

## SPEAKING AND LISTENING COMMENTARIES JUNE 2011 EXEMPLARS

### Candidate 1

Zwiwuya presents to us his view of the two political leaders he has chosen to compare. We are certainly clear by the end that he feels Mandela is more worthy of being described as an “icon” than Obama. His ideas and opinions are initially supported by clearly expressed opinions, although towards the end, his talk he tends to become repetitive. Although there are occasional lapses, Zwiwuya shows he is able to use standard English vocabulary and grammar effectively most of the time. He is able to talk directly to the camera quite well, although his wandering eye-line is distracting. Overall, the structure of this presentation lacks shape and direction and peters out rather than concluding strongly and clearly.

A mark of 9 at the top of Band 3 is appropriate

### Candidate 2 (Nahvoma)

Throughout this performance, Nahvoma seems to be working with a pre-prepared script. This is most obvious when she appears to forget the lines and has to step out of character to compose herself before continuing. The effort of concentration means that her eye contact is often down towards the floor rather than outwards to engage with her audience. This is a pity because there is much to commend in what she does achieve. She uses variations of intonation, pace and volume; she occasionally attempts to catch the language of the farm hand, for example at the beginning: “He hadda. He hadda do it.” She does use some gestures and introduces movement when she gets up and sits down at one point. There are certainly moments when she delivers her lines really well, for example the section where she compares the two mercy killings. At over two and half minutes, this is also a sustained piece of work. Had she performed this piece without the limitations initially indicated above, this would have been a very effective piece. As it is, best fit places it on the boundary between Bands 3 and 4.

A mark of 10 at the bottom of Band 4 is appropriate.

### Candidate 3 (Zahraa)

Zahraa performs a very engaging monologue, in role as Curley’s wife from *Of Mice and Men*. Her language, though not especially complex, is appropriate to character. Her facial expressions and eye contact support the variations in her tone, volume and pace to create a subtle range of moods across the performance. She does draw well on the novel, but it is important to remember that she is not being marked on how well her character aligns with the Steinbeck text. She is assessed on the extent to which she develops and sustains a character role: how well has she “become someone else in an ‘as if’ situation”. In her sustained portrayal of a lonely woman, Zahraa skilfully uses verbal and non-verbal techniques to create a complex and convincing character. The occasional repetitions and rare hesitations are minor flaws in a performance which clearly merits a mark in Band 5.

A mark of 15 is appropriate.

### Candidate 4 (Sheena)

Sheena is the fulcrum for much of this discussion, providing a reflective exploration of the series of images through her thoughtful and purposeful contributions. She presents her ideas clearly, using some variety of vocabulary, in a series of extended contributions. It is Sheena who seeks to provide a wider interpretation of the meanings of the texts, for example at the end of the discussion where she goes beyond description and engages with the symbolic meaning of images - of a “traditional London” being changed by terrorism. Her questions are apt, but they often seem to be voiced as much to help her analyse and reflect as to try to draw ideas from others. She uses a variety of intonation and eye contact to engage with Nahvoma, though less so with Zvitendo and Ajay. Overall, Sheena is at her best when offering ideas rather than responding to others. She does respond to ideas offered, but she cannot really be said to encourage participation – it is left to Zvitendo to try and throw a lifeline to Ajay, for example.

A mark of 11 in Band 4 is appropriate

Candidate 5 (Ajay)

When Ajay does contribute to the discussion, he speaks precisely, thoughtfully and with at least some authority. He offers his own view of the possible location where the initial image is set early on, citing evidence to support what he says. On the other occasion where he intervenes without being prompted by Zvitendo, he raises an interesting point about how the images are being used to position the way readers view terrorism. On the two occasions when Zvitendo specifically invites Ajay to engage, he offers some ideas and supports them with evidence, although his final comment on the dates, he admits, is something of a cul-de-sac. There is a clear sense that there is more to Ajay than he has managed to show in this discussion. However, on the very limited evidence he provides us with, he can only be said to have done “some” of each point in the Band 2 descriptors.

A mark of 5 in the middle of Band 2 would be appropriate.