



2013

Languages: Sinhala GA 3: Examination

Oral component

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, student performance in the 2013 Sinhala oral examination was very good. Most students were well prepared for the Discussion, but less well prepared for the Conversation.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Conversation

In this section some students did not elaborate much on information about their family, hobbies and future aspirations, and there were a few instances where assessors needed to ask many questions in order to extend the conversation. Many students responded to questions well but did not state their own ideas and opinions. A few students performed at an excellent level.

Communication

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

In most instances students responded well to questions and demonstrated a very good level of understanding. A few students were able to converse spontaneously, but there were some who often needed support in order to carry the conversation forward. Some students did not employ repair strategies, even when English terms were used.

Content

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

Most students presented a good range of information, but there was a lack of elaboration in some areas. Only a few students presented their own opinions and ideas and were able to clarify their statements. Students are reminded that they must prepare thoroughly.

Language

Criterion 3 – Accuracy of vocabulary and grammar

In most instances, students used appropriate vocabulary and grammar. The information was presented clearly in correct sentence structures. Few students used rote-learned language.

Criterion 4 – Range and appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar

In most instances a limited and simple vocabulary was used. An appropriate style and register was not used in most instances. Students are reminded that they should refer to their parents in a culturally appropriate manner, and that it is not like referring to a friend.

Criterion 5 – Clarity of expression

In most instances pronunciation was very good or excellent. More attention needs to be paid to stressing important facts, and using correct intonation and tempo, rather than only presenting the information.

Section 2 – Discussion

Communication

Criterion 6 – Capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively

Most students had a very good level of understanding and had the capacity to link well with assessors. There were also a few excellent students who carried the discussion forward with some original input. Most were able to respond readily and confidently. There was a very small number of students who hesitated or paused.

Content

Criterion 7 – Capacity to present information, ideas and opinions on a chosen topic

Most students showed a very good to excellent level of preparation. The information presented was relevant to the topic but often students' ideas and opinions were not included. In these cases, the Discussion was more like a presentation as students simply gave the information they had collected.

2013 Examination Report



Criterion 8 – Accuracy of vocabulary grammar

In general, students maintained good control of vocabulary relevant to the topic and used it appropriately. They used sentence structures correctly to express meaning. However, there were a few instances where students relied on rote-learned language that was not relevant.

Criterion 9 – Range and appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar

The vocabulary ranged from simple to excellent levels. Students were able to present information using accurate grammar. They demonstrated a very good awareness of appropriate style and register.

Criterion 10 – Clarity of expression

Most students' pronunciation was excellent. A few students used tempo and intonation to stress important facts and points. Students are reminded to use intonation, tempo and stress when giving information and expressing ideas and opinions.