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5: STRONG performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Maintains the exchange with a response that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task
- Provides required information (responses to questions, request for details) with frequent elaboration
- Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility
- Varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language
- Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors
- Mostly consistent use of register appropriate for the situation; control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing), despite occasional errors
- Variety of simple and compound sentences, and some complex sentences

4: GOOD performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Maintains the exchange with a response that is generally appropriate within the context of the task
- Provides most required information (responses to questions, request for details) with some elaboration
- Fully understandable, with some errors that do not impede comprehensibility
- Varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language
- General control of grammar, syntax, and usage
- Generally consistent use of register appropriate for the situation, except for occasional shifts; basic control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing)
- Simple, compound, and a few complex sentences

3: FAIR performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Maintains the exchange with a response that is somewhat appropriate but basic within the context of the task
- Provides most required information (responses to questions, request for details)
- Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility
- Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language
- Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage
- Use of register may be inappropriate for the situation with several shifts; partial control of conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing), although these may lack cultural appropriateness
- Simple and a few compound sentences

2: WEAK performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Partially maintains the exchange with a response that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task
- Provides some required information (responses to questions, request for details)
- Partially understandable with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the reader
- Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language
- Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage
- Use of register is generally inappropriate for the situation; includes some conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) with inaccuracies
- Simple sentences and phrases

1: POOR performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange by providing a response that is inappropriate within the context of the task
- Provides little required information (responses to questions, request for details)
- Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility
- Very few vocabulary resources
- Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage
- Minimal or no attention to register; includes significantly inaccurate or no conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing)
- Very simple sentences or fragments

0: UNACCEPTABLE performance in Interpersonal Writing
- Mere restatement of language from the stimulus
- Completely irrelevant to the stimulus
- “I don’t know,” “I don’t understand,” or equivalent in any language
- Not in the language of the exam

- (hyphen): BLANK (no response)
Sehr geehrte Frau Niemann,


Mit freundlichen Grüßen,
Sehr geehrte Frau Niemann,


Ich freue mich auf meine Region zu repräsentieren. Wie viel kostet dieser. Was soll ich tragen? Haben wir einen Club T-Shirt?

Mit freundlichen Grüssen,

Schüler
Sehr geehrte Kirsten Niemann,


Unsere Meinung.
Task 1: E-mail Reply

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Overview

This task assessed writing in the interpersonal communicative mode by having the student write a reply to an e-mail message. Students were allotted 15 minutes to read the message and write the reply. The response received a single, holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task. Students needed to be able first to comprehend the e-mail and then to write a reply using a formal form of address. The reply must address all the questions and requests raised in the message, as well as ask for more details about something mentioned in the message.

In this exam, within the theme of Contemporary Life (Alltag), students replied to an e-mail from Kirsten Niemann, program coordinator from the organization committee of “Youth Votes!” (Die Jugend stimmt!). In the opening of her message, Niemann says that the purpose of the international Youth Parliament is to discuss solutions to common problems and to bring these into the political arena. Niemann identifies the recipients of the e-mail as students who, through work for student clubs and associations, have gained leadership experience and are familiar with the interests and problems of their peers. She extends an invitation to these student leaders to represent the youth of their regions at the meeting in Berlin.

In order to structure the work of the youth parliament more clearly, she poses two questions to the recipients of the e-mail: 1) Could you please tell us something about your experience in school groups or other organizations? (Könten Sie uns bitte etwas über Ihre Erfahrungen in Schulgruppen oder anderen Organisationen erzählen?) and 2) In your opinion, what is an important problem for young people that we should discuss in the youth parliament? (Was ist Ihrer Meinung nach ein wichtiges Problem für Jugendliche in Ihrer Gegend, über das wir im Jugendparlament diskutieren sollten?) Niemann closes the e-mail by thanking the student for the feedback and by offering assistance with any additional questions the e-mail recipient might have.

Sample: 1A

Score: 4

This response is an example of a good performance in Interpersonal Writing. It maintains the exchange about being a representative in the youth parliament, with a generally appropriate response that briefly but accurately addresses the sender’s request for information. With some elaboration, the student describes a personal experience as president of a political club (“Ich bin in einem Club für Politik”) and mentions that the use of technology and social media is a potential problem (“Ein wichtiges Problem für Jugendliche ist wie viel Technologie wir benutzen”). The student also asks two relevant questions (“Wie viele andere Schülerinnen kommen?”; “Welche Seit beginnt es?”). The response thus demonstrates both comprehension of the stimulus and attention to the requirements of the assigned task. The answers are fully understandable with some minor errors (“interessiert mich”; “eine Repräsentanten zu sein”). The vocabulary is varied, and there is some idiomatic language (“Wir treffen uns”; “über Sozialemedien sprechen”). Overall the language is varied and generally appropriate, but it lacks ease of expression (“Ich liebe mit anderen Schülerinnen sprechen”). The student shows general control of grammar (“ich habe sehr viel über Politik … studieren”) and uses register correctly with a formulaic formal greeting and closing (“Sehr geehrte Frau Niemann”; “Danke für Ihre Email”; “Danke schon im Voraus für Ihre Hilfe”; “Mit freundlichen Grüßen”). The language contains mostly simple sentences with some compound (“Es interessiert mich sehr eine Repräsentanten zu sein”) and complex sentences (“Ein wichtiges Problem für Jugendliche ist wie viel Technologie wir benutzen”). The response accordingly earned a score of 4.
Sample: 1B
Score: 3

This response is an example of a fair performance in Interpersonal Writing. While the response provides all the required information, it maintains the exchange on a level that is only somewhat appropriate with a series of simple sentences that have noticeable linguistic flaws. It briefly answers the questions about the student’s experience in school organizations (“Ich bin in Band”) and about a problem that could be discussed in the youth parliament (“Ein wichtiges Problem für Jugendliche sein rauchen”). The student expresses interest in being a representative (“Ich interessiere mich für politik”) and manages to fulfill task requirements by asking two simple questions (“Was soll ich tragen?”, “Haben Wir einen Club T-Shirt?”). The student shows some control of grammar, syntax, and usage, although there are significant errors (“mehr tun über rauchenverbot können”) that make the response only generally understandable. Most of the text uses simple sentences and basic vocabulary, with a few compound sentences (“Meiner Meinung nach soll kein Studenten rauchen aber Sie rauchen”) and one unsuccessful complex sentence (“Ich denke Schule und unserer Generation mehr tun über rauchenverbot können”). The register is appropriate with an appropriate opening and closing phrase and formal form of address in the body of the e-mail (“Danke für Ihre Email”). This response accordingly received a score of 3.

Sample: 1C
Score: 1

This response is an example of a poor performance in Interpersonal Writing. It is an unsuccessful attempt to deal with the questions addressed in the e-mail and demonstrates that the student did not understand the stimulus. The student uses some formulaic language in the greeting and the opening sentence, but even here, inaccuracies appear (“sehr geehrte Kirsten Niemann”). Confusingly, the student offers thanks for feedback (“Vielen dank für dieses Feedback”), even though it is the student who is supposed to provide the sender with feedback in the form of responses to the questions posed in the e-mail. The student does mention the youth parliament (“Wir Schreiben über die Jugendparlament”) and other organizations but does not actually answer any questions from the e-mail. The sentences lack coherence and are thus barely understandable within the context of the task. Although the grammar and syntax appear somewhat correct, many of the phrases are borrowed from the letter itself (“anderen Organisationen erzählen”); thus, they demonstrate little control. The closing shows a minimal understanding of conventions for formal correspondence (“unsere Meinung”). This response accordingly received a score of 1.