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 Fischer,


Mit freundlichen Grüßen

-5- GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
Sehr geehrte Charlotte Fischer,

Ich bin so froh, dass ich darf mit Ihnen arbeiten.

Was für Projekte darf ich mithelfen?

Ich will am meisten mit meiner Arbeit aber alles ist gut für mich!

Ich will sehr gern für Sie arbeiten!

Die Formular wird in der Post morgen. Die eigene Fähigkeit das ich habe ist dass ich so gern mitführe bist.

Vielen Dank!
Sehr geehrte Charlotte Fischer,


Bitte sie, [lllllll] wie viele menchen wölsst du haben für urbeit?

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Task 1: E-mail Reply

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

Overview

This task assessed writing in the interpersonal communicative mode by having students 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 had to 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 Families and Communities (Familie und Gemeinschaft), students replied to an e-mail from Charlotte Fischer, chairperson of the Nature Protection League of Hannover. In the opening of her message, Ms. Fischer expresses her pleasure that the student is interested in working as a volunteer for the Nature Protection League. She goes on to mention that the League has several projects planned for the coming summer in which the student could participate. Some of the projects require physical outdoor work, but a student who preferred to work indoors could also be given a placement in the visitors’ center. In the next paragraph, the students are asked what kind of work they would be most interested in (Könten Sie uns bitte mitteilen, was für eine Naturschutz-Arbeit Sie am meisten interessiert?) and whether they have particular knowledge or skills that could be helpful in their work with the Nature Protection League (Haben Sie schon bestimmte Vorkenntnisse oder Fähigkeiten, die bei der Arbeit nützlich sein könnten?). Ms. Fischer also notes that it would be helpful if the student would fill out the attached form and return it via e-mail or post. Ms. Fischer closes the e-mail with assurances that she would be happy to answer any questions the student might have. Students were to ask for more details about something in the message; possible topics included questions about the Nature Protection League’s projects, the hours and/or location of the visitors’ center, and when the student might be able to begin work.

Sample: 1A
Score: 5

This response constitutes a strong performance in interpersonal writing. It maintains the exchange with a response that is clearly appropriate. All of the sender’s questions are answered in a smoothly-written self-description that forms the first two paragraphs of the e-mail. The answers are amplified with frequent elaboration (Ich weiß viele Bäumarten und Pflanze; Ich interessiere mich für Arbeit in freier Natur; Wenn Sie es brauchen, kann ich auch in Besucherzentrum arbeiten). Several questions are then asked of the sender; here, too, the ease and clarity of expression make the response fully understandable: Können Sie mir sagen, welche Projekte Sie machen? Occasional errors do not impede overall comprehensibility (Bäumarten; Gesätze; Was kann ich machen, um Sie zu helfen? Ich möchte Sie besser kennen). Phrases such as Ich bin begeistert, beim Naturschutzbund zu arbeiten illustrate accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage. Many complex and compound sentences are correct, or almost correct, for example Ich habe Interesse an Ihre Organization und ich möchte mehr Information bekommen. The register and tone of the e-mail are formal and consistent. This response received a score of 5.
Sample: 1B  
Score: 3

This response constitutes a fair performance in interpersonal writing. It maintains the exchange with a response that is somewhat appropriate within the context of the task, but it is very basic with no elaboration. It answers the sender’s direct questions by stating the student’s preferred work and skills (Ich will am meistens mit teire arbeiten); the student also asks a question and refers to the attached form. The limited vocabulary is very repetitive (e.g., arbeiten), and the lack of idioms combined with only some control of grammar (Die Formular wird in der post morgen; ... dass ich so gut mit Tiere bist.) make this response very basic but generally understandable. The register includes some conventions of formal correspondence (Sehr geehrte Charlotte Fischer), but the closing (Vielen dank!) is inappropriate. The sentences are both simple and compound, but they contain numerous errors in syntax. This response received a score of 3.

Sample: 1C  
Score: 2

This e-mail is a minimally appropriate response that only partially maintains the exchange. It starts promisingly with a polite statement: Ich bin sehr interessiert mit Sie zu arbeiten. What follows is a description that mentions the student’s love of nature but fails to answer the specific questions asked by the sender: Meinem ganzen lebe habe ich neben einem Berg und ich hat nature meinem ganzen lebe liebt. The student then inquires about how many people are wanted. The vocabulary in the response is limited, as can be seen from an overuse of the phrase ganzen lebe and the English word “nature.” The brevity of the e-mail is a further demonstration of limited vocabulary. The control of grammar, syntax, and usage is limited as well: ich hat ... liebt; wollst du haben. The use of register includes some conventions of formal interpersonal correspondence, but the inadequate task completion and the brevity of the response make this e-mail a weak performance in interpersonal writing; it accordingly received a score of 2.