



2011

Languages: Hungarian GA 3: Examination

Oral component

GENERAL COMMENTS

Students presenting for the 2011 Hungarian oral examination demonstrated language skills ranging from excellent to average.

Successful students engaged in the conversation enthusiastically, demonstrating a sound knowledge of the topic that they had obviously researched thoroughly. Less successful students conversed in a limited way, but could sometimes self-correct errors. These students had not researched their topics well and had limited information. Some students had difficulty engaging in the conversation and showed an inability to adequately communicate in Hungarian.

Students should choose the topic of their Detailed Study carefully. The chosen topic should allow students to do more than present a memorised speech that lasts for a few minutes. They should be able to talk about the topic, to form opinions and to engage in a discussion with the assessors. Students need to practise giving their own opinion, not just the facts they have learned. Some students repeated the same facts for different questions they were asked about their chosen topic.

Students need to be aware when choosing a topic from the study design that they must be able to provide the names of specific resources to support their discussion, and they need to extend the discussion to a range of relevant points within the boundaries of the topic. Using information from parents only is not considered sufficient resource material for the Detailed Study. Students need to research several resources outside the information supplied by their parents or teachers. Books, articles and films are potential resources for the Detailed Study.

Section 1 – Conversation Communication

Criteria 1 and 5

Students were able to link to what the assessors said and responded freely and confidently to the questions posed. Higher achievers were able to expand on and extend the conversation by using sophisticated language such as *pajkos*, while weaker students had a lot of trouble expressing themselves and needed a lot of support. Generally, students did not need much prompting or rewording of questions asked. However, some students gave only brief answers and had to be prompted continually. The time span allowed students to answer questions in depth and consequently students presented a range of ideas and exchanged information well with the assessors, resulting in a good flow of conversation in most cases.

Most students communicated effectively. Students were able to communicate using well thought out and carefully structured sentences. Even if their vocabulary was limited in some cases, the students were usually able to rectify major errors and were able to correct themselves on many occasions.

Content

Criterion 2

The range of information on family, work and leisure was generally satisfactory. The better student responses were characterised by their fluency. On the lower end of the curve, students needed prompting or the assessor needed to reformulate a question before the student could respond.

Most students were able to elaborate on their theme of school and family by providing a relevant response, even if they lacked a broad vocabulary. Students showed they could talk well about themselves so information about their school life, hobbies, interests and aspirations was well covered. Students gave a range of responses and some were even able to give opinions on complex ideas. At times, however, students gave very limited responses and did not engage further. Assessors had to then extend the question or ask the student for further information.

Students are reminded that they are not allowed to divulge their name or their teacher's name.

Some students were obviously translating literally from English, resulting in some quaint expressions: *királyos* instead of *királyi* or *gazdag* where a plain *sok* would be better. Some modifying suffixes were not known; for example, verbs



from nouns – instead of *csináltam néptáncot* the simple *néptáncra járok* would do, keeping in mind that lots of such transformations exist in the language. Abstract nouns are easily formed from common nouns.

Language

Criteria 3 and 4

High performing students were able to display a variety of vocabulary while lower-performing students had a limited vocabulary. About half of the students needed to pay more attention to correct grammar. Often the 'T' of the accusative was omitted or the case ending (for example, *-ba*, *-be* or *-hoz*, *-hez*) interchanged; for example, somebody *iskolához jár*. Anglicised versions still occur frequently, such as *magyart csinálok* instead of *magyarul tanulok*. Often the 'T' of the accusative was omitted, causing a case of double jeopardy; for example, *Magyart csinálok* and *csinálom gitárt*.

Overall, language use was quite good and students usually corrected themselves when they realised they had made an error with their grammar or pronunciation. In most instances, use of vocabulary was suitable and accurate. Some students' standards were very high and they used sophisticated language; however, others used slang such as *kaja*, which is not acceptable.

Finally, students spoke appropriately to the assessors and addressed them correctly.

Section 2 – Discussion

Communication

Criteria 6 and 10

Students generally performed well in this area. Most students were able to communicate well and discuss their chosen topic with the assessors in detail.

It is recommended that students do not respond with short responses such as yes or no, but instead provide an opinion or carry the discussion forward. Students should not memorise an entire speech about their chosen topic but rather introduce their topic for a minute and allow the assessors to engage with them. There were many instances where students needed to be interrupted or the assessors had difficulty interrupting students to ask questions.

Students should research their chosen topic thoroughly and be well prepared for the examination.

Weaker students' determination to correct themselves and to continue in their own words was well received by the assessors.

Content

Criterion 7

Students' communication was generally good if their research was thorough and complete. Students should ensure they choose a topic that they are able to expand on and give opinions about. Most students' topics were well chosen and researched.

Students should use multiple sources for information not just one type. Please refer to the *VCE Hungarian Study Design* for more information. Students were generally able to present their information well, with some bringing props; however, students who elect to do this need to ensure that they incorporate them into the discussion. The props should be relevant and support the topic.

Language

Criteria 8 and 9

Overall, the use of vocabulary was quite good and reasonably sophisticated, for example, *munkatílalom*, which indicated thorough research. However, when students expressed their own opinions or assessors sought their reasons, some students made grammatical errors. Examples included *Farsang negyven nap Húsvét előtt befejezi* instead of *A 'Farsang' Húsvét előtt negyven nappal ér véget*.

Students' grammar varied depending on their ability and on how confident they were with their chosen topic. Definite and indefinite numerals were used with singular nouns. This is a recurring problem, and yet its solution is simple enough; the Hungarian language does not tolerate tautologies. The numeral expresses multiples, so there is no need for plural nouns. Students should also pay attention to using correct case endings and idiomatic expressions.

2011 Assessment Report



Vocabulary and grammar were not always as accurate as they should have been. The perennial mistake students made was providing subject names in English. Students should be familiar with the correct Hungarian names and pronunciation of their school subjects; for example, Mathematics, Biology, Science and Arts should be replaced with *Számítás, Biológia, Tudományok* and *Művészetek*.

Students were quite often unaware of the social conventions governing Hungarian and addressed the assessors in the familiar second person singular. This should be avoided.

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

There was a range of topics chosen this year, but the focus was on Hungarian Customs and History – Famous Hungarians. Examples were *Farsang, Luca Napi Szokások, Tavaszi Szokások, Mátyás Király, Bartók Béla* and *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*.