



**2003**

**LOTE: Korean First Language GA 3: Examination**

### **Oral component**

Most students were well-prepared. Some students demonstrated an excellent level of performance in introducing the Detailed Study as well as the discussion. Their presentation was reminiscent of a well-written literature review, demonstrating an excellent understanding of the texts through very good combination of critical thinking of the literature and appropriate quotes from the texts. They also included a very thorough and detailed appreciation about the texts. More successful students were very confident in the discussion and maintained a very high degree of interaction with assessors. Their responses were always relevant to the texts and these students were able to expand their ideas with ease. They also did not hesitate to ask the assessors to repeat questions and lead the discussion.

However, there were some students who showed very poor discussion skills. They were mostly unable to present the Detailed Study and had to read from notes despite repeated reminding. Their presentation was either a summary of the texts or a review copy which must have been taken from the Internet. The content of their presentation was disappointing. Some students had not read the texts (they obtained summaries from the Internet) and in one case conveyed wrong information about the text. In the discussion, they seemed to be very nervous and not always able to provide relevant evidence from texts. When an assessor asked questions, they usually repeated sentences from their notes rather than expressing their understanding of the texts.

The types of texts chosen was another issue. Well-prepared students chose texts which showed a good combination of written and audio texts, popular and lesser known texts and texts of varying levels of difficulty. Poorly-prepared students chose only a couple of different types of texts, or very short texts (mostly songs).

Generally, students were able to answer introductory questions, such as ‘why did you choose this topic?’ or ‘what did you learn from the texts?’ and questions about the content of the texts. However, when a question needed critical thinking or combining more than one text, responses were not very spontaneous.

There were only three or four different topics used this year but as long as students include their own ideas and focus on different parts of the texts, this is quite acceptable. Most students included contemporary songs, as these are short and students are interested in them.

It is recommended that students complete reading texts in depth and develop a very good understanding of them. They also need to be prepared for a variety of questions. What is most important when preparing for the oral examination is that students read more literature and learn how to appreciate it in their spare time.

## **SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

### **Part A – Presentation**

Criterion 1 ‘Capacity to present information appropriately and effectively’ had three different areas to consider. Students must achieve 5 marks in all three areas to get the 5 marks. Firstly, vocabulary and grammar should be accurate, varied and appropriate; students showed a very good use of vocabulary and grammar this year.

Secondly, the students’ clarity of expression was considered. They had to use appropriate tempo, good pronunciation and excellent intonation and stress to achieve 5 marks. Most students did not have a major problem in this area, as they felt confident in speaking their own language. Assessors were trained not to confuse a student’s personality with their performance. For example, a quiet student tends to present with less stress and less obvious intonation. This is their personality rather than a lack of clear expression skills and as such is not penalised.

The last area for Criterion 1 was the capacity to engage with an audience. The level of fluency and coherence were important factors for maintaining engagement with assessors. Necessary eye contact at the appropriate time was another additional point. Some students, who read from their notes, did receive a gentle reminder a couple of times and if they kept reading marks were deducted.

Students must know their presentation but it is still a good idea if they bring notes, where they have written the main points. Students tend to rely on their notes more if the whole presentation is written on it. As students can always explore and extend their opinions during discussion, they should not make the presentation any longer than 4 minutes. Overall, more students achieved full marks for Criterion 1 than for the other criteria.

Criterion 2 is 'Relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinions and ideas'. Students who received the full 5 marks demonstrated the ability to combine facts with opinions/reasons very well and to keep the content relevant to the texts. Students who received lower marks presented irrelevant content and/or limited information and/or made no reference to the texts.

## **Part B – Discussion**

Criterion 1 related to the students' capacity to present information appropriately and effectively and there were three areas considered. Students who prepared well tended to convey their opinions very confidently and effectively. They comfortably asked for clarification of questions, and were able to rephrase when required. Such students stood apart from others particularly, in that they were highly connected with the assessors by expanding on responses and leading the discussion.

Assessors found it difficult to ask questions of students who gave short responses and/or lacked confidence in using their voice and/or maintaining the discussion.

Criterion 2 is about relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinions and ideas. Although it can be difficult to achieve full marks for this criterion, the students who gained the full 5 marks provided responses which were always relevant to texts, and showed a varied range of information and ideas. Such students also supported information with reasons, examples and evidence. They usually gave sufficient information without being asked. However, some students presented basic information and ideas and provided a very limited range of supporting evidence. They repeated sentences from the texts, sometimes providing irrelevant information.

It is recommended that teachers advise students about the exact examination procedure. Teachers need to be very familiar with the study design, so that students are able to concentrate better on their preparations. Teachers should refer to the VCE Assessment Guide for choosing types of texts. There were some texts that did not meet the guidelines, for example non-Korean literature. Teachers should encourage students to include depth and breadth of the content in their presentation. Although students are expected to introduce their presentation within one minute, most started their presentation without an introduction. It is a good idea for students to give a brief outline of their presentation, so that assessors can get a better understanding of the presentation in detail.

## **Written component**

In general, most students demonstrated a reasonably good level of language. Their range of vocabulary was particularly high this year with good spelling. It was also evident that students improved their listening skills. It is advisable that students become familiar with the types of tasks in the examination and the requirements in each section.

Questions 8 and 9 were the most important questions in Section 1. If students answered in point form, they were penalised as these questions required a one paragraph answer. Paragraph questions particularly needed more care, as each sentence had to be coherent and have a good flow. '임' or '것' are not appropriate ending registers for a paragraph. Some answers for Questions 8 and 9 were exactly the same as the listening script, which meant students just copied what they heard without considering the structure. Students were not overly penalised, however, when they expressed themselves in their own words and expressions (without changing the meaning), as it demonstrated a better comprehension.

In Section 2, some students did not fully understand the question. A few students wrote their own opinions for the section without responding to the content of the two texts. Students should learn how to combine the information in the two texts into their written responses. More successful students used the information from the two texts to support their ideas and opinions. They did not have to refer to the two texts equally, as long as the writing had sufficient evidence from each text. If students did not refer to the text at all or simply copied a few sentences without being coherent, they did not achieve a very good mark for Criterion 1.

In Section 3, most students chose Question 2. Imaginative writing is often considered to be easier than evaluative writing as it does not have any expected formality. However, imaginative writing is not so easy, as it should be interesting enough to attract the reader's attention. Imaginative writing students should be able to use various techniques such as a wide range of vocabulary, interesting expressions, detailed descriptions, unexpected endings and unusual storylines. Some pieces had very mundane content, and did not score very good marks for Criterion 1. Being able to use various descriptive words is another good skill needed to obtain additional points for imaginative writing.

Question 3 raised the issue related to the globalisation of English, not problems with studying overseas as some students wrote. In these cases, students lost some points in Criterion 1 (relevance of content). An important feature of evaluative writing is the ability to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of an issue. The writer should maintain an objective perspective. If they lose their perspective the writing becomes persuasive. Although a minimum number of advantages and disadvantages were discussed, students achieved a good mark as long as they gave sufficient and logical details.

Unusual points can attract the reader's interest so this gave an additional mark for Criterion 1. It is virtually unavoidable for the writer to give a brief opinion in the conclusion, even though the writing is evaluative.

## **SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

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

#### **Part A**

**Capacity to understand and convey general and specific aspects of texts**

**Answers**

**Question 1:** 이직률이 적다, 집중력이 뛰어나다. 업무 효율이 높아진다. 회사에 득이 된다 – any 2 of 3 (3점)

**Question 2:** 일을 할 수 있는 것 자체가 희망, 사회에 참여 할 수 있고 가사에 보탬이 될 수 있다 – any 2 of 3 (2점)

**Question 3:** 실제 상황 : (근로자 수 300명 이상의 사업장은 의무적으로 근로장의 2%이상을 장애인으로 채용해야 하지만) 지켜지지 않고 있다 or 단 한명도 채용하지 않고 있다. 장애인 채용을 벌금으로 대신하고 있다. (2점)

내년 장애인 고용법 내용 : 의무고용률을 모든 기업체로 확대, 장애인을 채용하지 않는 업체의 부담금 인상, 장애인을 새로 고용하는 회사에 1년 동안 월급의 50%를 정부가 지원 (3점)

Students should not leave any empty space in the written component, as there are no penalties for wrong answers. Most students achieved 5 (over 8 correct answers out of 10) marks in this part.

#### **Part B – Discussion**

**Capacity to present information appropriately and effectively; relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinions and ideas**

**Answers**

**Question 4:** 한국 정치, 한국 경제 변화, 기업들의 대처, 대양주 지역에서 한글 교육의 방향 설정 – any3 of 4

**Question 5:** 단기적인 목적 : 대학에 진학하기 위해 / 입시를 위해

장기적인 목적 : 한국학 연구에 앞장서기 위해 / 대학에서도 한국학을 공부(연구)하기 위해

**Question 6:** 심도있고 광범위한 연구 가능, 한국에 대한 대부분의 문헌들이 영어로 번역되어 있지 않기 때문에, 못하는 경우 한계가 있어서 – any 2 of 3

**Question 7:** 미국은 이민 역사가 길다, 교민 분포가 다르기 때문에, 교민 구성이 다르기 때문에

**Question 8:** 미국 사회를 그대로 따르면 안됨, 미국의 한국학 발전사를 보면서 미래 방향을 설정, 미국 사회와 호주사회가 다르기 때문에 답습, 모방은 안됨, 미국 모델을 그냥 따랐다가 실패했기 때문에 (새로운 시도), 두 사회의 다른 점을 고려해 한국학 방향에 대해 고민

**Question 9:** 학술활동을 (더욱) 활성화, 논문집을 한국과 전 세계에 배포, 전 세계의 한국 학자들과 같이 연구, 대학생과 대학원생들이 한국학을 더 많이 배울 수 있도록 장려, 교육 프로그램 개발

Most students answered Question 5 correctly by understanding short- and long-term purposes. Some students were unable to get 5 marks for Criterion 2, because they only listed the answers in sentences for Questions 8 and 9 because of sentence structure. Coherence and cohesiveness were not good in this case. Assessors encountered some misspelled words, however, students were not penalised unless there were some obvious repetitive misspellings. Students should not answer in point form for paragraph length questions.

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

**Capacity to identify and synthesise relevant information and ideas from texts; appropriateness of structure and sequence; accuracy, range and appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar**

The idea for the task in Section 2 was to assess how well students presented their own opinion (or persuaded the audience) by showing a good understanding and referring to the two texts. Students had to read the two texts and find contradictory opinions of the two parts, then give their own opinion. Some students summarised the texts instead of using them to support their own opinion. This kind of written response showed inappropriateness of sequence, lack of logic (Criterion 2) and a limited range of vocabulary. Some students who did not refer to the texts at all or copied a few sentences without any coherence did not receive a good mark for Criterion 1. Students are strongly advised to mention main points in the introduction, then refer to them again in the conclusion.

### Section 3 – Writing

#### **Relevance, breadth and depth of content; appropriateness of structure and sequence; accuracy of vocabulary and grammar; range and appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar**

In general, Question 11 was the least popular choice. The important aspect of this task was time – the future. One student presented a brilliant piece; however, he/she did not get a very good mark for Criterion 1 as it was about something in the present not the future. The writing should have addressed influences on other people as well as achievements.

Most students chose Question 12 and the important aspect of this question was what happened after opening the box. However, some students used one-third of their content to describe what happened before opening it. This was penalised for structure (students must read the task very carefully). However, there were some brilliant writers, who produced an excellent short story.

A number of students dealt with the issue of problems of studying overseas and lost their direction half way through the writing. They started with the issue of the globalisation of English, but focused more on problems in studying overseas. This was a very good example of the limitations of preparing answers.

In Question 14, some students who wrote about the advantages and disadvantages of secondary school did not achieve a very good mark for Criterion 1 due to relevance of content. This task was designed particularly for primary schooling, therefore students should have written material relating to younger overseas students.

In general, the standard of students' writing this year was high to very high.

© VCAA 2003

Published by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority  
41 St Andrews Place, East Melbourne 3002

Photocopying: This publication can only be photocopied for the use of students and teachers in Victorian Schools.

