2011 Assessment Report



2011 Languages: Korean First Language GA3: Examination

Written component

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, most students displayed a good understanding of the texts and responded well, demonstrating a satisfactory level of knowledge of the text types. Almost every student managed to complete answers to every question.

This year, students seemed to find Section 1 challenging. The listening text included similarities and differences of the two large organisations named in Text 1. These could only be identified by analysing and synthesising the content of the text.

In Section 2, there was plenty of evidence that students tried to develop their own ideas for the task and used the two texts to support their opinions. Some responses did not show the correct understanding of Bopunjuck and Sunbuljuck welfare. While the reading texts can be challenging, First Language students should be able to use their reading comprehension skills to understand and deliver the correct interpretation.

There were many interesting responses to the tasks in Section 3, particularly with regard to the imaginative writing task. Students chose evenly from all of the five tasks and demonstrated an improved knowledge of the text types.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Listening and responding

This year there were more questions requiring students to compare, contrast, analyse and synthesise information than in previous years. It was evident that some students found Section 1 difficult. Most students were able to note down the major parts of the text. However, some students were unable to answer correctly, which indicated that they listened to the text without understanding the content. It is very important that students practise their listening comprehension skills, not their dictation skills. Students who found Questions 1b., 1e., 1g. and 1i. challenging need to improve their listening comprehension skills.

Ouestion 1a.

민화협의 목적은 우리나라의 평화정착과 한민족의 공동 번영을 실현하기 위한 것이다. (1점)

For full marks the words in italics needed to be included.

Question 1b.

민족 대화의 창구(1점)

Students needed to answer 민족 대화의 창구 to get full marks.

Question 1c.

대북지원, 경제 협력 사업(1점)

Students needed to include both words in their answer to receive full marks.

Ouestion 1d.

통일을 추구하나 이론적(원론적)이고 and/or 실용적이지 못한(실제 적용할 수 없는) 생각 (1점

As long as the answer conveyed the above meaning, full marks were given.

Question 1e.

대북 지원, 통일 교육(2점)

Students needed to give the above words to get full marks, but they still received one mark for a correct answer. Many students missed out on marks in this question.

2011

Assessment Report

VICTORIAN CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY

Question 1f.

통일을 위한 우리의 자세는 시대와 현실에 맞게 유연해야 한다는 뜻입니다.

텍스트 인용 - 원칙은 변하지 않지만, 적용 방법은 시대에 맞게 (현실을 고려하여) 효과적인 대안을 마련하는 등 유연성이 있어야 한다. – 1점

As long as their answer conveyed the above meaning, students were awarded full marks.

Question 1g.

Many students missed out on marks for this question. Students were required to explain the two very different approaches to reunification mentioned in the text in two paragraphs.

Naming the approaches correctly attracted two marks (one each). If students provided a good explanation they received an extra mark.

Question 1h.

- 공동체 지향
- 자발성중심
- 수요자 중심 (2점)

Three correct answers received full marks, two correct answers received one mark and one or no correct answers received no marks. Many students received full marks for this question.

Ouestion 1i.

There were various differences in the two groups; however, the differences needed to be clearly mentioned in the text. Uyongjuck and Shilyongjuck approaches were not counted as a correct answer. Some students missed out on marks in this question.

An example of the differences could be: 여러 단체 연합/ 개인이 창설

대북 지원과 경제 협력사업 실시/ 통일 교육 실시

Marks were allocated as follows.

3 marks	두가지를 정확하게 지시했고, at least하나의 설명이 충분하다
2 marks	두가지를 정확하게 지시 <u>만</u> 했다. Or 한가지만 지시했지만 설명이 정확하고 충분하다
	Or 두가지를 정확하게 지시했고, 설명이 틀리거나 없다
1 mark	한가지만 지시했다.
0 mark	지시도 없고 /틀리고, 설명도 없고/틀리다.

Section 2 – Reading and responding

Students showed a good understanding of Section 2. Unfortunately, a few students copied information from the texts without conveying their own responses in their own words. This type of response typically included a poor sequence of the content.

Many students were unable to understand the texts in Section 2. They often mixed up the name of the welfare and its meaning or provided incorrect examples of the welfare, which meant they missed out on some marks from criterion 1. Some students tended to reuse words from the texts.

Published: 20 July 2012

2011

Assessment Report



Students were asked to give their opinion about the pros and cons of 'issuing free public transport cards for teenagers'. They were required to quote parts of the texts or to use the texts to support their ideas. If a student supported the issuing of the cards, then they were expected to agree with Bopunjuck Welfare. If not, they needed to disagree with Bopunjuck Welfare. Unfortunately, some students agreed with the system and then mentioned that they agreed with Sunbuljuck Welfare, which meant they missed out on some marks for criterion 1.

Regardless of their level of understanding of the texts, most students showed improved organisational skills in structure and sequence, which meant they received higher marks for criterion 2. Frequent use of appropriate connective words (conjunctions) was noted this year, which was also good evidence of the fact that students had learned to organise their responses more appropriately.

Many students performed poorly in spelling or used inappropriate vocabulary. Misspelling and using informal words reduces the quality of the content. To improve this, it is recommended that students read more formal pieces of writing and practise as many different kinds of writing as possible.

Section 3 – Writing in Korean

There were many interesting and well-written pieces this year. Most students managed the word limit well; they were able to provide well-structured writing within the given number of words.

Students also showed a very good understanding of the text types. Students should remember to include the dates and the writer's name (not their own name) for letter writing.

Question 6 was the most popular question this year. Most students discussed using a bicycle instead of driving their own car. This meant that students didn't provide details about the 'no supervision' part of the question. It was important to note that this question was about using 'an unsupervised bicycle rental system', which meant discussing the fact that it would not be supervised, as well as using a bicycle.

Students were successful in providing many interesting pieces of imaginative writing. In particular, there were many impressive stories for Question 4. The content was faithful to the task. Students should ensure that their imaginative writing has an appropriate structure –'ki, seung, junk and kul'. These four elements should be equal.

Published: 20 July 2012