



Oral component

GENERAL COMMENTS

Most students performed well in both sections of the Hebrew oral examination this year, although more thorough preparation could have improved the performance of some students.

Most students were able to satisfy the components of the three main assessment criteria: communication, content and language. However, students' scores for the language criterion were somewhat lower than those awarded for communication and content. Students' vocabulary was generally adequate and they were able to express themselves well. However, the use of genders, tenses and personal pronouns was sometimes incorrect.

Students who performed well in the Conversation section were usually able to discuss their chosen sub-topic in some detail in the Discussion section. Similar grammatical and lexical errors were made in both sections of the examination.

Students who are proficient in Hebrew grammar and syntax and are active speakers are usually able to discuss most topics confidently.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Conversation

This section consists of a conversation about students' personal worlds, including home life, family, school, hobbies, work and personal aspirations, and most students were able to converse fluently on these topics. They were enthusiastic and their communication was excellent. Few students relied on rote-learned answers. The more proficient students used a wide range of vocabulary and communicated confidently.

Section 2 – Discussion

Generally, students researched their sub-topics thoroughly and had detailed knowledge of their resources. Most students were able to support their opinions by referring to the texts they had studied. Students dealt with a wide range of aspects of their sub-topics and this made the discussion interesting. Some students brought photographs and other visual materials to the examination and used these materials to highlight their opinions effectively.

The more successful students spoke fluently, were able to develop an in-depth discussion and could demonstrate their own insights. The less successful students were hesitant, struggled to understand assessors' questions and found it difficult to give relevant answers. It was evident that some students had rote-learned material from their resources and as a result their capacity to develop the discussion was reduced.

The topics chosen should be appropriate to the student's language ability as some topics were handled well by some students but less well by others. Some sub-topics did not provide the student with sufficient enough scope in order to develop the discussion.