



## **NATIONAL UNITS**

### **TITLES/LEVELS OF NATIONAL UNITS MODERATED**

**INTER 1**  
**INTER 2**  
**HIGHER**

### **FEEDBACK TO CENTRES**

#### **General comments:**

Candidates were generally very well-prepared and aware of what was expected of them, and the majority of assessments were conducted and marked in keeping with national standards.

There is an on-going problem with documentation, although the number of incorrectly completed forms is decreasing. Some centres submit NABs, and even prelims were included. Careful reading of instructions is advisable, although, given the relatively frequent errors, perhaps revised instructions would be helpful

#### **Advice on good practice and areas for further development:**

It was clear that most teachers had established good relationships with their students, and encouraged them to give of their best with sympathetic interlocution. Some centres, however, had a standard set of questions. Where this occurred, teachers appeared not to listen to what was said to them, leading to a stilted conversation with little or no spontaneity.

Although the vast majority of candidates can make themselves understood, pronunciation and intonation continue to be problem areas.

The assessment of speaking at Inter 1 continues to present difficulties, possibly because of the lack of exemplification. It was found that candidates who were assessed using a role play involving personal language did better than those completing a transactional task, because of the greater opportunity to go beyond basic requirements.

Nearly all centres are well aware of standards and mark assessments accordingly. Internal moderation and reference to the exemplification material are effective measures to achieve this. Centres are also advised to refer to the arrangements for the conduct of assessments, particularly with regard to the required length of Inter 2 and Higher presentations and discussions. While the majority of centres comply with the requirements, and a few exceed them (rarely to the benefit of candidates) a small but significant number of candidates did not speak for the required length of time. This was often due to the candidate's own difficulty in sustaining a conversation and was recognized in the mark awarded, but in some instances discussions were not sufficiently developed by the interlocutor to allow candidates to demonstrate their capacity to speak at length and thus to deserve the mark given.