GFL

German as a foreign language

Portfolio Assessment in College-level Business German Courses: "Finding a Job in Germany"

Joshua R. Brown & Beate Brunow

Eau Claire, Wisconsin & Spartanburg, South Carolina

Portfolio Assessment in College-level Business German Courses: "Finding a Job in Germany"

Joshua R. Brown & Beate Brunow

Eau Claire, Wisconsin & Spartanburg, South Carolina

Communicative language teaching has been a hallmark of foreign language pedagogy in the US and abroad since the 1970s. Although classroom instruction and teaching materials are based on communicate teaching methods and ACTFL's five Cs and standards for foreign language learning, assessment warrants additional attention. Most forms of assessment in the communicative classroom still coincide with grammar-translation and audio-lingual methods. This article presents a model for a learner-portfolio in a Business German class as a form of assessment that can mend the disconnect between instruction and assessment by focusing on communicative abilities, cultural awareness, and real-world application, while also integrating skill-based knowledge. Although the portfolio project is conceived for the Business German classroom, its structure is readily applicable to other German courses. The article invites instructors to carefully examine the relationship between instruction and assessment and proposes ways of addressing the potential gap between the two.

1. Introduction: Communicative Language Teaching and Portfolio Assessment[1]

Since pioneering work by the late Dell Hymes (1971) on communicative competence and later applications of his theory into practice by Sandra Savignon (1972), many language programs both in the United States and abroad use communicative language teaching (CLT) as their approach to teaching a foreign language. In addition, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages incorporated communicative competence into their Standards for Foreign Language Learning, or the 5 Cs: communication, communities, cultures, comparisons, connections (Phillips & Abbott 2011). Competency in these areas equips students to communicate in an appropriate and meaningful way; moreover, these proficiency guidelines have influenced and

strengthened the practices of CLT (Brandl 2008:6). The standards frame communication not only in terms of the four basic skills but stress three modes of communication: interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational. Still, there is a tendency to remain focused on a skill-oriented approach to develop communicative competence instead of using CLT as a task-oriented approach that takes socio-cultural components into consideration (Brandl 2008:7; Schultz 2001:13). As a result, programs fall short of instituting the complete range of principles defined in both the 5 Cs and CLT (cf. Canale & Swain 1980; Doughty & Long 2003) and fail to develop appropriate types of assessment that reflect an integrated approach to instruction and evaluation (Shrum & Glisan 2000). This paper presents a learner-portfolio with the topic "Finding a Job in Germany" in a Business German class (third semester) as an assessment tool that mends the disconnect between communicative teaching methods and assessment by focusing on communicative abilities while also integrating skill-based knowledge.

Over the last twenty years, portfolios have been implemented as a student-centered teaching and learning approach and as a form of assessment in a wide variety of institutions and departments in Canada and the United States (Wright & Hartley 2009: 223f). Portfolios have come to be seen as appropriate forms of formative assessment in communicative classrooms, because they measure the quality of language ability, incorporate both spoken and written language, are context specific, longitudinal, and focus on both macro- and micro-skills (Hewitt 1995; Porter & Cleland 1995).[2] As a method of formative assessment, portfolios are developed throughout the semester to incorporate a wide variety of activities that are used in the classroom. Students become freer to express themselves in the language and more open to receiving and negotiating meaning in the foreign language. In gaining confidence in the foreign language classroom, learners develop not only more focused motivation, but a more positive outlook on learning the language.

---

[1] The authors thank Sandra Savignon, Carrie Jackson, and anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier versions of this article. Any errors that remain are our own.

[2] Our approach to paper-based portfolio assessment can easily be transferred to e-portfolios by using platforms such as LinguaFolio or the Global Language Portfolio (US adaptations of the European Language Portfolio), or as part of classroom management systems such as Blackboard, Moodle or Desire to Learn. The e-portfolio environment provides additional benefits to learners, such as more creativity with format and the kind of electronic evidence that can be added (audio and video), but may also bring with it some pitfalls in terms of technology skills (see Cummins and Davesne 2009; Cummins 2007; Yancey 2001 for a detailed discussion on advantages and challenges of e-portfolios).

Learner-portfolios present a "purposeful collection of students' work" (Genesee & Upshur 1996: 99) and document engagement with and reflections on language learning. Creating a portfolio requires that learners set goals, assess their learning outcomes, analyze and select evidence of their learning, and reflect on the process. Portfolios encourage learners to take a creative and reflective approach to their language learning and to develop their own voice in a different language, while reflecting on their language development and experiences. In addition, portfolios facilitate and prompt interaction and conversation between students and instructor about language goals, outcomes, and learning in general. A review by more than thirty authors concerned with the potential strengths of portfolios,[3] determined that portfolios have the

> "potential to document student growth and achievement, to encourage student reflection and self-evaluation, […], to provide evidence of learning processes as well as the products of learning, to help align instructional goals and assessment practices, [and] to provide evidence of learning outcomes" (Wright and Hartley 2009: 224).

As an approach to foreign language teaching, CLT stresses the dynamic negotiation of meaning as it is expressed and interpreted by interlocutors. Assessment is usually the least communicative of all classroom practices, in that discrete testing of isolated structural features of language often remains the norm (McNamara and Roever 2006). Due to ease of development and grading, assessment often reverts to grammar-translation in presentation, even while the day-to-day classroom management more closely aligns with CLT. Such activities signal a strong disconnect between communicative teaching and the form of assessment, further questioning the validity of such forms of assessment for the foreign language classroom focused on communicative abilities and on how communication interacts with the other Cs. Most recently, Cummins and Davesne (2009) and Abrams et al. (2006) have pointed to the opportunities available in qualitative portfolio assessment with regard to evaluating communicative proficiency and intercultural competence. Cummins and Davesne point to the opportunities for integrating authentic assessment through real-life situations and context that allows "students to imagine themselves operating effectively in the target culture" (857). Similarly, Adams et al. stress the active engagement with the L2 based on the authentic material and student-centered orientation of portfolios (89).

---

[3] The pitfalls of portfolios relate generally to the pragmatics of their implementation, i.e. informing instructors and students about the purpose and guidelines, providing a clear plan and schedule, and training teachers on assessing portfolios.

Portfolios are exemplary tools to reflect the principles of communicative language assessment, according to Savignon (1997), as they require dynamic negotiation of meaning with measurements of both written and spoken language. Assessment should incorporate a range of activities not just focused on the discrete traditional skills of listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Rather, assessment should holistically appeal to the expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning in the foreign language. Portfolios can accomplish this by providing authentic contexts and involving students in real-world tasks in which communication occurs in a meaningful context. In addition, Savignon (1997) argues that forms of assessment should present observable performance and be ongoing, i.e., formative. This does not mean that assessment needs to become the central point in the language classroom. In effect, the opposite is true. With formative assessment (in its widest sense), students continually prepare materials as part of their assessment. Furthermore, foreign language assessment should appeal to a wide variety of skill sets that are necessary beyond the language classroom. Especially in recent academic climates, where language courses are not always deemed necessary, the ability of the language classroom to overtly develop cognitive competencies employed in other areas of a student's life warrant their incorporation into assessment. To this end, communicative language assessment should incorporate both macro-skills (e.g., using context) and micro-skills (e.g., skimming and summarizing). To heighten students' knowledge of language and its role in the human experience, metalinguistic knowledge should also be a hallmark of communicative language assessment. These aspects, in particular, refine students' language abilities and provide a more pronounced opportunity for students to display their language skills (Bachman 1990:104-7; Bachman & Cohen 1998; Savignon 1997). The emphasis on these abilities and the structuring of assessment tasks around them make communicative assessment increase its accountability—in other words, we test what and how we teach (McNamara 2000).

In addition to addressing the characteristics of communicative assessment, it is advantageous to also attend to the goals of communicative assessment in order to more deeply appreciate both the expected validity and reliability of the assessment tasks and types. Savignon (1997) proposes that communicative assessment should measure progress, be a factor of motivation, show L2 learning strategies, and be an assurance for real world preparedness. By measuring students' progress, their performance constitutes not only an observable and valuable indicator of their abilities to the instructor, but it

also provides students with a motivating outcome of their own language learning. Moreover, proficiency and progress should be measured qualitatively and not quantitatively. In direct opposition to ALM approaches, communicative assessment evaluates the quality, type, application, and appropriateness of the utterance within a context and not the isolated amount of language, the amount of structural morphology, or the amount of rote learned rule applications that are used.

2. Business German Portfolio: "Finding a Job in Germany"

Business German courses are strongly becoming a force in foreign language programs both within the U.S. and internationally. The usefulness of German for students in business, finance, and management is supported not only by Germany's industrial leadership in Europe, but also by the importance of German-speaking countries as a place for world commerce and business. Many universities offer Business German as a content and functionally-based alternative to more traditional language courses (Cothran & Gramberg 2000). This paper presents a business portfolio in a course at the intermediate level with a focus on providing an introduction to the business world in a German-language context. At this level, similar to Bolten's (1994) suggestions for desirable aspects of a business language class, new vocabulary, pragmatic competencies in performing business duties, cultural specifics of the German business etiquette and intercultural communication, as well as introductory information on creating an application, a *Bewerbungsmappe,* are stressed.

In order to create a meaningful portfolio assignment, the content and assessment aspects of the course need to be connected and play and an integral role in students' collection, presentation, and evaluation of the material. As stated before, a portfolio is a meaningful collection of materials that demonstrate and document students' work and engagement; it requires students to showcase their work, and compose a collection of authentic material (realia) based on their creativity and interests. The goal of the semester-long intermediate Business German portfolio is to compile a *Bewerbungsmappe* that can serve as a draft for "real world" job and internship applications; the underlying theme of the portfolio is "Finding a Job in Germany." The portfolio consists of the following sections: (Component 1) job advertisement with content questions and a writing prompt: "How qualified am I?", (Component 2) *Tabellarischer* Lebenslauf and Werdegang/

Ausführlicher Lebenslauf, (Component 3) interview: dream job, (Component 4) job application form and *Bewerbungsschreiben*, and (Component 5) interview: job interview. These activities were distributed throughout the semester with guidelines for completion and submission and assessment rubrics. Students compile all of the components into a complete portfolio for their own reflection on the activities and their learning progress.

The first portfolio assignment (Component 1) presents students with a reading selection taken from a real job advertisement on *stellenanzeige.de* (appendix 1). Students respond to provided content questions by skimming the text. As higher level vocabulary might be too difficult for intermediate students, questions such as "What is the position?" or "Where is the position?" will be broad enough that any job advertisement would fit (appendix 2). The students are then encouraged to find their own job advertisement from a popular website (stellenanzeigen.de), and find a job that they would not only like, but also be qualified for at the completion of their degree. Their qualifications for the job and a discussion of the job requirements itself are written in a short essay (appendix 3). Here we note not only the use of realia, but also the student-centered activities, where students find the job that interests them. Uses of micro-level skills like scanning a text to answer content questions and the progression from interpretation to expression are all hallmarks of communicative assessment. Students are graded on correct answers to the questions.

The second portfolio assignment (Component 2) is the presentation of a German *Tabellarischer Lebenslauf* and *Werdegang/Ausführlicher Lebenslauf* (a prose summary of job experiences and other abilities that is presented to the employer and also orally mediated during a job interview) from a German student (appendix 4). The students will not only be able to see the differences between an American and a German resume, but they will also be able to further explore the idea of a *Werdegang/ Ausführlicher Lebenslauf.* Both of these aspects differ from the American context, so students are gaining cultural knowledge and again work with realia based upon the concepts learned in class. The content questions based on the *Werdegang/ Ausführlicher Lebenslauf,* focus on one of the structural issues raised in an earlier textbook chapter: the four words for "when" and "if."

Examples:

(1) _____ Markus 23 Jahre alt war, war er mit der Uni fertig.

_____ Markus als Betriebswirt arbeiten will, braucht er EDV-Kenntnisse.

Although we are assessing knowledge of structure, the integration of this structure into context of key course components makes it useful and appropriate for the student. By relying on the textual evidence, students can insert the appropriate word. An added activity would be to leave the second half of the statements blank, allowing students to elaborate on the information gleaned from the text. Here we see that single sentences do not necessarily need to signal non-communicative.

Students are also asked to write their own *Werdegang/ Ausführlicher Lebenslauf*. By relying on the ones they interpreted earlier in the semester, students are aware of the cultural differences between American and German resumes. These cultural differences, more so than the *Fachsprache*, often insisted upon in courses of this nature, are much more valuable to the students (Gerulaitis 1986; Rollings-Carter 1992). Moreover, the *Werdegang*, by its nature, is a retelling of past events in the applicant's job/ life history. Since it is meant for formal situations, the imperfect tense is necessary. Here we see the use of structure in an authentic real world task that also has a strong cultural component. Furthermore, by allowing students to put their own backgrounds into print, they are applying their personal histories into the German context, as they present themselves as applicants. The *Werdegang* is submitted to the instructor, who reads, corrects with correction codes, and gives the first draft a grade. Students then resubmit the writing assignment with corrections for a final grade based not only on grammatical accuracy but also cultural compatibility (appendix 5).

As CLT includes both written and spoken language, the next portfolio assessment item (Component 3) is an interview that is completed in groups and digitally recorded in the language lab. Although not the semi-direct method of interviewing, but still involving recording (McNamara 2000: 82), this interview technique allows both student and peers to listen again to each other's interviews and focus (if necessary) on structural or content issues. The assessment for this interview, based on provided rubrics that assess content, clarity, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation will be done by those fellow students who conducted the interview (appendix 6). This allows not only for a greater dependency on learner autonomy (Schalkwijk et al. 2002) but also focuses on a more holistic scale of assessing the interview. Importantly, the interview has several steps. First, students record the interview. Then they fill out peer-evaluation forms. After they have read the evaluation forms from their peers, students write (in English)

their own reflection on their German competency. Before adding all of the materials to the portfolio (peer-evaluations, self-evaluations, and recording), the instructor completes the grading rubric (appendix 7).

In using realia, students' motivation comes from the extrinsic aspects of learning a second language, namely that there are practical applications for their own experiences and goals. The next section of the portfolio involves those aspects (Component 4). A generic job application form, readily available from the *Arbeitsamt* online is given to the students (appendix 8). Now that the students have compiled their work histories, looked at jobs, talked about their dream job, they are ready to apply for a job. Instructors use this critical moment in the semester to show students the nuances related to writing a German letter of interest and application. Form and differences between a German letter and American one are paramount, as are the more pragmatic aspects of letter-writing skills, conciseness and formality. While it is beyond the scope of this present article to go into depth of this stage, we present students with real examples of *Bewerbungsschreiben* and encourage them to try their own (appendix 9). Several days of writing workshops, including peer reading and revisions, as well as instructor monitoring produce a final product, which the students can truly "own."

The last part of the portfolio (Component 5) is an interview taking the form of a mock job interview. For this interview, the role of assessor changes from peers to the instructor (by variation, this is a measure seen to help in validity of oral testing, cf. Brown (2003, 2005)). It will be a more direct test (McNamara 2000:82), and as such employs a defined rating scale with level descriptors (McNamara 2000:40-1). The rubric (appendix 7) is the same as for the previous interview and is based loosely on Bachman & Palmer (1996) with considerations drawn specifically from caveats posited against a "native speaker norm" in most traditional forms of oral assessment (cf. Lantolf & Frawley 1985).

With the entire application packet together, students are nearly ready to submit their *Berwerbungsmappe* at the end of the semester. The final element is a reflection, which is the only section that does not undergo revision and is graded purely for completion. Students are prompted to look over their entire *Bewerbungsmappe* and to reflect not only on how their speaking and their writing has improved over the semester but also on intercultural differences and the cultural specifics of an application in Germany. Since the instructor has seen each of these components and graded them throughout the

semester, the student is aware of their language progress and is now forced to gauge their language growth over the course of the semester. The components of the entire *Bewerbungsmappe* to be turned in at the end of the semester are:

Table. Portfolio components.

Portfolio component	Description of task	Structural goals
Component 1: Stellenanzeige	printout of job ad found online	job-related vocabulary
	peer evaluation of job-search interview	subjunctive, wishes
	self-evaluation of job-search interview	subjunctive, wishes
	instructor evaluation of job-search interview	subjunctive, wishes
Component 2: Lebenslauf & Werdegang	resume /*Tabellarischer Lebenslauf*	job-related vocabulary, cultural awareness
	first draft of *Werdegang/ Ausführlicher Lebenslauf*	expression of own abilities, imperfect tense, time connectors (als, dann, etc.); if and when
	final draft of *Werdegang/ Ausführlicher Lebenslauf* with graded rubric	expression of own abilities, imperfect tense, time connectors (als, dann, etc.); if and when
Component 3: Traumjob	interview in groups on dream job	subjunctive, wishes
	peer evaluation of dream job interview	subjunctive, wishes
	peer evaluation of dream job interview	subjunctive, wishes
	instructor evaluation of dream job interview	subjunctive, wishes

Component 4: Anschreiben	first draft of letter of application /*Anschreiben*	higher level / formal writing skills
	final draft of letter of application with graded rubric	higher level / formal writing skills
Component 5: Vorstellungs-gespräch	instructor evaluation of interview	conversational past tense, time connectors, wishes
Component 6: Reflexion	student reflection	conversational past tense, time connectors, wishes

Importantly, this portfolio is not realized as a semester-long project that is submitted for grading at the very end. Rather, this is a semester-long project aimed at enhancing students' reflection on their own growth in the foreign language and culture and making metalinguistic connections between their abilities and what they produce in the foreign language. The portfolio is graded throughout the semester, creating a lessened end-of-semester workload for the instructor. As such, the portfolio's greatest strength, its longitudinal culmination of a semester's work, allows for the student to take on the role of assessor in their self-reflection of their progress with the language and culture.

3. Conclusion

Learner portfolios incorporate and integrate both the expression and interpretation of spoken and written language in business-related contexts. Students' performance is observable not only structurally but also culturally. It assesses students' language performance in a meaningful context, including macro-skills (such as summaries) and micro-skills (such as skim and scan reading of diverse resources). As formative assessment, it requires revisions and emphasizes students' accountability and responsibility, while providing ample opportunity for instructor feedback. Portfolios are complex assessments that increase student-instructor interaction and the amount of feedback provided by the instructor. Due to their complexity, we recommend that

instructors carefully plan for portfolio implementation in advance. The planning stage not only includes the creation of assignments/themes, rubrics and guidelines, but also of a careful consideration of the content connection between the in-class material and the portfolio.

On this note, a word must be said to instructors' time. A portfolio is more work, both for the students and for the instructor as opposed to standard, fill-in grammar-focused testing. However, we note the extreme amount of longitudinal growth and better retention of language and cultural information, as opposed to simple "cramming" before the test and then forgetting the material that was assessed. It is also important to remember that the instructor receives drafts and completed tasks for the portfolio throughout the semester and needs only to read through the reflection at the end of the semester. Again, this does amount to more work than grading fill-in grammar-focused tests; however, we have found our own motivation to be sparked by joining the students in their job-journey. We no longer fret about students not getting correct adjective endings over and over and instead enjoy learning about our students' interests and seeing their language progression since the beginning of the semester. The completed portfolio / *Bewerbungsmappe* is a reminder to us of their growth and dedication to the language over the course of the semester. If nothing else, the portfolio has inspired us in the classroom as well. We reiterate, however, that careful planning and timely feedback throughout the semester on the part of the instructor is extremely important for a smooth-running portfolio-based semester. We have included some elements for others to use in the appendices, but we insist that instructors adapt these activities for their own learners and their abilities.

The usefulness of some of the applications of other cognitive strategies in the portfolio, such as skimming texts and inferencing, stresses the importance of an integration of skills and not the isolated memorization of habit-based language behavior rigidly segregated into traditional "skills." This integrative aspect of communicative assessment makes it a much more holistic form of assessment. Importantly, no structural information from the textbook/ curriculum was compromised and neither cultural nor sociolinguistic information was omitted in the formation of this assessment. Its validity

and reliability as an effective measure of language progress stands out as an appropriate and successful component of the CLT curriculum.[4]

One of the challenges with learner portfolios lies in the continuity required for this kind of assignment. At the same time, however, this longitudinal approach to learning provides more opportunities for formative feedback and reflection on learning. We hope that the materials in the appendices will inspire instructors to use our portfolio sequences and to adapt them to their own curriculum.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012) *ACTFL Publications.* Retrieved September 5, 2012, from http://www.actfl.org/files/public/national-standards-2011.pdf [last accessed 1 February 2014].

Abrams, Zsuzsanna; Byrd, David; Boovy, Bradley; Möhring, Anja (2006) Culture Portfolios Revisited: Feedback from Students and Instructors. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 39 (1/2), 80-90.

Annis, Linda & Jones, Carolee (1995) Student Portfolios: Their Objectives, Development, and Use. In: Peter Seldin (ed.) *Improving College Teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 181-190.

Bachman, Lyle (1990) *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, Lyle; Cohen, Andrew D. (1998) Language Testing - SLA Interfaces: An Update. In: Lyle Bachman, Andrew Cohen (eds.) *Interfaces between Second Language Acquisition and Language Testing Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-31.

Bachman, Lyle; Palmer, Adrian (1996) Test Usefulness: Qualities of Language Tests. In: Lyle Bachman, Adrian Palmer (eds.) *Language Testing in Practice: Designing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17-42.

Bolten, Jürgen (1994) Wirtschaftsdeutsch—Quo Vadis? Empirische Grundlagen für die Erstellung von Lehrmaterialien. In: Bettina Cothran and Cherry Hill (eds.) *Handbook for German in Business and Technology.* American Association of Teachers of German, 9-26.

Brandl, Klaus (2008) *Communicative Language Teaching in Action. Putting Principles to Work.* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

---

[4] Although portfolios have been assessed for their implementation in various classrooms (see the references in the introduction), we present the idea of portfolio assessment as an alternative idea for Business German instructors. We hope that a continuation of this project will yield data for further publication. Anecdotal evidence from student evaluations indicate that students enjoyed the portfolios for two main reasons: 1) they were able to reflect and resubmit many of the components / were able to receive feedback from peers before submitting a final version and 2) they were considerably less-burdened with the stress of cramming for a test or final exam.

Brown, Annie (2003) Interviewer Variation and the Co-construction of Speaking Proficiency. *Language Testing* 20 (1), 1-25.

Canale, Michael; Swain, Merrill (1980) Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47.

Cothran, Bettina; Gramberg, Anne-Kathrin (2000) Business German: The Next Step, the Birth of a new Discipline. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 33 (2), 148-171.

Cummins, Patricia; Davesne, Celine (2009) Using Electronic Portfolios for Second Language Assessment. *The Modern Language Journal* 93, 848-867.

Cummins, Patricia (2007) LinguaFolio and Electronic Language Portfolios in Teacher Training. In: Margaret Ann Kassen; Roberta Levine, Kathryn; Murphy-Judy, Martine Peters (eds.) *Preparing and Developing Technology-Proficient L2 Teachers.* San Marco, TX: Computer Assisted Language Consortium. CALICO monograph series 6, 321-344.

Doughty, Catherine; Long, Michael (2003) Optimal Psycholinguistic Environments for Distance Foreign Language Education. *Language Learning and Technology* 7 (3), 50-80.

Genesee, Fred & Upshur, John (1996) *Classroom-based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerulatis, Renate (1986) Essential Cultural Information in German Business Courses and Suggestions for Teaching it. *Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German* 19 (1), 41-48.

Hewitt, Geof (1995) *A portfolio Primer: Teaching, Collecting and Assessing Students' Writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hymes, Dell (1971) Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory. In: Renira Huxley and Elisabeth Ingram (eds.) *Language Acquisition: Models and Methods.* London: Academic Press, 3-28.

Lantolf, James; Frawley, William (1985) Oral Proficiency Testing. A Critical Analysis. *Modern Language Journal* 69, 337-345.

McNamara, Tim (2000) *Language Testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McNamara, Tim; Roever, Carsten (2006) *Language Testing: The Social Dimension*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Phillips, June; Abbott, Marty (2011) *A Decade of Foreign Language Standards. Impact, Influence, and Future Directions*. ACTFL. Web, 9.Sept. 2012.

Porter, Carol; Cleland, Janell (1995) *The Portfolio as a Learning Strategy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rollings-Carter, Faye (1992) Job Interviews in German: An Innovative Project. *Unterrichtspraxis/ Teaching German* 25 (1), 46-48.

Savignon, Sandra (1972) *Communicative Competence: an Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Schalkwijk, Eus; Van Esch, Kees; Elsen, Adri; Setz, Wim (2002) Learner Autonomy and the Education of Language Teachers: How to Practice what is Preached and Preach what is Practiced. In: Sandra Savignon (ed.) *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 165-190.

Schultz, Jean Marie (2001) The Gordian Knot: Language Literature, and Critical Thinking. In: Virginia Scott and Holly Tucker (eds.) *SLA and the Literature Classroom.* Boston: MA, Heinle, 3-31.

Shohamy, Elana (1996) Competence and Performance in Language Testing. In: Gillian Brown, Kirsten Malmkjaer, John Williams (eds.) *Performance and Competence in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 136-151.

Shrum, Judith; Glisan, Eileen (2000) *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Spolsky, Bernard (1978) Introduction: Linguists and Language Testers. In: Bernard Spolsky (ed.) *Approaches to Language Testing*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1-19.

Yancey, Kathleen (2001) General Patterns and the Future. In: Barbara Cambridge (ed.) *Electronic Portfolios: Emerging Practices in Student, Faculty, and Institutional Learning*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 83-90.

Zubizaretta, John (2009) *The Learning Portfolio. Reflective Practice for Improving Student Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix 1 (Component 1): Stellenanzeige

Unser Unternehmen ist dank seines einzig-artigen Konzepts **Deutschlands größtes und erfolgreichstes Handelsunter-nehmen für Designmöbel**. In unseren 3.000 – 6.000 qm großen, elegant gestylten Filialen (München, Stuttgart, Köln, Düsseldorf, Paderborn, Hamburg und Berlin) verkaufen wir mehr als 200 internationale Einrichtungsmarken, vom exklusi-ven Polsterensemble bis zur auf-wändig geplanten Luxus-Wohnwand.

Weil wir rasant wachsen, weitere Neueröffnungen planen und unsere neueren Stores konsolidieren, suchen wir kompetente Verstärkung:

Verkäufer
Büromöbel (m/w) München – Berlin – Düsseldorf

o Sie sind topmotiviert, gehen gerne auf Menschen zu und haben Spaß am Verkaufen?

o Sie haben Persönlichkeit und sind überzeugend?

o Sie sind versiert, wenn es um hochwertiges Büromöbeldesign und planungssicher wenn es um individuelle Kundenwünsche geht?

o Sie verlieren nie das wichtigste Ziel aus den Augen; dass Ihr Kunde am Schluss seine Unterschrift unter Kaufvertrag setzt?

o Sie haben bereits mehrjährige Verkaufserfahrung im Büromöbelbereich?

Wenn Sie also der High-Performer sind den wir suchen, dann bieten wir Ihnen eine gesicherte Zukunft mit Perspektiven und ein erstklassiges Einkommen mit hohem garantiertem Basisgehalt.

Appendix 2 (Component 1): Stellenanzeige-Fragen

Was ist das Unternehmen?

Wo ist die Stelle?

Was ist die Stelle?

Appendix 3 (Component 1): Stellenanzeige-Schreibübung

Beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen schriftlich.

Welche Stelle haben Sie gefunden?

Wo ist diese Stelle?

Was müssen Sie machen? Was sind die Voraussetzungen?

Welche Stelle hat Ihr Partner / Ihre Partnerin gefunden?

Wo ist diese Stelle?

Was muss er / sie machen? Was sind die Voraussetzungen?

Appendix 4 (Component 2): Lebenslauf und Werdegang

LEBENSLAUF

Markus Rausch
Schollstraße 4
80331 München
Tel. 0178-4523
Email rausch.m1778@gmx.de

Geburtsdatum:	23.5.1989	in Berlin
Staatsangehörigkeit:		deutsch
Familienstand:		ledig, keine Kinder
Schule	2000-2007	Elisabethschule (Gymnasium)
Zivildienst	2007-2008	Evangelisches Bildungszentrum in Köln
Studium	2008-2012	Freie Universität, Berlin Fachrichtung BWL Bachelor
Berufliche Tätigkeiten	SS 2011	Wissenschaftliche Hilfskraft Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften
Besondere Fähigkeiten		sehr gute EDV-Kenntnisse
Sprachen		Englisch, Französich

München, den 5.8.2012

Markus Rausch

Ausführlicher Lebenslauf/Werdegang

Mein Name ist Markus Rausch. Ich wohne in der Schollstraße 4, 80331 München. Geboren wurde ich am 23.5. 1990 in Berlin. Ich schloss mein Abitur im Jahr 2008 an der Elisabethschule mit einer Durchschnittsnote von 2.5 ab.

Im Anschluss an mein Abitur, absolvierte ich einen zehnmonatigen Zivildienst am Evangelischen Bildungszentrum In Köln. Ich arbeitete im Hauptbüro der Tagungsstätte und war für organisatorische Tätigkeiten zuständig. Da ich mich für die Seminarangebote interessierte, unterstütze ich auch das Team-Erwachsenenbildung bei der Seminarplanung. Ich konnte durch meinen Zivildienst meine kommunikativen Fähigkeiten im persönlichen, schriftlichen und telefonischen Umgang mit Interessenten und Teilnehmern deutlich erweitern.

Nach meinem Zivildienst studierte ich für vier Jahre Betriebswirtschaftslehre an der Freien Universität Berlin. Ich schloss das Studium im Juli 2012 mit der Note 1.5 ab. Im Sommersemester 2011 war ich als wissenschaftliche Hilfskraft an der Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften tätig und leitete als Tutor Übungen für das Seminar *Grundlagen der Betriebswirtschaft*. Durch diese Tätigkeit konnte ich meine Kenntnisse erweitern und vertiefen.

Durch meine Arbeit am Evangelischen Bildungszentrum habe ich sehr gute EDV Kenntnisse und als Tutor habe ich meine Englisch und Französichkenntnisse durch den Umgang mit internationalen Studenten/Innen gefestigt.

Berlin, den 5.8. 2012.

Markus Rausch

Appendix 5 (Component 2): Instructor Grading Rubric

Category	Points	Points possible
Content		**10**
Grammar		**9**
Vocabulary		**9**
Style		**6**
First Draft Grade		**10**
Revisions		**6**
Total		**50**

Comments:

Appendix 6 (Component 3): Peer and Self-evaluation forms

Peer Evaluation Form

Name:

Evaluator:

Mark the following with a + (good) , ✓ (satisfactory), or – (poor)

Organization:

Content:

Vocabulary:

Grammar:

Clarity:

Which grammar mistakes occur repeatedly?

Are there any mistakes with pronunciation? Which?

Are there any mistakes with vocabulary? Which?

What are your suggestions for improvement?

Self Evaluation Form (after reading the peer evaluation)

Name:

What are your speaking strengths?

What are your speaking weaknesses?

What do you hope to improve on the next interview?

Appendix 7 (Components 3 & 5): Instructor grading rubric

Clarity	
10 – 9 pts.	- All utterances and cultural references were understood by both speakers.
8 – 6	- Few utterances/references were not understood by either speaker.
5 – 3	- Some utterances/references were not understood by either speaker.
2 – 0	- Little or no clarity on behalf of the interviewee.
Comments:	

Vocabulary	
10 – 9 pts.	- excellent use of appropriate vocabulary
8 – 6	- good use of appropriate vocabulary
5 – 3	- average to below average use of appropriate vocabulary
2 – 0	- use of only basic vocabulary; resorts to English
Comments:	

Fluency and Interaction	
10 – 9 pts.	- excellent command of German and creative language use
8 – 6	- good fluency and speaks with confidence in German
5 – 3	- basic fluency and is uncomfortable speaking German
2 – 0	- most utterances are short and incomplete
Comments:	

Grammatical Accuracy	
10 – 9 pts.	- excellent command of grammatical structures
8 – 6	- good command of grammatical concepts
5 – 3	- basic command of grammatical concepts
2 – 0	- many grammatical errors, which often interfere with comprehension
Comments:	

Pronunciation	
10 – 9 pts.	- excellent pronunciation
8 – 6	- good pronunciation
5 – 3	- basic command of pronunciation
2 – 0	- little attempt at good pronunciation
Comments:	

Appendix 8 (Component 4): Job application form

Deutsches Arbeitsamt

Nachname	Vorname		
Familienstand	Geburtsdatum	Staatsangehörigkeit	Telef.Nr.

Aktuelle Anschrift
Straße
PLZ   Ort

Ausbildungsdaten

Berufliche Tätigkeiten

Andere Fähigkeiten

Appendix 9 (Component 4). Letter of application.

Markus Rausch
Schollstraße 4
80331 München

Marburg Möbel GmbH
z.H. v. Frau Bettina Grund
Schillerplatz 12
35039 Marburg

München, den 15.12.12

Ihre Anzeige auf *stellenanzeige.de* vom 10.12.12

Sehr geehrte Frau Grund,

Zum Inhalt:

-um welche Stelle bewerben Sie sich?
-warum sind Sie der/die Richtige für diese Stelle?
-welche Anlagen folgen?
-würden Sie sich über die Gelegenheit zu einem Vorstellungsgespräch freuen?

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Markus Rausch

Anlagen:
Foto
Lebenslauf
Zeugnisse

Biographical details

Joshua R. Brown (Ph.D. in German and Applied Linguistics, minor in Linguistics, Pennsylvania State University) is Assistant Professor of German at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. His research interests include assessment and German-American studies. He has published and presented research on the interfaces of language and (religious, gender, sexual) identity, language shift and cultural change.

Beate Brunow (Ph.D. in German Literature and Culture, minor in Women's Studies, Pennsylvania State University) is Assistant Professor of German at Wofford College. She has worked as a graduate instructional consultant at the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence at PSU. Her research interests focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning and nineteenth century German women writers.

Key words

business German, communicative language teaching, portfolio, student-centered, intercultural learning