

### Oral component

Students presenting for the oral assessment generally reached a satisfactory level. Students should carefully choose the topic of the detailed study. Some students went outside the guidelines as set out in the study design, page 22:

‘The detailed study should be based on the sub-topic related to one or more of the related topics listed on page 13’.

Topics such as the comparison of the student’s life with that of her mother, interesting as it is, falls outside the guidelines. Students must not divulge their name or school during the assessment.

### Section 1 – Conversation

#### Questions 1 and 2

Most students performed adequately in this section. The longer time span allows greater depth and consequently, students presented a range of ideas and interacted well with assessors, resulting in good flow of conversation.

#### Questions 3 and 4

Vocabulary and grammar were not always as accurate as they should be. Year 12 subject names were very often given in English. Students should be familiar with the correct Hungarian name and pronunciation of subjects, e.g.

**Mathematics, Biology, Arts.** Also in Hungarian one does not *csinál* subjects for Year 12 but *vizsgára készül* and the subject has the suffix *-ból, -ből*. English words occurred frequently.

Students seemed unaware of the social conventions of Hungarian and addressed the assessors in the familiar second person singular. This is unacceptable in Hungarian.

Grammatical and syntactical errors that occurred in the Conversation section were repeated in the Discussion. The instrumental *-val, -vel* was used by the more hesitant students instead of assimilation, 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, e.g. *minden tárgyakat* (sic).

#### Question 5

Pronunciation varied. On occasions the *T* was weak and the *R* was very often an English R, not the rolling Hungarian *R*, indicating Anglicised vocal patterns.

### Section 2 – Discussion

#### Questions 6 and 7

Many students chose an ecological topic, namely the cyanide poisoning of the Hungarian river Tisza in 2001. Rote learning was too evident in several cases. Other topics were good nutrition and diet, Hungary, travelling to Venice (Venice is an Italian city, therefore this was not a good choice for oral discussion) King Saint Stephen I of Hungary, Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II, King Mathias Corvin of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty, the Holy Crown of Hungary, the different kinds of love, money is not enough to make you happy and the comparison between a mother’s life and the student’s.

On the whole, topics were thoughtfully prepared and presented, discussions were well-argued and students were comfortable with their topics. Most students were able to expound their cases well; less so with rote-learners who were not able to move beyond the parameters of their set piece. In these cases, support was needed to maintain the flow of the discussion. In some cases, discussions on Tisza lacked depth. Repetition was also noticeable in some cases, e.g. travelling to Venice, and some hesitancy in the topic on Cardinal Mindszenty.

When choosing a topic from the study design, students must provide the names of specific resources used to back up their discussion. They must also be able to extend the discussion beyond the boundaries of the topic.

#### Questions 8, 9 and 10

Grammar was lacking in many areas. For instance, the absence of case endings was noticeable, the *T* of the objective case, or the case endings governed by verbs, e.g. *nép nem hallott Mindszenty*. Clearly, it would be interpreted that either the *T* of the objective case was missing (the people did not hear Mindszenty, i.e. he was not audible) or *-ról* which is governed by the verb *hallani* (the people did not hear about Mindszenty’s fame); similarly, *aki megyek* instead of *akivel megyek*. Possessive endings were also haphazard. The *J* was often inserted where it was not needed. Hungarian is very much a euphonic language, wherever it sounds awkward the *J* is omitted, e.g. *életet* instead of *életjét*. The reverse was also evident where students omitted the possessive ending altogether where it would have been necessary: *Embernek aki nem volt sok pénz* (sic) is a typical example of multiple grammatical and syntactical shortcomings.

Vocabulary varied. There were many English words in the discussion, e.g. ‘moral’ instead of the Hungarian *becsület* or *erény* depending on the context, ‘criminal’ instead of *bűnöző*, ‘history’ instead of *történelem* were but a few of the frequently occurring English words. Some students were obviously translating from English, resulting in some quaint expressions: *királyos* instead of *királyi* or *gazdag* where a plain *sok* would have been better. Some modifying suffixes were not known, e.g. verbs from nouns – instead of *csináltam tenis�* the simple *teniszezni* would do, keeping in mind that lots of such transformations exist in the language. Abstract nouns are easily formed from common nouns, e.g. *-ség* *fejedelmet elvenni* instead of *fejedelemséget*; *Izgalmas voltam* (exciting, sensational) instead of *izgatott* (agitated and

flurried) which was clearly needed in the context. Some confusion of meanings was evident originating from the process of translating from English: *lakni* and *élni* are distinct concepts, not interchangeable, as is in English. The first is to dwell in a house, flat, place etc., whereas the second is to exist, e.g. *élt 1892-től 1975-ig*.

## **Written component**

The 2002 examination was the first following the introduction of the new syllabus. Thirty-six students from New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia sat the Hungarian examination, and they prepared very well and achieved pleasing results.

The more successful students demonstrated very good skills in listening and responding, writing and Hungarian grammar. They also demonstrated a good understanding of the context, audience, and purpose of the various texts. Students who achieved at a satisfactory level had the skills to cope with the tasks, but did not display a high standard of lexical and grammatical knowledge. Students are advised to focus on improving the use of complex sentence structures and on developing a wide and appropriate vocabulary.

## **Section 1 – Listening and responding**

### **Part A**

This part was generally completed satisfactorily but many achieved a very high standard. All students completed the tasks. The students' capacity to understand general and specific aspects of the texts was very good and their listening skills were of a high standard.

Some students had problems in identifying and interpreting the purpose of the text and in using its content. The most common mistake in Part A was misunderstanding large numbers. Numbers are an important part of the language, and therefore students are encouraged to pay more attention to them.

#### **Text 1**

All students answered the questions very well, using complex sentences. Some students had difficulty in distinguishing the purpose of the text.

#### **Text 2**

Students answered the questions, but a small number had problems with part (b), i.e. the number of people at the celebration.

#### **Texts 3 and 4**

All responses were very good.

#### **Text 5**

This text was the most challenging in Part A. However, all students answered the questions, but some missed the point in part (a) (*pestis kereszt felállítása*). In part (c), some students gave compelling reasons, but in other cases only one reason was given.

### **Part B**

Students completed this section of the paper well and all of them answered the questions.

#### **Text 6**

Questions were generally completed well; although there was some difficulty in identifying the audience of this text (responses were sometimes not specific enough).

#### **Text 7**

In most cases this text was understood well. Responses were appropriate and grammatically well written by most students. In some cases students had difficulty understanding the final question (i.e. the treatment given to the patient).

Students understood the texts very well and used the given information to answer the question correctly. Generally, sentence structures were complex and spelling was correct. Spelling mistakes identified were only minor errors.

## **Section 2 – Reading and responding**

### **Part A**

Clearly, students understood the texts, although some had difficulty in evaluating the information in any depth. Students need to be exposed to a greater variety of text types and to practise a variety of tasks related to the texts.

#### **Text 8**

Students understood the text and responded to the first three questions very well although some had difficulty in analysing the text in order to determine the underlying moral.

#### **Text 9**

Most responses were generally very good. Students understood the content of the text, but some had difficulty in analysing the content in sufficient depth. In such cases, responses at times were incorrect, especially for parts (a) and (d).

### **Part B**

Part B was generally answered very well. All responses addressed the question, although some students deviated from the question and did not refer to enough cues in the text.

Students were required to understand aspects of a text by identifying, analysing, and responding to information. All responses were appropriately structured. The letter format was handled well, as was the 'tone' of the letter. Spelling was accurate, but some students had difficulty with double consonants.

The most outstanding mistakes were made when students used regional dialects, and this affected correct spelling (e.g. *mán* instead of *már* or *munkátul* instead of *munkától*). As stated in the Hungarian Study Design students need to use the modern standard form of the language and use the appropriate accents.

### **Section 3 – Writing in Hungarian**

#### **(completed by interstate students)**

This section was one of the best and most interesting parts of the examination paper. Question 11 was by far the most popular question, followed by Question 13 and Question 12. Overall, students gave excellent responses to Questions 11 and 13, although a few responses to Question 13 were very superficial in content. These were balanced by students who showed great depth and maturity in their writing.

A range of sentence structures and complex sentences were attempted, and most students used them quite accurately. Vocabulary was very good and was used appropriately, although some students used dialect in spelling or did not use correct accents.

Students are reminded not to use regional dialects in their spelling, to identify and correct such mistakes, and to ensure that they understand and use appropriate accents.