

CONTENTS

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN	2
Paper 0525/01 Listening	2
Paper 0525/02 Reading and Directed Writing	4
Paper 0525/03 Speaking	7
Paper 0525/04 Continuous Writing	9

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

<p>Paper 0525/01</p>

<p>Listening</p>

General comments

Candidates performed very well, with many achieving full or nearly full marks. This was true particularly for **Sections 1** and **2**, but even in **Section 3** many impressive scores were obtained.

As in other parts of the examination, candidates seemed to find ticking and matching exercises easier than writing answers in the target language.

A very small number of candidates did not attempt **Section 3**. As this examination is marked positively, candidates have nothing to lose if they attempt the full breadth and depth of the examination, and are encouraged to do so if they wish.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1-8

This exercise was done very well without any obvious pattern for the few who did not score full marks here.

Correct answers:

Question 1: B

Question 2: D

Question 3: A

Question 4: D

Question 5: A

Question 6: B

Question 7: C

Question 8: C

Exercise 2 Questions 9-16

This exercise caused few problems. Whilst some misspellings are accepted, **Question 15** elicited "Price" in quite a few instances instead of "Preis"; this was not accepted. (Please see detailed mark scheme for rejected answers.)

Correct answers:

Question 9: *Bahnhofstraße*

Question 10: *17/siebzehn/fünf (Uhr)*

Question 11: *Montags/am Montag*

Question 12: *Bus*

Question 13: *Anfang*

Question 14: *kostenlos/frei/umsonst/gratis*

Question 15: *(einen) (Überraschungs-)Preis*

Question 16: *puppenkind* (correct spelling needed to score)

Section 2**Exercise 1 Questions 17-24**

This exercise was generally very well done; if problems appeared, they usually concerned **Questions 19** and **23**.

Question 17: *nein*

Question 18: *ja*

Question 19: *ja*

Question 20: *ja*

Question 21: *nein*

Question 22: *nein*

Question 23: *nein*

Question 24: *ja*

Exercise 2 Questions 25-31

As ever, candidates found answers in the target language more problematic. Most candidates nonetheless scored well here. Some misspellings were tolerated, provided they did not impede understanding. **Question 29** often elicited an enumeration of the different jobs Carlo had undertaken and thus failed to score. Some answers to **Question 31** mentioned his free time at the weekend and missed marks here.

Question 25: *an die guten Seiten/den Kontakt mit Menschen*

Question 26: (i) *Englisch*

(ii) *Französisch*

Question 27: *die Persönlichkeit*

Question 28: *eineinhalb/anderthalb/1 1/2 Jahre/18 Monate*

Question 29: *den (ganzen) Hotelbetrieb zu verstehen*

Question 30: *eine leitende/führende Position/Hotelchef zu werden*

Question 31: *ohne Probleme/macht ihm nichts aus/ist ok*

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 32-37**

Despite this being the most difficult part of the examination, most candidates coped well. If mistakes occurred, they usually involved **Question 32**, where B was selected, **Question 34** where B was selected or **Question 36** without a set pattern for the erroneous selection.

Question 32: C

Question 33: B

Question 34: A

Question 35: C

Question 36: D

Question 37: A

Exercise 2 Questions 38-44

Most candidates scored well here despite the need in this most discriminating and difficult part of the examination to manipulate the target language and write coherently in it. Please see the detailed mark scheme for rejected answers. **Questions 42 and 43** probably caused most problems. The lack of/need for money was frequently cited as the answer to **Question 42**.

Candidates failed to score if they omitted Euro/€ with the amount spent per month for **Question 43**. In **Question 44** the desire for *parental* contact needed to be mentioned.

Question 38: *die Regierung/der Staat*

Question 39: *(aus) Deutschland*

Question 40: (i) *(richtige) Kleidung*
(ii) *(richtiges) Handy*

Question 41: (i) *als (amüsantes) Spielzeug*
(ii) *als Statussymbol*

Question 42: *wenn sie ein Handy kaufen wollen/beim Kauf eines Handys*

Question 43: 72 000 000€/72 Millionen Euro

Question 44: (i) *die Eltern wollen (ständig) Kontakt mit den Kindern*
(ii) *(Kids wollen) modisch (sein)*

Paper 0525/02
Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

Candidates performed very well indeed, with many achieving full or nearly full marks, particularly in **Sections 1** and **2**. As in other parts of the examination, candidates found ticking and matching exercises easier than producing answers in the target language.

Section 3 is designed to be the most difficult part but even here the majority of candidates acquitted themselves well.

Candidates should bear in mind that **Section 3, Exercise 1** does not require detailed written answers if they selected “yes” as the correct answer. Some, but fewer candidates than last year chose to elaborate on their “yes” answers, thus losing time unnecessarily.

Candidates are also advised not to rush through the first few exercises. Some candidates made mistakes with **Section 1, Exercise 3** which seemed incompatible with their excellent work later on.

Comments on specific questions***Section 1*****Exercise 1 Questions 1-5**

Very few candidates made any mistakes in this exercise. There was no discernible pattern to the few incorrect answers.

Correct answers:

Question 1: B

Question 2: A

Question 3: C

Question 4: D

Question 5: D

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

Most candidates scored fully with this exercise.

Correct answers:

Question 6: F

Question 7: E

Question 8: D

Question 9: C

Question 10: A

Exercise 3 Questions 11-15

The majority of candidates scored well in this exercise. There were nonetheless a surprising number who seemed to have rushed it; their answers appeared not really compatible with their excellent work elsewhere and on more difficult tasks.

Correct answers:

Question 11: *ja*

Question 12: *nein*

Question 13: *nein*

Question 14: *ja*

Question 15: *ja*

Exercise 4 Question 16

Most candidates scored full or nearly full marks here. There are 3 marks available for addressing themselves successfully to the rubric and a further 2 marks for quality of language, notably appropriate use of tenses. Please see detailed mark scheme for the exact allocation. Candidates are asked here to write around 40 words. While they are not penalised for writing an excessive number of words, writing too little reduces their opportunity to gain language marks.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17-25

Most candidates scored full or nearly full marks in this exercise. **Questions 18, 24 and 25** caused most problems if mistakes were made.

Correct answers:

Question 17: *ein Drittel der/aller Schüler/(mehr als)drei Millionen*

Question 18: *(er ist) der größte Schultyp/die größte Schulart*

Question 19: *sie sind fleißig/arbeiten schwer*

Question 20: *wenn die anderen Kinder die Schule verlassen haben/wenn es still wird in den Räumen/abends*

Question 21: *(sie sind) zehn/in der vierten Klasse*

Question 22: (i) *manche schlafen schon*

(ii) *andere lesen noch*

Question 23: *um ein Uhr (nachts)/um eins*

Question 24: *ein gemeinsam geschriebenes Buch/sie schreibt ein Buch mit ihren Schülern*

Question 25: *Sie ist schon 60 (Jahre alt), schläft aber immer noch auf dem (harten) Fußboden mit den Kindern*

Exercise 2 Question 26

Candidates who incorporated all points mentioned in the rubric scored extremely well in this exercise; if marks were lost then it was due to failing to address themselves to all necessary points. Please see detailed mark scheme for precise allocation of marks.

10 marks were allocated for all bullet points, two per bullet point. A further 5 marks were available for quality of language. The 5 marks for accuracy are awarded on a positive basis with candidates being credited for appropriateness and correctness in usage, of tenses, structures, and agreements, for example.

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 27-33**

The majority of candidates performed very well here. Time was wasted by some who wrote detailed responses to “yes” answers, which was not necessary. Corrections, i.e. writing out answers, are only needed if the answer is *no*. In general, **Questions 28** and **31** caused most problems if wrong answers were given.

Correct answers:

Question 27: *ja*

Question 28: *ja*

Question 29: *nein, man sollte auf das Alter der Leser achten*

Question 30: *nein, manche sind schlecht geschrieben/es ist schwer, die guten Geschichten herauszufinden*

Question 31: *ja*

Question 32: *ja*

Question 33: *nein, sie findet es gut/ist froh, wenn Leute sich in die Geschichten vertiefen*

Exercise 2 Questions 34-41

Good scores were obtained by many candidates. As already indicated, answers in the target language cause most difficulties and given this there were many pleasing performances.

Correct answers:

Question 34: *weil ihre Mutter arbeitete/nachmittags nicht zu Hause war/sie nachmittags allein zu Hause war*

Question 35: *sie geht jetzt in die Zirkusschule/hat nachmittags etwas zu tun/findet das Leben jetzt spannend/hat im Zirkus ein neues Zuhause gefunden/ist(nachmittags) in einem Zirkus*

Question 36: (i) *Eltern haben/eine Elterninitiative hat damit begonnen*

(ii) *um den Lücke-Kindern einen Platz zu verschaffen/das Leben der allein gelassenen Kinder zu verbessern/Kinder müssen nicht allein zu Hause bleiben*

Question 37: *in verschiedenen Stadtteilen*

Question 38: *schulischen Unterricht/schulische Hilfe/Spaß(am Sport)*

Question 39: *sie ist freiwillig/sie gehen regelmäßig hin/das Zirkusleben bringt sie einander näher/zusammen/sie lernen/haben Spaß (any two)*

Question 40: *dass alle Hautfarben und Nationen zusammen kommen*

Question 41: *es gibt nicht genug Finanzen, um sofort mehr Kinder aufzunehmen/sie haben nicht genug Geld/haben geldliche Probleme*

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

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the Teachers' Notes for March – April 2005.

As in previous years the ability of candidates to communicate in German was impressive and there were many high scoring performances by candidates. The full range of marks was available to all candidates and the spread of performance from candidates was again wide, with the general standard being very comparable to that heard in previous years.

Centres generally conducted the Speaking Test very professionally and Examiners had prepared themselves thoroughly before the examination. This preparation on the part of Examiners is crucial to enable candidates fully to demonstrate their abilities and avoid them becoming confused by role play situations developing unnecessarily into mini-conversations – or by certain role play tasks not being asked or not completed.

Occasionally, Examiners did not ask appropriate questions in the Topic and/or General Conversation sections of the test. Again, thorough preparation for these sections can produce excellent performances from candidates, who should be prepared to use the full range of time frames (present, past and future) in these sections of the test. Examiners need to ensure that they ask the sort of questions which will allow these time frames to be used. Otherwise marks on Scale (b) (Linguistic Quality) may well be limited, as is explained on pp 6 and 7 of the Teachers' Notes.

Most Centres forwarded the appropriate sample size for the Centre with clear recordings, in labelled cassette boxes; only a few recordings were of poor quality. Centres are reminded that MS1 copies and Working Mark Sheets must be sent to the Moderator with the recordings.

Administrative work in Centres was generally very good this year, with very few clerical errors of addition on the Working Mark Sheet.

The recommended timings for each section of the test were usually observed, although some Centres did not separate the Topic and General Conversation sections of the test, which can make moderation difficult.

The mark scheme was applied fairly consistently overall and the order of merit within Centres was generally accurate. Where adjustments were necessary, the lack of different time frames in the conversation sections or failure to complete role play tasks were usually to blame.

Comments on specific questions***Role Plays***

Examiners are reminded to encourage candidates to attempt all parts of each task. If only one part of a task is completed, the full three marks cannot be awarded. The majority of candidates, however, were able to converse fluently in their role plays and make use of natural and idiomatic German to complete their tasks. Examiners should adhere to the rubrics and printed stimuli of the role plays and not attempt to add to or extend the set tasks, nor develop them into mini-conversations. Full guidance is given on page 6 of the Teachers' Notes booklet, under **Structure of the Examination**.

A Role Plays*Page 13*

Most candidates were able to make the most of this relatively straightforward situation, and most were able to use the printed stimulus on the card to produce *Wo kann ich ... bekommen?*

Page 14

Overall this role play was also quite well-done, as it had the flavour of a general snippet of conversation, with both parties able to act it out to full advantage.

Page 15

Again this role play was generally accessible, but the two-part question *wann und wo?* did often need the Examiner to guide the candidate to both tasks.

B Role Plays

These tasks are intended to be more demanding, in that they require the ability to use a range of time frames and to give explanations, justifications and opinions where necessary. The longer tasks were often split by the Examiner, which is quite appropriate.

Page 16

Again, this task had the flavour of a genuine conversation and was generally well done. Some candidates though responded to the opening enquiry with *es geht mir gut* and omitted to add how they had slept.

Page 17

This role play was demanding, but the rubric did offer the candidate information that could be utilised in the answers. The final utterance was straightforward and brought most candidates the full 3 marks available here.

Page 18

This role play was also demanding, although the first utterance was straightforward and candidates could cope well with the topic of language skills and hobbies. The middle three Examiner queries did also elicit some well-phrased and interesting language.

Topic (prepared) Conversation

Presentations in this part of the test ranged widely from monologues, where even struggling candidates were left to fend for themselves, to an immediate transition to more general conversation. Examiners are asked to let candidates speak for at least a full minute on their topic before interrupting. Many Examiners and candidates did an excellent job here, producing a natural and not too over-rehearsed presentation and subsequent discussion with spontaneous exchanges in a variety of time frames, and a full range of vocabulary and structure.

The choice of topics was very wide; in many Centres candidates chose very challenging topics (the environment etc.) and were able to speak at a very high and sophisticated level; in other Centres, candidates were happier with less complex topics such as school, home life, future plans etc.

Candidate performance was generally very good on this part of the test with some fluent, interesting expositions and discussions. The minority of candidates, who clearly do not prepare a topic as prescribed by the syllabus, cannot be awarded high marks on Scale (a) (quality of presentation and preparation).

General Conversation

The best performances from candidates in this section of the test were ones where they were encouraged to use a variety of time frames, relevant vocabulary and appropriate structures; many were able to demonstrate a high degree of fluency in their responses to the Examiner's questions. A good range of topic areas was used, including school, holidays, family life, education, daily life etc. – all of which are entirely appropriate. A minority of Examiners do ask questions which are perhaps too sophisticated for the average candidate, thus denying such candidates the opportunity to demonstrate what they know or can offer with a more basic level of vocabulary and structure.

On both the Topic and General Conversations, it is essential that Examiners ensure that candidates are offered the opportunity to respond in a range of tenses, otherwise marks above the satisfactory band on Scale (b) cannot be awarded. Similarly candidates whose topic or conversation is a good deal shorter than specified in the syllabus cannot expect to be awarded full marks if they do not have the time to demonstrate a wide range of vocabulary and language structure.

General impression

It was pleasing to see that the impression mark was consistently well used by the majority of Examiners.

Paper 0525/04 Continuous Writing

General comments

The candidates demonstrated a wide range of competence. This ranged from a significant number with apparent native or near-native speaker competence, who might be more appropriately challenged by a First Language examination, to a few who had difficulty formulating the simplest of sentences, and who were perhaps inappropriately entered for this paper. The overall standard was encouraging.

Presentation for the most part was good, although handwriting was sometimes very difficult to decipher. Candidates should be aware that this could disadvantage them.

The great majority handled German syntax well. Some candidates did not always use capital letters appropriately; they were occasionally missing for nouns, even in some very fluent scripts, and in a number of cases *sie* and *Sie* were confused, which impaired communication. *Ich* was sometimes inappropriately written in the upper case. Some candidates used the upper case in a seemingly arbitrary fashion and on occasions used capitals for adjectives and not for nouns. Gender and case were often wrong.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

There were many extremely good letters and it was clear that most candidates were thoroughly versed in this skill. Candidates are most strongly advised to note the requisite number of words, i.e. 110 – 140; a significant number exceeded this and wrote more than 200 words. This was not to their advantage.

- (a) Some candidates used an inappropriate informal opening and used *du* instead of *Sie* or muddled the two in the letter.
- Candidates introduced themselves appropriately.
 - Many good explanations as to why the candidate's parents had not written themselves were given for this bullet point.
 - Many good outlines of the situation were given for this bullet point.
 - The majority of candidates suggested possible perpetrators of the graffiti, although a few candidates wrote sentences which were irrelevant or incomprehensible suggesting that they had not understood the word *verantwortlich*.
 - Many candidates requested assistance as specified: *Fragen Sie den Hausmeister, wie er Ihnen helfen kann*, but a number seemed to have misunderstood the task and offered ways in which they themselves might help instead. Some candidates had already written so much that their enquiry fell outside the 140 word count. Some candidates wrote *sie* rather than *Sie* and the meaning was obscured.
- (b) Candidates tackled this task well.
- Candidates suggested a range of possible reasons for wanting to keep a pet.
 - This was well answered; dogs proved to be very popular.
 - This was answered very well indeed: candidates reported a variety of responses from their families.
 - Candidates who described how they had reacted were in the minority. Many just commented that this was bad or unfair.
 - Most requested advice appropriately. A number of candidates misunderstood and asked their pen friend about his/her rat, instead of seeking their advice: *Bitten Sie ... um Rat*.

Question 2

There were some very good answers here, with only a few very weak candidates writing completely irrelevant material. It is likely that such candidates were inappropriately entered for this paper.

There were many relevant stories with appropriate vocabulary where candidates were wrongly accused of shoplifting, had won a prize or were offered employment. Other more fanciful stories with tenuous links to the rubric had candidates being offered modelling jobs or marriage proposals by the manager. Slightly disconcerting were those where the candidate got away with shoplifting and laughed afterwards about it, and those where the link to the supermarket was inconsequential and the tale was of gangsters and detention.

Just a few candidates wrote part of or their entire essay in the present tense; candidates are reminded of the need to write in an appropriate past tense and to avoid drifting from the rubric. Some stories were too long.

Some candidates spent far too much of the essay scene-setting and reiterating the rubric rather than developing the story. Candidates are reminded that the rubric asks them to tell what happened afterwards.

It was evident that whilst letter writing had been very well rehearsed and executed in almost all cases, this second exercise was sometimes dealt with less successfully by the same candidates.