

### Part 3 : Open Ended Discussion (Flooding in Thailand)

The test taker produces stretches of language at a fairly even tempo. Although there is occasional hesitation while he searches for ideas, there are no noticeably long pauses. Communication is facilitated by the effective use of signposts. For example when listing the problems faced by flood victims he uses **first** and **second**. Then, to explain how the internet can be useful in disasters, he divides his response into two parts: **prevention** and **cooperation** or what he later describes as **pre** and **post-flooding**. In general, he expresses himself clearly, expanding his ideas and giving relevant examples.

In terms of grammatical range, he goes beyond the use of short, simple sentences, introducing a variety of connectors such as **and**, **but**, **also**, **because**, **so**, **in order to**, **without** and **after**. There is also evidence of some simple linking clauses. For example:

**The fast flood ... flow ... of information can prevent or at least warn the people that the water is coming .....**

In addition, the test taker demonstrates a range of functional language to talk about possibility, ability and to make recommendations. For example, in the case of the latter he suggests:

**I think the project of building a dam is not sustainable: they should interest ... put interest more in like growing forest to permanently absorbing excess water.**

He also produces a broad range of vocabulary, including some more specialised language. For example, he discusses the importance of ensuring the **fast flow of information** in the pre-flood phase and the need to **convey information quickly** in the post phase. He refers to the government's plan to build a dam in order to **redirect** or **divert the water**. He suggests that growing forests would help to **absorb excess water**. Appropriate to the discussion on project management, he expresses doubts about whether a particular project is **sustainable**.

While grammatical and lexical mistakes occur, they do not cause misunderstanding. For example, the test taker uses the present instead of past tense when talking about problems people faced in 2011.

**they don't have the place to live.... they don't have the place to eat, they don't have the electricity and water ..... they have to shut down a lot of factory.**

However, he goes on to use the simple past tense correctly, informing the interviewer that **at that time** *[the time of the floods in 2011]* **I was in the United States** and that Thai people there **did a lot of fundraising events and sent money to the Red Cross**. Errors do occur in the formulation of more complex sentences. Referring to protests against the building of a dam he says **you may see that the last 2 month** instead of **have seen**.

To sum up, the test taker performs well in terms of fluency and coherence. His pronunciation is clear and lexical range and accuracy is generally high. In addition, he produces a range of grammatical structures but is inconsistent in terms of accuracy. However, his mistakes do not cause misunderstanding. Therefore, the test taker is awarded a B2+ overall.

