### Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison

#### 5: STRONG performance in Presentational Speaking
- Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Clearly compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including supporting details and relevant examples
- Demonstrates understanding of the target culture, despite a few minor inaccuracies
- Organized presentation; effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices
- 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 presentation
- Pronunciation, intonation and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility
- Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility

#### 4: GOOD performance in Presentational Speaking
- Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including some supporting details and mostly relevant examples
- Demonstrates some understanding of the target culture, despite minor inaccuracies
- Organized presentation; some effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices
- Fully understandable, with some errors which 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 presentation, except for occasional shifts
- Pronunciation, intonation and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility
- Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually improves comprehensibility

#### 3: FAIR performance in Presentational Speaking
- Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including a few supporting details and examples
- Demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture, despite inaccuracies
- Some organization; limited use of transitional elements or cohesive devices
- 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 presentation with several shifts
- Pronunciation, intonation and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally impede comprehensibility
- Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility

#### 2: WEAK performance in Presentational Speaking
- Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Presents information about the student’s own community and the target culture, but may not compare them; consists mostly of statements with no development
- Demonstrates a limited understanding of the target culture; may include several inaccuracies
- Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices
- Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener
- Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language
- Limited control of grammar, syntax and usage
- Use of register is generally inappropriate for the presentation
- Pronunciation, intonation and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times; errors impede comprehensibility
- Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually does not improve comprehensibility

#### 1: POOR performance in Presentational Speaking
- Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Presents information only about the student’s own community or only about the target culture, and may not include examples
- Demonstrates minimal understanding of the target culture; generally inaccurate
- Little or no organization; absence of transitional elements and cohesive devices
- 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
- Pronunciation, intonation and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend; errors impede comprehensibility
- Clarification or self-correction (if present) does not improve comprehensibility

#### 0: UNACCEPTABLE performance in Presentational Speaking
- Mere restatement of language from the prompt
- Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic
- “I don’t know,” “I don’t understand” or equivalent in any language
- Not in the language of the exam

- **(hyphen): BLANK (no response although recording equipment is functioning)**
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Task 4: Cultural Comparison

Note: Student responses are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors. In the transcripts of students’ speech quoted in the commentaries, a three-dot ellipsis indicates that the sample has been excerpted. Two dots indicate that the student paused while speaking.

Overview

This task assessed speaking in the presentational communicative mode by having students make a comparative oral presentation on a cultural topic. Students were allotted 4 minutes to read the topic and prepare the presentation and then 2 minutes to deliver the presentation. The response received a single holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task. The presentation needed to compare the student’s own community to an area of the German-speaking world, demonstrating understanding of cultural features of the German-speaking world. Furthermore, the presentation had to be organized clearly.

Within the theme of Beauty and Aesthetics, students were asked which events and activities in their community might be pertinent to young artists (“Welche Veranstaltungen oder Aktivitäten in Ihrer Umgebung haben etwas mit jungen Künstlern zu tun?”). In their oral presentations students had to compare perspectives on this question in their home community with those in a German-speaking region, and they were also invited to describe their own observations or experiences, or what they had learned in school.

Sample: 4A
Score: 5

Transcript of Student’s Response


Commentary

This presentation clearly compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including supporting details (“Ausbildung,” “Kunst,” “Musik”) and relevant examples (“Kulturwerkstatt,” “Kunstclub”). The student is fully understandable, and occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility. Even though the presentation is not thoroughly organized, the effective use of transitional elements makes it easy to follow (“Es ist sehr anders von hier in Kanada”). The varied and appropriate vocabulary is complemented by accuracy in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors. Clarification improves comprehensibility, and even though there is a shift toward the end of the presentation, the use of register is mostly consistent and appropriate. Overall this is a strong performance.
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Sample: 4B
Score: 3

Transcript of Student's Response
Die Aktivitäten in meiner Umgebung, das etwas mit jungen Künstlern zu tun hat gehabt, gehabt hat, ähm ist äh meine Theaterklasse. Ähm in die Klasse hat, in der Klasse äh haben wir wie Schauspieleren gelernt zu, zu sein, Schauspieleren zu sein gelernt und, ähm, ich habe auch eine Kunstklasse gehabt, ähm, wir haben viel zu malern und äh zeichnen gelernt, es war viel Spaß. Ähm, in Österreich, ich habe einen Freund aus Österreich und er hat gesagt, dass in Österreich äh Musikschule gibt und äh dass die Kinder mit ähm gute Musike skills äh gehen da und ähm, sie lernt viel ähm über Musik und ähm ich denke, das ist . .

Commentary
This presentation is a suitable treatment of the topic and includes a few supporting details and examples (theater, music). The student compares his own community with the perspective of an Austrian exchange student. Even though the pacing is slow, the presentation is generally understandable. Some errors may impede comprehensibility. The vocabulary is appropriate but basic, and there is some control of grammar and syntax. Clarification and self-correction sometimes improve comprehensibility. Overall this is a fair performance.

Sample: 4C
Score: 2

Transcript of Student's Response
Im Amerika, Musik ist sehr, sehr interessant. Ich liebe Musik und ich denke, Sie liebe Musik, also. Ich spiele die Klavier und Trommeln. Deutschland ist sehr interessant für es ist Musik. Rammstein ist ein Band im Deutschland sehr popular. Also, Football auf, im Amerika ist nicht Fuß, Football in Deutschland. In Deutschland Fußball ist ein Spiel mit Fuß und amerikanische Football ist nicht diese. . . In Amerika, Soccer ist die deutsche Fußball . . Ich habe kein Idee, was zu sagen.

Commentary
This presentation is an unsuitable treatment of the task. Though the student mentions music, the response does not compare the student’s own community and the target community, and the presentation consists of statements only, with no development. The further treatment of sports is irrelevant to the topic. The presentation is barely organized, which can cause confusion for the listener. The scarce vocabulary and the limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage impede comprehensibility, and the use of register is generally inappropriate for a presentation. Overall this is a weak performance.