

## *Trinity Certificates in ESOL Skills for Life*

# Entry 3

# Speaking and Listening sample performances

## Trinity marks and comments on candidate performance

### Introduction

These notes should be used in conjunction with the DVD/website examples of Trinity ESOL examinations. These video samples were filmed under real exam conditions. Sometimes short edits have been made but these examinations are a true record of what Trinity examinations are all about. They are not presented as examples of 'best practice' and do not attempt to show the perfect examination from either the candidate's or examiner's perspective. Trinity oral examinations are a direct test of a candidate's interactional skills and therefore all the human factors of normal everyday interaction have to be taken into account when observing them.

Whilst you're watching, concentrate on the specific task type as well as on the language and communicative strategies used by the candidate. Refer to the Entry 3 syllabus for the task-specific mark schemes for each task. The generic performance descriptors, which are listed in our Introduction Booklet, have been reproduced below, for your reference. Trinity examiners use these to decide the extent to which a candidate has achieved the criteria stated in the task-specific mark scheme.

**There are three samples of Entry 3 (Trinity Certificates in ESOL Skills for Life Speaking and Listening Entry 3) exams.**

## Generic performance descriptors - Speaking and Listening

These generic descriptors are to be used in conjunction with the Task-specific mark scheme for each task at each level.

**For each task at each Entry level,** the examiner uses the three generic band performance descriptors to assess the candidate's performance on a 4-point scale.

**For each task at Level 1 and Level 2,** the examiner uses the three generic band performance descriptors to assess the candidate's performance on a 7-point scale.

Assessment strands	Secure pass	Pass	Below pass
Coverage of component skills, knowledge and understanding of the level  1. Speak to communicate 2. Listen and respond 3. Engage in discussion	The candidate's contributions provide sustained evidence of good coverage of the relevant component skill/s, knowledge and understanding throughout the task in each of the three standards. The candidate achieves the communicative purpose of the task with ease and independently without the need for support from the examiner.	The candidate's contributions provide some evidence of coverage of the relevant component skill/s, knowledge and understanding in each of the three standards. The candidate achieves the communicative purpose of the task but may need some support from the examiner to do so.	The candidate's contributions provide limited evidence of coverage of the relevant component skill/s, knowledge and understanding in each of the three standards. The candidate only partially achieves the communicative purpose of the task even with the support of the examiner.
4. Accuracy, range and appropriacy of the key language items of the level	The candidate uses a wide range of specified items successfully. These are well controlled and are used appropriately and consistently throughout the task. There are few inaccuracies.	The candidate attempts to use a range of the specified items. The candidate's contributions are mostly appropriate for the task and are generally well controlled although some inaccuracies may be evident but do not impede communication.	The candidate produces very few samples of the key language items. These are not well controlled and inaccuracies can impede communication. The candidate's contributions may not, at times, be appropriate for the task.

## **Entry 3**

### **Artan**

Please note this examination reflects the 2006 Entry 3 syllabus.

Overall result: Below Pass (16/30)

Results breakdown:

<b>1) Individual Component</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>Task 1</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>Task 2</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>Task 3</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>2) Group Component</b>	<b>Mark</b>
Engage in discussion (Ed)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0

#### **Component One: Individual Interview**

##### **Task 1**

Artan manages to communicate some basic information and simple comparisons but is handicapped by frequent hesitations. His understanding of the examiner is adequate but an insufficient grasp of accuracy and appropriacy lets him down. There is confusion in his word order and use of tenses and adverbs.

##### **Task 2**

Hesitation is again a feature of this phase, with the result that the story remains unfinished within the given time. There is much searching for language and inaccuracies are frequent. The candidate clearly does not have the range or the fluency required for this level.

##### **Task 3**

Artan demonstrates an acceptable level of understanding and is able to respond with some idea of appropriacy but hesitation and inaccuracies are again highly evident.

#### **Component Two: Group discussion**

Very few of the structures in the syllabus for this level are attempted by Artan during the discussion. He attempts to take part in the discussion but his efforts are laboured and incomplete.

## Entry 3

### **Shazia**

Please note this examination reflects the 2006 Entry 3 syllabus.

Overall result: Pass (20/30)

Results breakdown:

1) Individual Component	Mark
<b>Task 1</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
<b>Task 2</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
<b>Task 3</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	<del>3</del> 2 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	<del>3</del> 2 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
<b>2) Group Component</b>	<b>Mark</b>
Engage in discussion (Ed)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0

#### Component One: Individual Interview

##### Task 1

In the first task, Shazia is sometimes hesitant in responding to the examiner's questions, though she clearly understands him. She achieves an acceptable level of accuracy and appropriateness, though there are some problems with word order and agreement.

##### Task 2

Though she is still hesitant at times, Shazia tells her story clearly, using a sufficient range of the language of the level with an acceptable degree of accuracy.

##### Task 3

Shazia performs particularly well in the role-play section and is able to listen and respond to the examiner and communicate more readily than in other components.

#### Component Two: Group discussion

Unfortunately, Shazia does not get involved in the group discussion for most of the time, especially when she could have sought the opinion of others, and produces such a small sample of the language that it is impossible to assess her at more than the minimum mark. This example shows the importance of facilitator intervention during the group discussion in order to give quieter candidates like Shazia an opportunity to participate.

## Entry 3

### **Rizgar**

Please note this examination reflects the 2010 Entry 3 syllabus.

Overall result: Below Pass (16/30)

Results breakdown:

1) Individual Component	Mark
<b>Task 1</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>Task 2</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>Task 3</b>	
Speak to communicate (Sc)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Listen and respond (Lr)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 2 <del>1</del> 0
<b>2) Group Component</b>	<b>Mark</b>
Engage in discussion (Ed)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0
Accuracy, range and appropriacy (ARA)	3 <del>2</del> 1 0

#### **Component One: Individual Interview**

##### **Task 1**

Although Rizgar's speech isn't always clear, he compares the way families live in his country and the UK (e.g. the living arrangements in houses) and makes comments about the differences in weather. He asks the examiner some (not always well formed) questions, and maintains the conversation though he does at times lack clarity. He doesn't seem completely prepared but he is able to listen and respond appropriately. Rizgar doesn't produce many examples of the key language items and there are inaccuracies in his language which impede clarity and communication ('...*weather...my country better here.*')

##### **Task 2**

Rizgar is obviously trying to remember a story he has learnt off by heart and, as he struggles to remember it, his communication is unclear. For example, it's difficult to decipher that a man is by the river and hears calls for help. As Rizgar produces very little language and is focusing on remembering his story, he produces very few samples of the key language items. The language he does produce is not well controlled ('*was boy in the river...very dangerous. He was in water was water very deep.*')

**Task 3**

Rizgar communicates his story of the events in the role play and expresses statements of fact (e.g. describing the woman in the shop), but doesn't make requests or ask questions. He responds to the examiner's instructions quite quickly and appropriately but does need a bit of support at the beginning of the role play, and he doesn't use strategies to clarify or confirm understanding. Rizgar produces very few samples of the key language and this is not well controlled (*'Morning near eleven o'clock', 'Some lady taking my bag.'*). He is not able to produce the language of the level although he can describe the woman.

**Component Two: Group discussion**

Rizgar doesn't seem to follow the main points of the discussion at the beginning, as he ignores what the others have said. However, he does make relevant contributions as the discussion progresses as he talks about the other man's children and joins in the barbecue joke. Rizgar attempts to use a range of the items and his language is generally well controlled (e.g. contributions about the weather and transport). He does better here than in the individual component of the exam.