

# **Assessment Report**

## **Scholarship, 2008**

### **German**

## COMMENTARY

All questions were handled well by candidates. However many candidates, accustomed to the format of a discussion of advantages/disadvantages, discussed both in Task One: Question Two when only disadvantages were asked for.

Candidates need to read questions carefully so that they answer accurately.

### **The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and/or knowledge:**

- ability to make a thorough summary of the information given in the recording
- ability to extract the important details from the written text
- a high level of sophistication in understanding the subtleties of the text
- ability to build up an argument, clearly expressing and supporting their point of view with logical reasoning
- ability to consistently maintain a personal voice
- ability to use rich language with advanced, even stylish, vocabulary that kept the context in mind and integrated the language seamlessly into the task
- ability to use idiomatically appropriate language in both the speaking and writing tasks, where phrases were well integrated into the fabric of, and fitted the style of, the text produced
- excellent prior knowledge of the topics being assessed.

### **Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above, and in addition they:**

- used erroneous/little vocabulary and structures from curriculum level 8
- expanded only briefly on their own ideas
- gave minimal evidence of interpretation
- created a very broad summary that lacked detail or included detail that was weighted towards the first text with little reference to the second
- spoke haltingly and/or mispronounced several words
- spoke too quickly, read out answers without inflections, and did not sound natural
- communicated in only one language register, even when a different one was asked for
- provided short responses that did not show thorough understanding or answer the questions adequately
- repeated ideas from the stimulus text in answers on a related topic
- included previously learnt material that was largely unrelated to the topic
- gave lengthy answers that had little linkage/relevance to the topic
- stayed very close to the source text and/or tried to insert unnatural and idiomatically inappropriate, apparently rehearsed expressions and phrases into the text.