



**National Qualifications 2012
Internal Assessment Report
Gàidhlig/Gaelic (Learners)**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of National Courses verified:

Gàidhlig & Gaelic (Learners): Standard Grade

Gàidhlig & Gaelic (Learners): Intermediate 1

Gàidhlig & Gaelic (Learners): Intermediate 2

Gàidhlig & Gaelic (Learners): Higher – Assessment of Speaking

General comments

Most centres have a clear and accurate understanding of requirements; however, a small minority do not follow these to the letter.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Most assessments were within the tolerance factor of three marks and accepted accordingly. However, the quality of some recordings could be improved. There was evidence of good practice by candidates and interlocutors.

Evidence requirements

There was clear understanding of evidence requirements.

Administration of assessments

Current National Assessment Banks were used to conduct the assessments.

Areas of good practice

Most centres showed evidence of good practice, therefore supporting the National Standard. Some interlocutors showed good skills; they were patient and sympathetic and ready to assist with prompting when necessary – this, however, was commendably kept to a minimum, enabling pupils to perform well within the criteria set out. Generally, questions were suitably demanding at all levels, and a number of interlocutors succeeded in getting the best out of candidates, with evidence of good relationship between interlocutors and candidates. Many tests were professionally conducted. There was some evidence of improvements in standards within certain centres.

Specific areas for improvement

Some centres should engage in more interactive discussion, leading to more spontaneous conversation as required by the task. Some recordings were unclear at times, and should be conducted carefully in order to minimise interference from any other sources/candidates, eg school bells, traffic noise. Recordings should be checked for clarity prior to submission.

Some centres awarded marks which were too high, while some erred on the conservative side and marks had to be revised slightly.

In one centre the interlocutors dwelt exclusively on questions related to pupils' chosen topic of study to the exclusion of other aspects of coursework and general topics. As a result candidates did not receive the opportunity to display their full range of speaking skills and ability.

Some discussions were unnecessarily prolonged and in one or two instances ran substantially over the allocated time. Assessments should be conducted within the time allocated.

Most questions were appropriate for the level specified. However, the interlocutor should avoid asking candidates for factual information such as lists of school subjects studied and allow scope for them to express or justify opinions. An interactive discussion leads to a more spontaneous conversation and shows the candidate's performance at its best – this was evident with a significant number of the assessments.

It would be helpful to ask more open-ended questions at a relaxed pace to avoid one word responses. The interlocutor should give candidates time to answer a question if they do not respond immediately. Also, the interlocutor should avoid repeating candidates' answers.

In some instances, it was noted that there was a tendency for candidates to be over-prepared when talking about their individual study, with a resultant lack of spontaneity when talking about this topic. The discussion should be an interaction between the candidate and interlocutor on this topic, rather than a more formal speech.

Interlocutors should not spend too much time giving information in the course of assessments and should restrict themselves to asking questions, although there was less evidence of this in tests conducted this year.