Dear Sir/Madam,

Actually, I do not have a say regarding "Other Countries Standards", but I have a say about the OET itself. It is generally believed that the test should be reviewed for the following reasons:

First of all, the listening sub test is actually testing the copy-writing skills of the candidate and not the real understanding of the dialogue. I think this skill is not needed in a doctor clinic. I have never seen a doctor copying a patient complaint as fast as the OET tape.

Secondly, what does it mean to a patient in a clinic if his/her treating doctor can read a topic and answer all questions within the 20 or 30 minutes time limit in the reading sub test? Therefore, what is the meaning of such a highly sophisticated reading test for a general practitioner?

Thirdly, I think the writing component of the test is generally fair, except that the marking procedure is very strict.

Finally, the speaking sub test is totally agreed by almost all of the candidates I have met to be the most practical test for evaluation, in spite of the fact that many OET candidates have reported that when they are interviewed by a non-experienced OET examiner, their performance is adversely affected.

In conclusion, I believe that the English language test requirements should be reviewed. It is largely believed that the writing and the speaking (which tests the listening capacity at the same time) sub tests are the real components needed to apply for a GP job.

Let the competition for a job be in how many years of experience the applicant has, his/her personality and knowledge. All these can be judged in a 20 minute interview arranged and supervised by the state boards. To pass the writing sub test and then the interview (which tests the listening and the speaking components of the OET) will definitely put an end to the OET nightmare.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Kind Regards,

Dr. Dawood Sammour