



2011 Languages: Sinhala GA 3: Examination

Oral component

GENERAL COMMENTS

In the 2011 examination, student performance was generally of an average standard; only a few students performed at a high or excellent standard.

It was evident that some students were not aware of the requirements of the Conversation section. For example, some students mentioned their names, the names of their parents and their family members, and the names of their schools. Some students struggled to speak on the topic of family and assessors had to ask questions to return them to the topic.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Conversation

Criterion 1 – Capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively

Criterion 5 – Clarity of expression

Most students responded confidently to the questions asked, demonstrating a very good level of understanding. There were a few instances where assessors had to ask many questions to enable the continuation of the conversation as the information provided by the student was very brief. Some students used repair strategies to correct mistakes in pronunciation and when English terms were used.

Most students had excellent pronunciation and intonation, but correct stress and tempo were rarely evident. Improvement is needed in this area.

Criterion 2 – Relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinion and ideas

Some students were not well prepared and struggled to provide sufficient information in response to questions in order to continue the conversation for seven minutes. In these instances assessors had to ask many questions. Other students were very well prepared, providing sufficient information, elaborating on and supporting the information with examples, and expressing their opinions and ideas.

Criterion 3 – Accuracy of vocabulary and grammar

Criterion 4 – Range of appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar

Many students used accurate grammar and appropriate vocabulary. However, the range of vocabulary was very limited in many instances.

Section 2 – Discussion

The topics chosen for the discussion were very appropriate, and were based on aspects of arts and entertainment, technological advancement and the environment. Most students evaluated and expressed their ideas and opinions to some extent during the discussion. There were a few instances where it was evident that students had rote-learned information.

Criterion 1 – Capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively

Criterion 5 – Clarity of expression

Most students were confident with the topic of their discussion. They linked with the assessors by answering the questions with confidence and many used good repair strategies. Pronunciation was very good in most cases but good stress and tempo was very rarely evident.

Criterion 2 – Relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinion and ideas

Most students were well prepared and able to provide good depth of information and express their views. Some students elaborated on and supported their views and opinions with examples, quotes and proverbs. Some students were less well prepared and the assessors had to ask further questions in order to extend the conversation.

2011 Assessment Report



Criterion 3 – Accuracy of vocabulary and grammar

Criterion 4 – Range of appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar

Most students used accurate grammar and vocabulary. There were a few instances where the range of vocabulary was excellent.