



# **National Qualifications 2012 Internal Assessment Report**

## **German**

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

# National Courses

Titles/levels of National Courses verified:

German Intermediate 1

German Intermediate 2

German Higher

## General comments

Centres this year had accurately applied National Standards at all three levels (Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher), interlocutors in general brought out the best in their candidates and candidates were well prepared. It was also noted that there was generally an improvement in candidates' grasp of grammatical structures with, for example, more use of subordinate clauses and a wider variety of tenses.

## Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Almost all centres are fully aware of the Course Arrangements and recommendations, as given in the document *National Qualifications Assessment of Speaking in Modern Languages*, and of the categories, criteria and pegged marks therein. However, at Intermediate 1 level, centres must ensure that they are aware of the requirements of the instrument of assessment if not using one from the National Assessment Bank.

## Evidence Requirements

All centres were aware that CDs or cassettes had to be submitted, but there were instances in which the candidate could have been more clearly heard had the microphone/recording device been closer to the candidate than to the interlocutor, or had there been less background noise. Centres also need to ensure that CD recordings have been formatted to play on any type of machine. At Intermediate 1 level it would be helpful if a copy of the instrument of assessment were included.

## Administration of assessments

Virtually all centres administered the assessments in accordance with the existing guidelines and documentation. Many candidates were given the opportunity to cover a wide range of topics in which content and structure were entirely appropriate to the level, and were able to sustain the discussion part of the assessment with less reliance on prompts. There were also many performances which fell into the Good or Very Good categories; however, there were instances where the interlocutor prolonged some assessments to the detriment of weaker candidates.

In centres where two interlocutors had been involved in assessment, it certainly appeared that cross marking and discussion of the marks awarded had taken place.

### **Areas of good practice**

Candidates had been well prepared in virtually all of the centres but the best performances came from the use of open-ended questions, which allowed candidates to show what they could do.

Where Higher candidates chose presentation topics more suited to that level, performances tended to be better and often led into more wide-ranging discussion areas.

Most interlocutors were sympathetic in their questioning and had obviously worked hard to put candidates at their ease, resulting in some very pleasing discussions.

### **Specific areas for improvement**

Although pronunciation was generally good, there is still evidence of candidates not accurately pronouncing words with umlauts.

In some centres it was evident that candidates had been over-prepared for the discussion element of the assessment, which resulted in the candidate's performance sounding stilted and over-rehearsed.