

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE GERMAN

---

Paper 0525/01

Listening

## General comments

There were many candidates with an excellent level of German. They coped well with the different sections and levels of the paper, particularly those sections where answers were indicated by ticking boxes. However, a number of candidates encountered problems with answers that required response in the target language.

A number of candidates misread questions.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Erster Teil***

#### *Erste Aufgabe*

#### **Questions 1 - 3**

These were answered correctly by the majority of candidates.

#### **Question 4**

*um Viertel nach zehn* was sometimes misconstrued.

#### **Question 5**

Most candidates answered this question correctly.

#### **Question 6**

Candidates were sometimes confused by *Kuli* and *Lineal*.

#### **Question 7**

Most candidates answered this question correctly.

#### **Question 8**

Only a few candidates confused *links* and *rechts*. The candidates understood *Zweite Straße*.

#### *Zweite Aufgabe*

#### **Questions 9 and 10**

The candidates did not have any problems with these questions.

#### **Question 11**

Most of the candidates understood *gratis*, but it was often misspelled.

#### **Question 12**

A number of candidates provided additional and unnecessary information in their answers.

### **Question 13**

A number of candidates misunderstood *Besichtigungstag* and gave a time as an answer.

### **Question 14**

*Den berühmten Wein* was often misheard and rendered as *grunen Wein* or other similar permutations.

### **Question 15**

*Am* was often followed by a time rather than a day.

### **Question 16**

Most candidates understood this question and answered correctly.

## ***Zweiter Teil***

### ***Erste Aufgabe***

The whole exercise was well done. When problems did occur, they were caused by *zufrieden* (**Question 17**), *vorsichtig* (**Question 20**) and *spart* (**Question 22**).

### ***Zweite Aufgabe***

**Questions 25, 26 and 27** were answered correctly by the majority of candidates.

### **Question 28**

A small number of candidates gave the answer *er wollte die Schule verlassen*. This, however, was not sufficient and in order to score marks *Mechaniker* needed to be included in the answer.

### **Question 29**

The majority of candidates answered this question well.

### **Question 30**

Candidates needed to infer the answer and the majority were correct in answering *auf Franks Seite*.

### **Question 31**

This question was answered well and was not a problem for candidates.

### **Question 32**

A number of candidates got this question incorrect by suggesting that he should speak to his parents first.

## ***Dritter Teil***

### ***Erste Aufgabe***

The majority of the candidates answered this exercise very well. There was no discernible pattern of error in the few mistakes which were made.

### ***Zweite Aufgabe***

With a number of excellent exceptions, most of the candidates did not achieve full marks.

### **Question 39**

Candidates needed to say that a number of new buildings were needed (*gebraucht*) because the government had moved to Berlin.

#### Question 40

Candidates needed to write *aus dem Ausland/aus aller Welt* in order to score.

#### Question 41

*Er hat umgefahren/ungefahren/ungesehen* was frequently provided as an answer, instead of the correct *Er hat sich umgesehen/ist herumgefahren*.

#### Question 42

Most candidates achieved full marks here, but the spelling of *Teddys/teddybären* was frequently incorrect.

#### Question 43

Most candidates answered correctly.

#### Question 44

A number of candidates answered with 'what he wanted to eat/drink'. In order to score marks *den Preis/wieviel er bezahlt* was required. *Zahlen* was frequently given as *zählen/zählt*, which is incorrect.

#### Question 45

Most candidates answered correctly.

#### Question 46

Many candidates did not differentiate between the *Besitzer* and the *Kunden*.

Paper 0525/02

Reading/Directed Writing

#### General comments

The great majority of candidates managed to score well.

Most marks were lost, when candidates did not read or follow the rubrics carefully enough, in particular with **Questions 21** and **35**.

The Extended section required a careful reading of both text and questions and some candidates lost marks by trying to lift chunks of text for their answers; this applied particularly to **Questions 42 to 48**.

A number of candidates found the cloze exercise difficult, but a pleasing number of candidates scored well.

The majority of candidates had been well prepared.

#### Comments on specific questions

##### **Erster Teil**

##### *Erste Aufgabe*

##### **Questions 1 - 6**

Most mistakes occurred with **Question 1**, where *Fahrkarten* was chosen and in **Question 5**, where *Fisch* and *Fleisch* were confused.

## *Zweite Aufgabe*

### **Questions 7 - 12**

Generally, this whole exercise was well done.

## *Dritte Aufgabe*

### **Questions 13 – 20**

These questions were well answered, but mistakes arose in **Question 15** where a number of candidates answered *JA*.

## *Vierte Aufgabe*

### **Question 21**

On the whole, candidates scored well here but a few did not adhere to the rubric and therefore did not include all the necessary points. The plural of books (*Bücher*) was often mistakenly given as *Buchen* (beech trees).

## **Zweiter Teil**

### *Erste Aufgabe*

### **Questions 22 – 34**

Most candidates performed well. **Question 25** elicited a number of answers unconnected to the text. **Questions 24** and **34** produced most errors but without a clearly discernible pattern.

### *Zweite Aufgabe*

### **Question 35**

Low scores from some candidates occurred through a failure to address the rubric adequately.

## **Dritter Teil**

### *Erste Aufgabe*

### **Questions 36 – 41**

Most candidates performed well here and the majority scored highly.

### *Zweite Aufgabe*

### **Questions 42 - 48**

A number of candidates seemed to have overlooked the first paragraph. The word *Kundenkreis* was not well understood in **Question 43**. In **Question 44** a progression of Jill Sanders' career was required.

A number of candidates lifted chunks from the text. This produced a common answer of *jene Leute* for **Question 45**.

It is also incorrect that Joop designs for the people of Potsdam, as suggested in answer to **Question 46** by a number of candidates.

**Question 47** often elicited the answer *Parfüms*, but a number of other designers do exactly the same.

**Question 48** was well done by the majority of candidates.

Candidates at this level should not be lifting answers directly from the text without any linguistic adaptation.

There were pleasing results for those candidates who had read the text carefully and tried to answer the questions in their own words.

### *Dritte Aufgabe*

#### **Questions 49 – 68**

Those candidates with a sound grasp of grammar scored well here. Good candidates scored full or nearly full marks.

**Paper 0525/03**

**Speaking**

#### **General comments**

These comments are to be read in conjunction with the Teachers Notes for March – April 2002.

Most Centres recorded and forwarded the appropriate sample size for their Centre. There were a few Centres who sent in work which did not cover “as wide a range as possible” and interpreted “good” as not including their “very good” candidates, which made the moderation of the whole range more difficult. Centres with more than one Teacher/Examiner are reminded of the Administrative Notes, paragraph 2 on page 3, 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 IGCSE Languages Officer. If two Examiners are used, then Centres must ensure rigorous standardisation takes place.

Cassette boxes were well labelled by the majority of Centres with the correct candidate order and cassette sides indicated.

Overall, the quality of the cassette recordings was good, although one or two recordings were very poor. It should be stressed that the tape must run uninterrupted between sections, in accordance with the Instructions.

The vast majority of the WMSs were correctly completed and forwarded in accordance with the Board’s instructions. Most Centres now introduce the Role-Plays before the beginning of the test, but still very few record the Role-Play number on the WMS or the cassette box.

The majority of Centres followed our advice to forward the MS1 copy to the Moderator and the top copy to CIE.

A number of Centres do not double-check the additions on the WMS nor take sufficient care transcribing marks to the MS1. This slows down and complicates the moderation process.

The vast majority of Examiners had prepared themselves professionally before the examination and prepared their candidates to deliver their best; Examiners were fully conversant with both the Role-Play situations and the mark scheme. However, it should be noted that an Examiner’s lack of preparation can result in candidates being unable to fully demonstrate their ability. Also, a small number of candidates were unprepared for the examination, most obviously in the topic and the general conversation where thorough preparation can produce solid performances without sounding stilted or like pre-learnt monologues.

Examiners should conduct the examination meticulously, especially regarding the timings. An increasing number of Examiners do not adhere to the recommended timings for each section of the examination and curtail the topic and general conversation. A number of Examiners even ran the sections together, which makes moderation very difficult and deprives the candidate of the opportunity to demonstrate their linguistic ability.

An increasing number of Examiners applied the mark scheme inconsistently. This arises from a lack of preparation in familiarising themselves with the detail of the mark scheme. This 'subjective' marking leads to difficulties in moderation where weak candidates have been given high marks for little evidence of linguistic ability and yet are placed above the better candidates. This sort of marking occurs when, as detailed in the Role-Play notes, full marks are awarded even when a candidate passes over a task or, in the Conversations, fails to make use of the past and future tenses and yet is awarded a 'very good' linguistic content mark.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Role-Plays***

Many candidates conversed fluently in their Role-Plays and made use of natural idiomatic German to complete the tasks.

The majority of candidates fared very well on the Role-Plays. However, Teachers/Examiners should not be tempted to supply the candidate with the language or structure which the candidate is required to give and then still reward the candidate full marks. Examiners should give the candidate every opportunity to deliver the information required and gain full marks. If the candidate 'glosses over' or omits information, the Examiner should ask the candidate specifically for that information. For example, in the Role Play on page 16, if the candidate only gives one disadvantage of camping it is quite legitimate to ask the candidate for a second reason, simply by asking *und?*

It should be noted that Examiners should not correct candidates' mistakes. However, verbal errors are not minor and only one mark can be awarded if a task is not completed.

Teacher/Examiners should adhere to the rubrics and printed stimuli of the Role-Plays and not add to or extend the set tasks, nor develop the tasks into mini-conversations (See the Teacher's Notes on page 6, Structure of the Examination).

#### ***Role-Plays A***

##### **Page 13**

Most candidates did very well. A number of stimuli could be successfully completed without a verbal construction. Candidates occasionally failed to pick up on the plurality of *Fächer* or were unsure how to handle the verb *gefällt*.

##### **Page 14**

The majority of the candidates did well as they were able to express both their future and past holidays with ease. Several of the utterances did not require a verbal construction. The Examiners should not try to develop this Role-Play into a mini-conversation.

##### **Page 15**

The first utterance resulted in some confusion from several candidates who interpreted the stimulus as relating to how long they had already been on the site. The verb *gefallen* proved difficult to some candidates. The final two requirements were often 'run together' as the candidates tried to cover all the information.

#### ***Role-Plays B***

##### **Page 16**

This Role-Play proved a good discriminator as it involved a variety of language skills, from the use of different tenses through giving reasons for preferences to explaining how you would do something. The final task proved the most difficult, but most candidates did well.

##### **Page 17**

This Role-Play demanded a good level of language competence. Most candidates managed to use the rubric to help them to explain the problem, whilst the weaker candidates declared that they had lost the item, *gestern*. The third utterance showed that many candidates were unable to express what they had done when they discovered the loss.

The majority of candidates handled the first task well. Candidates experienced some difficulty in expressing when they would arrive in Augsburg (in the third task) as opposed to when the next train left. Many also forgot to say whether they were tired. A number failed to explain what they did during the flight and when they left home. A few Examiners, in their eagerness to help their candidates, suggested a meeting place to their candidates and therefore deprived them of the marks.

### **Topics**

Candidates presented prepared topics ranging from *meine Familie* and *mein Urlaub* to more interesting titles such as *Gesundheit*, *Tätowierungen*, *Aids* or *Freundschaft*. Subjects which were relevant or interesting to them personally are inevitably more stimulating and hence 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 then be able to answer questions on a wide variety of personal issues. Candidates who clearly do not prepare a topic as prescribed by the syllabus, cannot be awarded high marks for scale **(a)** (quality of presentation and preparation).

There was an increase in the number of candidates who sounded as if they were reciting a 'pre-learnt monologue' and no significant searching questions were asked. Centres are reminded that candidates may use illustrative material, e.g. photographs, if appropriate to their topic, but are not allowed to use written notes of any kind.

Examiners must consult the Instructions to Teachers very carefully as an increasing number of Examiners are awarding higher scale **(b)** marks to candidates who do not or cannot convey past and future meanings. Such candidates cannot be awarded above the satisfactory band. Similarly, candidates whose topic or conversation is significantly curtailed cannot expect to be awarded full marks if they do not have time to demonstrate a wide range of vocabulary and language structures.

Again it must be noted that some Examiners do not make it clear where the **Topic** ends and the **General Conversation** begins. This can be extremely difficult for the Moderator, especially when, in addition, the Examiner curtails each section.

### **General Conversation**

The General Conversation was well performed by a large number of candidates who demonstrated a high degree of fluency in their responses to questions.

Many Examiners skilfully moved from the topic to the general conversation without repeating the same topic questions and therefore avoided putting their candidates at a disadvantage.

The majority of Examiners posed questions on a range of topics different to the topic section; most Examiners moved from the predictable topics of family and school to the more demanding areas of future plans and asking for reasons and justifications.

Occasionally, there were lists of pre-prepared questions and answers which were asked at random and therefore the feel of a general conversation was lost.

A very small number of Examiners posed questions which were too sophisticated for the average to good candidate and therefore denied the candidate the opportunity to demonstrate what they knew and could do with basic vocabulary and structures.

However, there were a few Examiners who asked questions that were too basic to elicit a higher level of language and as a consequence the scale **(b)** marks were often too generously awarded.

As in previous years it was pleasing to see the Impression mark consistently well used by the majority of Examiners.

### General comments

The candidates demonstrated a wide range of competency, with more than usual gaining very high marks. The overall standard was encouraging.

Presentation for the most part was good, but candidates should try to ensure that their handwriting is legible.

In the main, candidates wrote using the reformed spellings as required. However, a number of candidates did not and it was particularly evident with the use of  $\beta$  in *daß*, which is no longer correct.

The greater majority handled German syntax well. A number of candidates did not use capital letters appropriately; they were often missing for nouns, even in some very fluent scripts. Also *sie* and *Sie* were frequently confused. Genders 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 advised to note the word limit; a number of candidates significantly exceeded this, which was not to their advantage.

#### **(a)** *Letter etiquette*

A number of candidates wrote inappropriate letter openings and greetings rather than a more formal opening which was required. Conversely a number closed the letter with *Hochachtungsvoll* which is rarely used now except in very official circumstances. Overall:

- Introductions were appropriate;
- It appeared that many candidates did not understand *geeignet* and so did not write about their suitability;
- Candidates frequently lifted text from the rubric which is not allowed or they did not ask questions, as required in the rubric. Candidates must be made aware of this requirement.

#### **(b)** Some candidates lifted text from the rubric which is not permitted. Overall:

- The situation was well described;
- Many candidates did not describe their reaction to the situation;
- Candidates were generally able to formulate an appropriate question.

#### **Question 2**

There were a number of very good answers here. Occasionally candidates did not read the rubric carefully, however, and wrote a great deal about events preceding the discovery of the missing car, none of which proved to be relevant. There was much lifting from the rubric, which is not to the candidates' advantage. Stories were relevant with appropriate vocabulary, but a number of candidates wrote in the present tense.