



2013

Languages: Hungarian GA 3: Examination

Oral component

GENERAL COMMENTS

All the students spoke confidently during the 2013 Hungarian oral examinations. They handled open-ended questions well in the Conversation and Discussion. They communicated information clearly and were able to connect well with the assessors.

In the Conversation, the students gave interesting accounts of their studies, current lives and future aspirations.

The students were generally well prepared for their Discussion topics. They were able to discuss the topic well and express opinions clearly and convincingly.

The assessment criteria were covered well. The information was relevant and had breadth and depth. Students used a range of vocabulary and grammar appropriate to the context, task and audience.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Conversation

Communication

Criterion 1

All students communicated well, using well-thought-out and carefully structured sentences. Even if the vocabulary was limited in some cases, the students were generally able to rectify major errors.

Pronunciation in some cases was inexact, particularly the ‘T’ sound being either weak or ‘swallowed’, which also occurred with the ‘R’ sound. Intonation is sometimes very level or even ascending, rather than descending, at the end of the sentence in Hungarian.

Content

Criterion 2

The range of information on family, work and leisure was usually satisfactory. The more able students were characterised by their fluency. The less successful students needed prompting, or the assessors had to rephrase the question before the student was able to respond. Most students were able to elaborate on the topics of school and family even if they had a limited vocabulary.

Most students performed well on this criterion. Students presented a range of ideas and interacted well with assessors, resulting in a good flow of conversation.

Language

Criterion 3

Variety of vocabulary was evident in the case of able students, but less so at the lower end. Students are encouraged to also attend to their knowledge of grammar. Often the ‘T’ of the accusative was omitted; for example, *-ba*, *-be* or *-hoz*, *-hez* interchanged; for example, somebody *iskolához jár*. Anglicising still occurred frequently, such as *magyart csinálok* instead of *magyarból készültem* or *magyarból vizsgázom*.

Vocabulary and grammar were not as accurate as they should have been. The grammatical and syntactical errors and mistakes that occurred in the Conversation section were also repeated in the Discussion. The instrumental *-val*, *-vel* is invariably always used by the more hesitant students instead of using the assimilation with doubling the terminal consonants as in the case of terminal *-z*, *-s*, *-g* and others. *Kézvel* instead of *kézzel*, *szüleimvel* instead of *szüleimmel*, etc. The use of singular nouns following definite or indefinite numerals is another recurring error; for example, *minden tárgyakat* (*sic*).

Some grammatical mistakes recur every year. The two kinds of conjugation in Hungarian, the direct and indirect, are frequently confused and need considerable attention.



Criterion 4

Students should be familiar with the correct Hungarian name and pronunciation of their school subjects, such as Mathematics, Biology or Art, because the subjects studied for Units 3 and 4 are often said in English. The most consistent error continues to be students mixing Hungarian words with English words.

Students are quite often unaware of social conventions governing the Hungarian language and address the assessor in the familiar second-person singular. This is not done in Hungarian.

Criterion 5

High-scoring students had no difficulties with expression and their pronunciation was close to perfect. Low-scoring students were very slow to respond and often used English words. Quite often the weaker students did not know how to carry on the conversation.

Section 2 – Discussion

Some students prepared Hungarian customs as their topic of discussion. Others discussed historical figures such as *Mátyás király*, *Hunyady János*, *Zrinyi Ilona Szent István* and *Mindszenty Hercegprímás* and artists such as *Liszt Ferenc* and *Munkácsy Mihály*.

Students generally performed at an adequate level. It is recommended that students carefully choose the topic of the Detailed Study carefully. They are required to have more knowledge on their chosen topic than a memorised speech of a few minutes. They should be able to speak about their topic, form an opinion and engage in a discussion with the assessors. They need practice giving their own opinions, as some students simply repeated the same facts for different questions.

All students used resources that covered their chosen topic satisfactorily.

Communication

Criterion 6

Sometimes students repeated statements instead of elaborating on them. The less well-prepared students had difficulty carrying the discussion forward.

Content

Criterion 7

Students gave many opinions on their topics, though not all used evidence to support these opinions.

The more successful students presented an excellent range of information, ideas and opinions with reasons and were able to compare their ideas with other ideas.

Clarifications were not always adequate. All students showed evidence of being prepared, although they did need to inform themselves of synonyms.

There should be less reliance on rote-learning. Student should be prepared for free conversation and to elaborate on ideas and opinions.

Language

Criterion 8

Somewhat limited vocabulary was evident in some cases.

Definite and indefinite numerals were used with singular nouns. The language does not tolerate tautologies and yet this is a recurring problem. The numeral expresses multiplicity and there is no need for plural nouns. Attention should also be given to correct case endings and idiomatic expressions.

Vocabulary varies. There are many English words in the discussion; for example, ‘moral’ instead of the Hungarian *becsület* or *erény* depending on the context; ‘criminal’ instead of *bűnöző*; ‘history’ instead of *történelem* are a few of the frequently occurring English words. Some students obviously translated from English, resulting in quaint expressions: *királyos* instead of *királyi*, or *gazdag* where a plain *sok* would be better. Some modifying suffixes are not known; for example, verbs from nouns, and instead of *csináltam tenisz* the simple *teniszezni* would do, keeping in mind that many of such transformations exist in the language. Abstract nouns are easily formed from common nouns; for example, *-ség fejedelmet elvenni* instead of *fejedelemséget*.

2013 Examination Report



Criterion 9

With limited vocabulary and expressions, grammar usually suffers too. The other grammatical mistakes are the rule of suffixes regarding movement: *-ba*, *-be* governs movement towards a place and *-ban* *-ben* refers to being in the place. When the person is going towards or leaving from a place, then *-hoz*, *-hez*, *-höz* or *-től*, *-től* need to be used.

Criterion 10

Pronunciation varies. The 'T' is weak, overall the 'R' is very often the English 'R', not the rolling Hungarian, which indicates anglicised vocal patterns.

Students need to be aware that when choosing a topic from the study design, they must be able to provide the names of specific resources used to support their discussion, as well as extending the discussion to relevant points beyond the boundaries of the topic.