



---

# **GCSE EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**GCSE (NEW)  
GERMAN**

**SUMMER 2022**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

### **Online Results Analysis**

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
Unit 1	1
Unit 2	4
Unit 3	6
Unit 4	10

## GERMAN

### GCSE (NEW)

Summer 2022

#### UNIT 1 SPEAKING 3820U10-1 & 3820UA0-1

##### General Comments

Although it has been two years since centres have conducted formal speaking examinations, the Unit 1 speaking assessments were completed and uploaded onto the system within the required time frame. The majority of centres included the administrative documents required: the authenticity form, declaration form and list of the task allocations for the candidates. Even though there were one-off changes to the conversation this year and the way in which some sub-sub themes had been removed, the way in which the candidates were asked appropriate questions for the second part of the conversation showed excellent practice on the part of centres. Centre numbers and Candidate numbers were always included with each uploaded file, ensuring the correct identification of the individual candidate. Centres also introduced each test appropriately allowing examiners to cross reference against paper copies.

The majority of centres showed an understanding of their candidate's ability and consideration was made when entering candidates of the 'accessibility of assessments for learners of different abilities', thus ensuring that candidates were able to access the tasks appropriately. Very few candidates sounded out of their depth – although individual centres may choose to reflect on the way in which they decide upon the tier of a candidate in future series.

On the whole centres fulfilled the time limit allocated for the tests in the specification and for the individual elements within the tiers (Foundation 5-7 minutes/ Higher 7-9 minutes for 2022 series only). However, whilst the timings for each task are approximate, teachers must adhere to the overall timings, as any speaking evidence that exceeds these timings, will not be marked. Teachers must keep track of these timings and ensure that each candidate has enough opportunity to show their capabilities before the overall time limit is reached. It is worth repeating that ***any speaking evidence that exceeds these timings, will not be marked.***

Most centres arranged appropriate venues for the assessments and recordings were generally clear. In some cases, there was excessive noise, often the result of the school bell, which impeded both the clarity and, at times, the flow of the examination. All but one centre adhered to guidance around the required format of the recordings (.mp3). Where the guidance was not followed, sound files were unable to be opened and had to be converted by the centre to the correct format before marking could take place.

A small number of candidates' tests cut out prematurely as they had not been properly uploaded. This is difficult for centres to notice in advance, although a smaller file size could be an indicator of a problem. Where this had occurred, it was swiftly resolved as centres had kept the original copy of the sound file securely with the examinations officer at the centre.

## **Comments on individual questions/sections**

### **The Role Play**

The majority of candidates were able to fulfil the requirements of the role play activity at Foundation and Higher Tier. The candidates clearly used the preparation time appropriately and were able to respond well to most questions. When candidates struggled, this was often in response to the unseen question or when required to formulate a question. At Higher Tier, some candidates self-penalised, if they extended their response to the prompt, resulting in an inaccuracy in either use of vocabulary or grammatical structures. On some occasions, teachers prompted students who were faltering. At times, this is understandable as a means of helping the test to move along (and is perhaps a more satisfactory way of conducting the examination than leaving the candidate to agonise for an extended period when they clearly do not know the answer), but it must be re-iterated here, that any deviation from the teacher script will result in 0 marks for that part of the role play. Candidates' performance was consistent with the pre-Covid cohorts.

### **The Conversation**

The majority of candidates at both Foundation and Higher Tier were able to access this part of the assessment and were well prepared for the task, enabling them to answer questions on the two topics. On the whole, the two parts of the task were timed equally, and candidates were able to perform to their ability in each topic. Candidates who had prepared the first part of the test extremely well, but then were not as proficient in the second part could often not access the highest band. As alluded to in the introduction, where timing was not in line with the guidance and students did not have enough time to give opinions and details about the second part, they also lost marks for Communication and Interaction. Candidates who could interact with the teacher and respond scored highly. Pronunciation and intonation was generally good.

The vast majority of centres posed questions which enabled students to answer with a range of time references and a variety of complex structures. Most candidates had been prepared well for this element and were able to develop their answers to questions on the different topics. The candidates who performed best were able to express opinions and justify their views, using complex structures. A few candidates scored less well as they attempted to produce longer, overly complex answers, which made little sense. The mastery of different time references remains perhaps the trickiest aspect of spoken German for most students.

### **Summary of key points**

The majority of centres continue to prepare their candidates well for the speaking element, taking into consideration the different demands of each task. Considering there has been a two-year gap since the last set of formal speaking tests and that adjustments had been made to the format this year, the excellent conduct of the examinations is to be applauded. In order to ensure that each candidate is given the opportunity to access the appropriate range for their ability teachers should, in subsequent series.

- Be aware of the importance of adhering the timings.
- Familiarise themselves with the assessment grid and use this to help prepare students both in lessons and in the marking of pre-public examinations.
- Prepare students for the unprepared. By encouraging students to produce language spontaneously and naturally, teachers can help students achieve the very highest marks in terms of Communication and Interaction on the conversation and improve outcomes for the unseen questions on the role-play.

- Find an appropriate setting for the speaking examinations, away from student traffic during break time and lesson change over, and from intrusive bells. The latter may be more difficult, but some centres do insist on the school bell being deactivated for the duration of speaking examinations.
- Keep developing strategies to help students become more confident and efficient when using different tenses.

**GERMAN**

**GCSE (NEW)**

**Summer 2022**

**UNIT 2 LISTENING 3820U20-1 & 3820UB0-1**

**General Comments**

Candidates completed tasks related to themes and sub-themes at both levels. There were very few unattempted questions or sections to questions.

Some candidates at both levels still appear to be anticipating words used in the boxes or pictures e.g. *Arzt* for doctor when the phrase on the CD used was *Medizin studieren*. It is important to concentrate on the information given on the CD (see summary comments).

Several candidates gave too much information, adding detail that wasn't required but which contradicted their answer, resulting in a +1/-1 mark.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

**Foundation Tier**

- Q.1** Generally no issues.
- Q.2** Generally no issues, some confusion with part (d), several candidates choosing the teacher option.
- Q.3** Part (a) caused the most problems. Very few candidates chose the dentist, most ticking the engineer.
- Q.4** Generally well attempted. Occasional difficulties arose with *Fleisch* and *Fisch*.
- Q.5** Section 1 was well attempted, although some candidates repeated the answer for part (b) in part (c). Section 2 produced some good responses.
- Q.6** Section 2 part (d) provided various responses, but most candidates did not express the fact that it is girls' teams are becoming more popular
- Q.7** Both sections produced a mixed response at both tiers. Section (a) *übermorgen* often ticked incorrectly as *tomorrow*. *Fahrräder* was often missed, and section (e) appears to have caused some difficulty with *too hot* often chosen as the correct answer.
- Q.8** At foundation level in particular this appears to have been challenging. Surprisingly, *Kellnerin* and *Pilotin* were often conveyed incorrectly. Some candidates offered too much information, sometimes contradicting themselves, others only offering a single word in the opinion box. The future opinion box was generally well attempted.
- Q.9** This question gave several good responses. In part (b) candidates often did not pick up on the word *kostenlos*.

## Higher Tier

Questions 1-3 are common to both tiers

- Q.4** Section 1 (a) No pattern was established here, a number of candidates offered *18 hours, 2 weeks* as answers instead of *2 hours*. There were no issues with section 2.
- Q.5** There was no pattern to this question, sections (b), (c) and (d) producing a variety of ticks in the boxes.
- Q.6** Generally well attempted. Some confusion arose in responses to sections (d) and (e).
- Q.7** This question produced a variety of responses. In section 2 the word *fantastic* was often offered on its own without explaining what was fantastic.
- Q.8** This question produced a few good responses from candidates. In section (d) the fact that *he sleeps better* was often not picked up.
- Q.9** There was no pattern to this question. Questions (b) and (f) appearing to cause the most difficulties. Section (a) most candidates ignored the word *früh*. Section (e) various numbers offered, and *pro Tag* often ignored. Section (f) the word *Ausbildung* generally unfamiliar.

## Summary of key points

### Characteristics of successful responses.

Responses which were short and concise.

Responses which did not add incorrect/superfluous details which can result in -1 (minus one) mark if contradicting the correct statement.

### Areas for improvement

Read the questions carefully to check precisely what is asked for.

Only provide the specified number of answers/details. Several candidates lost points because they gave too much information e.g. three details where two were asked for, resulting in a +1/-1.

In Question 8 at Foundation (2 at Higher) the opinion box requires just one concise **opinion**, but more than 1 **word**, in order to gain a mark.

Listen for information on the audio and make notes, but do not anticipate words that may or may not be used in the recording.

Listen out for compound words and try and break them into smaller units, e.g., *Kinderarbeit*

Practise listening to **numbers** in all forms, e.g., **distance, time, fractions**

Practise listening to plural forms of nouns e.g. *Fahrräder/Länder/Schwimmbäder*.

**GERMAN**

**GCSE (NEW)**

**Summer 2022**

**UNIT 3 READING 3820U30-1 & 3820UC0-1**

**General Comments**

Despite the challenges that teachers and learners faced over the last years, it was pleasing to see how candidates displayed their ability to understand a wide range of German in different types of texts.

All questions in the Foundation and Higher Tiers were accessible to all candidates. The paper followed the same format as in previous years and candidates were familiar with the type of questions, e.g. tick boxes, what is the text about etc.

Even though short answers in English/Welsh are encouraged, candidates must make sure that the answers are not ambiguous. One-word-answers are not always precise enough to gain the mark (please see below for examples).

Despite the challenges that teachers and learners faced over the last years, candidates showed their ability to understand a wide range of German in different types of texts.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

**Q.1 Foundation Tier**

Candidates completed this question well overall. A number of candidates mixed up “*Sportlehrer*” and “*Musiklehrer*”.

**Q.2 Foundation Tier**

Candidates found this question on transport challenging and pointers in the text were not always identified e.g. “*nerven ... Autobahn*” – “*Autofahren stressig*”.

**Q.3 Foundation Tier**

Most candidates ticked the correct box for (a) and (e) but found the rest of the task demanding. Adverbs proved to be challenging e.g. “*nur, jeden Tag, nie*”.

**Q.4 Foundation Tier**

In Q.4 candidates coped well with (a) “*In den Texten handelt es sich um...*”. Weaker candidates failed to identify the correct tense in (c) and vocabulary linked to the environment was challenging for some.

**Q.5 Foundation Tier**

Candidates were able to identify the correct person for each statement. Question (a) was occasionally ticked incorrectly because “all year round” was falsely linked to “*im Sommer*”.

#### Q.6 Foundation Tier

The literature-based questions are still posing challenges for candidates. Weaker candidates lacked vocabulary i.e. “*aufstehen*”, “*Frühstück*” and dates. For (b), the word “beginning” in the question was overlooked and pupils referred to the birthday at the **end** of the month rather than the first of April. In (f), pupils were asked to reply with an activity (“What is the family **doing**?”) yet many candidates replied with the location only “in the kitchen”.

#### Q.7 Foundation Tier

Most candidates gave the correct answers for (a) but some gave one-word answers i.e. “Munich” which do not answer the “why” question. In (b), many replied with a one-word answer “travel”, but Germans still travel only less often **abroad**. Stronger candidates identified the past tense required to answer (c).

#### Q.8 Foundation Tier/Q.1 Higher Tier

Higher Tier candidates scored more marks in the overlap questions because of better basic vocabulary like time, transport, duration. A large number did not understand the time “*Viertel nach acht*” or duration “*eine Stunde*”. In (e), many thought the grand - mother was ill because they did not read the next line (“*Ist Oma Slättberg krank?*” “*Nein*”).

#### Q.9 Foundation Tier Q.2/Higher Tier

Candidates completed (c), (e) and (f) very well. The majority of Higher Tier candidates also understood the idea of work experience (b) and voluntary work (d). Some candidates answered (a) as “work” instead of “get a job” which is not precise enough because the text states that you can work for work experience or voluntarily.

#### Q.10 Foundation Tier (translation)

A large number of candidates did not understand “*auf dem Land*” and translations like “in the land” were common. Some overlooked the preposition “*für*” in “*es gibt nicht viel für junge Leute*” and translated the second sentence as “there are no young people”. The last part of the translation was in the past tense. Weaker candidates translated the entire text either in the past tense or present tense but failed to distinguish between them.

#### Q.3 Higher Tier

Q.3 required detailed reading skills and some candidates failed to identify words such as “*Jedes Jahr*” and jumped straight to “*Montag*” in the first line of the text for (b). Similarly, in (d) they read “*fotografieren*” but failed to take the part before into consideration “*nicht mit Blitzlicht*”.

#### Q.4 Higher Tier

Some candidates still leave blank boxes in this tick-box exercise. Most candidates answered (a), (c), (d) and (e) correctly. For (b) and (f) tenses were not always identified. A common error was that Niklas and Felix were not both talking about the future (for (b)) and the past (f)).

#### Q.5 Higher Tier

In general, responses were good, but a common error was that animals were not identified for (a) in compound nouns (“*Vogelschutzgebiet/Hundewiesen*”). (c)-(f) were mainly answered correctly.

### Q.6 Higher Tier

For question (a) “What is the article about?” many candidates only referred to the first paragraph instead of the entire article. In (b) some candidates gave one-word answers e.g. “families” but no mark could be awarded because of a lack of detail. Not **all** families are affected, only those outlined in the mark scheme. Similar, the answer “families with children” could not be accepted because the idea of **large** families i.e. families with **a lot of** children had to be conveyed. Most candidates identified at least one point for (d) but surprisingly only the more able candidates understood “*rauchen*”. In (f) many candidates wrote the number “781” without realising that this referred to Euros, not the world population. However, “*jeder zweite Mensch*” was understood by the majority of candidates.

### Q.7 Higher Tier

It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates identified the negative correctly for (a). Questions (b) and (c) were also often answered correctly, most candidates understood that the nurses were very friendly and that Hanna was a trainee nurse from Lebanon. In (e) candidates mixed up what Hanna and Tschick say: “*Hauptsache, dir macht’s Spaß*”, *sagte sie*.- “*sie*” referring to Hanna, not Tschick. Some vocabulary proofed challenging e.g. “*heiraten*” and “*Besuch bekommen*”. Some candidates were misled by “*praktisch*”, translating it as “practical”, not “practically”.

### Q.8 Higher Tier

All candidates were able to answer some of the questions, with (a), (d) and (e) being the highest scoring questions. For (a) “*einer der längsten Sandstrände*” the answer “long beach” was accepted instead of “one of the longest”. In (c) many candidates described Danny Wallace as a TV moderator instead of TV presenter, author or the person who opened the museum. Some also thought he was the museum’s founder. In (d) some one-word answers could not be accepted e.g. “poster” as they were too vague. For (e), candidates were supposed to give examples of how money was raised but weaker candidates replied with what money was raised for (Sport Relief). The last question was only answered correctly by very able candidates, others understood “*sozial*” but not the compound noun “*Sozialwohnung*”.

### Q.9 Higher Tier (translation)

Weaker candidates did not understand key vocabulary like “*Gesundheit*”, “*wichtig*”, “*gegen*” or “*Nikotinverbot*”. This led to confusing answers that could not be awarded marks. Most candidates identified the correct tenses but found the question challenging. At time parts of the sentences have been omitted e.g. “*Auf der letzten Party*” was translated as “at a party” – not mentioning “**last** party”. Poor English caused a lack of communication and marks could not be awarded because of ambiguity within the answer.

## Summary of key points

Overall, candidates coped well with a wide range of texts and tasks styles, but the literary texts are still proving challenging.

- Candidates must ensure that they read all questions thoroughly and answer in unambiguous English. Being precise is very important in accessing the full range of marks.
- Full sentences are not required, but for many questions more than one-word answers (i.e. incl. a verb/noun) must be given to be awarded the mark.
- Pupils who used highlighters and annotated the text usually did well as they focused on detailed reading rather than skimming the text, especially in the Higher Tier.
- Many candidates are still making mistakes by overlooking words or verb endings which indicate tenses.
- The entire time allocation should be used to give each question enough thought.

**GERMAN**  
**GCSE (NEW)**  
**Summer 2022**  
**UNIT 4 WRITING**

**General Comments**

Candidates were familiar with the format of questions of the writing paper. Most were able to convey meaning and communicate facts, ideas and opinions in German. Higher Tier candidates often justified their views and developed ideas.

Candidates managed to answer all questions in the allocated time. However, some candidates did not always adhere to the word count. Where the word count was clearly below the requirements, candidates did not produce enough content for higher marks to be awarded.

Some candidates pre-learnt scripts for themes that were not part of this exam paper. Marks could not be awarded for irrelevant information that did not respond to the rubrics. Some candidates were entered for the Higher Tier but lacked even the basic range of vocabulary and structure required for this Tier.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

**Q.1 Foundation Tier**

Candidates were awarded marks for conveying the meaning fully or partially, even if minor errors were present. Some candidates still write a lot more than necessary including complex structures that are not required for Q.1 e.g. past/future tense or *weil*.

A good degree of accuracy was required to be awarded full marks. Minor errors such as incorrect gender or agreements did not result in loss of marks.

- Personal quality:

The majority of candidates was able to give simple answers using *ich bin* correctly.

- Language(s) you speak:

The majority of candidates used *ich spreche* correctly, but many were unable to spell *deutsch*.

- Father/mother's job:

The 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular *er/sie ist* had to be used. One job would have been sufficient, but most candidates wrote about their father and mother.

- How you earn money:

The majority of candidates used *ich arbeite* correctly, adding places or job titles e.g. *in einem Café*. A few candidates gave too much detail i.e. pay/work hours which was not required. Full marks were awarded if the degree of accuracy was good regardless of the length of the answer.

- What you save money for:  
Some candidates did not remember *sparen* but were awarded full marks for using other, often more complex structures instead i.e. *ich möchte Geld für ... haben* which reflects good knowledge of the language studied.
- How you spend your money:  
Similar to the above, many candidates did not use *ich gebe mein Geld für ... aus*, but used other verbs i.e. *ich kaufe/ich gehe ... aus* instead and were awarded full marks.

## Q.2 Foundation Tier

The majority of Candidates was able to write the required 50 words by giving information and opinions related to travel. Weaker candidates lacked basic vocabulary like *ich fahre/es gibt/man kann + infinitive*. Many included free time activities e.g. *ich spiele Fußball* and only used simple structures. Some candidates attempted to include the past/future tense which was not required. They gained marks for attempting complex structures but often lost marks due to poor accuracy. It was noticeable that many candidates did not know present tense verb endings in 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular.

## Q.3 Foundation Tier/Q.1 Higher Tier

The vast majority of candidates were able to give details about the theme of healthy lifestyle. Some did not understand “Gesundheit” and wrote about festivals/culture because of the theme title “Identity and Culture”. Many candidates, mainly Foundation Tier candidates, did not refer to a range of tenses. A reference to different tenses is essential to achieve marks in the top bands. Many Higher Tier candidates wrote a lot more than 100 words, but some weaker candidates struggled to write the required number of words.

Key vocabulary and structures related to this theme were usually well known by Higher Tier candidates, whereas weaker Foundation Tier candidates only wrote about food and drink. Many centres prepared their candidates well and taught them to use a range of tenses, structures and idioms. At times, idiomatic language was used incorrectly e.g. *in meiner Meinung nach* and some errors were reoccurring like *also=therefore vs auch=also*, *ich bin rauchen* (-ing in English), *viel vs weil* and the distinction between the noun and adjective *Gesundheit vs. gesund*. Especially weaker candidates used random adjectives to give opinions, but they failed to justify these. Candidates were aware of the requirements of the tasks. Looking at candidates’ notes next to their responses, shows good preparation by teachers. Less able candidates struggled to use verbs correctly. Syntax was also challenging for weaker candidates. The new-style questions allowed better candidates to show off their German knowledge. They were able to include idioms, tenses and more complex structures to convey clear meaning e.g. *Mein Lieblingsessen ist Brot, weil es lustig ist*.

## Q.2 Higher Tier

Both topic options were accessible for candidates and equally chosen. Candidates mainly followed the required word count with some exceeding 150 words. Better candidates justified their views and gave a lot of detail. Many candidates were able to include complex structures, idioms and a very good variety of vocabulary that contributed to excellent responses with detailed information. Some candidates wrote too much about school studies rather than school life. It is not compulsory to include the given bullet points, but they guide candidates to use the correct range of language so they can access marks in top bands. Better candidates showed a very good range of vocabulary and structures that referred to the bullet points.

It was a pleasure to see how many candidates were able to include language associated to different themes to respond to improvement of their school. Many included references to the environment or food.

Communication and content were generally good, but linguistic knowledge and accuracy proved more challenging for many. Verb endings in the present tense were often incorrect and references to the past were only occasionally fully correct. Some candidates lacked a wider range of vocabulary and complex structures. Typical errors included *bekommen vs become* and no Umlaut for conditional *würde* (imperfect *wurde* used instead).

### **Summary of key points**

Candidates were generally very well prepared for the requirements of the tasks. Seeing candidates' notes next to their responses shows good teaching practice i.e. remember to include tenses and a range of structures. The majority of candidates showed good ability to communicate information related to a range of topics. Less able candidates struggled to use verbs and basic topic related vocabulary correctly. Syntax was also challenging for weaker candidates. Bullet points in FT Q.2/HT Q.1 and HT Q.2 could be used better to fulfil the requirements to access the top bands, including manipulating structures and vocabulary given in the target language.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)