

<u>2004</u>

LOTE: Hungarian GA 3: Examination

GENERAL COMMENTS

Students who undertook the Hungarian examination in 2004 showed satisfactory language skills ranging from excellent to average. Students generally achieved an adequate level.

It is recommended that students choose the topic of their detailed study carefully. Their knowledge of the chosen topic should be more than just a speech that they have prepared. Students should be able to talk about the topic, form opinions and engage in discussion with the assessors. Students need to practise expressing their own opinion, not just relaying facts they have learned. They should also avoid repeating answers for different questions.

All students used very appropriate resources for the topics. Students need to be aware that the detailed study should be based on a sub-topic related to one or more of the topics listed on page 13 of the Hungarian Victorian Certificate of Education Study Design.

Students should note that reading poetry is **not** a discussion. Students must not divulge either their name or their teacher's name during the oral examination.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Conversation

Criterion 1

Communication: Students were able to communicate well and used well thought out and carefully structured sentences. Students were usually able to self correct major errors, although limited vocabulary was used in some cases.

Pronunciation: In some cases pronunciation was inaccurate; the 'T' sound was either weak or 'swallowed' altogether and the 'R' sound often fared similarly. Intonation was sometimes very level or even ascending, rather than descending at the end of the sentence as should be the case in Hungarian.

Most students performed adequately in this section, and some did well. Students presented a range of ideas and interacted well with the assessors, resulting in a good flow of conversation in most cases.

Criterion 2

The range of information on family, work and leisure was generally satisfactory. Stronger students were characterised by greater fluency. Weaker students either needed prompting, or for the assessors to reformulate a question before the student could respond. Most students were able to elaborate on the theme of school or family with relevant information on the topic, even if they lacked an extended vocabulary.

Criterion 3

Very able students showed an excellent variety of vocabulary, but this was less evident in weaker students. Grammar needed more attention overall. Often the 'T' of the accusative was omitted (*Matematika csinálok* or *csinálom gitár*), or the case ending (for example *-ba -be* or *-hoz -hez*) was interchanged (somebody *iskolához jár*). Anglicisms still occurred frequently; for example, the much commented upon *matematikát csinálok* instead of *matematikából készültem*.

Criterion 4

Vocabulary and grammar were not always accurate. Many students still gave the names of the subjects they studied in Year 12 in English. Students need to ensure that they are familiar with the correct Hungarian names and pronunciation of their subjects.

Students were quite often unaware of social conventions. Many still addressed the assessors in the familiar second person singular. This is socially unacceptable and quite incorrect.

The grammatical and syntactical errors and mistakes that occurred in the 'conversation' section were sometimes repeated in the 'discussion'. The instrumental *-val*, *-vel* was invariably used by the more hesitant students instead of using the assimilation by doubling the terminal consonants, as in case of terminal *-z*, *-s*, *-g* and others. *Kézvel* instead of *kézzel* and *szüleimvel* instead of *szüleimmel* were common problems. The use of singular nouns following definite or indefinite numerals also occurred (for example *minden tárgyakat* [sic]).

2004 Assessment Report



Section 2 – Discussion

Some students prepared Hungarian cuisine and customs as their topic of discussion, while others discussed the historical personages of *Attila*, *Mátyás király*, *Petőfi Sándor* and *Szent István*.

Criterion 5

Better students had no difficulty with expressions, and their pronunciation was close to perfect. On the other hand, weaker students were very slow to respond to questions, hesitating and often using English words. Weaker students did not know how to carry the conversation forward, despite encouragement and assistance from the assessors.

Criterion 6

Some students tended to rely on rote learning. Others were hesitant and stumbled over words and idioms, often needing prompting and support. Sometimes students repeated statements they had made previously instead of elaborating upon them. The historical topics resulted in a livelier exchange between student and assessors and a surprising degree of perceptive comment and original input. Many students often had solid, detailed information to offer, which was very pleasing.

Criterion 7

Opinions abounded in every type of topic. The underpinning of opinions with reason and evidence, however, was lacking in some instances.

Clarifications were not always adequate. Preparation was evident in all cases, but students have to be prepared with synonyms; for example *disznótor* presented some difficulties. This is a well used expression in preparing a slaughtered pig.

Students need to rely less on rote learning, and should practise the use of spontaneous conversation and be able to use either synonyms or provide an explanation.

Criterion 8 and 9

Limited vocabulary was evident in some cases. For example, 'newspaper' appeared as újságpapír, which does not mean newspaper, but newsprint. Similarly *kihímezte* does not mean 'embroider'. This seems to be a translated anglicism. *Bírok bírhatja* was used in lieu of *tudok. Bírni* is used in purely physical context; for example 'a weight is too heavy to carry' *nem bírom ezt a nehéz kosarat vinni*. The English expression 'it takes more time' can never be *használják több időt*, but rather should be *sok időt vesz igénybe* or *sok időt tölt el azzal*.

The definite and indefinite numerals are used with singular nouns. This is a recurring problem with some students. The numeral expresses multiplicity, therefore there is no need for plural nouns. Correct case endings and idiomatic expressions should also be revised.

Students should concentrate on acquiring an extended vocabulary. Often English words were used in the discussion, for example 'moral' instead of the Hungarian *becsület* (or *erény* depending on the context), 'criminal' instead of *bűnöző*, and 'history' instead of *történelem*. Some students may be translating from English, resulting in *királyos* instead of *királyi*, or *gazdag* where a plain *sok* would be better. Some students also had difficulty modifying suffixes, especially verbs from nouns; for example, instead of *csináltam tenisz* the simple *teniszezni* would do, keeping in mind that lots of such transformations exists in the language.

Criterion 10

Students could improve their pronunciation by focusing on the following areas: the 'T', which was often weak; and the 'R', which was very often an English 'R', not the rolling Hungarian, which indicated anglicised vocal patterns.

Students need to be aware that when choosing a topic from the Hungarian Victorian Certificate of Education Study Design, they must be able to provide the names of specific resources used to back up their discussion, as well as be able to extend the discussion to relevant points beyond the boundaries of the topic.