



## Oral component

### Conversation

Generally, students showed evidence of thoughtful preparation and adequate linguistic knowledge to maintain a satisfactory level of communication. There were more outstanding students whose fluency was excellent and fulfilled the various criteria well. Others were often hesitant, sometimes using English expressions that were repetitive. However, there were no serious shortcomings in this section.

#### Criterion 1 Capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively

Most students were competent in offering their facts and opinions to the assessors, and the level of interaction was well maintained with questions and exchanges flowing well. Responses from students, less sure of themselves had to be elicited.

#### Criterion 2 Relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinions and ideas

In most cases students informed themselves of the salient points of what they considered important for their individual needs, e.g. plans for the future or their leisure time activities. Information about their families was in all cases exhaustive and most students could give reasons and considered opinions. New ideas or lateral elaborations were not always evident in the less successful students. Reformulation of previous utterances overall was not infrequent.

#### Criteria 3 and 8 Accuracy of vocabulary and grammar

Vocabulary in most cases was adequate for effective communication, but variation is not strong for some students at the lower end of the scale. Students need to learn the correct Hungarian words for the subjects they prepare for Year 12 certificate, e.g. *történelem, kémia* or *vegytan*. remain unheeded. In Hungarian we do not „do” „*csinál*” subjects for any certificate, diploma or degree, we simply „*tanul*”, e.g. „*magyart, angolt, matematikát tanulok*” or in the past tense „*tanultam*” or differently formulated: „*magyarból ect. fogok vizsgázni*”. Many students do not understand the word „*készülni*” or „*felkészülni*” which is more or less the standard opening question by assessors to introduce the conversation on school or future plans. Students need to listen carefully to the question posed by the assessor, paying attention to the interrogative and the verb and use the same in your reply, e.g. „*Miből készültél az érettségire?*” The reply offers itself naturally: „*Magyarból, angolból, matematikából készültem a vizsgára*”.

The nature of discussion necessitates a larger, richer, and sometimes specialised vocabulary, and overall that was well in evidence. Grammatical misuse tends to be repetition, the use of plurals and accusatives and many „*ss*” conjugation of the subjunctive was used as indicative, instead of „*tj*” (e.g. „*Nem látja az erdőt a fáktól*” instead („*nem látja*”). Several English expressions were also used. It would have been appropriate to hear *IDEGENFORGALOM* more often when discussing tourism, but it was not the case (this is a basic, defining word of the industry).

#### Criteria 4 and 9 Range and appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar

The less able students supported their views with simpler sentences using coordinating conjunctions, i.e. „*és*” „*vagy*” for compound sentences instead of conjunctions for more elaborate and interesting subordinate conjunctions adverbial clauses, clauses of reason or purpose, comparison such as „*azért, mert, aki, amit, mióta, amennyi, ahány, nemcsak, hanem, olyan, amilyen stb*”. These constructions can be learned almost painlessly by studying the occasional folksong or many proverbs, e.g. „*Amilyen a fogadj Isten, olyan az adjon Isten; Ahány ház annyi szokás*”. There is a great deal of incorrect usage with the „*T*” of the accusative, simple by omission, or the use of the singular following definite or indefinite numerals, e.g. „*Három könyvet olvastam*” is the correct form, not „*Három könyveket olvastam*”.

#### Criteria 5 and 10 Clarity of expression

Pronunciation mostly falls down in the case of the sound „*R*” which should be rolled. Except in the case of the recent arrivals, or those who spent holidays in Hungary, the intonation is markedly un-Hungarian. Hungarian has a descending tone in the indicative sentence whereas rising tone signifies questions. To use a rising tone in indicative sentences or statements is quite strange. The stress on the first syllable of the word, in most cases was not well stressed by students. Stress is a subtle aural distinction and needs some attention in class, in examples such as “*Szent István korona Magyarországra van*”, „*ő főzik*” „*sok pénzt kaptam*” „*ahol tudsz megnézni hidakat*” „*tetszett a ruhák*”, should have been said like: „*Az Országában őrzik Szent István koronáját*” „*ő főz*” „*sok pénzt kaptam*” „*onnan megnézheted a hidakat*” „*a ruhák nekem nagyon tetszettek*”.

## Discussion

Overall, uniformity and dullness were apparent in dealing with certain topics, e.g. tourism. There was little evidence that students had studied their topics in-depth for 15 hours as specified in the study design. Some students could talk about the chosen topic for only a few minutes with a lack of detailed knowledge evident. For students to know that the river Danube is a world heritage river, and be ignorant of the origin or the name Margitsziget or the reason for a castle having been built on the hill of Buda was surprising.

Some students failed to introduce their topic and references, which is clearly outlined in the Hungarian Study Design (Unit 4 End-of-year examinations page 29).

The student will be expected to either make reference to texts studied or may support the Discussion with objects such as photographs, diagrams, and maps. Notes and cue cards are not permitted.

### Criterion 6 Capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively

Students were able to clearly state the sub-topic of their Detailed Study. Beyond some bright openings, there were depressingly repetitious offerings by most students who chose tourism as their topic. The World Heritage Program was the chosen topic for the Detailed Study. Sometimes the very formulation of launching into the discussion was the verbatim echo of the statement made by the previous student, which unmistakably pointed to rote learning in class to a great degree. There was very little expansion of the topic; students kept referring back to their previous statements. Some students made rather basic mistakes in misplacing – geographically speaking – certain famous places such as Lake Balaton. A significant number of others had no knowledge about which else except the two or three places of heritage importance, which they prepared, parrot-fashion. This entailed missing such obvious landmarks as the *vár* and its current important cultural function. There was very little satisfactory exchange or lateral comments. When entering a discussion, students who obviously did most rote learning were not conspicuously successful in maintaining an exchange, but kept reformulating previous statements. In this case advancing the discussion was somewhat limited. Those who prepared historical persons, e.g. *Petőfi Sándor*, or *Attila* or *Szent István* maintained a more effective exchange. The level of communication was also more expansive and spontaneous.

### Criterion 7 Capacity to present information, ideas and opinions on a chosen topic

Students referred to authorities rather than giving their own opinion in the case of the topic dealing with tourism. Most were quite shallow in their scope and there was a monotonous uniformity of approach by students, even giving the order of the sources they used, not giving the impression of variety or sufficiency. However, discussions on historical persons, such as *Petőfi Sándor*, or *Attila* or *Szent István* were prepared in greater depth and consequently comments were more perceptive because they exhibited more understanding, a greater degree of engagement and enthusiasm on the part of the students. There was a good range of individual opinions on the part of students dealing with historical personages.

© VCAA 2003

Published by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority  
41 St Andrews Place, East Melbourne 3002

Photocopying: This publication can only be photocopied for the use of students and teachers in Victorian Schools.

