

CONTENTS

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN	2
Paper 0525/01 Listening	2
Paper 0525/02 Reading and Directed Writing	5
Paper 0525/03 Speaking	7
Paper 0525/04 Continuous Writing	10

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

Paper 0525/01

Listening

General comments

In general, candidates performed very well with many achieving full or nearly full marks in all sections of the examination, but particularly in **Sections 1** and **2**.

A small number of candidates' active production of written German was in marked contrast to the good understanding demonstrated through ticking and matching tasks. The concept of "the sympathetic native speaker" was applied as far as possible when marking written answers.

A small number of candidates did not attempt **Section 3**, although they in fact achieved excellent scores in **Sections 1** and **2**. It is worth reminding candidates, including Core candidates, that even if they do not achieve very high marks in **Section 3**, which is necessarily the most difficult and discriminating part of the examination and designed to be just that, a lower score here does not invalidate or penalise scores for the previous sections.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1-8

Most candidates scored full marks here. When they did not, **Question 1**, involving the ability to tell the time, and **Question 8** were most frequently incorrect.

Correct answers:

Question 1: B

Question 2: D

Question 3: A

Question 4: C

Question 5: D

Question 6: D

Question 7: C

Question 8: B

Exercise 2 Questions 9-15

Most candidates achieved full or nearly marks here. A small number chose to spell out the numbers, which is unnecessary and led to some incorrect answers.

Bauernhof was sometimes confused with *Bahnhof*. *München* was accepted without the *Umlaut*. A small number of candidates appeared unfamiliar with the German alphabet and could not render *Mausekind/mausekind* correctly.

Correct answers:

Question 9(a): 17 (Uhr)

Question 9(b): 10 (Uhr)

Question 10: €2

Question 11: Bauernhof

Question 12: München

Question 13: Pferde/n

Question 14: Spielplatz

Question 15: Mausekind

Section 2

Exercise 1 Questions 16-23

Most candidates coped well with this exercise. **Question 18** was the answer which was most often incorrect. Some candidates had not picked up that Daniel lives in a state of rebellion against society *and* his parents.

Correct answers:

Question 16: ja

Question 17: nein

Question 18: nein

Question 19: ja

Question 20: ja

Question 21: nein

Question 22: ja

Question 23: nein

Exercise 2 Questions 24-31

Most candidates coped well with this exercise though a number needed to pay closer attention to personal/possessive pronouns: Martina for example was turned into "er", her domicile was frequently rendered as "*bei seinen Eltern*". This was not penalised at this level; however, it did prove a problem throughout the paper.

Correct answers:

Question 24: seit 6 Jahren

Question 25: jede Woche/wöchentlich

Question 26: als nichts Besonderes

Question 27: bei ihren Eltern

Question 28: sie ist stolz auf Martina/gelassen/ist an den Feuerwehralltag gewöhnt

Question 29: mit siebzehn (Jahren)

Question 30: die (schwarze) Uniform

Question 31: Regeln/Befehlen/Vorschriften zu folgen

Section 3

Exercise 1 Questions 32-37

Candidates performed well in this exercise. There was no recognisable pattern to any wrong answers, except for **Question 37**, where D – *Mathe-Experte* – was sometimes offered as the answer instead of C – *mit Computern unerfahren*.

Correct answers:

Question 32: A

Question 33: B

Question 34: C

Question 35: D

Question 36: B

Question 37: C

Exercise 2 Questions 38-46

Section 3, Task 2 is meant to be the most discriminating and difficult part of the examination, partly because of the level of information given, as well as the need to manipulate language and to write coherently – even if briefly – in the target language. A good number of candidates coped extremely well, with the following questions posing the most problems:

Question 41: Some candidates omitted the subject in their statements, e.g. “ARD” or “*der staatliche Wetterdienst*”, and thus rendered their answers meaningless.

Question 42: Most wrong answers implied that people had done *nothing*, failing to understand that they had reacted *slowly*.

Question 43: A number of candidates picked out “*keine Panik*” from the cassette, thus giving the opposite meaning to that needed.

Again, personal pronouns were problematic: *Herr Kachelmann* was not infrequently represented by **sie**.

A small number of candidates had misheard “*Firma/Firmen*” as “*Film/Filme*” at the start of this exercise, which produced some interesting variations.

Correct answers:

Question 38

Der staatliche Wetterdienst/der Staat

Question 39

Es gibt heute mehrere Firmen/Kachelmanns Firma ist dazu gekommen

Question 40

Sie warnen zu spät/sind zu vorsichtig (mit wichtigen Informationen)

Question 41

ARD hat schon früh/am Sonntagmorgen gewarnt/der staatliche Wetterdienst hat erst später/am Abend gewarnt.

Question 42

Die Bevölkerung hat langsam/nicht sehr schnell/nicht sofort reagiert

Question 43

(man sagte,) Kachelmann habe Panik gemacht/ausgelöst/man hat ihm Panikmache vorgeworfen

Question 44

Weil sich dann ein Riesenapparat in Bewegung setzt/Feuerwehr und Polizei werden alarmiert/es ist teuer/es kostet viel Geld

Question 45

Es bringt Zeit/man kann seine Sachen/den Hausrat in Sicherheit bringen

Question 46

Er hat viele Dankesbriefe bekommen/viele Leute haben ihm gedankt

<p>Paper 0525/02 Reading and Directed Writing</p>

General comments

Candidates performed very well, with many achieving full or nearly full marks, particularly in **Sections 1** and **2**. As in other parts of the examination, candidates found it easier to supply tick answers and to do matching exercises than to produce accurate written German. **Section 3**, the most demanding part, obviously posed greater difficulties, but even here a good number of candidates managed to score highly.

Candidates should bear in mind that **Section 3, Exercise 1** does *not* demand detailed written answers if they select yes as the correct answer. A number of candidates chose to elaborate on their answers in this way, possibly losing time in the process.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1-5

This exercise was well done generally with **Questions 1** and **4** posing difficulties for some candidates.

Correct answers:

Question 1: D

Question 2: B

Question 3: D

Question 4: C

Question 5: A

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

This matching exercise was well done by virtually all candidates.

Correct answers:

Question 6: B

Question 7: C

Question 8: E

Question 9: D

Question 10: F

Exercise 3 Questions 11-15

Most candidates scored well here. Some did not recognise that *Alpen* corresponds to *in den Bergen* and that *übermorgen* is not *am folgenden Tag*.

Correct answers:

Question 11: *ja*

Question 12: *ja*

Question 13: *ja*

Question 14: *nein*

Question 15: *nein*

Exercise 4 Question 16

Most candidates scored full marks on this simple directed writing task. 3 marks out of a possible 5 are available for addressing the points listed for communication; a further two marks are available for quality of language.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17-24

This exercise was usually well executed without any particularly discernible pattern for mistakes made. **Question 18** did not always elicit enough information for the two marks available to be awarded. Candidates should bear in mind the need to provide sufficient detail in such cases.

Correct answers:

Question 17: *wie sie aussieht/will schick sein*

Question 18: *schaltet den Computer ein/geht ins Internet/fragt jemanden, der sehen kann (ob alles zusammen passt)*

Question 19: *der Erfinder von Klickblick*

Question 20: *blinde und sehende Menschen*

Question 21: *fast keine/wenige Kenntnisse sind nötig*

Question 22: *bei Kleidung/mit Geld/mit Fotoslim Büro*

Question 23: *die Blinden*

Question 24: *bei Transportproblemen/mit einem Handy-Service für Blinde*

Exercise 2 Question 25

This directed writing task was worth 15 marks. Most candidates scored well. Where full marks were not obtained, this was usually due to candidates skipping one or two of the points which needed to be addressed to gain marks for communication. A small minority misunderstood specific bullet-points, taking *Umzug* for example to be a form of transport; *Umgebung* too seemed unfamiliar to a few.

A small number of candidates omitted the last communication point, namely the invitation to the penfriend to visit.

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 26-32**

There was no discernible pattern for any mistakes made and most candidates attempting this section scored well. As mentioned in the introduction, a number of candidates elaborated on the answers, writing them out fully, even if they had chosen the *yes* option. Corrections, i.e. writing out answers, are only needed if the answer is *no*.

Correct answers:

Question 26: *ja*

Question 27: *nein, sie freut sich darauf*

Question 28: *ja*

Question 29: *nein, er möchte in der internationalen Wirtschaft arbeiten*

Question 30: *nein, sie steigt erst seit kurzem wieder an*

Question 31: *ja*

Question 32: *ja*

Exercise 2 Questions 33-38

In this, the most discriminating and difficult part of the examination, some candidates lost marks by attempting to lift sections from the text, often giving the wrong answer. Occasionally, candidates' active production of German let them down; at times their answers were so lacking in detail as to merit no marks. Able candidates scored well and proved capable of competent and successful handling of the target language.

Correct answers:

Question 33: *Plattenbauten/Müll überall/hohe Kriminalität*

Question 34: *sie will den Ghattokids neue Chancen bieten/sie kennt all die traurigen Geschichten und will etwas ändern/aus Mitleid*

Question 35: *nein, jeder hat irgendwelche Talente (die andere nutzen können)*

Question 36: *sie lernen ein besseres soziales Verhalten/die schulischen Leistungen verbessern sich auch*

Question 37: *sie können sich (durch Lichttaler) Wünsche erfüllen/können anderen helfen/können sich aussuchen, wie lange sie arbeiten und was sie machen wollen.*

Question 38: *sie treffen sich jetzt im Jugendheim/grölen nicht mehr auf dem Fußballplatz herum/machen im Chor oder bei Breakdance mit/können öffentlich auftreten und richtiges Geld verdienen.*

Paper 0525/03

Speaking

General comments

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the **Teachers' Notes** for March-April 2004.

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

Centres generally conducted the Speaking Test very professionally with Examiners preparing themselves thoroughly before the examination and preparing their candidates to deliver their best. Where the role play situations are less well prepared this can result in candidates not being able fully to demonstrate their ability and appearing somewhat confused as the situation is unnecessarily extended into a mini-conversation; in a few Centres some tasks in the role plays were actually not completed. The importance of Examiners asking appropriate questions in the Topic and/or General Conversation sections of the test is again highlighted. Thorough preparation for these sections can produce excellent performances: candidates should be prepared to use the full range of time frames (present, past and future) in these sections of the test as well as a wide range of other structures. Examiners should give ample opportunity to ask the sort of questions which will allow a variety of tenses to be used, otherwise marks under Table B (b) (linguistic quality) risk being limited, as stated in the **Teachers' Notes** (pages 6 and 7).

Most Centres forwarded the appropriate sample size for the Centre with clear recordings, in cassette boxes which were well labelled. A few recordings only were of poor quality. It should be stressed that the tape should run uninterrupted between sections in accordance with the instructions (page 5).

The administrative work done in Centres was again much appreciated. It would be helpful if the Role Play Card number was indicated on the WMS for each candidate recorded in the sample.

The recommended timings for each section of the examination were usually observed, although some Examiners did run together the Topic and General Conversation sections, which does make moderation difficult.

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

Centres are reminded of the administrative arrangements (paragraph 2, page 3 of the **Teachers' Notes**) where they are advised in the interests of standardisation to use only one teacher/Examiner. Only where there is a large candidature is permission for the use of an additional Examiner to be sought from the CIE Product Manager. If two Examiners are used, then Centres need to ensure that rigorous standardisation takes place.

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, only one mark can be awarded. The majority of candidates were able to converse fluently in their role plays and make use of natural and idiomatic German to complete the required tasks.

It is highlighted in the **Teachers' Notes** (page 4) that a candidate's mistakes should not be corrected. As has been stated earlier, Examiners should adhere to the rubrics and printed stimuli of the role plays and not add to or extend the set tasks, nor develop them into mini-conversations. Full guidance is given on page 6 of the booklet, under **Structure of the Examination**.

It should be stressed that it is not necessary to have a completely correct answer for the award of 3 marks for a role play item: an accurate utterance, which is expressed in authentic idiom and appropriate register with minor errors will score the marks; however, an incorrectly formed verb is likely to reduce the mark to a maximum of 2, and where the verb used might cause confusion as to tense form (e.g. *ich bin .. gehen*), a mark of 1 would be normal.

A Role Plays

Page 13

Most candidates did well on this role play, although sometimes asking for the friend's holiday plans proved difficult. Suggesting things to do together and explaining how the friend should travel were generally well-expressed.

Page 14

Most candidates were able to handle this role play well and in the required tense, offering suitable opinions on Austria and a variety of things to do together.

Page 15

Once again this role play did not cause any problems and candidates could do well; opinions given on the German school were varied and appropriate.

B Role Plays

These role plays are intended to stretch candidates more in that they require the ability to use different time frames and to give explanations, justifications and opinions where necessary. The longer tasks were often split by the Examiners, which is quite appropriate. Most candidates were also careful to take into account the context of the task, set out in the rubric.

Page 16

Many candidates did not take the appropriate register into account when phoning the manager to ask for a job. Most were, however, able to convey what they had done in the past, although difficulties arose in finding the appropriate German to ask for details of pay and hours of work; most were able to indicate when they would write to confirm their interest in a post.

Page 17

Some candidates seemed to find this role play more complex, and giving details of what had happened and how they had helped led to difficulties. However, giving the other information required did not pose a problem.

Page 18

This role play too appeared for some to be rather demanding, though candidates were generally able to give the information required about the absent friend after careful questioning by the Examiner. Expressing what progress had been made by the friend in the foreign language was usually understood if not always very well-expressed.

Topic (prepared) Conversation

As in previous years, a pleasing and wide range of topics was offered. The best examining in this section sounded natural and not too over-rehearsed. It gave rise to natural, spontaneous exchanges whilst encouraging the candidates to use a variety of tense, vocabulary and structure. Examiners are reminded to let candidates speak for a full minute before interrupting: in a few cases candidates were questioned as soon as the section started and this was often not helpful for the candidate.

The choice of topics was appropriate in most cases. In a few Centres candidates talked on very challenging topics, at a highly sophisticated level. In some cases, they could not sustain the high level of performance in the discussion section and would perhaps have been more comfortable choosing a more straightforward topic such as holidays, free-time, school, ambitions/future plans; some candidates, however, were able to sustain the high level and did very well indeed on this section.

On the whole candidates performed very well here, and some fluent, interesting expositions and discussions were heard. The range of prepared topics was very wide, with subjects which were relevant or interesting to candidates personally; these are inevitably more stimulating and can bring forth a whole range of descriptive individual language. Well-prepared candidates are then able to proceed to the **General Conversation** with greater confidence, knowing that they will have the opportunity at that point to answer questions on a wide variety of personal issues. Candidates who clearly have not prepared a topic as prescribed by the syllabus, cannot be awarded high marks for **Scale (a)** (quality of presentation and preparation).

Examiners should refer closely to the **Marking Instructions (Teachers' Notes, pages 9 – 12)** as there are still cases where higher **Scale (b)** marks are awarded to candidates who do not (or cannot) convey past and future meanings. Such candidates may not be awarded above the satisfactory band (see **Teachers' Notes, page 6**). Similarly, candidates whose topic of conversation is substantially shorter than it should be cannot expect to be awarded full marks if they do not have time to demonstrate a wide range of vocabulary and language structures.

Examiners are requested to make clear where the **Topic** ends and the **General Conversation** begins. This makes the task of the Moderator easier.

General Conversation

Again, the best performances from candidates here were ones where they were encouraged to use a variety of tenses, relevant vocabulary and appropriate structures and many were able to demonstrate a high degree of fluency in their responses to the Examiners' questions. As in previous years, the overall standard of work heard in this section was high. A good range of topics was discussed, with most Examiners covering at least 2 or 3 areas. Topics covered included school, holidays, family life, education, daily life, life in other countries, geographical surroundings and free-time – all of which were entirely appropriate. A few Examiners do pose questions which are over-sophisticated for the average candidate; such candidates need to have the opportunity to demonstrate what they know or could offer, if a more basic level of vocabulary and structure were used.

General Impression

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

Paper 0525/04
Continuous Writing

General comments

Performance by candidates covered a broad spectrum, ranging from apparent native speaker or near-native speaker competence to some who had difficulty formulating very simple sentences, and who were perhaps inappropriately entered for this paper. The overall standard was encouraging.

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

In the main, candidates wrote using the reformed spellings as required. In just a few cases, candidates used *ß* in *daß*, which is no longer correct.

The great majority of candidates handled German syntax well. Some 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. *Ich* was sometimes inappropriately written in the upper case. 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**; 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* in the letter.
- 1 Candidates introduced themselves appropriately.
 - 2 Many good points were made here.
 - 3 As 2 above.
 - 4 Whilst some candidates made appropriate enquiries about both accommodation and public transport, it was apparent that a significant number did not understand *öffentliche Verkehrsmittel*; they either omitted to mention it or asked how many/much the addressee had. Candidates are reminded that all parts of the task need to be covered to gain the point.
 - 5 This task was generally accomplished well. However, some candidates had already written so much at this point that the enquiry fell outside the 140 word limit.

(b)

- 1 Candidates tackled this task well, although some lifted from the rubric, which is not to their advantage.
- 2 This was well answered.
- 3 This was answered very well indeed. However, some candidates wrote so much here that they considerably exceeded the word count for the letter as a whole at this stage.
- 4 Candidates were generally able to express themselves appropriately here and wrote a variety of reasons, ranging from a romantic encounter to educational benefit.
- 5 Where candidates had not exceeded the word count they dealt with this task appropriately.

Question 2

There were some very good answers here, although a significant number of candidates did appear to have misunderstood the rubric and wrote irrelevant material. Candidates are reminded of the need to avoid writing irrelevant material as they cannot be given credit for this.

Some candidates seemed to have confused *niemand* in the title with *jemand* and wrote about the person – criminal or crying child for example – they found at the school rather than the fact that there was, unusually, no-one there. On the whole, though, stories were relevant, with appropriate vocabulary. Just a few candidates wrote some or all of their essay in the present tense and candidates are reminded of the need to take the opportunity in this paper in particular to use a wider variety of structures and to write in an appropriate tense. A few candidates spent too much of the essay setting the scene rather than developing the story. Whilst letter writing was certainly very well rehearsed and executed in almost all cases, this exercise was sometimes dealt with less successfully by the same candidates.