

GERMAN

Paper 7159/12
Listening

Question Number	Key
1	D
2	C
3	D
4	B
5	A
6	B
7	C
8	D

Question Number	Key
9	C
10	B
11	D
12	B
13	A
14	C

Question Number	Key
15	B
16	F
17	C
18	E
19	A

Question Number	Key
20	A
21	B
22	A
23	C
24	C
25	A
26	B
27	C
28	B

Question Number	Key
29	C
30	A
31	B
32	A
33	C
34	D

Question Number	Key
35	C/E
36	A/C
37	B/D

General comments

This listening examination was entirely multiple choice. It was noted that almost all candidates gave answers to all the questions, although there were a few instances where candidates either failed to answer or did not follow the rubric correctly, particularly in the last set of questions where they were required to tick two boxes per question.

The paper does get gradually more challenging as it progresses, from the first set of questions that test isolated common vocabulary to the final sections where understanding the whole gist of conversations is required. This was reflected in the candidates' performance.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

Overall, candidates with a sound basic vocabulary performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. Vocabulary areas included animals, clothes, vegetables and numbers.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract featuring a children's story. Again, identification of common vocabulary was required and there were no deliberate distractors. However, the words were embedded within longer sections of text. Vocabulary included professions, numbers, colours, parts of the house, means of transport, and the natural world.

The word most frequently not known was *Metzger*. *Straßenbahn* was also unfamiliar to a number of candidates, as was the very common colour *grau* which caught out about 30 per cent of candidates.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends planning a cycling holiday and discussing what different towns have to offer. Many candidates struggled to find the correct answer for the first three questions but performed better by the time they got to **Question 18** and **Question 19**.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard an interview about shopping tips to save money for the family. Here a more global understanding of the situation and views were required. There were tempting distractors in the choices that discriminated well between candidates. In **Question 20**, for example, *70 Euro* was a successful distractor and in **Question 22** the word *Markt*. Some candidates were also tripped up by answers that they would expect to be correct; for instance they would expect the family to eat a lot of fresh fruit but, unexpectedly, this was not the case. The questions that candidates had most difficulty with here were, in fact, **Question 25** and **Question 26**.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview about *Reparaturcafés* and reusing items efficiently across the world. This was an appropriately demanding exercise at this stage of the paper, as candidates are required to demonstrate the ability to understand specific details within a context and to be aware of attitudes and opinions.

In **Question 29** very few candidates chose the correct option, **C**, with many choosing **D**, presumably because they were distracted by the words *Touristen* and *verkaufen* that they heard in the recording.

Question 31 was the answer that most candidates got right, closely followed by **Question 33**.

Questions discriminated appropriately for this stage in the examination.

Questions 35–37

Here candidates heard three dialogues on a related topic (driving and transport). For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five.

Candidates found the passage about the police chase the hardest and performed best on the middle passage about E-scooters. This was an appropriately demanding and challenging exercise at this stage of the paper.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 7159/22 Reading</p>

Key message

Question group 1

Candidates match a series of short statements with the correct pictures.

Question group 2

Candidates match a series of short notices or signs commonly found in public places with an explanatory statement. The texts are all set in the same context.

Question group 3

Candidates answer multiple-choice questions with three options on a short text.

Question group 4

Candidates demonstrate understanding of a text, by answering straightforward, open questions. The emphasis is on answer location, and not on precise lifting; however, the subject, personal pronouns and possessives need to be unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct.

Question group 5

Candidates match a series of descriptions of the requirements, interests, or skills of different people with the correct description of places, events, services or activities. All texts are on a common theme.

Question group 6

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: The subject, personal pronouns and possessives need to be unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct.

General comments

The Paper was tackled very well by many of the candidates. Candidates should be aware that in the case of **Question Groups 4 and 6**, the subject needs to be unambiguous and personal pronouns/possessives need to be used in such a way as to make the answer unambiguous. Manipulations must be correct including when a candidate adds extra material not needed to answer the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1: (a)–(e)

Just a very few candidates selected incorrect answers in this initial Question group. There was no discernible pattern to explain this.

Question group 2: (a)–(e)

This was completed well by many candidates, but a few supplied incorrect answers for **2(c)** and did not seem to know where the child might play in the sand.

Question group 3: (a)–(g)

Accomplishment for this Question group was mainly good with a significant number of candidates selecting all correct answers. Errors were most frequent in the case in **3(b)** with candidates not reading carefully enough to understand the length of Patrick's club membership. In the case of **3(d)** some candidates selected the wrong answer and may not have understood *gewinnen* in the text.

Question group 4: (a)–(k)

Question 4(a) was answered well by virtually all candidates.

Question 4(b1) posed no problem.

Question 4(b2) was answered well by the greater majority offered the lift *der immer spielen wollte*, which could not be credited.

For **Question 4(d)** some candidates wrote *die* or *ihre Kusine* and this could not be credited as it was not clear to whose cousin this referred.

For **Questions 4(e), 4(f)** and **4(g)** almost all candidates supplied an appropriate answer.

Question 4(h) revealed that few candidates could manipulate the language to supply an appropriate answer as required here. Answers such as *Sie könnten sie/uns/ihre/ihnen einen Hund teilen* could not be credited.

Answers to **Question 4(i)** varied, with some candidates explaining correctly that she wants to walk the dog. Some answers were not credited as the language had not been correctly manipulated.

Question 4(j) was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Many answered **Question 4(k)** appropriately. Some, however, wrote *Der Hund/Er heißt Pucki* and did not describe the dog.

Question group 5: (a)–(e)

Some candidates acquitted themselves well here and gained full marks. There were some who matched 2 or 4 of the 5 correctly but gave a wrong response for the remainder.

Question 5(a) seemed to be problematic for some. In the case of those who were unsuccessful, it seemed that they had not grasped that close reading rather than word-spotting was required.

Question group 6: (a)–(i)

Although there were many good responses to Questions in this Question group, some candidates would be well advised to look more closely at the question, 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 interrogatives or had not focused on them. It seemed that a number of candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied chunks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

For **Question 6(a)** some candidates wrote *In der ersten Pause* and did not add the required *nach dem Wochenende* and so could not be credited.

For **Question 6(b)**, some candidates clearly understood the question, but others wrote *Für deine/seine/ihre Frisur kein Geld ausgeben*, which could not be credited.

For **Question 6(c)**, candidates provided appropriate answers.

For **Question 6(d)** some candidates did not seem to have read the question carefully and answered 900.

Question 6(e) revealed the inability of many candidates to provide the infinitive *sein*, and they wrote *Gesünder sind* as an answer.

Question 6(f) was answered correctly by most candidates.

For Questions **6(g)** and **6(h)**, most candidates located the right part of the text and seemed broadly to understand the questions, but answers were often not accurate or not precise enough to be credited.

Question 6(i) was clearly understood by most candidates, but candidates often failed to use the correct word order and so did not gain the mark.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 7159/03 Speaking</p>

Key messages

- The emphasis of this syllabus is firmly on successful communication within familiar situations.
- All tasks in this Speaking exam now are genuine communication exercises, in which candidates can show that they can understand and produce the target language.
- The structure of the Role Plays and Topic Conversations requires good understanding of the spoken language and spontaneity of response.
- Successful communication can be achieved even without absolute grammatical accuracy, as long as the language employed is appropriate to the situation and clear enough to be understood.
- In the role plays successful communication can be achieved in relatively short responses, but for higher marks in the conversations the language offered must be more expansive. Throughout the topic conversations, ideas and opinions should be expressed, developed and justified.
- Candidates should be able to converse on familiar topics, be expansive, describe events, experiences and ambitions, give reasons, evaluations and explanations for their ideas and plans, or relate a brief story.

General comments

These comments should be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for October/November 2022.

Like in other recent examinations, most centres conducted this – still relatively new – Speaking Test very well. Most candidates seemed very well prepared for the demands set in this exam and the large majority of examiners conducted the exam exactly in the spirit in which it was intended. Most examiners adapted very well to the requirements of this syllabus and displayed a confident awareness of the structure and timing of the various sections of the examination. They were patient, allowed time for the candidates to think, and prompted them to give fuller responses and to develop their ideas further.

In the Role Plays most complied with the instructions as to how many times a question can be repeated; and in the Topic Conversations, as to when the alternative questions provided should be used. Most examiners had mastered the technique of encouraging fuller responses by asking extension questions, either using the example extension questions, such as 'Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr', or providing appropriate alternatives of their own. Any question that will encourage a candidate to be more expansive on a question in the paper is welcome, if it looks as if the candidate will provide only brief answers and rush through a topic.

Many examiners were able to conduct successful conversations – lasting approximately four minutes – on each individual topic by using only the five questions provided in the Teachers' Instructions. Others ensured that the topic conversations provided enough material for accurate marking by asking up to two further questions of their own choice. This is particularly important in cases where candidates have been rather brief in their answers to the five scripted questions and have thus not provided enough evidence of the quality of their communication and language. There were, fortunately, only a few centres, where up to eight further questions were asked, but as these often were closed questions which did not encourage candidates to expand in their answers, they did not really serve the candidates well. Further questions should encourage candidates to elaborate, expand, narrate and/or explain.

Although the role plays are not timed, they should ideally be completed in two to three minutes and the whole test in ten or eleven minutes. Most centres achieved this successfully.

Comments on specific questions

Role Plays

The new format, with candidates seeing only the scenario during their preparation period, without any outline of the planned questions, is potentially quite demanding, but is continuing to be very successful, as it encourages spontaneous interaction. There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners followed instructions and asked the questions exactly as they were printed. The first two questions are designed to elicit straightforward (often very brief, possibly even just one-word) answers within a present tense time frame. The remaining three questions are intended to produce responses that are either in a past or future time frame or requiring an opinion or justification of a statement. Here also, the length of the answer is not important. Full marks are given for all complete answers, where the meaning is clear and unambiguous.

It is important for examiners to stick exactly to the script as given, as this ensures equality of opportunity for all candidates. If a candidate does not understand (or comprehend) a question the first time it is asked, it can be repeated once. Most examiners did this very well and very few either failed to repeat the question or repeated it several times.

Mostly the marking of the role plays was commendably accurate. Occasionally, examiners were slightly harsh in their interpretation as to what constitutes a ‘minor error’. Thus, an incorrect auxiliary (‘ich habe in die Schule gefahren) or an incorrect verb ending (‘wir möchte in die Stadt gehen’) may still be part of a clearly understandable response, where ‘the information is communicated’, as the mark scheme descriptor for two marks states. The important criterion for awarding a mark of one is: ‘Errors impede communication’. An incorrect time frame usually obscures meaning (Question: ‘Und was isst du normalerweise zum Frühstück?’ Response: ‘Ich habe Toast und Marmelade essen’), as does an incomplete answer. For example, in the question ‘Wann stehst du normalerweise in der Woche auf?’, the ‘wann’ component of the question must be answered, as otherwise the response can, at best, be partial.

A good guideline for awarding one mark for an utterance would be: In a real-life situation, would you feel you need to ask a further question for clarification?

There were relatively few marks of zero, (no creditable response), as all the role plays proved to be accessible to most candidates.

It is also worth mentioning that the role play task becomes much easier for the candidate, if an examiner genuinely enters into the spirit of a role play and conducts it like a spontaneous conversation on a given subject. It certainly does not put candidates at ease, if it is conducted like a series of unrelated questions, starting the role play with ‘erste Frage’ and continuing it more like an interrogation than a role play. Fortunately, only very few examiners conducted the role plays in such a fashion.

Comments on the individual Role Plays:

Card 1: (Tagesablauf)

As there were many centres in this session who entered just a single candidate, this was the role play which was used most often. It proved straightforward and, for the large majority of candidates, caused very few problems. A few candidates had difficulties with the phrase ‘Wann stehst du ... auf?’. A simple statement of time, like ‘um sieben (Uhr)’ was sufficient for full marks, but an answer like ‘um 19 Uhr’ was deemed to be ambivalent and raised doubts as to whether the question had been fully understood. The answer ‘nichts’ was accepted as a perfectly good answer to ‘Und was isst du normalerweise zum Frühstück?’, as was any answer that listed any likely items of food and/or drink one might consume for breakfast (we even had the answer ‘Brot und Wasser’ a few times). Any reasonable answer to the question ‘Was hast du gestern nach dem Frühstück gemacht?’ was accepted, and, as long as the time frame in the answer was clear, was given full marks. For **Question 4** (‘Findest du das Essen in Deutschland besser oder bei dir zu Hause?’), clearly the most common answer was ‘bei mir zu Hause, weil die Mama kocht’ (or similar), so it was clear that specific knowledge of food in Germany was not required.

This role play typified the standard pattern for role plays in the new syllabus, as detailed above: two questions where a brief answer would suffice, two encouraging a response using a past or future time-frame, and one requiring a justification or an opinion (perhaps a ‘double question’ as on this occasion).

Card 2: (Camping-Wochenende)

Similarly, this role play caused few problems. Again, the first two questions mostly elicited brief answers, like 'am Morgen' or um 10 Uhr' (to the question 'Wann sollen wir am Samstag zum See fahren'), and 'mit dem Auto' or 'mit dem Fahrrad' (to the question 'Und wie kommen wir am besten zum See?'). However, it was really good to see that the new format of the role plays, which allows candidates to be creative and come up with personalised responses, encourages candidates to think on their feet and even to use their sense of humour. Thus, particularly **Question 3** in this role play ('Was möchtest du machen, wenn wir am See sind?') elicited many very creative – and sometimes very funny – responses. A few candidates had difficulties with the phrase 'Wo übernachtetest du...?', but, on the other hand, highly interesting answers with a variety of good reasons were given in response to this question as well.

Card 3: (Familie)

This role play was generally done very well. The first question, 'Wo lebst du mit deiner Familie?' drew a wide variety of responses, from the simple 'hier in Kairo' to more complex responses like 'wie wohnen in einem kleinen Dorf ungefähr 10 Kilometer außerhalb der Stadt, weil es dort ruhiger ist'. A very small minority of candidates had difficulties with the word 'Geschwister' in **Question 2**, but most answers were adequate, from giving a simple number (sufficient for full marks) to a more detailed description of the number of siblings a candidate might have. It might be a good place here to draw attention to the fact again that this is a role play situation, in which the candidate is taking on a role, in which he/she is talking with a parent of their German friend. Therefore the answer to **Question 5**, 'Was möchtest du heute Abend mit uns zusammen machen?' clearly does not refer to the candidate's own family, and an answer like 'ich möchte mit meinem Bruder ins Kino gehen' is only partially acceptable.

Card 4: (Kochen als Hobby)

Again, this role play encouraged creative answers and was generally done very well. An interesting variety of dishes was offered to **Question 1** ('Und was willst du kochen?'). In this context, cakes were accepted as a viable response. **Question 2** was a very good example of the importance to respond to the key question word, which in this case was 'wie oft'. Responses were only credited with full marks if they contained a reference to frequency ('manchmal', 'einmal in der Woche', 'jeden Tag', 'fast nie' and many other expressions showing frequency were accepted). Very creative and funny answers were given to **Question 4** ('Warum ist Kochen ein gutes Hobby?'). One good example maybe is: '... weil ich selber gern und viel esse'.

Card 5: (Im Souvenirladen)

This again proved to be straightforward, candidates coped well with the situation of buying a T-shirt and souvenirs in Austria. For **Question 1**, asking how much money candidates were prepared to spend for the T-shirt they intended to buy, any feasible amount (I heard amounts of in between 5 Euros and 150 Euros) was accepted as a reasonable response, but responses giving an amount and the local currency of the country where the exam took place could not be accepted as completely adequate. Responses to **Questions 3** and **4** displayed a good amount of creativity, especially in response to the question as to what a candidate might do after getting home with souvenirs bought in Austria. Sometimes concern has been expressed that questions like 'Was haben Sie denn hier (i.e. in Österreich) schon alles gemacht?' might require specific knowledge of Austrian tourist attractions, so it may be reassuring to know that responses like 'Ich bin mit meinen österreichischen Freunden ins Kino gegangen' were fully accepted, as was any response that answered the question with a reasonable activity (or reasonable activities) in the correct time frame.

As there were fewer centres with more than five candidates, the following role plays were not heard so frequently, so the notes on them will be briefer.

Card 6: (Medien und Schulbibliothek)

This role play worked extremely well and there were very creative responses to the question as to whether school libraries are still important nowadays. Reasons given for why books might still have a place in today's world in spite of the spread of electronic readers were also very interesting.

Card 7: (Der verlorene Zimmerschlüssel in der Jugendherberge)

Again, there were few problems and candidates coped well with its demands.

Card 8: (Arbeitspraktikum in Wien)

Similarly, this role play proved straightforward to candidates. Referring again to the importance of responding to the main question word, in **Question 1** ('Woher kommen Sie denn?') a country, a region or a town/city could be accepted as a correct answer, provided it was preceded by a correct preposition, like 'aus' or 'von'. An answer like 'ich komme in Bangalore' was regarded as ambivalent and could not be credited fully. For **Question 2** ('Wie alt sind Sie?'), while we might have expected to get an age between 16 and 20, candidates who were saying they were older than this were also credited with full marks, while candidates who might have replied they were younger than 14 would not have been, as they would not have been accepted for work experience.

Card 9: (Umfrage über das Lernen in der Schule)

Those candidates we heard with this role play had no major difficulties with it, and again, some very interesting responses were offered, especially on **Question 5** ('Wie denkst du wird der Unterricht in zwanzig Jahren sein?').

Topic Conversations

As with the Role Plays, both candidates and examiners coped well with the requirements for the Topic Conversations, and a lot of complex and meaningful conversations were developed. The fact that questions to the conversations are now scripted offers several advantages, as closed questions, which in the previous syllabus often prevented even good candidates from developing their answers and expanding on a topic, are not asked any more. Also, as every candidate is asked the same questions, there is genuine comparability of standards and an increased level of fairness.

Most examiners asked questions exactly as printed, the majority also repeated questions when required and continued to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were forthcoming to the original questions. Also, examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like 'Kannst du noch mehr darüber sagen?', with the effect that most candidates managed to produce sufficiently long and meaningful conversations by answering the five questions in some detail. Good use was also made of the fact that examiners can ask up to two further questions, if the conversation was too short or insubstantial, and, again, the majority of centres did this very well. Only a very small minority of examiners asked closed further questions, which did not help candidates to use expansive language and thus hindered rather than helped them.

It was very pleasing to hear that in nearly all cases a similar standard was maintained for the further questions, as had been evident in the responses to the set questions and there was no evidence of memorising or over-rehearsal in the further questions asked by examiners.

Many exams were a pleasure to listen to with candidates producing interesting content and ambitious language. It was very good to hear candidates use subordinating conjunctions (indem, nachdem, damit, sobald) which helped them develop, justify and/or explain their statements. The best candidates also used structures like passives and subjunctives with confidence. Similarly, words and phrases like 'außerdem' and 'aus diesem Grund' were often used by candidates who ended up being marked at the top of the range for Quality of language. It is also worth pointing out again, (already mentioned above in the **Key messages**), that candidates are encouraged in this new format to be expansive, to tell stories, to give evaluations and to describe events.

It is also worth remembering that a candidate is no longer restricted to the top of the 'poor' box in the mark scheme if they do not produce completely correct past and future tenses. Instead, a candidate's use of tenses is now marked as part of the general impression for Quality of language, using the descriptors provided in the mark scheme. Accurate use of tenses is only one aspect of the 'range of structures listed in the syllabus' that the final Quality of language mark will be based on. The Quality of language mark also takes into account other aspects of language use, like the range of vocabulary used and the intonation and fluency of a candidate.

On the whole, the descriptors in the mark scheme for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of language' were used very accurately by examiners in deciding on the mark bands and marks they awarded. Far fewer adjustments to the marks had to be made than previously with the old syllabus and mark scheme.

The 'Alternative Frage(n)' for **Questions 3, 4 and 5** of the topics proved a very useful tool, as those alternative questions, which were formulated using more accessible language and linguistic concepts, made it possible even for weaker candidates to have a relevant attempt at answering the respective questions. Thus, these questions also proved to be a very good differentiating tool.

Like in the role play situations, there was no appreciable difference in difficulty between the seven topics. A great effort had been made to avoid setting questions where knowledge of one particular item of vocabulary might determine as to whether a candidate could answer a question. The setters of the exam also made sure all questions covered accessible topic areas, which are part of the 0525 syllabus, and which were expected to be covered by the textbook materials candidates might have used. Consequently, it was felt that all topics were equally accessible and were asking for linguistically similar types of responses.

After hearing a great variety of responses from candidates from different educational and cultural backgrounds, it is safe to say that there was not a single question in any of the seven topics that caused any particular difficulties. It was particularly fascinating to listen to the responses to the questions asking for opinions and evaluations (**Question 5** in Topic 1, **Question 3** in Topics 2, 3, and 4, and **Question 5** in Topics 5, 6 and 7), where the candidates' creativity and spontaneity was at its very best. Again, hearing those imaginative responses was a further indication that encouraging candidates to answer spontaneously to questions that are of genuine interest to them was a very positive step to take within this new syllabus.

No comments on the individual topics are included in this report due to the reasons given above and the fact that overall marks achieved in the different topics were totally comparable.

Randomisation

The large majority of centres followed the randomisation guidelines given in the Teachers' Notes exactly. This is very important both for reasons of fairness and confidentiality (in centres with many candidates), but the pairings of role plays and topics given in the Randomisation sheet also makes sure that candidates are given the opportunity to show what they are capable of in a variety of topic areas. Unfortunately, a very small number of centres limited this opportunity for the candidates by pairing topics with similar subject content.

Recordings/audio files

It was good to see that the new system of uploading both audio files and exam paperwork to Submit for Assessment worked well. Most centres uploaded their files straight after the exam had taken place and thus enabled a speedy completion of the moderation process. However, unfortunately there were some cases where over a month elapsed between the date of the exam named on the audio file and the date when the files were finally uploaded. Also, several centres uploaded paperwork and no audio files at first and needed to be chased for the audio files. It is sincerely hoped that the good practice of uploading all necessary files straight after completion of the exam and internal moderation will become the norm for all centres in future.

Before recordings are uploaded, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. Fortunately, this year there appeared to be far fewer problems with poor recordings. 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, so that it is difficult to hear them.

Administration

Administration in centres was generally good and, in this session, very few centres made errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the working mark sheet (WMS). Assessment was deemed to be more accurate than in the past, and the order of merit was generally correct.

Marking by centres

Scaling was required in far fewer centres in this session. It is also interesting to note that there were roughly as many centres where the marking was too severe, as there were centres that marked too leniently.

Centres obviously had made good use of the excellent mark descriptors in the mark schemes for both 'Communication' and 'Quality of Language' and thus managed to mark their candidates accurately. Reasons for excessive generosity included awarding high marks for Communication, when candidates had not offered ideas and opinions, as answers had been too factual. The fact that the Language mark is now given globally also clearly makes it easier to give accurate marks for Quality of language.

GERMAN

Paper 7159/42
Writing

Key messages

It is important that candidates read the questions carefully and respond to the exact tasks set. Writing on the topic area in general terms is unlikely to gain much credit. Full Task Completion marks can only be awarded if every part-question is answered. A thorough knowledge of the question words in German is helpful in achieving this. Candidates should also ensure that they are using the appropriate tense for each task. In **Question 2**, candidates will usually be required to demonstrate the use of present and future tenses, and in **Question 3**, they will often need to use past, present and future tenses in different tasks. In both questions, candidates will need to express opinions and give reasons for their choices.

General comments

There was no evidence of candidates being short of time. The correct number of questions was answered by almost all candidates and most answers were of an appropriate length.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates have to complete an electronic form by filling in the answers to five questions. A confident knowledge of the basic question words is essential for this task.

A form had to be completed for a Lost Property Office giving details of an item that had been lost. *Fundbüro* seemed to be an unfamiliar concept for a number of candidates.

Task 1 asked about an object that had been lost. There were many correct suggestions of small items such as mobile phones, bags, pullovers, and books. However, *verloren* was not always familiar: jobs and school subjects occurred regularly and, occasionally, mother or teacher.

Task 2 asked where the item had been lost (*wo?*). The logic of the question required a place from which the item could have been handed in to a Lost Property Office and so answers referring to transport (*Bus, Zug*) or places in a town (*Park, Spielplatz*) were expected, not the school classroom or a room at home. As this is **Question 1**, there is no necessity to include a preposition such as *in*, but it was encouraging that many candidates did so correctly.

Task 3 asked when (*wann?*). Correct answers could have been a day of the week, a month, a time (e.g. *10 Uhr*), or *letzte Woche*, but not *nächste Woche* or *morgen* because they refer to the future.

Task 4 asked about the colour of the item. Most candidates recognised *Farbe* and responded appropriately.

Task 5 required a further detail (*Weitere Beschreibung*) about the item. Most did give a further detail, often a second colour or a reference to size. There were some sophisticated descriptions but a single word is sufficient in this question.

Question 2

The topic of this writing task was Reading (*Lesen*). Five points had to be made in response to four bullet points. The first three points referred to candidates' reading preferences while the fourth asked about an ideal library. The fifth point asked about free time activities the following weekend and so had to be expressed in the future tense.

This question was assessed out of a maximum of 12 marks, using a single set of grade descriptors.

Task 1 asked for two pieces of information: what candidates like or do not like reading, and why. Both items of information were needed for a complete response to the task. A small number of candidates did not recognise *Lesen* and referred to school subjects (presumably understanding 'lesson') but most gave detailed and interesting explanations about their reading preferences. It should be noted that '*ich lese gern*' does not answer the question 'what'. The word for book(s) (*Buch/Bücher*) is a basic item of vocabulary which needs to be written accurately because it can be confused with words of similar spelling but different meaning and so gain no credit.

Task 2 asked where candidates most like to read. Many different places were chosen with clear reasons given for the choice. Some omitted this task, possibly because they misunderstood *wo*.

Task 3 gave candidates the opportunity to use their imagination and to write about an ideal library. Most achieved this well and gave detailed descriptions of the appearance and facilities of the library. One recurrent difficulty was the correct use of *es gibt*.

Task 4 required a future tense to describe leisure activities for the following weekend. Candidates were generally confident in their use of the future tense and many answers were detailed.

Question 3

In **Question 3**, there was a choice between writing an email about being on one's own at home one Saturday (**3a**) and a blog about a recent school exchange (**3b**). A significant majority of candidates chose **3a**.

Question 3 is assessed in banded mark schemes under three headings: Task Completion, Range and Accuracy.

(a) Candidates generally had the vocabulary and structures to complete all the tasks.

Task 1 asked for an explanation as to the parents' absence and needed a past tense. Most reasons given were work related or due to the illness or old age of a family member. Some complicated relationships were explained but they would have benefited from the use of *von* to express possession (e.g. *von meinem Vater*) rather than the non-German apostrophe.

Task 2 gave the opportunity to write about activities at home. Most responses were well written, used the past tense correctly, and added interest by mentioning activities that were usually forbidden by their parents.

Task 3 asked candidates to explain why they do or do not like spending time on their own. This gave a great deal of scope and was generally well answered with detailed explanations.

Task 4 anticipated a reaction to the parents' return home (e.g. *ich war froh, ich habe mich gefreut*) but there were also several descriptions of how clean/chaotic the house was or of what the candidate was doing when their parents arrived. These were also considered a valid interpretation of the task.

Task 5 needed the future tense to explain who candidates would like to live with in the future. Answers were varied and generally well expressed. The use of *ich werde* with the infinitive was generally good with word order mainly correct. However, *ich mochte/ich wurde* cannot be credited as references to the future as they are past tenses. The use of the conditional (*ich möchte/ich würde*) is needed in this instance.

(b) Relatively few candidates chose this question, but those who did performed well.

Task 1 required the past tense to say how the journey to Germany was completed. Most candidates handled flying or going by train competently. The most common errors were the use of *Flug* instead of *Flugzeug* and the incorrect choice of auxiliary verb (*haben* rather than *sein*).

Task 2 asked what candidates did during the exchange visit and gave them the opportunity to use the names of school subjects or to mention sports activities. The past tense was needed.

Task 3 asked for an opinion in the present tense about the German school system and there were interesting responses which showed a knowledge of this. No marks were lost for incorrect facts about the German education system.

Task 4 required an opinion about the significance of exchange visits. There were thoughtful answers ranging from the learning opportunity to the expense.

Task 5 asked about a prospective school trip for the following year. Most candidates answered on task and were not tempted to write about the next holiday with family or friends. The use of *ich werde* with the infinitive was generally good with word order mainly correct.

Question 3 Range

Many candidates opted for short clauses and used a small number of conjunctions, usually *weil* or *und*. In order to access the top bands for Range, sentences should be of different lengths and linked using various conjunctions such as *dass*, *denn*, *wenn*, *obwohl* and the relative pronouns. Word order could be changed as in: *am Wochenende werde ich ...* or *leider war ich* Variety was introduced successfully with expressions such as: *entweder ...oder*, *sowohl als auch*, *meiner Meinung nach*, and there was an attempt to vary vocabulary although there was a fair amount of repetition. Interest was added with the use of adjectives (e.g. *meine nette Freundin*, *der Kuchen war lecker*).

Question 3 Accuracy

There was evidence of careful preparation, and basic structures were generally sound, although there was some poor spelling and choice of vocabulary. The use of capital letters was patchy and inconsistent. Candidates would benefit from learning to use a simple possessive (e.g. *das Zimmer von meiner Schwester*). Although verbs are not now assessed separately, the way they are formed and used does influence the Accuracy mark. The mismatch between the subject and the verb (as in *ich backen*, *ich hat gespielt*) and the inaccurate formation of the past participle (*gebakt*, *gegeht*) 'frequently impeded communication'. While they no longer need to count the number of verbs used, candidates are advised to ensure they have a thorough knowledge of a wide range of verbs in past, present and future tenses as this will increase their mark in all three assessment categories.