

### Writing Test K06 Scoring Guide for Writing Test K06 (F2000)

Directions for self-scoring: As soon as possible after your test, compare your test (or your recollection of it) with the performance profiles below. You should be able to judge the larger features (length, completeness) easily. As for judging detail and accuracy, a look through current and recent materials, especially dialogs and word lists, will almost surely help your evaluate (and help you learn more effectively by the vividness of the recollection). Mark each part at the performance level you think fits you (check-mark in the margin near the number at the left, circle around rating text, etc.). Total the points and put the total in the “Self-score” blank. Your instructor may choose to offer a “no-fault” test review the next class meeting after the test.

#### Part 1 (1/3) “cheat sheet”

<b>6</b>	The list is complete and very accurate, and includes anticipation of a complication (menu item not available, etc.). Food vocabulary does not “live” on K4. Questions include both YN and W- types, with word order and question-words (wieviel, etc.) accurate.
<b>5</b>	The list covers all major stages of the situation (greeting, asking about items, ordering with a polite phrase rather than just naming items, getting more of something, paying, and leave-taking). It is accurate enough that almost all of its words, if pronounced as written, would be comprehended readily. K6 content and structures are used freely but with some inaccuracy of form (but not concept). Could be brought to 6 with a few comments and a few minutes of rewriting.
<b>4</b>	The list will do the basic job of obtaining a full meal, though it has moderate “holes” in content or language (ex: payment stage is missing or one stage uses fragmentary language). Vocabulary and structures up through K4 are solid; K6 vocabulary & structures are present, though inaccurate. Could be brought to 5 with a few teacher comments and a few minutes of redrafting.
<b>3</b>	The list is more K4 (Imbiss) than K6, but what is there is accurate. Could be brought to 4 after a few hours of study and a few teacher comments.
<b>2</b>	K6 content and structures are very thin, and K4 material, however rich, is inaccurate; or, however accurate, is still thin. Reading 3 would need many comments and several hours of study.
<b>1</b>	Just a few words, mostly distorted.

#### Part 2 (1/3) phone msg notes

<b>6</b>	All 4 parts are addressed fully and accurately. Indicators: möchten (spelling and use with another verb); past tense hatte- or rich use of war-; hotel vocabulary accurate in spelling, gender and plural; accomplishes item 4 with vielleicht; ich weiß, Sie haben nicht viele Zimmer; or similar; uses and accurately distinguishes nicht & kein.
<b>5</b>	most of 6; could be brought to 6 with a few minutes of rewriting and a few teacher comments.
<b>4</b>	Accomplishes items 1, 2, & 3 with simple but basically accurate language, and makes a fairly successful attempt at item 4, maybe using oder. Could be brought to 5 with brief study and some teacher comments.
<b>3</b>	Does 1, 2, and 3 with simple and moderately flawed language, or else two of the three are done very well but the third is very weak or absent; essentially no success with item 4. Could be brought to 4 with a few hours of study and some teacher comments.
<b>2</b>	Fragmentary content expressed in fractured language.
<b>1</b>	Like 2, but only a few words

#### Part 3 (1/3) special interest

<b>6</b>	The task is accomplished fully, in language that shows mastery of K1-6, with vocabulary that shows the writer has gained from projects and special-interest activities (or has learned family-term vocabulary systematically).
<b>5</b>	Writer clearly has acquired some systematic special-interest vocabulary; carries out the task with accurate basic language.
<b>4</b>	a) Writer uses some (more than a few) special-interest words; carries out the task, but with more than a few errors in basic language (main tenance [=4-level] language breaks down under stress of higher-level task); or, b) Writer produces current language richly and quite accurately, but shows little special-interest vocabulary.
<b>3</b>	Writer seems not to have acquired much specialized vocabulary at all, and writes a generalized message which is simple but still accurate enough to be understood.
<b>2</b>	Essentially no specialized vocabulary; much distortion even in simple language, or else very little, though perhaps accurate, language.
<b>1</b>	Few words, mostly distorted