in **Question 19**, and *zufrieden* in **Question 20**.

Questions 21–29

Most candidates answered these questions well, but in some cases candidates copied out whole chunks of the text, presumably in the hope that the answer must be there, and sometimes this led to some strange renderings : e.g. **Question 21** *sie Architektin werden wollte*, **Question 25** *sie fand spannend sie* and **Question 29** *als Fotografin immer bekannter wurde* .

Question 24 caused a few problems as many candidates did not fully understand the *sowie*, and consequently, missed out one of the two adjectives.

In **Question 27** some candidates did not fully understand the word *Arbeitsstelle*, and so did not add the word *suchen*.

Question 29 was challenging for a significant number of candidates who did not understand the word *Beruf*, and these candidates copied out the incorrect part of the text.

Questions 30–34

The true/false part of this exercise was done well by most candidates and most scored full credit. A very few candidates ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all 'Nein'. The correction for the three false statements was more complicated for some candidates. In **Question 30** many candidates talked about the *Eiscafé*. In **Question 32** some candidates got the wrong preposition if they wrote about when the work stopped. Some candidates got **Questions 33** and **34** the wrong way round. In **Question 33** candidates often chose the wrong part of the text to copy out and ended up just writing a negated statement of the original.

Some candidates corrected True sentences, even though they had written "T" as an answer.

Although there were many good responses to questions in this exercise, some candidates would have benefited from looking more closely at the interrogative, so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates 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 and candidates are reminded that indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required indication of comprehension.

Questions 35–41

Many candidates viewed this exercise in the same way as **Exercise 2, Part 2**, and they copied out large chunks of the text in the hope they hit the target somewhere. Lifts of whole sentences nearly always result in invalid material and so no credit can be awarded. This was apparent in **Questions 35** and **40** in particular. In **Question 36**, several candidates did not understand *plötzlich* and so wrote *sie war arbeitslos und plötzlich*, which made little sense. In **Question 38** many candidates did not write enough: *Angst* on its own did not fully answer the question, and *Angst fühlen* did not work. In **Question 41** a number of candidates did not understand the final sentence and answered with *vier nach drei Monaten*.

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

1–5 Some candidates found these questions challenging, mainly because some basic vocabulary seemed unknown.

Question 1 *Hafen*, **Question 2** *Spiegel* and **Question 5** *Roman* all seemed problematic for some candidates. These are words in the MCVL, and in each question it would be anticipated that they could have been worked out through a process of elimination.

6–10 Most candidates had no problems at all with this second exercise, and many answered fully correctly.

11–15 This exercise was handled very well by most candidates with the majority scoring full credit. **Question 15** was more challenging than the rest of the exercise with some candidates opting for *Federball* rather than *Laufen*.

16–20 A significant number of candidates seemed to have problems with locating the answers in the relevant part of the text in this exercise and many candidates appeared to guess. **Questions 16** and **20** proved the most challenging.

21–30 This element of the **Zweiter Teil** was typically approached in a very straightforward manner. Most candidates answered this exercise well. However, some copied out whole chunks of the text, presumably in the hope that the answer must be there, and sometimes this led to some strange answers.

Question 26 was challenging for many candidates. Some candidates just wrote *die Sehenswürdigkeiten* and did not supply a verb, so this answer could not be credited. In **Question**

28 some candidates' responses did not make it clear whether they were referring to Lisa's father or the grandmother's father.

31–35 The true / false part of this exercise was done reasonably well by candidates, with some answering fully correctly. However, as in previous years, a few candidates ticked either all of the 'Ja' boxes or all of the 'Nein' boxes.

In **Question 31** and **32** some candidates selected *Nein* but did not always supply a justification. Where one was supplied, there was no obvious pattern. It may be that candidates did not understand *tot* in **Question 31** and *hinauswerfen* in **Question 32**. **Question 33** proved difficult for some who opted for *ja* or wrote a justification which showed lack of understanding with some even writing of finding a desk in the rubbish. **Question 34** was handled well by most candidates. In **Question 35** it was clear that *enttäuscht* was often not understood.

36–42 Although there were good responses to questions in this exercise, some candidates would be well advised read the questions more carefully so that they provide the information requested. Some candidates 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 large chunks of the text. Candidates are reminded that at this stage of the examination, indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required level of genuine comprehension.

Many candidates seem to view this exercise in the same way as **Exercise 2, Part 2**, and they copy out large chunks of the text in the hope they hit the target somewhere. Lifts of whole sentences nearly always result in invalid material and so no credit can be awarded. This was apparent in **Questions 37, 38, 41** and **42** in particular. In answers to **Question 37**, several candidates wrote about finding a solution suggesting a lack of understanding of the text.

In **Question 41** many candidates wrote that the parents were happy because the houseboat was attractive. In **Question 42** a number of candidates did not seem to understand what was in fact practical for Martin and wrote that he had a job offer in the city.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/03
Speaking

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for May/June 2018.

Most Centres conducted the Speaking Test well and most Examiners aimed to bring the best out of their candidates, examining them in an efficient yet friendly manner.

In the Topic or General Conversations most asked appropriate questions. However, some Examiners asked for points of general knowledge and this is inappropriate in this type of exam, whilst some pitched the questions at a level which was too basic.

Examiners must ensure that they always ask questions in **both** conversations to elicit responses in **both** past and future tenses. If they do not elicit a past/future construction straight away they should ask more questions of a similar nature until they are satisfied that the candidate has done the best they can. It is also possible to rephrase questions, such as by changing *Was wirst du machen?* to *Was möchtest du machen?*

As far as the Presentation is concerned, some Centres encouraged candidates to open with a formula similar to the following: „*Ich habe meine Stadt als Thema gewählt und heute möchte ich zuerst über unsere Umweltprobleme sprechen*“ This ensures that both past and future tenses have already been used, at least for the Topic Conversation, and that access to the higher marks for Language is established. It should be remembered that *ich möchte* provides a perfectly acceptable future time frame, or indeed *ich würde*, *ich könnte* or *ich habe vor*. Of course, more than one example of each tense is ideally required for a good, very good or outstanding mark for Language to be awarded.

It is essential that Examiners carefully consult the instructions in the Teachers' Notes, as some Examiners incorrectly awarded a mark in the satisfactory band or above for Language to candidates who did not convey past and future meanings. It is worth reiterating that Examiners should ensure that **both past and future** tenses are produced **by the candidate** in **both** conversations

As far as the Role Plays are concerned, there were some Centres where the correct randomisation procedure was not followed: it is essential that the cards are used according to the randomisation formula stipulated. 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. In a small number of Centres Examiners disadvantage their candidates in the Role Play situations by missing out tasks and not querying wrong or incomplete answers. It is very important that Examiners realise how necessary it is to respect the instruction to pause in role play B. If they fail to do this, candidates have no chance to react, as required, which costs them two possible marks. If only one of two parts of a task is completed, the maximum mark is one out of three.

Most Centres kept to the stipulated timings, which are approximately 5 minutes for each of the conversations. The timing for the Topic Conversation includes a Presentation lasting a maximum of two minutes. Examiners should intervene and start a conversation if the Presentation goes over two minutes.

The role plays are not timed and should take less than 5 minutes, but some Examiners allowed or even encouraged candidates to elaborate and expand on the required utterances. 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. If the conversations 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. Unfortunately, there were a small number of Examiners who 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. Files should be named according to the Centre and candidate numbers rather than the teacher or Examiner name. Before CDs are despatched, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. This year Moderators encountered some 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 and it was difficult to hear them.

Administration in Centres was generally good but many Centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheet (WMS). Please note that an electronic WMS which adds up the marks automatically can be downloaded from www.cie.org.uk/samples. 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 Role Play tasks had not been adequately completed or past or future tenses were missing from one or both of the conversations.

Internal moderation, when there was more than one Examiner, was usually carried out satisfactorily. It is essential though that the marks for **each marking category** on the **Working Mark Sheet** are the **final internally moderated marks**. Please rewrite the WMS if necessary. The total marks on the WMS are then transferred to the MS1 and both totals must be identical.

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 aloud to 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. It is important that Examiners allow candidates to respond to the first part of a question to ensure appropriate credit can be awarded. Most candidates managed to use accurate pronunciation as well as the correct register, and the past tense responses were on the whole successful. Question formation again proved challenging to some candidates and this is an area where candidates would benefit from further preparation.

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)

There were some pronunciation problems, with *feiern* and *Euro*. *Nur* was sometimes omitted, though not penalised, and it should be emphasised that candidates need to have practised forming questions.

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

This role-play was sometimes challenging for candidates, mainly with the final question, K5. Some candidates forgot, or were not prompted, to thank the person at the Reception. *Umkleideraum* caused pronunciation difficulties, as did the reflexive verb *sich befinden*. Candidates could have simplified by asking *Wo finde ich...?*, and some did this.

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

This role-play was challenging for some candidates, and many could not use *gern* correctly in K2, where a one word answer of *Gerne!* would have been accepted, nor could they formulate a question accurately for K5(ii). Even the “Hören Sie gut zu und wählen Sie” question caused problems in this situation, as “*im Wald machen*” was not accepted for 3 marks.

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)

Not all candidates appeared to be fully aware of the Alps, or their geography, and often could not think of a good reason for wanting to work there. However, “*Ich möchte Geld verdienen*” or “*Ich möchte mein Deutsch verbessern*” were valid responses. If candidates failed to greet the manager, and some were not reminded to, credit could not be given for this part of the question. In K3 not everyone could react with *Freude*, possibly not understanding the vocabulary item. In K4, where mention of two things done during previous part-time work was required, most could think of two past tense sentences as a response, but there were some unlikely part-time jobs chosen, such as doctor or teacher. *Arbeitszeiten* caused many problems, as it proved hard to pronounce for some candidates and is in the plural, so a singular verb was penalised. “*Von wann bis wann muss ich arbeiten?*” avoided both problems.

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

This was challenging for some candidates. Many, surprisingly perhaps, did not understand the question for K2, regarding what they did personally to help the environment but K3 about the problems of their own town was answered better. *Schade* was the most frequent “surprised reaction”. Many forgot they were talking to their partner, not a teacher, and did not use *Sie* appropriately.

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

Not knowing exactly what *Erfahrungen* implied made K2 difficult for some candidates. *Toll* was not an appropriate expression of “surprise” in K3. Many candidates used *2 Uhr* for *2 Stunden* and were limited in the credit that could be awarded in K4. “*Ich habe den ganzen Tag frei*” and “*von 12 bis 2*” were two correct responses that avoided this problem. Again, *du* was required in K5, and well-formulated questions, such as “*Was für einen Hund möchtest du haben?*” were only offered by stronger candidates.

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 “My 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, and fewer Centres than in previous years seemed to have over prepared their candidates for this section. The conversation should sound natural and a listener should not be aware that obvious preparation has taken place. A high number of candidates were limited in the marks they could access for Language because they did not manage to produce correct past and future tenses. This was usually either a result of the Examiner not asking the appropriate questions or not rephrasing or choosing new questions, when initially no correct tenses were 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 responded to candidates by asking them to give more detail. This often led to a more natural discussion. Sensitive and thorough questioning helped candidates and enabled them to give opinions and justifications using a wide range of structures and tenses. A good Examiner, of which there were many, showed genuine interest in what a candidate had to say.

If Examiners ask closed questions this does not encourage candidates to expand, and also limits their performance. It is best not to repeat the same questions from candidate to candidate as this does not sound

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. Again this year some really good candidates were limited in the marks they could achieve as even though they were fluent, 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 generally appropriately assessed but 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 was good were not always fluent or had good pronunciation or intonation.



GERMAN

Paper 0525/42
Writing

Key messages

Centres should remind their candidates to read through the tasks in each question carefully and to answer the specific demands of each task set. In **Question 3**, candidates will need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks. It is important that they look for the tense in each individual task and ensure that their answer is given in the same time frame.

General comments

Overall, most Centres had prepared their candidates well for the demands of this examination, and candidates made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the examination specifications. In this session, many candidates produced successful answers, making use of good language and demonstrating clear understanding in their responses. Candidates appeared to know what was expected, in terms of both communication and language. Many candidates set out their answers in **Questions 2** and **3** in ordered paragraphs, to match the tasks set, making the flow of their answers more coherent.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of eight items which might be found in a bedroom. They could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary of five such items. Most candidates answered this well and the majority achieved full credit. Candidates usually chose common items found in a bedroom and many relied on articles of clothing to make up their totals. Some candidates listed words for the rooms themselves (e.g. *Schlafzimmer/Badezimmer/Dusche*) and these were not accepted. Generally spelling was good this year, though many candidates wrote nouns without a capital letter. Plurals were a challenge for candidates across the ability range and, in this session, *Buche/Buchen/Büche* were sometimes given, but could not be accepted as plurals for *Buch*, since they have alternative meanings.

The pictures given on the paper are designed to help prompt candidates' responses, but some candidates seemed to think they had to give the exact meanings, rather than produce vocabulary they are familiar with. Candidates should be reminded that the pictures are intended as ideas to help them, and are not prescriptive.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer four sub-questions about a favourite month. The topic was very successful and there were many excellent and varied responses.

Almost all candidates attempted the question and the majority answered well. Most candidates worked through the four tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence on each. However, Centres should note that in order to gain full credit for Communication, candidates should be sure to cover all four Communication points. A number of candidates failed to cover the fourth point. Generally the language used was very good, with many candidates gaining full credit for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say which month they like best. This was usually managed well, though a few candidates referred to a specific season rather than to a specific month, and some mentioned more than one favourite month.

- (b) Candidates were asked to describe what they like to do during this month. Most were able to write at length about the activities which they like to do, though a few understood '*in diesem Monat*' to refer to the month in which they were sitting their examination and so they wrote about what they like to do in the month of May, rather than in their favourite month. Many went on to write in more detail about what they did last year during that month, etc.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain what the weather is usually like in this month. Describing the weather presented very few problems and most candidates were able to give several weather details, with many going on to add opinions and further information.
- (d) Candidates were asked to say whether they would like to live in another climate in the future. This task presented difficulties for some candidates who had not understood '*Klima*' and had simply written a standard answer about where they would like to live in the future, without any reference to climate/weather. Candidates should be reminded to answer the specific requirements of the tasks in order to gain the Communication marks. However, many successful candidates gave sophisticated climate-related reasons for their choices, often citing enjoyment of sporting activities in hot/cold climates as their reason.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write an email of thanks to their uncle for a birthday gift of a new bike. Out of the three choices for **Question 3**, this option was the most popular, perhaps due to the accessibility of both the concepts and the language in the question topic. Generally, email etiquette was successful and many emails began/ended appropriately. A minority of candidates include too much letter etiquette and they should be reminded to focus instead on the specific tasks set.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to thank the uncle for the bike and to explain why he/she liked it. There were many successful answers with most expressing their thanks correctly, though the verbs *danken/bedanken* were not always used well and there was some confusion over the correct pronouns to use with these verbs. There were also various incorrect spellings of *Geschenk*. Many candidates gave clear reasons for liking the bike, often mentioning the colour or explaining why it is better for them to be able to cycle rather than walk/drive. A present tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded.

Part (b)

This task asked how the candidates had already used the bike. For both Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers in a past tense. Although some candidates managed this, a significant number of candidates used the present tense and referred to how they are using the bike (e.g. going to school, going out with friends), rather than stating how they had already used it. Candidates needed to read questions carefully and to note the time frame being used in each task. Most, however, were able to score at least one tick and many answered well, with detailed accounts being given.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe how he/she celebrated his/her birthday and the task again required a past tense for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Many wrote about their birthday, though some were rather unimaginative, with answers typically including a list of gifts received. The stronger candidates gave more information and were able to pick up a good number of verb ticks in descriptions of activities at birthday celebrations.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe why it is better to travel by bike rather than by car. A minority of candidates appeared to have confused the word '*statt*' with '*Stadt*', but overall the task was handled confidently by the majority of candidates, with some impressive reasons ranging from noise, traffic jams and cost to environmental impact and healthy exercise. The topics of the environment and

health had clearly been covered well in many Centres and candidates had a wide variety of vocabulary and ideas to use. The present tense was required for two Communication ticks.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to say where they would like to cycle next weekend and why. They were required to give an answer using a future time frame in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Many candidates answered well, and the majority of candidates were able to use a future time frame successfully. However, a significant number of candidates had not read the details of the question carefully enough and so wrote generally about plans for where they would go next weekend (or even about future holiday destinations), rather than mentioning specifically where they would cycle/go by bike. There was a lot of confusion over the verbs *gehen/fahren* in this task particularly.

Question 3(b)

For this question, candidates were asked to write a blog on the topic of 'my class trip'. This was the second most popular choice for **Question 3** and was generally answered well. Many candidates appeared to be basing their accounts on actual experience so were able to write with variety and interest.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe the place/places visited on the class trip. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Most candidates were successful here and were able to give the destination of their trip as well as add further interesting detail/description.

Part (b)

This task required candidates to give an account of activities undertaken on the class trip. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Again, most candidates were successful. Often candidates focussed on what/where they had eaten over the course of the visit.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to explain whether they like/don't like class trips. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Most candidates attempted this question but many had failed to read/understand the question correctly and gave an opinion about this particular class trip, rather than an opinion about class trips in general. Many struggled in their use of the verb '*gefallen*', which was in the question itself, whilst others made their own attempts at giving a preference, but were again challenged (e.g. there was much confusion with *liebe/lieber*). Usually a maximum of one Communication tick was awarded for this task.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to explain whether they prefer to travel in their own country or abroad. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Most candidates made a good effort here and were able to give clear, often sophisticated, reasons for their choices.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked where they would like to travel in the future and why. A future time frame was needed for two Communication ticks. Most answered this task well and were able to express, clearly and accurately, their aspirations for future travel destinations.

Question 3(c)

For this question, candidates were required to write an account about becoming separated from his/her parents, whilst in town with them aged five. Candidates were given the first sentences, which set the scene of the account to follow.

This was the least popular option for **Question 3**, but was chosen by both stronger and weaker candidates. Stronger candidates were able to demonstrate language and grammar to cope with a more complex narrative.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain their reaction to their parents no longer being there. Most were able to say that they were sad/unhappy/afraid or that they cried/ran around looking for their parents, 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)

Candidates were asked to explain who helped them as a lost five year old, and what this person did to help. Most referred to a shop assistant/passers-by/policeman encountering them and taking them to look for their parents. The more straightforward accounts were generally more successful, whilst the more ambitious tended to lack accuracy in language. For both Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers in a past tense.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to explain how their parents found him/her again. The more able candidates were generally able to explain coherently, but those with less linguistic confidence found this more of a challenge, and usually just stated where/when the parents found him/her. For both Communication ticks, the task required answers in a past tense.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe their reaction to the family being together again. Most were able to express some sort of happy reaction, though the past tense was needed for both Communication ticks to be achieved.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to explain how they will look after their own children in the future. Most made a very good effort with this task and there were both sensible and imaginative suggestions made. For two Communication ticks, a future time frame was needed.

Language

Many candidates demonstrate a confident command of the German language. Others found it more difficult to communicate, and they struggled particularly with accuracy of verbs and tenses. Candidates' use of future time frames was generally good but many were challenged when referring to the past. In this session candidates were required to express preferences and many were unable to do so accurately. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) were a challenge for candidates. Incorrect use of pronouns also presented a problem, both for communication and for the awarding of verb ticks.

There were some able candidates who were capable of reaching full marks on verbs, but who failed to do so simply because they did not include enough different verbs/verb forms. Only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a verb tick and it must, of course, be in the appropriate tense. Many candidates needed further help in learning to recognise the tense of a set task and in responding accordingly. Candidates also needed help in distinguishing between the use of the verbs *gehen/fahren*.

Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded according to the banded mark scheme. This session, there were a number of candidates who scored very highly with some excellent language used. Word order amongst many candidates was good, and generally candidates used subordinating clauses effectively. Many candidates attempted justifications of opinions and reasons, with '*weil*' mainly being used. Most commonly used conjunctions were '*weil/dass/wenn*' with the occasional '*obwohl*'. There were fewer adverbial links or other connectives, such as '*ausserdem/trotzdem/zwär*'.

Candidates should be reminded to take greater care over spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns. Candidates also need to be sure to write legibly, as poor writing hinders both communication and accuracy.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/43
Writing

Key messages

Centres should remind their candidates to read through the tasks in each question carefully and to answer the specific demands of each task set. In **Question 3**, candidates will need to demonstrate the use of past, present and future time frames in the different tasks. It is important that they look for the tense in each individual task and ensure that their answer is given in the same time frame.

General comments

Overall, most Centres had prepared their candidates well for the demands of this examination, and candidates made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the examination specifications. In this session, many candidates produced successful answers, making use of good language and demonstrating clear understanding in their responses. Candidates appeared to know what was expected, in terms of both communication and language. Many candidates set out their answers in **Questions 2** and **3** in ordered paragraphs, to match the tasks set, making the flow of their answers more coherent.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of eight items which might be found in a living room. They could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary of five such items. Most candidates answered this well and the majority achieved full credit. Candidates usually chose common items found in the living room. Some candidates included in their lists some words for rooms (e.g. *Wohnzimmer/Badezimmer/Büro*) and these were not accepted. Generally spellings were good this year, though many candidates wrote nouns without a capital letter, and plurals were a challenge for candidates across the ability range.

The pictures given on the paper are designed to help prompt candidates' responses, but some candidates seemed to think they had to give the exact meanings, rather than produce vocabulary they are familiar with. Candidates should be reminded that the pictures are intended as ideas to help them, and are not prescriptive.

Question 2

This question required candidates to answer four sub-questions about food and cooking. The topic worked well and was accessible with many excellent responses.

Almost all candidates attempted the question and the majority answered well. Most candidates worked through the four tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence on each. However, Centres should note that in order to gain full credit for Communication, candidates should be sure to cover all four Communication points. Generally the language used was very good, with many candidates gaining full credit for Language.

- (a) Candidates were asked to say what time they eat in the evening. Many were able to answer successfully and could explain the time that they eat their evening meal, though some mentioned the length of time for the meal or referred to different meals in the day.

- (b) Candidates were asked to say who does the cooking at home. Most were able to communicate this information well, with many going into detail about who cooks which meal with whom, and going on to describe what meals/food they cook, etc.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain what they like to eat and why. Almost all were able to describe food which they don't like and to explain why, with many going on to talk about their food preferences and their favourite foods as well.
- (d) Candidates were asked to say where they will eat for their next birthday. The task presented difficulties for some candidates who failed to read/understand the word 'wo', and who wrote about *what* they would like to eat for their next birthday, rather than *where* they would like to eat. Candidates should be reminded to answer the specific requirements of the tasks in order to gain the Communication marks. However, many successful candidates gave clear descriptions of where they would like to eat and went on to give further details of what they would eat/who would be there/etc.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write an email to a friend, describing what happened last weekend, when the candidate was asked by a neighbour to look after their child. Out of the three choices for **Question 3**, this option was the most popular amongst candidates.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain why he/she had to look after the neighbour's child last weekend. For both Communication ticks to be achieved, the task required answers in a past tense. There were many successful answers given, with explanations often mentioning a sick relative or the parent needing to stay late at work, most likely situations with which the candidates were themselves familiar with and felt at ease writing about.

Part (b)

This task required candidates to describe what activities he/she did with the child. The past tense was needed for both Communication ticks to be achieved. Many wrote confidently and with detail about the activities they had undertaken with the child, and generally used a wide range of verbs.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to explain whether babysitting is a good part-time job. The present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Most were able to express a clear opinion (usually positive) and to back it up with a reason (well paid, fun, etc.).

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say what age children are at their most interesting, and to explain why. The present tense was required for two Communication ticks. This was the most challenging task of the question, with a significant number of candidates misunderstanding or missing it out entirely. Some simply wrote about whether or not children are interesting.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to say whether or not they would like to have children in the future. They were required to give an answer using a future time frame in order to achieve both Communication ticks. Many candidates answered well, and the majority of candidates were able to use future time frame successfully.

Question 3(b)

For this question candidates were asked to write a blog on the topic of 'film' following a recent visit to a film studio. This was the second most popular choice for **Question 3** and was generally answered well, with many including interest and detail in their responses.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe what they did during the recent visit to the film studio. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Most candidates were successful here, describing what they saw/did/ate, etc. and usually attempting, at least, to bring their knowledge of film into their response.

Part (b)

This task required candidates to describe which film stars they had met on their visit. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Many candidates were able to list or even give details about the film stars they had seen, with some adding opinions and references to specific films, etc.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to give their opinion about the lifestyle of film stars. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. This was the least well attempted task in the question. Some candidates appeared not to understand what was being asked of them. Others struggled to know how to answer and some left it out entirely.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to say whether they prefer to watch films at home or in the cinema and why. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Although most candidates evidently had an opinion, many struggled in their attempts to communicate their preference, and there was particular confusion with *liebe/lieber*.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to state whether they might like to work in the film industry in the future. A future time frame was needed for two Communication ticks. Many made good efforts with this task and were able to refer to their future work. Some struggled, however, to give specific thoughts about working in the film industry.

Question 3(c)

For this question, candidates were required to write an account about his/her discovery, coming out of the house to be taken to school by his/her parents, only to discover that the family car was gone. Candidates were given the first sentences, which set the scene of the account to follow.

This was the least popular option for **Question 3**, but was chosen by stronger and weaker candidates. Stronger candidates were able to demonstrate language and grammar to cope with a more complex narrative.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to describe his/her reaction to the car having disappeared. Most were able to say that they were shocked/unhappy/afraid or that they cried/shouted, etc. A past tense reaction was required for this task, so those expressing their reaction in the present tense were limited to one Communication tick out of a possible two.

Part (b)

This task required candidates to describe his/her parents' reaction, on discovering that the car was gone. Again, most candidates were able to describe their shock/disbelief/fear, or explain what they did/how they felt in response. 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 (c)

Candidates were asked to explain how he/she went to school that day. Many managed this well, giving an account of how they walked/went with a friend/took a bus or taxi. There was, however, some confusion over the verbs *gehen/fahren* in this task particularly.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe how they tried to find the car again. Stronger candidates were generally able to explain coherently, but those with less linguistic confidence found this more of a challenge, or even omitted it entirely. For both Communication ticks, the task required answers in a past tense.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to explain what they will do next week, without a car. Most made a very sensible effort with this task and went on to explain how they would walk/use a bus or taxi, or travel with a friend. For two Communication ticks, a future time frame was needed.

Language

Many candidates demonstrate a confident command of the German language. Others found it more difficult to communicate, and they struggled particularly with accuracy of verbs and tenses. Candidates use of future time frames was generally good but many were challenged when referring to the past. In this session candidates were required to express preferences and many were unable to do so accurately. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) were a challenge for candidates. Incorrect use of pronouns also presented a problem, both for communication and for the awarding of verb ticks.

There were some able candidates who were capable of reaching full marks on verbs, but who failed to do so simply because they did not include enough different verbs/verb forms. Only the first instance of a given verb form can gain a verb tick and it must, of course, be in the appropriate tense. Many candidates needed further help in learning to recognise the tense of a set task and in responding accordingly. Candidates also needed help in distinguishing between the use of the verbs *gehen/fahren*.

Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded according to the banded mark scheme. This session, there were a number of candidates who scored very highly with some excellent language used. Word order amongst many candidates was good, and generally candidates used subordinating clauses effectively. Many candidates attempted justifications of opinions and reasons, with *'weil'* mainly being used. Most commonly used conjunctions were *'weil/dass/wenn'* with the occasional *'obwohl'*. There were fewer adverbial links or other connectives, such as *'ausserdem/trotzdem/zwär'*.

Candidates should be reminded to take greater care over spelling and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns.