

Oral component

Most students were clearly aware of the procedures and requirements for the oral examination. Students had been adequately prepared apart from a few who found it challenging due to inadequate preparation. As in previous years, some students displayed a certain degree of nervousness and anxiety. Most were able to overcome their anxiety in the early stages of the general conversation. In order to enhance their performance, students should try to prepare themselves psychologically for the encounter with the assessors and develop strategies to relax and overcome their fears and anxiety.

Part 1 – Conversation

Students performed very well overall in this part of the examination. All five areas were confidently covered but some responses sounded like recitations, rather than natural conversation. While it is essential to prepare for this part of the task, students must not rely on prepared statements, and need to be aware that their responses should link directly with the assessor's questions or comments. Some common problems occurred particularly when referring to the vocabulary relating to subjects studied or when talking about their future aspirations. A few students responded with 'yes' or 'no' type restricted utterances and assessors had to try hard in order to make such students extend their responses.

Part 2 – Discussion

Some students prepared for this part of the oral examination in a similar fashion to the 'Report and Discussion' of the previous VCE. It should be noted that the focus of this section is **to discuss and explore the sub-topic and aspects of the texts covered during the Detailed Study**. It is expected that students draw on the texts they have studied and discuss and explore ideas and opinions related to their sub-topic and relate this to Turkish speaking communities.

It is essential that in their introduction (up to one minute) students state concisely the theme of the Detailed Study and the sub-topic chosen (including any particular aspect if applicable), together with at least three resources studied in class. The introduction therefore should not simply be a report, but should give assessors an indication of the area of discussion. Students should not memorise chunks of information/set statements for use during the oral examination. Texts should be used to support, expand and explore their sub-topic and not merely as the basis of a recount. Students should also be reminded that cue cards are not allowed during this part of the examination.

It is important that students and teachers select materials for the Detailed Study with care so that students are exposed to a variety of views. The type of texts used by students varied significantly in complexity and it was apparent that some students used English texts on which to base their study. In keeping with the intent of the study design, texts should be in Turkish so that students are exposed to key vocabulary related to their sub-topic. It is advisable that students are exposed to one or two substantial texts such as a film, a novel or an article. This will ensure that students have greater depth and breadth of information and a better chance to sustain a discussion on the sub-topic chosen for up to seven minutes.

Given the amount of time allowed for each section, students require a more extensive range of vocabulary and grammatical structures. Examples might be the use of idiomatic expressions where appropriate, going beyond the present tense to express ideas and opinions and more depth in preparation, including knowledge of specialist vocabulary related to the Detailed Study.

Teachers are advised to consider strategies to assist students in expanding their vocabulary. Students need to expand their vocabulary and sentence structures to be able to converse comfortably. In this way unnecessary repetition or pauses will be avoided. The use of simplistic vocabulary and grammar can, to a certain extent, be overcome if the students are clearly guided to concentrate on the 15 hours extensive class time during the study of their Detailed Study topic.

The most common errors involved inaccurate sentence structures, tenses and the use of non-Turkish vocabulary. Incorrect use of noun cases and idiomatic expressions also featured as common problems for some students. Other problems included students speaking in monotones, gaps in the flow of conversation and incorrect phrasing and tempo, all resulting in a less fluid production of language.

Despite the examination conditions, students on the whole, coped well and were able to successfully request clarification or information in Turkish, when necessary.

Written component

Teachers and students should be aware that examiners may ask questions that address the syllabus outcomes in a manner that requires students to respond by integrating their knowledge, understanding and skills developed through studying the course. The knowledge, understanding and skills developed through the study of discrete sections, should accumulate to a more comprehensive understanding than may be described in each section separately.

Section 1 – Listening and responding

Some advice:

- students need to be reminded to answer in the language specified on the examination paper
- students should be encouraged to make use of the ‘Notes Column’, and refer to these when writing their responses
- students must be reminded that only one answer is correct in a multiple-choice question.

Part A

Question 1

Most students attempted this question and gave the required response.

Question 2

Some students ticked more boxes than the response required. The message was completed with most, if not all, of the required answer. Only a few of the responses were in Turkish, which was not the required language.

Question 3

a.

There were few problems with this question, as most students answered correctly.

b.

There were many varied correct responses to this question.

Question 4

a.

Most students indicated the correct response.

b.

The word ‘language’ in the question was misinterpreted by some students. The question required students to explain the language used to describe the beauty of nature. Almost all students mentioned offences and fines for littering. The imperative at the end of the passage was noticed by most students. Some students referred to the images created by the language, e.g. *yemyeşil parklar, harika temiz sahiller*.

Question 5

a.

Most responses included the two components to this question; that the traditional family is changing and that family members are undertaking tasks that they were not doing before.

b.

Students demonstrated a thorough understanding of the speaker’s point of view and presented and explained relevant references from the text.

Part B

Question 5

In general, this question was well answered. More successful responses included examples from the text.

Question 6

a.

A range of responses was provided by students.

b.

Responses were quite good and most students gave all the necessary information.

Question 7

Most responses to this question were relevant and included a good comparison of ideas of the two generations, both parents and children.

Section 2 – Reading and responding

Part A

This section was worth 20 marks and contained two questions (8 and 9).

When judging performance in this part, examiner/s take into account the extent to which students demonstrate the capacity to understand general and/or specific aspects of texts, by comparing, contrasting, summarising, or evaluating, and conveying the information accurately and appropriately.

All questions were mandatory. Most students attempted all questions and understood the texts well. Virtually all students responded in the correct language, English. Poor handwriting skills added to the problems of deciphering, as did the use of pencils and red pens. Students should write in either blue or black pen. Some students did not read the texts carefully and did not spend sufficient time in analysing the questions, which led to misinterpretation and irrelevant responses. Other students exceeded expectations, demonstrating high level skills and excellent understanding.

Question 8

a.

Most students responded correctly.

b.

Students were required to extract and summarise information, and sequence relevant details in a logical manner. The range of responses demonstrated the diverse competencies of students.

c.

Students had to demonstrate a perceptive ability to analyse and evaluate the text. The more capable students demonstrated their ability well.

Question 9

a.

Most students did not give the correct response, even though some of them received full marks for the rest of the question. The text needed to be read and analysed carefully to find the correct answer.

b.

A detailed explanation was required to demonstrate good understanding of the text and most students were awarded at least 1 mark.

c.

Most students were able to exchange information in response to the text.

d.

This was a challenging question, which was handled very well by the more capable students, some of whom demonstrated different approaches and supported them with appropriate examples. Some students gave quality responses, demonstrating their ability to compare and contrast and to evaluate the text extremely well. Other students, however, gave rather poor responses.

e.

This was the most challenging part of this question. Students had to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the text, analyse the information and the language used by the writer. Virtually all students attempted this question, regardless of their level of ability.

Part B

Question 10

Performance in this section was judged by taking into account the following points:

- the extent to which a response demonstrated the student's capacity to understand general and specific aspects of the text read (by identifying, analysing and responding to information)
- the extent to which the response conveyed information coherently and appropriately.

Most responses included some of the information, ideas and/or opinions from the text when writing about experiences as an exchange student, but failed to present depth of treatment, even when responses conveyed information with variety in vocabulary and good sentence structure.

Many experiences comprised lengthy descriptions of how students decided to join the program and how they were picked up by their Australian host family at the airport, in addition to shorter references and information from the given text.

Much of the information from the text was chosen appropriately, but not treated in depth.

There were also responses where the level of language, knowledge and capacity were satisfactory or basic, but where the response contained references to most of the points mentioned in the text with simple, but meaningful experiences and examples, instead of just mentioning that they were shown around or that they got to know other cultures.

Most responses included points regarding friendships, language, education and cultural exchange, and encouragement to take part in the program. It was interesting to see that experiences in Australia and with the host family were described in a very positive way, e.g. 'In a country that doesn't discriminate against age, weight, height, culture – all possess a sense of freedom to live their lives the way they like. I lived in a community with strong ties to life, that puts lots of importance on nature.'

Many responses included most of the information and treated in depth the ideas and opinions. Some of those demonstrated extensive understanding, others a thorough knowledge and understanding of vocabulary and sentence structure. Most responses tried to convey information by using the correct text type and its conventions.

Text types caused some difficulty, as in general, a lack of understanding of how to write an article, and how to structure and sequence ideas was evident.

Some responses merely copied sections of information from the text without putting it into the context of the question. Even though the number of copied responses was few, there seemed to be a lack of depth and description in

incorporating personal experiences into a relevant response. However, some responses that detailed the student's own experiences did not relate to the given text and were inappropriate.

Weaknesses in language were evident in the incorrect spelling of words (which can change the meaning of the word completely), the omission of punctuation and sentence structure/syntax/tense.

Overall, Question 10 was quite well understood. Most students attempted the question and only a few wrote minimal responses. Even though the language tended to be more colloquial and the text type was not fully followed by many students, most responses demonstrated a satisfactory to extensive level of language and included responses to some, or most, of the information presented in the text.

Section 3 – Writing in Turkish

(completed by interstate students)

Almost all students attempted this section with Question 12 more popular than Question 11. Only one student wrote responses to both questions.

The quality of the responses covered the entire range of performance levels. Overall, students understood the questions and showed maturity in handling the requirements of the tasks and structured their responses well.

Generally, students did not answer these questions in depth. Some students wrote minimal responses even though they seemed to be able to express complex ideas and the level of Turkish seemed to be high. In some instances there was a lack of creativity. Most students wrote appropriately for the specified text type. Of the two text types, a diary entry and a speech, the former was more popular. While students did not have problems addressing the requirements of the text types, there were, at times, some problems with linking relevant ideas and with the organisation of the ideas.

Generally students adhered to the specified word length of 200–250 words. In expressing their ideas, many students used effective expressions, appropriate words, and a broad vocabulary as well as complex sentence structures.

Some students were quite successful in comparing positive and negative points of view when answering questions. They were linguistically correct in terms of grammar, syntax, spelling, and relevant choice of vocabulary.

Spelling mistakes were apparent, and punctuation was not always correctly applied. Sometimes punctuation was not used at all. Very good students used a wide range of interesting vocabulary but others used only familiar and predictable vocabulary, as well as simple sentences. Very few students inserted English words into their sentences.

Common errors included: incorrect vocabulary, incorrect grammatical structures, linking sentences together to carry the same idea and overuse of simple conjunctions (*evet, ama*).

Some further advice:

- writing should be legible and neat with a black or blue pen NOT pencil used to write answers
- students to use the formal 'you', i.e. *siz* in their writing, not *ser* which is informal
- write either formally or informally, as appropriate to the question
- break words into proper syllables, e.g. *okul'a* to school, *saat'im* my watch
- emphasis should be given to grammatical structures and vocabulary for example:
 - selecting personal pronouns to match noun endings
 - using the same tense throughout complex sentences
 - combining two or three simple sentences (ideas) into complex sentences without losing track of content
 - differentiating between similar sounding words
 - emphasising how dots, e.g. *u, ũ, i, o, õ* and tails, e.g. *ç, c, ş s*, can change meaning completely
 - *pitik* at the end
 - using double consonants in writing, i.e. *akillca, hissedip, teşekkür*
 - using phrases incorrectly.