



### Written examination

The written examination consisted of three sections: Section One: Listening; Section Two: Viewing and reading; and Section Three: Written communication (Stimulus response in Part A and Extended response in Part B). Candidates were required to attempt all questions in Section One, Section Two and Part A of Section Three. They had a choice of one out of three questions in Part B of Section Three.

Attempted by 63 candidates	Mean 64.15%	Max 93.50%	Min 18.00%
Section means were:			
Section One: Response: Listening	Mean 63.65%		
Attempted by 63 candidates	Mean 19.10(/30)	Max 29.00	Min 3.00
Section Two: Response: Viewing and reading	Mean 64.60%		
Attempted by 63 candidates	Mean 25.84(/40)	Max 39.00	Min 5.00
Section Three: Written communication Part A: Stimulus response	Mean 59.95%		
Attempted by 62 candidates	Mean 7.19(/12)	Max 11.50	Min 0.00
Section Three: Written communication Part B: Extended response	Mean 67.42%		
Attempted by 63 candidates	Mean 12.13(/18)	Max 16.50	Min 2.50

### General comments

As in previous years, most candidates scored higher marks for the practical component than the written component. In the practical examination, candidates performed well when they were discussing the stimulus. Their performance fell short of expectations during conversation when they could not rely on rehearsed language to express their views. In the written examination, there was a noticeable improvement in the quality of answers to Question 33 (Written communication: Stimulus response). However, in other parts of the written paper, candidates frequently answered questions with verbatim translations of irrelevant passages from the listening and reading texts. This indicated that candidates might not have read the texts and the questions carefully.

### Practical examination

Overall, candidates' used accurate language in their responses; however, the range of language they used was limited.

#### Advice for candidates

- Incorporate a wider range of vocabulary when you discuss the stimulus questions.
- Focus more on language accuracy and the flow of speech when you are engaging in a conversation.

#### Advice for teachers

- Devote more resources to help students develop spontaneous speaking skills. This involves much more than just public speaking training. It also incorporates listening and responding skills necessary for dynamic face-to-face interactions. Ideally, a strategy of encouraging spontaneous interactions needs to be built into routines in all second language classrooms.

### Written examination

All sections of the examination were well attempted, with no evidence of time management issues as was apparent in previous examinations. Candidates' performance was strongest in the extended answer section and weakest in the extended response section. They performed evenly in the listening and reading sections of the paper.

### *Advice for candidates*

- You are advised against translating lengthy portions of the texts when you are answering questions. A more productive way of using time is to focus on carefully reading the texts, understanding the questions, and constructing answers that address the questions.
- When you are answering the written communication questions, read the questions carefully to make sure your responses are relevant.

### *Advice for teachers*

- Highlight the importance of reading the questions carefully when preparing your students for the examination.

## **Comments on specific sections and questions**

### **Practical examination**

#### **Part B: Discussion of stimulus (25 Marks)**

There was an improvement in language accuracy from last year's results. However, the range of language used and candidates' responses to questions were less satisfactory.

#### **Part C: Conversation (25 Marks)**

Lower marks were awarded for language accuracy, responses to questions and the flow of speech than in the previous section of the examination. Many candidates experienced difficulties when they were required to engage in spontaneous communication.

### **Written examination**

#### **Section One: Response: Listening (30 Marks)**

Most candidates did well in multiple-choice questions. Those candidates who consistently scored high marks in Listening questions that required longer answers also did well in other parts of the written examination paper.

#### **Section Two: Response: Viewing and reading (40 Marks)**

This year many reading comprehension questions were designed with explicit scaffolding structures to make the texts more accessible to the candidates. This strategy was effective in helping candidates to produce answers that were relevant to the questions. However, candidates with less well-developed comprehension and responding skills continued to answer in ways that did not adequately address the questions.

#### **Section Three: Written communication Part A: Stimulus response (12 Marks)**

There was a noticeable improvement in the overall quality of answers to this year's stimulus response question.

#### **Section Three: Written communication Part B: Extended response (18 Marks)**

The numbers of candidates attempting the three optional extended response questions were more evenly distributed this year than in the past. Cases of candidates relying too much on rote learning of model texts were also less prominent than last year.