

GERMAN

Paper 7159/03
Speaking

Key Messages

Examiners must ensure that they always ask questions in **both** conversations that should lead to 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, rephrasing their questions if necessary.

General comments

Most centres conducted the Speaking Test well and many Examiners displayed an efficient yet friendly manner. In the Topic or General Conversations most asked appropriate questions to allow candidates to achieve their potential.

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 ensured that both past and future tenses were used and that access to the higher marks for Language was established for the Topic Conversation. It should be remembered that *ich möchte* provides a perfectly acceptable future meaning, or indeed *ich würde*, *ich könnte* or *ich habe vor*. Ideally, the presentation should have a mainly personal, rather than a general content. The emphasis should not be placed on remembering facts, either here or in the Topic Conversation. Opinions and personal experience are more important.

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 for Language in the satisfactory band or above to candidates who did not convey past and future meanings. 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 the published randomisation formula must be adhered to: each candidate should be given one card containing two role play situations, and according to the formula a different one must 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 incorrect 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 limits the marks that can be awarded. 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. 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.

Please note that in the case of a conversation lasting more than seven minutes, Moderators will stop listening at the seven-minute mark, which may mean that a past or future tense is not credited.

A small number of Examiners did not indicate a transition from one conversation to the other, which makes it difficult to award marks separately for the two different conversations.

The Topic Conversation includes the Presentation, which should last a maximum of two minutes. Examiners should intervene and start a conversation if the Presentation goes on beyond that time.

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.

Administration

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. Please name the files according to the centre and candidate numbers rather than the teacher or Examiner's name. Before CDs are despatched, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. This year there were some issues with CDs that did not play, or 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 placed the microphone too far from the candidates, so that it is difficult to hear them.

Administration in centres was generally good and this year few centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheet (WMS). Assessment was generally consistent and the order of merit was usually correct. However, it was necessary to scale some centres' marks and it was more common for marking to be too generous 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 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. In case of discrepancy, Moderators accept the WMS marks as correct and amend the MS1 marks. This may mean that if correct procedure has not been followed the internal moderation that may have taken place could be negated.

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. Many 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. Examiners should read the introduction to the situation, rather than asking the candidate to do this. 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 and all the tasks were accessible. In some cases candidates were unable to gain credit for a reaction (whether a positive one, or one of surprise or disappointment) as Examiners did not pause 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 successful. Question formation proved challenging for some candidates.

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)

For the second task in A1 the name of a day was expected, and not a date. In **task 3**, if *zum See* was the chosen destination, a response of *zum See fahren* should have been awarded only two marks, as the language was not appropriate to the situation. In **task 5** some candidates were confused by the Examiner's previous scripted comment and selected a time for their outing, rather than asking for the cost. Some

practice is required in converting the indirect questions given on the cards for **task 5** of the A role plays, into direct questions since incorrect word order was often a problem here.

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

Apart from the general issues mentioned for A1, there were few problems in this role play. Some candidates found it difficult to express the second part of **task 1**: 'I have a few questions about the school.' Others were not sure how to pronounce *Kantine* in **task 5**.

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

Again there appeared to be few major difficulties with this role play. In **task 3**: for '*Mein Freund wird 16 Jahre alt*' it would have been acceptable for maximum marks to use *Freundin* or *Mein Freund ist...*

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)

This role play was mostly well done, but conveying surprise was difficult for many candidates in **task 4**, as *überrascht* was clearly unfamiliar to them. However, most could successfully convey two things that they had recently done 'in Germany' in the past tense for **task 3**. Formulating the question for the final task caused many problems of word order.

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

Some candidates found producing a correct *ich will...* in the first task challenging. However, most could convey disappointment well enough, perhaps by using *schade*. Finding two reasons for arriving late was challenging for some candidates, but if only one of these was in a past tense, and the other in the present, this was acceptable. 'It's raining and the traffic was heavy' might serve as an example. If *Euro* was mispronounced in the final task, as was frequently the case, maximum marks should not have been awarded. Some Examiners did not even query the fact that candidates had used the completely wrong currency for Germany, which should also have been noted. '*Ich weiß nicht. Meine Freundin hat sie gekauft,*' was an ingenious response that avoided the possible difficulty over the currency.

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

Some candidates forgot to use *du* to their exchange partner, and this should have been reflected in the mark awarded. Finding two reasons for delaying the visit could have been in the present tense for full marks. The final task, asking what present to bring the partner's family, was misunderstood by some candidates, who asked the Examiner (the partner) to bring a present. The Examiner was required to give a suitable response, mentioning a suitable present, to end the conversation. This required some imagination, of which '*Nichts – du bist das Geschenk!*' was perhaps the best example.

Topic Presentation/Conversation

Topic choice was in general appropriate and most candidates appeared interested in what they were presenting. It is helpful if candidates start their presentation by saying what their chosen topic is. Candidates should choose something specific, such as 'My visit to Frankfurt', rather than 'Frankfurt'. In a small number of centres the candidates all spoke on the same topic, which is not recommended, nor is the topic of 'Myself' or 'My life'.

It is important that the Topic Conversation does not sound rehearsed, and few centres seemed to have prepared their candidates too thoroughly for this section. The conversation should sound natural and spontaneous and a listener should not be aware that obvious preparation has taken place. Many candidates did not manage to produce correct past and future tenses in this part of the test and so limited themselves in the marks they could be awarded for Language. 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 seemed to be forthcoming. Stronger candidates attempted a variety of structures, with inversion, or verbs correctly placed in subordinate clauses, and displayed a good range of vocabulary and idiom.

General Conversation

Many candidates performed well in this part of the test and a good range of topics was seen, 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, responding 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. Good Examiners showed genuine interest in what candidates had to say.

Occasionally Examiners asked closed questions which did not encourage candidates to expand, and also limited 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. Examiners should avoid difficult and inappropriate questions or questions requiring general knowledge which candidates might not be informed about. This year some strong candidates were limited in the mark they could achieve for Language as the whole of a particular conversation was in the present tense. It is advisable not to leave questions in the past or future tenses until the end of the conversation to avoid this happening.

Mark for General Impression

The impression mark awarded was usually appropriate. However, some Examiners were rather severe on candidates who made a lot of grammatical errors but nevertheless had a good level of fluency and a good accent. Conversely, some candidates whose grammatical accuracy was good were not fluent or had poor pronunciation or intonation. As a general guide, judging fluency is the most important aspect when awarding this mark, followed by accent and then accuracy.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 7159/12 Listening</p>
--

Key Messages

Candidates should write as legibly as possible and make their final response clear when they have changed their mind about an answer.

Candidates should consider the context of questions when selecting their answer to ensure it is logical.

General comments

The first section of the examination proved accessible to almost all candidates. The second section proved to be a little more demanding, whilst the third section provided a sufficient challenge for the most proficient candidates.

Most candidates followed the instructions for the paper well but a few candidates did not tick the correct number of boxes in **Question 16** or unnecessarily wrote out full sentences in **Questions 17 – 21**. 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 usually need to create full sentences to be credited, but they do have to respond in a meaningful way.

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. Some candidates had difficulty recognising *Bauernhof* in **Question 5** and some had problems distinguishing between skating and skiing in **Question 8**.

Task 2: Questions 9–15

This task consisted of items of local news. All candidates managed to recognise the month in **Question 9**. The requirement to write provided a challenge to some candidates, but *Frankreich* in **Question 10** should be a country candidates are familiar with. *70er*, the answer to **Question 12**, was sometimes given as 7 or 17 which seemed to demonstrate that the candidate had not considered the context.

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 talking about giving and receiving presents. Some candidates identified all six

statements correctly but a score of four or five was more usual. There was no particular pattern to the incorrect answers.

Task 2: Questions 17–21

The two associated tasks in the second section of this paper featured two interviews about food waste in school canteens. Candidates had to find a replacement for the crossed out, incorrect word or number. Their answer also had to make sense in the context of the sentence. Candidates generally performed well in this task. In **Question 17** most achieved a recognisable rendering of *Ganztagsschulen* and the number in **Question 18** was usually amended correctly. *Überrascht* in **Question 20** caused problems for some.

Task 2: Questions 22–25

This was the first task where candidates were unsupported in their answers. Most candidates understood *schmecken* when answering **Question 22** even though using it correctly was challenging for many candidates. The other three questions were usually answered well.

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 this was a multiple choice task, the complexity of the text in this last section combined with the four option format makes it a more challenging combination of reading and listening. The interview was with Rita Neumann about her job as a pilot. The majority of candidates understood what she said and a number of candidates gave five or six correct answers.

Task 2: Questions 32–39

The final task consisted of an interview with 16-year-old Thorsten describing his life 'home alone'. Most candidates gained some marks in this task because although some questions were designed to challenge the stronger candidates, others were well within the reach of the majority.

In **Question 32** most candidates seemed familiar with the vocabulary item *geschieden*.

In **Question 33** almost all candidates understood that Thorsten's mother was an engineer. Few knew how to spell the word but anything that was recognisable as a 'sound-alike' or 'look-alike' was credited.

In **Question 34** many understood that Thorsten was unwilling to change schools and leave his friends. Some candidates could not be credited for an answer with *verlassen* as they omitted a negative.

Question 35 was generally well answered.

Question 36 was the most challenging question for candidates in this final task. This was the question most frequently left blank. For those candidates who were not familiar with *streiten*, there was the alternative answer using *Putzfrau*.

In **Question 37** most candidates were credited for their answer with many alternative spellings for *Nudeln* and *Soße* accepted.

Question 38 was generally competently answered but some candidates seemed not to recognise *reden*. The essence of the answer was that he liked to be with his friends, which could be understood from the context and many candidates expressed this idea sufficiently well to be credited.

Question 39 was generally well done. The answer required *wenn* to make sense but alternatives *er*, *man* and *ich* were acceptable. It had to be clear in the second element that it was something in the flat that was causing a problem and not just the flat itself.

GERMAN

Paper 7159/22
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** candidates are asked to respond to questions requiring both gist and detailed understanding. Whilst selective lifting may be appropriate to answer some questions, mere location and transcription indicating vague understanding is not. **Exercise 1** requires candidates to decide whether statements are true or false and to justify the false ones. In **Exercise 2** candidates are required to answer open questions.

General comments

The questions were answered very well by many candidates. In some cases, very poor handwriting and crossing and rubbing out made answers difficult to read. Candidates seemed to find all sections accessible, and all candidates were able to show their ability in their answers. There were some candidates who did not attempt all questions, even those which were multiple choice.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–5

These questions were answered well by many candidates. **Question 5** caused some candidates a problem as they confused *Rechnen* with *Rechnung*.

Questions 6–10

Most candidates had no problem at all with this second exercise, and many scored full marks. **Question 10** was challenging for some candidates who saw *Hause* and did not see the *fahren*, and so opted for answer **F**.

Questions 11–15

Questions 11 and **12** were generally answered correctly, as was **Question 14**. However, **Questions 13** and **15** caused difficulties. In **Question 15** candidates may not have recognised that it was Lena's parents, not Lena herself who did the inviting.

Questions 16–20

Most candidates seemed to understand the concept of looking for the right part of speech and then the appropriate alternatives. However, there were many candidates who did not work out the right part of speech to fit in the gap. There were a few candidates who thought that none of the words offered were right, so added their own and some who disagreed with the spellings given. **Questions 16** and **17** were completed more accurately than the other questions in this section, but **Question 18** was the hardest for many candidates.

Questions 21–30

These questions were usually approached in a very straightforward manner. Most candidates scored well on this exercise, but others copied out whole chunks of the text, presumably in the hope that the answer must be there, and sometimes this led to some strange language.

Question 21 usually had the right answer somewhere within what the candidate wrote, but many candidates did not understand the common word *Farbe* and consequently got the answer wrong. There were several possible correct answers to **Question 23**, but none had anything to do with a broken washing machine, but this was often given as an answer. **Question 24** was straightforward, but many candidates misunderstood the concept needed in **Question 25**, and if they did understand it, some found making a negative very difficult. **Questions 26** and **27** were dealt with well by nearly all candidates. For **Question 28** some candidates clearly understood the concept, but did not gain credit as they were too brief, not answering the *wie* part of the question. Candidates sometimes produced very strange language for **Questions 29** and **30** as they tried to manipulate the text, and struggled with personal pronouns.

Questions 31–35

Generally, this part of the paper was well done. There were, however, some candidates who chose false for every question and a smaller number who chose true for every question. Correcting the answers proved more problematic. There were candidates who wrote out large chunks of the text presumably thinking that the answer must be in there somewhere. Answers needed to be more concise.

In **Question 32** many candidates mentioned that the father took the mother to the station and then the daughter to the airport, without actually saying how. Most candidates got **Question 33** correct, but those who did not, wrote about traffic problems and being late to the station. **Question 34** was challenging for some candidates, and many felt that they could only answer the question by adding *nicht* to the original statement.

Questions 36–41

Although there were many good responses to questions in this exercise, some candidates struggled with the interrogative. 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. Candidates should be reminded that indiscriminate lifting is unlikely to demonstrate the required level of genuine comprehension. Lifts of whole sentences nearly always resulted in invalid material and so no score.

For **Question 36** candidates often seemed to understand the concept of an *Umfrage* but added *teil* into the answer which made no sense to the sentence. Most candidates understood **Question 37** and produced an adequate answer. Accuracy with word order for **Question 38** was problematic for many candidates, as the verb was left at the end of what now was not a subordinate clause. Again, some had difficulties with pronouns as there were phrases such as *'ihr reicht/ sie reicht das Taschengeld...'*. Occasionally candidates seemed to have misread *reicht* as *reich* and so wrote answers which made no sense. For **Question 39** candidates often wrote too much and invalidated their answer with extraneous material. Candidates should be reminded that the space provided for answers is an indication of the length of answer required. **Question 40** was not problematic for most candidates. However, some confused *mäht* with *macht*. **Question 41** allowed several choices for the answer, and most candidates scored at least one mark. Putting *beim Putzen* without a verb and then *beim Aufräumen helfen* in the second answer was understandable, but candidates needed to make each answer stand on its own and therefore, *helfen* was needed in both.

GERMAN

Paper 7159/42
Writing

Key messages

Centres should remind candidates to read through the tasks in each question carefully and to answer the specific demands of each question. In **Question 3** candidates 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 in the appropriate time frame.

General comments

Candidates were usually well prepared for this paper and made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the questions. Some candidates even noted down where they had answered in the appropriate tense, showing they were aware of the requirements. In this session many candidates responded well, showing good understanding, and demonstrated good use of language.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Question 1

Candidates were required to write a list of eight weather conditions. They could gain up to 5 marks for communicating the vocabulary of 5 relevant items. Many candidates found this straightforward and achieved the full 5 marks. However, for a significant number of candidates the task proved challenging with many failing to achieve full marks. Many candidates were uncertain of weather-related spellings, often confusing nouns and verbs, or using phonetic/made-up spellings. Some candidates did not read the instructions carefully enough as they appeared to ignore the reference to '*die Wettervorhersage... Wie ist das Wetter?*' and instead they looked at the pictures and interpreted them using other non-weather vocabulary (e.g. references to seasons, fever, forest). Candidates should be reminded that the pictures given on the paper are included to help prompt their responses within the given topic and are not prescriptive.

Question 2

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

The question was marked out of a maximum of 10 marks for Communication and 5 marks for Language. Most candidates attempted the question and scored highly. Many candidates worked through the tasks logically and wrote at least one sentence on each. However, to gain all 10 Communication marks, candidates need to cover all four Communication points. A few candidates failed to cover one of the tasks, and the maximum Communication mark in this instance was 9. Overall, the language used was good, with many candidates scoring full marks for Language. However, some candidates failed to take note of the tense required by each task and so missed out on credit for Communication.

- (a) Candidates were asked to give an opinion about their holidays. This required a simple opinion and many candidates were successful in their responses. However, a number of candidates did not recognise the question word '*wie?*' and either did not respond to the task with an opinion or gave an answer which showed a misunderstanding, e.g. giving an account of how their family finds/books their holiday on the internet. Others failed to use the appropriate tense in their answer (present) and so were unable to score for Communication.

- (b) Candidates were asked to describe what they like doing with their friends during the holidays. Generally, this was well answered and many candidates gave detailed answers about the activities which they and their friends enjoy in the holidays. However, a few candidates failed to include reference to their friends and only talked about what they/their family do. Others ignored the tense (present) and gave an account in the past tense, and so were unable to gain Communication marks.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain what they are obliged to do during the holidays. This task led to a number of misunderstandings. Some candidates saw 'zu Hause' and gave an account of what they/their family do/like doing at home but without reference to what they are obliged to do. Candidates must answer the specific requirements of the tasks in order to gain the Communication marks. However, some candidates responded well, referring to having to complete household chores/homework tasks/music practice, and so on.
- (d) Candidates were asked to describe their future holiday plans. This was usually well understood, and the majority of candidates responded clearly and with reference to the future.

Question 3

Candidates choose to complete one of three possible options. This session, (a) and (b) were the most popular choices and candidates were fairly evenly spread across these. Relatively few candidates chose (c) and they were often, although not always, the stronger candidates.

- (a) Candidates were required to write an account of what happened the previous week, when they had to help at home. Of those who attempted this task, many did well but there were a few who appeared to confuse 'Haushalt' and/or 'Aufgaben' with 'Hausaufgaben'.

Part (a)

This task required candidates to explain why they had to help at home last week. There were many successful answers with most candidates giving sensible reasons, such as their parents being unwell/away on business or their family having people to stay or hosting a party. A few confessed to doing something wrong and explained that they had been given household chores to do as punishment for this. However, the most common answer was: 'Meine Mutter war krank' and candidates who attempted something more complicated were often less successful with their use of language. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded and this was challenging for some candidates. Candidates should be reminded to read questions carefully and to note the time frame required for each task.

Part (b)

This task asked what the candidate did to help at home last week. Many candidates used a good range of vocabulary for household tasks, but were often less confident writing about them in the past. The use of *putzen* (spelling) and *aufräumen* (separable prefix) caused many problems and confusion over *kochen/Küche/Kuchen* was common. However, most candidates were able to gain at least one Communication tick and many answered well, giving detailed accounts.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to describe whether they liked doing these household tasks. This was intended to be a general opinion on the subject but without careful reading of the verb many candidates interpreted this as an opinion on what they had done the previous week to help at home. Therefore, some candidates did not score as highly for Communication here. Others were confused by the word 'Aufgaben', confusing it with 'Hausaufgaben', and this also affected their communication. Few candidates went on to give a reason for their opinion and there was a limited range of vocabulary used to express opinion, with many candidates resorting simply to 'langweilig'.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to explain whether young people should help at home and to give reasons. The first part of the task was done well, with candidates manipulating the language correctly to make an accurate statement. Many candidates went to give good reasons (acknowledgement of parents working hard/having to travel and so needing help around the house, etc., and a few

candidates complained that they had so much schoolwork that they could not help with chores as much as they might like to). However, other candidates clearly had insufficient vocabulary/linguistic skills to express their reasons.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to describe what housework would look like in the future. The intention here was for a general description about the future of housework but many candidates personalised this and referred simply to which tasks they would/would not do, or suggested even that they might hire a *Putzfrau*. Some simply referred to what they would do next week to help their mothers. Those who were more imaginative were usually successful, referring, for example, to the future use of technology/robots. A future time frame was required for two Communication ticks.

- (b) For this question, candidates wrote a blog on the topic of work experience. This was a popular choice and was generally answered well. Candidates often based their accounts on actual experience and so were able to write with insight and opinion on the subject. However, for some there was some confusion over what exactly was meant by '*Arbeitspraktikum*'.

Part (a)

Candidates needed to state where they worked for their work experience. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. This was an introduction to the topic, but a large number of candidates did not succeed in stating where they had worked, and some candidates missed it out entirely. Reference to a town or a work-place was acceptable but several candidates added who they worked for, perhaps because they were not totally sure they understood the question word *wo*. Many were unsure which preposition to use in their response. For example, '*in meiner Tante*' or equivalent was quite common, as was the use of *auf* for *in*.

Part (b)

This task required an account of what they had done during their work experience. A past tense was required for both Communication ticks to be awarded. Candidates often seemed to be missing the necessary vocabulary for this task, and some struggled with the past tense, but many made answered well, referring to having helped someone/made the coffee, and so on.

Part (c)

Candidates were asked to explain why it is important for young people to do work experience. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Most candidates attempted this task but many struggled to explain their answer well. The concept of work experience being important was understood but many candidates struggled to find the vocabulary and structures to express why, for example, it would make it easier to find/choose a job/career in the future. Usually a maximum of one Communication tick was awarded for this task. Earning money seemed to be a common reason, suggesting that some candidates had understood '*Arbeitspraktikum*' to mean a part-time job, rather than work experience.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to explain where people learn more: in work experience or in school. A present tense was required for two Communication ticks. Most candidates answered this well and referred to their experience of the working world which had given insights into future life after school. Others appreciated the breadth of learning available in schools. Some found school and work equally valuable in different ways. Often a lack of accuracy of language prevented candidates from gaining both Communication ticks, however.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked what sort of job they would like in the future and why. A future time frame was needed for two Communication ticks. Most candidates did well on this task and were able to convey their desires for a future career/job. There were some ambitious choices, as well as those expressing their desires for their dream job. However, a minority of candidates used *bekommen* where *werden* was required and this could not communicate the message.

- (c) For this question, candidates wrote an account about waking up the previous night because there was suddenly a loud noise. The first sentence was provided to set the scene of the account to follow.

This was the least popular option, and whilst those who chose it were usually the stronger candidates, there were also weaker candidates who attempted it. Candidates who had a wide vocabulary and sufficient language for a more complex narrative were the most successful. Some candidates wrote good stories but did not answer all of the bullet points clearly, so despite some strong language and original ideas, did not score 10 for Communication.

Part (a)

Candidates needed to explain their reaction to waking up and hearing a loud noise. Most were able to say that they were frightened/shocked/anxious. 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 where the noise came from. This gave plenty of scope with answers ranging from car alarms to cats in the kitchen to a tree falling on the house, and so on. The more straightforward accounts were generally more successful, whilst the more ambitious were sometimes less accurate. 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 reacted when they woke up. Many did well on this task with clear reactions given and most candidates expressed these in the third person. For both Communication ticks, the task required answers in a past tense.

Part (d)

Candidates were asked to describe how they calmed down after the event. Many made good suggestions for this and listening to music or reading a book were popular answers. Others described having a drink of water, reading or shutting the window. Here, simple ideas using straightforward vocabulary were most successful. The past tense was needed for both Communication ticks to be achieved.

Part (e)

Candidates were asked to explain what they would do that evening in order to sleep well. Most candidates addressed this well with a variety of sensible suggestions seen. For two Communication ticks, a future time frame was needed.

Language

Candidates used a variety of verbs and verb forms appropriate to the question chosen. The formation of past participles and the correct use of the auxiliary were often problematic, especially in **3(a)** (household tasks in the perfect tense) and **3(b)** (tasks carried out on work experience). Modal verbs were often incorrectly used with *zu* and the distinction between *mochte* and *möchte* was not understood by some candidates. Many candidates were able to use the present and future tenses accurately but there were examples of confused tenses, where the past participle was used without the auxiliary as an attempt at the present tense or with *werden* as an attempt at the future tense.

Basic structures and vocabulary were generally used well. However, the use of capital letters was not always accurate. Nouns (genders, cases and plurals) were challenging for some candidates. Incorrect use of pronouns also presented a problem, both for communication and for accuracy. A number of candidates simply missed out a bullet point in either **Question 2** or **Question 3** and candidates should be sure to attempt all parts to have the highest chance of success in Communication.

Marks for Other Linguistic Features were awarded from the banded mark scheme. This session, there were a number of candidates scoring highly. Candidates usually showed correct word order and used

subordinating clauses effectively. However, some weaker candidates struggled with word order. Many candidates attempted justifications of opinions and reasons but 'weil' was by far the most common conjunction used. The use of *dass/das* was often confused. Candidates should take care in spellings and, in particular, over the accurate use of capitals on nouns/lower case letters on pronouns.