Scholarship

2012 Assessment Report

German

COMMENTARY

Overall, responses to the questions tended to lack flair or originality. While many responses were technically highly accurate and demonstrated native speaker level proficiency, they did not show a similar level of achievement in terms of critical thinking, perceptiveness or broader social awareness. Few candidates demonstrated the ability to persuade or engage their intended audience by using humour or different registers.

Questions Two and Three in particular followed a similar format and made similar demands on the candidates. Responses to these questions tended to be well organised, but rather predictable. Notably lacking from the speaking section were answers which demonstrated a global perspective or made reference to the broader social implications of social networking.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:
- demonstrated the ability to select and maintain an appropriate register in their response
- showed a controlled use of language, and were able to select and combine effective phrasing, vocabulary and language features so that their response commanded the audience's attention
- communicated an awareness of intercultural knowledge, and related the questions to both their own lives and to broader social or cultural contexts.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:
- selected an appropriate register, and successfully organised their ideas to communicate in a convincing manner
- used a wide range of language to communicate to a specific audience, including idiomatic or technical expressions as appropriate
- included a wide range of appropriate language which was fit for purpose, and often included a sense of "personal voice".

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:
- provided short spoken responses to the questions
- included content in one part of their answer which was better suited to a different section or repeated similar content in two sections e.g. gave examples of how they or their friends used Facebook in both Question Three and Question Four
- used language inaccurately, so that communication was hindered at times.