

GERMAN

Paper 0525/11
Listening (Multiple Choice)

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/12
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

June 2021 was the first time the Listening test was multiple-choice. Candidates generally performed well and most attempted all questions.

The German extracts gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual pieces, to testing their ability to understand specific information, as well as opinions and explanations in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

Overall, candidates performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. For **Question 5** most candidates had no difficulty in associating *60 Minuten* in the question with *eine Stunde* in the dialogue. In **Question 6** some candidates did not know *Hemd* and chose either option **D** or **B** (*Jacke, Short*).

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured a Freecycle website. Overall, they performed well in this exercise. For **Question 12**, some candidates did not recognise *Pflanzen* and having understood *Garten* assumed Marion wanted a lawn mower and incorrectly chose option **C**. There was no clear pattern of incorrect answers for the other questions.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends planning the week's programme for the youth club. This is a new task and was challenging for some candidates. This was especially the case for **Question 17**. The most frequent incorrect answers were **D** and **E**. For **Question 15**, some candidates answered **A** or **F** instead of **E**. For **Question 16**, some candidates answered **B** or **F** instead of **A**. **Questions 18** and **19** were answered well by most candidates.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews about food and cooking. The exercise included a greater element of distraction. **Questions 20** to **24** were generally answered well. Incorrect choices were most frequently **C** in **Question 20**, **B** in **Question 21**, **B** in **Question 22**, **A** in **Question 23** and **B** in **Question 24**.

The second interview was more challenging, especially **Questions 25** and **28** which were about Nils's attitude towards food and food preparation rather than being purely factual. In **Question 28** candidates heard *Stress* and assumed **B** was the correct answer.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Marilla, a female rapper. Candidates needed to identify specific details and have an awareness of attitudes and opinions.

The level of difficulty increased in the second half of the interview, when only stronger candidates chose the correct options. In **Question 32** the most popular incorrect answer was **D** as candidates heard *Russland* and *Eltern* but overlooked *weggezogen*. In **Question 33** many candidates chose options **C** and **D** rather than the correct option, **A**. In **Question 34** few candidates chose the correct option **D** while **A**, **B** and **C** each attracted an equal number of candidates.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard a discussion between Maria and Felix about the merits of a holiday cruise. For each question in this exercise, candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This exercise required listening for detail and assessing opinions.

With the exception of **Question 36**, most candidates identified the true statements correctly. Many candidates chose **E** as the second true statement which referred to a visit to the Greek islands in the past, whereas the reference the candidate heard was to the future.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/13
Listening (Multiple Choice)

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

June 2021 was the first time the Listening test was multiple-choice. Candidates generally performed well and most attempted all questions.

The German extracts gradually increased in terms of length and density and featured monologues, conversations and interviews. The emphasis of the questions moved from targeting the candidates' ability to pick out information contained in short factual pieces, to testing their ability to understand specific information, as well as opinions and explanations in longer interviews and discussions.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1–8

Overall, candidates performed very well in this exercise. The extracts were straightforward and short. A few candidates went for *Post(straße)* and chose **D** instead of the correct answer *Bäckerei* (**A**). In **Question 4** some candidates did not know *Brille* and opted for **D** rather than **B**. In **Question 5**, **D** *U-Bahn* was correct, but all the other transport options were chosen by some candidates.

Questions 9–14

Candidates heard a longer extract which featured a school project week. Some candidates found this task a little more challenging, in particular **Question 9**, perhaps because they heard *März* before *...und zwar in der letzten Woche*. Some candidates chose option **B** possibly because they thought *zwar* was *zwei*. In **Question 10**, some candidates were unfamiliar with *Chor* and despite the support of *Lieder* and *singen*, incorrectly chose **D**. In **Question 13** *Bäume* was not known by some candidates who chose randomly from the options.

Questions 15–19

This was a matching exercise in which candidates heard a conversation between two friends discussing a proposed family holiday. This is a new task and was challenging for some candidates. This was especially the case for **Question 15**, where the most frequent incorrect answer was **A**. However, option **A** was in fact the answer to **Question 19** so candidates were left without a viable option for this question and just selected randomly. **Question 18** was answered well by candidates.

Questions 20–28

In this exercise, candidates heard two interviews about housework. The exercise included a greater element of distraction. The answers containing the same vocabulary used in the interview led some candidates to choose this option, although it was untrue. This was the case in **Questions 21, 22, 25, 26** and **27**. Other incorrect choices were possibly due to unfamiliarity with the vocabulary.

Questions 29–34

Candidates heard an interview with Karin Timm, a crime fiction writer. Candidates needed to identify specific details and have an awareness of attitudes and opinions.

There was no particular pattern to the incorrect choices. Those candidates who made incorrect choices appeared to be focusing on items of vocabulary common to both the dialogue and the statements in questions to make their choice, rather than understanding the details of the interview.

Questions 35–37

Candidates heard an interview with Christian, an animal trainer. For each question in this exercise candidates had to identify **two** correct statements from a choice of five. This exercise required listening for detail and assessing opinions.

The most common mistakes were the choice of **D** in **Question 35** where candidates heard the vocabulary item *krank* in the interview, and **A** in **Question 36** when candidates failed to discriminate between *Tierheim* in the interview and *Tierhandlung* in the statements. Option **E** was also quite frequently chosen despite the fact that the sense was the opposite of what Christian actually said in the interview. There was no particular pattern to the other incorrect choices.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/21
Reading

Key message

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.

General comments

The paper was answered very well by many candidates. In some cases candidates did not read the text closely enough for Question group 5. On some occasions candidates added extra information in answers which was not required. Any manipulations must be correct in these circumstances

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

(a) – (e) Candidates had no problem with these questions.

Question group 2

(a) – (e) This was completed well by many candidates. Some candidates did not seem to be familiar with the vocabulary, but there was no discernible pattern of errors.

Question group 3

(a) – (g) Performance for this Question group was generally good. Errors were most frequent for **3b**, with candidates not understanding that Noah had left school and in 3c where candidates often did not select the correct adjective to describe him.

Question group 4

(a) – (k) Most candidates answered **4a, b** and **c(i)** correctly. Just a very few weaker candidates provided completely irrelevant answers.

For **4c(ii)** some candidates could not manipulate the text appropriately to convey that Stefan might find his grandmother's diaries interesting, and as a result wrote that 'she' would find them interesting.

4d was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

4e Most candidates answered this correctly with just a very few answering *Deutsch* or in a few cases, *Englisch und Deutsch*.

4f was straightforward for most candidates.

For **4g** and **h**, most candidates identified the correct piece of information in the text, but were not credited as they did not manipulate the text correctly as required.

4i was answered correctly by most candidates.

Answers to **4j** were mostly correct with just a few candidates referring to afternoons in the park instead of the evening activity.

4k Most candidates answered appropriately.

Question group 5

(a) – (e) Relatively few candidates answered these questions fully correctly. There were some who matched 4 of the 5 correctly but gave a wrong response for **5a** or **5e**. Many candidates scored 0 or 1 and 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 these questions, some candidates would have benefited from reading the questions more carefully so that they could 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 some candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied chunks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

For **6a**, there were many good answers, but some candidates referred to the dogs enjoying the walk which did not demonstrate understanding of the text.

For **6bi**, candidates either understood the question and got the answer right or wrote something completely irrelevant. Some wrote incorrect one-word answers such as *ärgerte* or *geärgerte*. Some lifted the whole sentence about the litter.

For **6bi**, some candidates located the answer but failed to manipulate the language correctly.

For **6c**, a significant number of candidates lifted from the text. They failed to manipulate the language and wrote *werde* rather than changing it to *wird* or *wurde*. Some omitted *dass* in their response.

For **6d**, candidates often located the correct part of the text, but simply wrote *der Müll gesammelt* or similar.

Despite candidates locating the information correctly, answers to both parts of **6e** and **6f** revealed the inability of many candidates to formulate a simple sentence accurately.

6g was answered well by most candidates.

For **6h** and **6i** candidates either understood and wrote appropriate answers or else provided irrelevant or inaccurate responses.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/22
Reading

Key message

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.

General comments

The paper was answered very well by many candidates. In some cases candidates did not read the text closely enough for Question group 5. On some occasions candidates added extra information in answers which was not required. Any manipulations must be correct in these circumstances

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

(a) – (e) Just a very few candidates selected incorrect answers in these initial questions mainly because some basic vocabulary, in particular *Hefte* seemed unknown.

Question group 2

(a) – (e) This was completed well by most candidates with only a few clearly confused by the word *Aula*.

Question group 3

(a) – (g) Performance on these questions was mixed with a significant number of candidates selecting all correct answers, and others selecting none. Errors were most frequent with prepositions in **3(d)**, *essen* and *kochen* in **3(f)** and distinguishing the various people in **3(g)**.

Question group 4

(a) – (k) Many candidates misunderstood **4(a)** and talked about Stefan showering.

4(b) also caused some problems with candidates saying that Stefan was tired (which may have caused him to fall) and many invalidating their answer by including slipping and falling as part of their answer.

4(c) was answered reasonably well by most candidates, but **4(d)** caused problems with additional material and singulars and plurals, e.g., *ein* or *einmal Handtücher*.

4(f) revealed that few candidates understood personal adjectives with many incorrectly using *sein* when *ihr* was required.

For **4(g)** most candidates got Stefan, but many just gave *der Chef* as the other answer.

4(h) was answered well.

For **4(i)** most candidates located the right part of the text, but very few candidates managed to manipulate the text well.

Answers to **4(j)** showed that prepositions were not clearly understood, as there was a wide range of them. It seemed that *Bekanntem* was not understood as there was often no preposition or the preposition *in*.

4(k) Most candidates answered appropriately.

Question group 5

(a) – (e) Relatively few candidates answered these questions fully correctly. There were some candidates who matched 4 of the 5 correctly but gave a wrong response for **5(a)** or **5(d)**. Many candidates scored 0 or 1 and 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 these questions, some candidates would have benefited from reading them more carefully so that they could 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 some candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied junks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

For **6(a)**, some candidates answered with *unordentlich*, which described the room and not the wardrobe.

For **6(b)**, some candidates understood the question and got the answer right, but there were many incorrect answers and misunderstandings. Some stated that Hanna ought to recycle, which did not answer what was asked.

For **6(c)**, candidates who recognised *wem* in the question tended to get the answer correct. However, it was clear that many did not understand this interrogative.

For **6(d)**, candidates often located the correct part of the text, but were too brief in their answer, and simply wrote *am Bahnhof*.

Both parts of **6(e)** revealed the inability of nearly all candidates to express the dative construction accurately, but some used good ingenuity to get around it and still convey the right answer. For the second part, word order manipulation was poor.

For **6(f)**, it was clear that the interrogative *wozu* was not understood. Very few candidates used the *um...zu* construction correctly which meant that their answers could not be credited.

For **6(g)**, most candidates found the right answer but often added superfluous information. **4(h)(i)** and **(ii)** had the widest range of answers, mostly incorrect, especially the first part of the answer. The main problem seemed to be in identifying the right part of the text and then being able to manipulate it.

6(i) was answered well by most candidates.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 0525/23 Reading</p>
--

Key message

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.

General comments

The paper was answered very well by many candidates. In some cases candidates did not read the text closely enough for Question group 5. On some occasions candidates added extra information in answers which was not required. Any manipulations must be correct in these circumstances

Comments on specific questions

Question group 1

(a) – (e) Candidates had no problem with these questions.

Question group 2

(a) – (e) This was completed well by many candidates. Some candidates did not seem to be familiar with the vocabulary, but there was no discernible pattern of errors.

Question group 3

(a) – (g) Performance for this Question group was generally good. Errors were most frequent for **3(b)**, with candidates not understanding that Noah had left school and in **3(c)** where candidates often did not select the correct adjective to describe him.

Question group 4

(a) – (k) Most candidates answered **4(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)(i)** correctly. Just a very few weaker candidates provided completely irrelevant answers.

For **4(c)(ii)** some candidates could not manipulate the text appropriately to convey that Stefan might find his grandmother's diaries interesting, and as a result wrote that 'she' would find them interesting.

4(d) was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

4(e) Most candidates answered this correctly with just a very few answering *Deutsch* or in a few cases, *Englisch und Deutsch*.

4(f) was straightforward for most candidates.

For **4(g)** and **(h)**, most candidates identified the correct piece of information in the text, but were not credited as they did not manipulate the text correctly as required.

4(i) was answered correctly by most candidates.

Answers to **4(j)** were mostly correct with just a few candidates referring to afternoons in the park instead of the evening activity.

4(k) Most candidates answered appropriately.

Question group 5

(a) – (e) Relatively few candidates answered these questions fully correctly. There were some who matched 4 of the 5 correctly but gave a wrong response for **5(a)** or **5(e)**. Many candidates scored 0 or 1 and 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 these questions, some candidates would have benefited from reading the questions more carefully so that they could 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 some candidates did not understand what was being asked as they just copied chunks of the text without manipulating it or changing the person.

For **6(a)**, there were many good answers, but some candidates referred to the dogs enjoying the walk which did not demonstrate understanding of the text.

For **6(b)(i)**, candidates either understood the question and got the answer right or wrote something completely irrelevant. Some wrote incorrect one-word answers such as *ärgerte* or *geärgerte*. Some lifted the whole sentence about the litter.

For **6(b)(i)**, some candidates located the answer but failed to manipulate the language correctly.

For **6(c)**, a significant number of candidates lifted from the text. They failed to manipulate the language and wrote *werde* rather than changing it to *wird* or *wurde*. Some omitted *dass* in their response.

For **6(d)**, candidates often located the correct part of the text, but simply wrote *der Müll gesammelt* or similar.

Despite candidates locating the information correctly, answers to both parts of **6(e)** and **6(f)** revealed the inability of many candidates to formulate a simple sentence accurately.

6(g) was answered well by most candidates.

For **6(h)** and **6(i)** candidates either understood and wrote appropriate answers or else provided irrelevant or inaccurate responses.

GERMAN

<p>Paper 0525/03 Speaking</p>

Key messages

- The emphasis of the new syllabus is firmly on successful communication within familiar situations.
- The new structure of the Role Plays and Topic Conversations requires good understanding of the spoken language and spontaneity of response.
- Communication can be achieved even without strict grammatical accuracy as long as the language used is appropriate to the situation and clear enough to be understood.
- In Role Plays, successful communication can be achieved in relatively short responses, but for higher marks in the conversations, ideas and opinions should be expressed, developed and justified.
- Candidates should be able to talk about 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

Conduct of the Examination

Many centres conducted the Speaking Test which had a new approach required from teachers preparing their candidates and from those actually conducting the examination very well indeed. Many examiners had clearly adapted very quickly to the changed requirements and displayed an efficient yet friendly manner and 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 examiners complied with the instructions about how many times a question could be repeated and in the Topic Conversations about when the alternative questions provided should be used. Not all examiners encouraged fuller responses by asking extension questions. However, others used the example extension questions, such as *Erzähl mir bitte etwas mehr*, extremely well or provided appropriate alternatives of their own.

Many examiners conducted successful four-minute conversations on the topics using only the five questions provided in the Teachers' Instructions. Others ensured a full four minutes by asking up to two further questions of their own choice. However, some did not ask sufficient additional questions and the conversation remained too short, whilst others did not adhere to the rubric and asked more than the two additional questions specified.

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.

Administration and Recordings

Most centres forwarded an appropriate size of sample, on labelled CDs or memory sticks, with each candidate's digital file saved individually. Files should be labelled according to the centre and candidate numbers rather than the teacher or examiner's name. Before recordings are despatched, spot checks must be made to ensure that every candidate is clearly audible. Even though the majority of recordings were of a good quality, a small minority of centres placed the microphone too far from the candidates and it was difficult to hear them.

Administration in centres was generally good and there were few errors in the addition of the candidates' marks on the Working Mark Sheet (WMS).

Assessment and Internal Moderation

Assessment was generally consistent and the order of merit was usually correct. However, it was necessary to scale some centres' marks and there was a slight tendency for marking to be too generous rather than too severe. Centres had clearly adapted very quickly to the new mark scheme. Reasons for excessive generosity included awarding high marks for Communication when candidates had not offered ideas and opinions as answers had been too factual.

Internal moderation when there was more than one teacher examining was usually carried out satisfactorily. However, it is essential that the marks for each marking category on the Working Mark Sheet are the final internally moderated marks. It is important to rewrite the WMS if changes have been made during Internal Moderation. The total marks on the WMS must then be transferred to the Assessed Marks Report and both totals must be identical.

Comments on specific questions

Section A : 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 proved to be a great success. There were many lively performances from candidates and nearly all examiners coped very well with the new requirements. Although the Role Plays should ideally be completed in two to three minutes, some examiners took them more slowly, which is understandable but perhaps less natural. The first two questions are designed to be answered fairly briefly if so desired, but longer responses are also fine, as long as the main piece of information is not obscured or forgotten. The remaining three questions will always be intended to produce responses that are either in a past or future time-frame or requiring an opinion or justification of a statement, and these should all be answered as fully as the candidate wishes.

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 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, at the other extreme, repeated it several times.

The marking of the Role Plays by centres was occasionally slightly harsh. Sometimes only one mark was awarded where two marks would have been more appropriate. One of the important criteria for awarding a mark of one is: *Errors impede communication*. Quite often this point was overlooked in the marking if a candidate produced an incorrect verb form. The incorrect verb was assumed to have impeded communication, but this is not always the case. For example, an incorrect auxiliary, such as *Er hat gegangen*, or an incorrect verb ending, may still be part of a clearly understandable response, where *The information is communicated*, as in the descriptor for two marks. However, mostly the marking of the Role Plays was accurate. Relatively few marks of zero for no creditable response were awarded or deserved, as all the Role Plays were accessible to the majority of candidates. Only one or two individual Role Play questions were more challenging for some candidates.

Comments on the individual Role Plays

Card 1: (Looking for a job in a hotel)

This Role Play was fairly straightforward and caused very few problems for the large majority of candidates. Some candidates struggled to find a specific job they might do in the hotel, but it was acceptable to say they wanted to work in the restaurant or kitchen without giving a job title. Borrowing 'manager' from the scenario was not considered appropriate, however. This Role Play typified the standard pattern for 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, (or a 'double question' as on this occasion) and one requiring a justification or an opinion.

Card 2: (Planning a walk, but the weather is bad)

Some candidates were not sure how to answer the *Wie lange?* question which began this Role Play. Possible valid answers that were heard included *Nicht lange*, *2 Stunden*, *oder so* or *Nur ein paar Kilometer*, often with a reason given, such as a comment on the bad weather. As in previous years *Zwei Uhr* was not accepted for *Zwei Stunden* and in this case the examiner should repeat the question, perhaps emphasising

Wie lange? to encourage the candidate to think again. **Question 4** included a second question in the plural (*Was habt ihr gemacht?*) but a response in the singular was acceptable. As in all the Role Plays and conversations, the use of modal verbs in questions sometimes caused confusion and candidates would benefit from further practice in future years. In **Question 5**, *Was wollen wir machen?* should have been familiar at this level.

Card 3: (At the doctor's with an allergic reaction)

There were few problems for candidates in thinking of symptoms of an allergic reaction but surprisingly, *seit wann?* caused some difficulties.

Question 4 was usually answered well: for example *Gut* as a response would have achieved full marks, but most candidates provided the detailed reasons expected. However, some candidates were taken by surprise by the inclusion of *sonst* and asked for the question to be repeated as a result. A suitable response for future plans should fit the role play scenario, so 'doing my exams' or 'studying' was not an appropriate response if talking about fixing a further doctor's appointment whilst on holiday, as in **Question 5**.

Card 4: (Phoning partner's family before setting off)

This proved to be fairly straightforward with the exception of the second part of **Question 5** (*Gibt es etwas, was du nicht essen darfst?*) which some candidates found more challenging. For this question any reasonable response was accepted, even if the candidate had perhaps not grasped the exact meaning of *darfst*. There were also some very good responses to this question where full reasons were offered, some based on a candidate's religion or health issues.

Card 5: (Eating at a Schnellimbiss)

Some candidates found it challenging to respond to **Question 3**, as it was probably unexpected, but some good and linguistically accurate reasons were provided for eating at a fast-food restaurant, even though they were not always healthy ones. **Question 5** also required quick thinking but was usually answered well and in a future time-frame.

Card 6: (At a party in Austria)

This was well dealt with by most candidates. The main difficulty was the phrasing of **Question 5** (*Was hast du morgen vor?*), which caused some candidates to give inappropriate answers. This phrasing should be expected and practised alongside the other possible questions designed to trigger a response using a future tense or time-frame, such as *Welche Pläne hast du?* or *Was wirst du/möchtest du machen?* No actual knowledge of parties in Austria was required to answer **Question 4**. Some candidates were able to point out some cultural differences compared with their homeland, others also gained full marks with straightforward answers such as: No, they are the same, or we also eat, dance and listen to music.

Card 7: (Discussing the arrival of a new sibling)

Some candidates were surprised by the first question or found it difficult to say *Es geht ihnen gut*, or similar. As long as the information was communicated unambiguously two marks were awarded here. Answers to **Question 3** which were not considered to be housework were not accepted, for example watching television. Not everyone knew, or expected to hear, *Einzelkind* in **Question 5** and there were some inappropriate responses.

Card 8: (At school with a German partner)

There were no major difficulties with this Role Play and some very good responses to **Question 4** about why foreign languages were, or were not, a good subject to do at school.

Card 9: (The environmental problems in a city)

As in Card 3, *seit wann?* caused some difficulties in **Question 1**. Otherwise, candidates managed this Role Play well. No specific knowledge of Cologne was required and only general information or opinions on environmental issues, with which most candidates appeared to be familiar.

Topic Conversations

As with the Role Plays, both candidates and examiners coped well with the new requirements, and a lot of complex and meaningful conversations were developed. The majority of examiners asked questions exactly as printed, and also repeated questions when required and continued to ask the alternative questions, when no answers (or indeed inappropriate or rudimentary answers) were given to the original questions. Also, examiners encouraged candidates to expand on their answers with phrases like *Kannst du noch mehr darüber sagen?*, so most candidates managed to produce 3½ - 4 minutes of meaningful conversation by answering the 5 questions in some detail. Good use was also made of the fact that examiners can now ask up to 2 extension questions if the conversation is too short and the majority of examiners did this very well. Many candidates produced interesting content and ambitious language.

Comments on the individual Topics

Topic 1: (Clothing)

In this topic the second question caused considerable difficulty to candidates. To quite a large number of candidates the word *Farbe* appeared to be unknown, and so they could not really answer this question. As it was a one of the first two questions and intended to be straightforward, there was no alternative question.

In **Question 4** there were candidates who tried to answer this question with just a single sentence, when more detail was required.

Question 5, about what clothes they might wear when older, was often imaginatively dealt with, with references to 'clothes to make me look younger', uniform to be required for a future job, or simply 'the same cool stuff as now'.

Further questions from examiners, to make sure the conversation lasted 4 minutes, included questions on fashion and school uniform. Although these, and other similar topics, were clearly very well known to candidates, a similar standard was maintained as had been evident in the responses to the set questions and there was no evidence of memorising or over-rehearsal of any material in this, or any of the other, Topic Conversations.

Topic 2: (Self, family, friends)

Question 1 was sometimes misunderstood to refer to the friend's character and not their appearance, as *sieht aus* was unfamiliar or misheard.

Seit wann occurred again in **Question 2** and caused a number of difficulties for candidates.

The other questions on this topic were dealt with well and produced interesting discussions and opinions, particularly on the supposedly annoying habits of siblings.

Topic 3: (Travel and transport)

In **Question 4** some imagination was required to invent a car problem. It is worth emphasising that the responses in Topic Conversations do not have to be true but can be role-played if necessary for the situation. Further questions from examiners included asking how important travel is in general, and discussing bicycles as a preferable form of transport.

Topic 4: (People and places)

This topic was also well dealt with. In **Question 3** some candidates misunderstood *Vorteile* and listed the disadvantages. Not everyone understood *Ort* in **Question 4** and this word also occurred in the alternative question, but the words *interessant* and *besucht* should have been sufficient to provoke a response. Beaches, museums and capital cities seemed to be the favourite places visited.

Further questions included some on languages to be learned in future, and this was relevant as a follow-up to discussion of a move abroad, which was candidates' favoured response to **Question 5**.

Topic 5: (Work and careers)

A number of candidates answered **Question 1** about their *Ferienjob* with responses such as *Ich möchte Arzt werden*, which were not really appropriate. Most candidates coped well with the question of how important (or not, as the case may be) earning lots of money was for them.

Question 3 was another example where a response could have been imagined, and which could be practised in future. If candidates have not actually had a job to earn some extra money they could imagine that they have and tell the story. One interesting further question was: what job would you *not* want in the future, and why?

Topic 6: (Surroundings and buildings)

As with *Farbe* in Topic 1, *Gebäude* in this topic caused some difficulty to a number of candidates. Again, as this was a **Question 1**, there was no alternative question. In **Question 3** there were many candidates who did not pick up first time on *Einkaufsmöglichkeiten* or required the alternative question.

The Stadt/Land issue was re-visited in several discussions on further questions.

Topic 7: (Communication and technology)

While this topic and the questions with it may have caused consternation 20 years ago, the candidates of today coped and expanded without any major difficulties. This seemed to be a very popular topic for many. There were imaginative responses to the question as to what communication might be like in 20 years' time. The alternative **Question 5** helped slightly weaker candidates to get started quite effectively and the dangers of the internet were often brought up in further questions.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/41
Writing

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/42
Writing

Key messages

For **Question 1**, centres should encourage candidates to fill in every gap, without leaving any blanks.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should work through the tasks in order. Candidates should look at the tense required by each task set in **Question 2** and **Question 3** and should ensure that their answer is given in the same time frame.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared and made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the new exam specifications. Many candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding and demonstrating good language use.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

In **Question 1**, candidates are required to produce five items of vocabulary as part of a form-filling exercise. Candidates were asked to fill in an application for an evening course on behalf of a friend. They were asked to give their nationality, list two hobbies/interests, name an evening course their friend would like to attend, and specify a preferred day. Candidates could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary of these five items. Many candidates completed this task easily, and many achieved the full five marks.

Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 5 were usually well answered. Spellings were often not correct but were often accepted since communication was achieved through 'soundalike', as indicated on the mark scheme.

Task 1 asked for the person's nationality. Many candidates wrote the name of their country. Where the adjectival form was used, spelling was often an issue.

In **Tasks 2 and 3**, the majority of candidates were able to give two hobbies/interests, though *Leszen* for *lesen* was a common error that was not accepted, and misspellings which created another word were also not accepted (e.g. *Mahlen* was not accepted for *malen*). Candidates who used the same vocabulary (e.g. *Fussball*) for **Tasks 2, 3 and 4**, could only be credited once for the same vocabulary item.

In **Task 4**, *Kurs* was not always understood, and many wrote the name of a particular qualification (*IB*, *GCSE*, etc.) or a school year group (*Y9*, *Oberstufe*, etc.), rather than the subject of the evening course.

Generally, **Task 5** was answered well and the spelling of the days of the week was generally good. Dates were accepted in place of a named weekday, but candidates would benefit from learning the appropriate German style for the writing of dates.

Question 2

Candidates answered questions on the topic of their schoolfriend. The questions were expressed in four clear bullet points. Candidates needed to take care to read and respond to the particulars of each question, rather than simply writing generally on a given topic area. Candidates who wrote about their chosen friend, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing tasks which had been set, could not score on the specific bullet points which they had not addressed.

Almost all candidates attempted this question, and the majority were able to score well, with many candidates writing at length, on task and in good, basic German. Most candidates worked through the five tasks systematically and wrote at least one sentence on each task. To reach the higher bands, candidates needed to show evidence of each requirement in the band. Generally, the language used was good, with many candidates scoring well. Overall a variety of vocabulary was used, and many candidates added simple explanations with linking words (e.g. *because...*). However, verb conjugation was challenging for many weaker candidates.

Task 1 asked what the candidate's friend looked like. This presented a challenge for weaker candidates who did not seem to understand *aussieht*. Those who left out the physical description of the friend did not fulfil the task, and this impacted on the band they were able to reach for the final mark. Candidates who understood usually described hair and eyes, with many also referring to physical stature. There were some comparisons used, such as 'is bigger/taller than me', etc.

Task 2 asked for the candidate's opinion of their friend, but many candidates misunderstood *finden* in this bullet point and gave an account of how they had met their friend (e.g. in primary school/on holiday) rather than giving their opinion of the friend. Some confused *wie* with *wo*, or misunderstood *finden* in this sense.

Task 3 asked for reasons for their opinions. Some candidates expressed an opinion without a reason (or gave reasons that did not make sense, e.g. *Mein Freund ist hilfsbereit, weil er gern Fussball spielt*). Others gave a list of more adjectives. Stronger candidates thought about the bullet point as a whole and gave opinions and reasons that linked together well (e.g. *Mein Freund ist intelligent, weil er immer gute Noten hat*).

Task 4 asked about activities the friend liked to do in their free time. This was generally answered well but a minority answered about themselves rather than about their friend, and so could not score. However, answers with *wir* were accepted.

Task 5 asked what the candidate would do after school with their friend. However, *nach der Schule* proved problematic for some candidates who gave accounts about activities during the school day or in school (rather than after school). Some candidates interpreted *nach der Schule* as referring to what they will do after leaving school (e.g. university/work plans), and this interpretation was accepted.

Question 3

A small minority of candidates wrote on a different topic to the questions set or simply copied out the language of the rubric. However, the majority attempted to answer the question as set. There were a few very short answers where candidates had insufficient German to attempt the question in full.

Task Completion

Marks gained by candidates for their Task Completion depended largely on how well they had understood the specific tasks set. The banded mark scheme focuses on how successfully the tasks are completed, how much information is conveyed and how relevant the detail is.

Range

Many candidates were able to show a variety of linking words/connectors, use of simple/complex structures, and a range of vocabulary. Longer sentences were used by many, with *weil* being the most commonly used conjunction, followed by *denn*. The strongest candidates demonstrated an ability to use a range of conjunctions, including *obwohl*, *um...zu...* and *wenn* clauses, etc.

Many candidates used a good range of verbs, but there was limited successful use of modal verbs. There was little variety in adjectives chosen, and a limited use of negatives. Other than *nicht*, some candidates used *nicht nur* or *sondern*. *Außerdem* was frequently seen, as was *meiner Meinung nach* but the latter was rarely used correctly. Overall, few candidates used more complex constructions, such as relative clauses or *wenn* clauses with the conditional.

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3(a)** offered the opportunity for a range of helping at home vocabulary and in **Question 3(b)** there was an excellent range of vocabulary on the topic of environment (e.g. *Erderwärmung, Klimawandel, fossile Brennstoffe, Mikroplastik, Energiesparlampen and Müllsammelaktionen*).

Accuracy

This session many candidates had problems with basic verb conjunctions. Some candidates were unaware of or confused by the use of an auxiliary verb for the perfect tense and by the use of *werden* plus infinitive for the future tense. Candidates often did not use the tense required (e.g. many used the present tense to say, in **Question 3(a)**, how they help an elderly lady, or in **Question 3(b)** what they do in school to reduce waste, instead of using the perfect tense to describe what they have done). Very few candidates used relative clauses correctly, and word order was an issue for many. A number of candidates seemed confused by the use of *Sie* in the rubric, and many were unable to demonstrate accurate use of *sein/ihr*.

Many candidates were successful in conveying information without understanding being impeded but overall, the level of accuracy was often not strong. However, the strongest candidates were highly accurate and used verbs, word order, case, etc. very effectively.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write a letter to their friend, about helping an elderly lady last week.

Task Completion

The interpretation of *alten Dame* varied, with some candidates referring to a teacher or to someone else older than themselves. *Alten* was misread as *Eltern* by a number of candidates. There were very competent candidates who did not address the precise requirement of a particular bullet point and could not therefore move up the banded mark scheme. Others wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic of helping an elderly person but did not give the specific details/opinions/reasons asked for in the bullet points. However, many candidates were able to make convincing responses to the questions.

Task 1 required candidates to explain how they helped the elderly woman. A number of candidates did not complete the task, because they used the present tense or simply the infinitive rather than the past tense. Some candidates were not specific about how they helped the old lady, so could not be awarded credit. However, many candidates wrote a successful answer, referring, for example, to helping the elderly lady at home, or assisting with her shopping. Some added extra details, and many had at least attempted a past tense, usually perfect tense.

Task 2 asked candidates to explain why they had to help the lady. Many candidates gave valid reasons, with many referring to the woman's age, or mentioning a physical illness or ailment. Some candidates tried to develop a more complex scenario for their narrative (e.g. the elderly lady falling in the road or having a problem with her dog) but they did not always have the language skills to explain this effectively.

In **Task 3**, candidates were asked to give a reason for liking/not liking spending time with elderly people. Many good answers were given for this task, but a significant minority wrote about a grandparent, rather than about elderly people in general. There was often a limited range of vocabulary, with most candidates giving simple reasons, such as 'because it is boring'. Many candidates struggled to use *gern* appropriately, with many trying to use it as a verb.

Task 4 asked for details about what the older generation can do for the younger generation. This task was sometimes misunderstood as asking what the younger generation can do for older people. Some candidates stated that 'they can help', without explaining how, but many were able to suggest that the older generation can advise or pass on their knowledge/experience to the younger generation. Language was sometimes a challenge in this task, with candidates not knowing the verb 'to teach', and instead using *lernen* which became confusing.

Some candidates found it difficult to separate out **Tasks 3** and **4**, either confusing the two, or finding it hard to explain why they like being with older people, and then going on to describe what older people might do for younger people.

Task 5 asked what would be important for the candidate when they are old, and a future time frame was required in answers. Some candidates were not successful in this task because they referred to something they would like to do in the future (e.g. getting a job), without reference to being old or to the importance of the activity. Others seemed not to understand *persönlich* or *wichtig*; or did not make an attempt at a future time frame. However, the majority of candidates who did answer this point correctly, used a variety of

structures and vocabulary. The strongest answers referred to visits by family members, to having friends or people to help them, or to keeping healthy and fit.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were required to write an article for their school magazine on the topic of plastic. Most candidates who chose this option had both the knowledge and the vocabulary to do so. There were some excellent responses, with strong evidence of this being a familiar, well-taught topic, but some weaker candidates seemed to lack the topic-specific vocabulary, or the understanding of the rubric required to deal with the subject area. Some candidates missed out a task in their responses to this question.

Task 1 required candidates to explain why it is important to use less plastic. Most candidates gave 'because it is bad for the environment' as a reason, often focussing on sea pollution and the way in which plastic enters the food chain. Even the weakest candidates were able to produce convincing responses. Many made use of good examples of expanded language, reasons and a correct application of more advanced grammatical structures.

Task 2 required candidates to explain what they had done recently to reduce plastic in school, and an attempt at a past time frame was needed. This proved difficult because many candidates explained the school's actions at the moment and so used the present tense. Some candidates possibly did not understand *neulich*. Some used the past tense to describe past talks or the recent buying of new bins, before going on to explain how the school was moving forward in the present. This worked well.

Task 3 asked candidates to explain how their family tries to use less plastic. This was answered successfully by many candidates, with recycling/using paper as the most common answers. Some candidates gave eloquent responses with plenty of examples and well-connected sentences. Others merely stated that their family tries to produce less plastic waste, without giving any detail as to how they do this.

Task 4 asked what else the candidate did for the environment. A significant minority of candidates lifted part of the question, without adding any of their own vocabulary, and the word *sonst* seemed to create some confusion. Others made generalisations (*man sollte, man kann*, etc.). However, many were successful, with references to using a bike/public transport instead of a car, saving water/energy, and even litter picking, etc.

Task 5 asked what the world would look like in the future. Many gave good responses, suggesting what might happen if mankind continues to act without changing our approach to the environment. Others focused on the positive, with general optimism, and suggested how things would improve for future generations.

GERMAN

Paper 0525/43
Writing

Key messages

For **Question 1**, centres should encourage candidates to fill in every gap, without leaving any blanks.

In **Question 2** and **Question 3** candidates should work through the tasks in order. Candidates should look at the tense required by each task set in **Question 2** and **Question 3** and should ensure that their answer is given in the same time frame.

General comments

Overall, many candidates were well prepared and made good efforts to respond to the requirements of the new exam specifications. Many candidates produced clear answers, showing understanding and demonstrating good language use.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

In **Question 1**, candidates are required to produce five items of vocabulary as part of a form-filling exercise. Candidates were asked to fill in an order form for purchasing flowers as a birthday gift. They were asked to give two colour preferences, add any additional item which might be ordered with the flowers, specify a preferred day for delivery, and note the occasion for which good wishes were being sent. Candidates could gain up to five marks for communicating the vocabulary for these five items. Many candidates completed this task well, and many achieved the full five marks, but there were a number of blanks left, and even some of the strongest candidates did not achieve full marks on this first question.

Tasks 1, 2, and 4 were usually well answered. Spellings were often not correct but were often accepted since communication was achieved through 'soundalike', as indicated on the mark scheme.

Tasks 1 and 2 asked for the preferred colours of the flowers. Most candidates completed these, with *rosa/rot/blau* being especially popular choices. Some candidates left blanks here and did not seem familiar with some basic German vocabulary, such as colours.

In **Task 3**, many candidates were able to suggest an additional item (e.g. *Pralinen, Schokolade*) but again some candidates left blanks.

Task 4 was usually answered well and the spelling of the days of the week was generally good. Dates were accepted in place of a weekday, but candidates would benefit from learning the appropriate German style for the writing of dates.

Task 5 was the most challenging, with candidates less sure about vocabulary for specific occasions. The most common response was *Geburstag* but a significant number of candidates left blanks for this task.

Question 2

Candidates answered question on the topic of their family. The questions were expressed in four clear bullet points. Candidates needed to take care to read and respond to the particulars of each question, rather than simply writing generally on a given topic area. Candidates who wrote about their family, giving the details they wanted to mention, but without addressing tasks which had been set, could not score on the specific bullet points which they had not addressed.

Almost all candidates attempted this question, and the majority were able to score well, with many candidates writing at length, on task and in good, basic German. Most candidates worked through the five tasks systematically and wrote at least one sentence on each task. To reach the higher bands, candidates needed to show evidence of each requirement in the band. Generally, the language used was good, with many candidates scoring well. Overall a variety of vocabulary was used, and many candidates added simple explanations with linking words (e.g. because...). Verb conjugation and word order was challenging for many weaker candidates.

Task 1 asked for a description of the candidate's family and was generally answered well, with candidates listing family members and describing their looks/personalities.

Task 2 asked what the candidate liked doing with their family. Many answered clearly, with references to shared leisure activities undertaken with siblings/parents.

Task 3 asked for the candidate's opinion on their family life. This was the most challenging task for many candidates who did not seem to understand *Familienleben*. Some gave general statements/opinions about the family/family members, rather than answering specifically about their family life. Others seemed to have understood *Leben* as *lieben*.

Task 4 asked for reasons for their opinions on family life. Many were successful in this, even if they had not fully understood the reference to family life. The strongest candidates understood and thought about the bullet point as a whole and gave opinions and reasons that linked together well. (e.g. *Mein Familienleben ist sehr gut, weil wir uns immer sehr gut verstehen.*)

Task 5 asked what candidates would do next week with their family. Generally, this was answered well with candidates referring to activities/visits/trips that they would undertake. Some candidates wrote only about what they do, rather than what they would do, and this limited marks.

Question 3

The majority of candidates attempted to answer the question as set, but there were a few very short answers where candidates had insufficient German to attempt the question in full.

Task Completion

Marks gained by candidates for their Task Completion depended largely on how well they had understood the specific tasks set. The banded mark scheme focuses on how successfully the tasks are completed, how much information is conveyed and how relevant the detail is.

Range

Many candidates were able to show a variety of linking words/connectors, use of simple/complex structures, and a range of vocabulary. Longer sentences were used by many, with *weil* being the most commonly used conjunction, followed by *denn*. The strongest candidates demonstrated an ability to use a range of conjunctions, including *obwohl*, *um...zu...* and *wenn* clauses, etc.

Many candidates used a good range of verbs, but there was limited successful use of modal verbs. There was little variety in adjectives chosen, and a limited use of negatives. Other than *nicht*, some candidates used *nicht nur* or *sondern*. *Außerdem* was frequently seen, as was *meiner Meinung nach* but the latter was rarely used correctly. Overall, few candidates used more complex constructions, such as relative clauses or *wenn* clauses with the conditional.

In terms of vocabulary, **Question 3** offered the opportunity for a vocabulary on the topic of trips out/travel in **Question 3(a)** and on the topic of health and fitness in **Question 3(b)**.

Accuracy

This session many candidates had problems with basic verb conjunctions. Perfect tenses and even simple futures seemed to present a challenge. Candidates often did not use the required time frame in their answer to a specific task. Very few candidates used relative clauses correctly, and word order was an issue for many.

Many candidates were successful in conveying information without understanding being impeded but overall, the level of accuracy was often not strong. However, the strongest candidates were highly accurate and used verbs, word order, case, etc. very effectively.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were required to write a letter to their friend, about a trip into nature last week.

Task Completion

Overall, this question was tackled well, but there were some very competent candidates who did not address the precise requirement of a particular bullet point and could not therefore move up the banded mark scheme. Others wrote a descriptive narrative on the general topic but did not always address the specific details/opinions/reasons required by the tasks set. On the whole, though, many were able to give good responses to the questions.

Task 1 required candidates to explain where/with whom they made the trip, and a past time frame was needed. As a result, a number of candidates did not complete the task because of their use of the present tense or an infinitive, instead of an attempt at the past. However, many candidates wrote a successful answer, with clear details about the past trip.

Task 2 asked candidates to explain what they saw/did on their trip. Most were successful in their response to this and were able to express themselves on the topic of past travel experiences. There were some more unusual accounts of interesting animals/vegetation seen, whilst others chose to write more traditional accounts of activities undertaken.

In **Task 3**, candidates were asked to give a reason for liking/not liking spending time in nature. Some good answers were given for this task, with reference to environmental or health reasons. However, a minority left this task out, whilst others were limited in the range of vocabulary they were confident of using.

Task 4 asked for an opinion/or reason on why it is better to live in the town or the country. Many explained that the town was more interesting or had more amenities, whilst others explained how they preferred a quieter lifestyle.

Some candidates found it difficult to separate out **Tasks 3** and **4**, either merging the two, or finding it hard to talk more generally about nature in **Task 3**, but then go on to give an explanation/preference in **Task 4**.

Task 5 asked what sort of trip the candidate would undertake next time, and a future time frame was required. There were many references to travel plans but the strongest answers referred to visits to specific places, rather than general desires to travel abroad, etc.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were required to write an article for an online magazine on the topic of health. Most candidates who chose this option had both the understanding and required vocabulary to answer well.

Task 1 required candidates to explain what they had done/not done last year for their health and an attempt at a past time frame was needed. Most candidates were able to refer to food eaten/sport activities undertaken (or not). Use of the past tenses were generally successful here. Stronger candidates used expanded language, reasons and more advanced grammatical structures.

Task 2 asked for details about whether the candidate's current lifestyle is healthy or unhealthy. Many answered well, with further references to eating habits or sport activities.

Task 3 asked candidates to explain how they might improve their lifestyle. This was answered well by some candidates, who referred to plans for more sport/healthier eating, etc. However, others struggled for ideas, and gave only brief responses.

Task 4 asked why there are an increasing number of fitness centres. Some gave a successful response, with references to lifestyle, health, etc. Others had not understood the question (perhaps *immer mehr* was not understood) and some wrote about a specific fitness centre or left this task out entirely.

Task 5 asked whether future generations would be healthier/unhealthier. Some gave concerned responses, suggesting what might happen if people do not change their eating/fitness habits. Others gave positive responses, and suggested future generations would be healthier, as people become more aware of their health.