



**2012**

**Languages: Hungarian GA 3: Examination**

## **Oral component**

### **SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

#### **Section 1 – Conversation**

Students' competency ranged from fluent and near flawless speaking ability to adequate and hesitant in the 2012 Hungarian oral examination. At the higher end of the range, the conversational vocabulary was sophisticated and varied. Some of these students showed evidence of correct idiomatic usage, executed with assurance and ease.

It should be noted that in 2012 all students seemed very clear about the expectations of the oral examination, as detailed in the study design, and the standard of language acquisition was excellent.

##### **Criterion 1**

Most students were able to communicate effectively. They connected with assessors and responded to posed questions freely and confidently.

Generally, students did not need much prompting and questions did not have to be reworded often. They were able to carry the conversation forward and displayed excellent pronunciation and intonation. On many occasions, most students were able to correct themselves. All students spoke clearly and confidently, and used highly effective repair strategies.

##### **Criterion 2**

Students gave a range of responses and some were able to give opinions on complex ideas. All students gave relevant responses. Most were able to clarify information and express their opinions clearly and logically.

##### **Criterion 3**

Students usually self-corrected when they realised an error had been made with their grammar or pronunciation.

Students spoke appropriately to assessors and addressed them correctly. In most instances, the use of vocabulary was suitable and accurate. All students used appropriate vocabulary and grammar to suit the context and purpose of the task.

Students should be given opportunities to practise general conversation, so that they learn to progress and expand the Conversation when asked simple questions. For example, when asked *Mit tudsz nekiünk mondani az iskoláról?*, the answer should be more than a simple, *Nagy*.

A common problem was definite and indefinite numerals being used with singular nouns. Students should remember that the language does not tolerate tautologies. The numeral expresses multiplicity, so there is no need for plural nouns; for example, *egy könyv, két könyv, sok könyv, néhány könyv*.

Students should also pay attention to correct case endings and idiomatic expressions. Some students translated words literally from English, resulting in some quaint expressions, for example *közlekedési lekvár* (traffic jam) instead of *csúcsforgalom*. Some modifying suffixes were not known, for example, when modifying verbs from nouns, instead of *csinállok táncot* the simple *táncolok* would suffice, keeping in mind that numerous similar modifications exist in the language.

#### **Section 2 – Discussion**

##### **Criterion 1**

Students responded confidently. They presented their topic clearly and communicated very well. There was a broad range of topics within the major topic, which was Famous Hungarians (Szentgyörgyi Albert, Dózsa György, Rományi József, Gábor Zsazsa, Körösi Csoma Sándor and Petőfi Sándor).



Students generally performed well in this area. Most students were able to communicate their chosen topic to assessors in detail. It is recommended that students do not respond with short answers, for example, yes or no, but give an opinion or carry the discussion forward.

The presentations were outstanding and well researched. They were unique, relevant and interesting, and gave much scope for the assessors to engage with the student.

### **Criterion 2**

Students should ensure that they choose a topic on which they are able to expand and give opinions about. They should use multiple sources of information, not just one type as this is limiting. For example, students should consider reading a number of books as well as undertaking research on the internet. Students were generally able to present their information well, with some opting for props. We recommend that students who do elect to use props ensure that they somehow incorporate these into the Discussion. The props should be relevant and support the topic.

Students presented an excellent range of information. They had good ideas that were clearly expressed and they were able to defend their opinions, showing evidence of their knowledge of the topic.

### **Criterion 3**

A good range of vocabulary was used (with correct grammar) and it was appropriate to the context and audience. Overall, the use of vocabulary was quite good, which indicated thorough research. However, when opinions or reasons were sought from students, some grammatical errors were made.

Strong students had no difficulty with expression and their pronunciation was close to perfect. For some students, the 'T' was weak and 'R' was often pronounced as the English 'R', not the rolling Hungarian form of the letter, indicating anglicised vocal patterns. This is a problem every year. Students need to rely less on rote-learning and should practise their conversational skills more so that the Discussion flows more smoothly.

Grammar skills varied depending on students' ability and how confident they were with their chosen topic, but overall there was an improvement from previous years.

Students chose interesting famous people from the fields of history, literature, science and art. Other famous people who could be looked at in the future include Wass Albert, Nyíró József, Széchenyi István and Mindszenty József.

Most students used the internet, books and notes from their classes as resources for information. Nearly all students provided the names of specific resource material that was used to back up the Discussion. It is recommended that students familiarise themselves with information relating to the Detailed Study from the study design.

Overall, the skills and preparation of students was very good – close to excellent – and they spoke clearly and confidently.