

Moderation Feedback – Central - 2005

Assessment Panel:

Modern Languages

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

**French: Intermediate 1
 Intermediate 2
 Higher**

General comments on moderation activity

(a) The moderation of Speaking

Assessments very largely concordant with moderator judgements. I identified a number of very good performances, and there were very few candidate performances which did not at least fulfil the criteria for Satisfactory.

It should again be emphasised that the role of the teacher/interlocutor is a crucial factor in the successful conduct of the test and in ensuring that a real discussion between candidate and teacher takes place.

There are still some instances of candidates presenting a rehearsed or over prepared performance which the interlocutor fails to develop with any degree of spontaneity.

(b) Language in Work (retrospective moderation)

Higher

There were a number of very good performances here also. However, several candidates (in two centres) failed to fulfil the criteria of the NAB, failing either to cover the bullet points as required (the message) or, in the case of the letter, failing to include the six pieces of information which constitute the core of the task.

All of the above issues have been drawn to the attention of the centres concerned in the Moderator Report Form. The centres have been advised that they should take the necessary steps to ensure that these issues are addressed, and that they will be moderated again in this area next year.

Advanced Higher

One centre was moderated in Language in Work at Advanced Higher. While the pieces submitted were satisfactory, candidates at this level should be encouraged to show more initiative and to use a range of language appropriate to this level.

Centres who cover this Unit at Advanced Higher should be reminded that the submission of a bibliography is a requirement.

Specific issues identified

(a) The moderation of Speaking

Unlike in previous years, when there has been a tendency to conduct overlengthy tests which more often than not are not to the candidate's advantage, a number of centres went too far in the opposite direction this year and conducted discussions which fell short (in some cases far short!) of the minimum requirements. This was an issue with four of the nine centres moderated, and has been highlighted in the feedback to the centres concerned in the Moderation Report Form, in the hope that they will take account of this in the conduct of future assessments.

In the interests of standardisation, and in order to give sufficient opportunity to judge the candidate's ability to sustain performance, time allocations should be observed as closely as possible.

Despite modification, the Intermediate 1 speaking assessment remains extremely narrow and restricted.

The completion of the Moderation Sample Form proved less haphazard than in previous years (particularly 2004) but there were still some inaccuracies in the entries on this form. At Intermediate 1 level, some centres failed to indicate on the MSF, and/or to include in their documentation, the NAB which had been used to conduct the test.

(b) Language in Work

In some centres, there was a notable lack of variety in both the letter and the messages. Candidates should be encouraged to show more initiative and variety.

The assessments for the Language in Work Unit are under review, and amendments in the requirements at different levels may go some way towards eliminating some of the problems encountered this year.

More than half of the centres moderated in this Unit failed to indicate which NAB had been used on the Moderation Sample Form.

Feedback to centres

Centres' attention should be drawn yet again to the guidelines on the conditions for the conduct and recording of the speaking tests in quiet surroundings. There were still some examples of candidates whose performance was difficult to assess as a result of external noise.