National Qualifications 2015
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 NQ Courses verified:

German: Higher (speaking test)

General comments
In general, all the centres verified showed they were familiar with and understood the requirements of the speaking test at Higher level; this applied to both the content and conduct of the test.

All of the centres verified this year were accepted.

Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials
It was clear from the way in which tests were conducted that schools are very familiar with the Course Arrangements and recommendations as outlined in the document entitled National Qualifications Assessment of Speaking in Modern Languages. In addition, all centres were familiar with the categories, criteria and pegged marks as detailed in this document.

Evidence Requirements
All centres submitted recordings on CDs but they should ensure that they have been formatted in such a way as to allow them to be played on any type of CD player. Recordings were of a good quality, with candidates being clearly heard. Centres should, however, also ensure that all required paperwork is submitted with the verification materials.

In one or two cases it was noticed that the length of presentations was well beyond the recommended time for Higher level — since the extra time does not benefit candidates it would be better if they were to keep to the times suggested for the speaking assessment.

Administration of assessments
Centres had prepared their candidates well for the assessments. The choice of topic(s) chosen by candidates for the presentation was varied and entirely appropriate to Higher level. Interlocutors used mainly open-ended questions and covered a wide variety of topics in the discussion part of the assessment. They were sympathetic to candidates’ nerves and showed skill in re-phrasing questions to assist candidates’ understanding.

All of the centres verified administered the tests in accordance with the available guidelines and documentation, using appropriate assessments for Higher level;
where there was more than one interlocutor it was evident that schools had successfully used internal verification procedures.

**Areas of good practice**

There were some excellent performances and some of the discussions sounded very natural with little evidence of candidates being over-prepared. For the majority of the assessments the length of the speaking test was entirely appropriate.

All the interlocutors were very supportive and displayed a relationship with their candidates which put them at their ease.

Topics chosen for the presentation varied widely at Higher level and candidates freely expressed opinions and gave reasons for these opinions. Pronunciation was on the whole of a good standard.

In general, a wide range of vocabulary and structure was used and at Higher level candidates often displayed accurate grammatical knowledge, correctly using subordinate clauses, inversion and adjectival agreements.

**Specific areas for improvement**

As in previous years, the use of the umlaut has continued to cause problems for some candidates, as has the ‘ch’ sound; it is felt that at Higher level candidates should be able to cope with both these sounds accurately.