

2012 HSC Notes from the Marking Centre – Italian

Contents

Introduction	1
Beginners.....	2
Oral examination	2
Written examination	3
Section I – Listening.....	3
Section II – Reading skills.....	4
Section III – Writing in Italian	6
Continuers	7
Oral examination	7
Written examination	8
Section I – Listening and responding	8
Section II – Reading and Responding	9
Section III – Writing in Italian	11
Extension.....	12
Oral examination	12
Written examination	13
Section I – Response to prescribed text.....	13
Section II – Writing in Italian.....	14

Introduction

This document has been produced for the teachers and candidates of the Stage 6 courses in Italian. It contains comments on candidate responses to the 2012 Higher School Certificate examinations, indicating the quality of the responses and highlighting their relative strengths and weaknesses.

This document should be read along with the relevant syllabuses, the 2012 Higher School Certificate examinations, the marking guidelines and other support documents developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of Italian.

General comments

Candidates need to be aware that the marks allocated to the question and the answer space (where this is provided on the examination paper) are guides to the length of the required response. A longer response will not in itself lead to higher marks. Writing far beyond the indicated space may reduce the time available for answering other questions.

Candidates need to be familiar with the Board's [Glossary of Key Words](#), which contains some terms commonly used in examination questions. However, candidates should also be aware that not all questions will start with or contain one of the key words from the glossary. Questions such as 'how?', 'why?' or 'to what extent?' may be asked, or verbs that are not included in the glossary may be used, such as 'design', 'translate' or 'list'.

Preparing for the Beginners/Continuers oral examinations

Detailed advice is provided on the Board's website for teachers and students about the nature and conduct of the HSC oral examinations at:

www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au/syllabus_hsc/languages.html

However, teachers and students are reminded that:

- Questions will refer to the candidates' personal world in relation to the prescribed topics in the syllabus.
- Neither the number of questions nor the number of topics covered by the examination is predetermined. The examiner may ask questions that relate to a previous response made by the candidate or introduce a new topic.
- Candidates should answer each question ONLY with information related specifically to the question asked.
- The examiner will interrupt candidates who attempt to dominate the conversation with long, rehearsed monologues at an appropriate moment.
- Candidates will be asked a range of question types, which may include hypothetical questions (eg What if ... ?), questions that require them to express/justify an opinion or questions requiring them to answer from another person's perspective (eg Does your mother like ... ?).
- Candidates will be asked questions that relate to past, present and future experience.
- If candidates do not understand a question, they may ask for a question to be repeated, clarified or rephrased in the language being examined. Candidates should NOT ask the examiner to translate words or questions.
- Candidates should NOT identify themselves, their teachers or their schools to the examiner.

BEGINNERS

Oral examination

Most candidates fulfilled the requirements of this examination and maintained a five-minute conversation in which they discussed their personal world as it related to the prescribed topics. They responded in Italian to a variety of questions, exchanging information and expressing opinions, using acceptable intonation and pronunciation.

In better responses, candidates manipulated the language using a wide variety of language structures, correct tense and vocabulary in order to respond to the question appropriately. They responded and elaborated, gave an explanation and/or an opinion without relying on learned responses that did not answer the question. These candidates also moved between tenses confidently using the past, present, future and conditional tense. They used modal verbs, a range of vocabulary and some good idiomatic expressions. Proverbs and idiomatic expressions were used sparingly but with maximum effect. In better responses, candidates were able to maintain communication without losing fluency when the examiner redirected the conversation to a different prescribed topic.

Recurring errors included misuse of modal verbs, eg *voglio vado, devo or studio posso nuoto*. The verb *piacere* was used incorrectly across the tenses. Candidates used *scorso* and *prossimo, divertente* and *divertirsi*, or *interessante* and *interessato* incorrectly. In weaker

responses, candidates did not conjugate verbs to agree with subject *lui, lei, noi* or *loro*. They used *simpatico* and *bello* to describe everything.

Many candidates avoided the use of the future tense. Frequently candidates used the incorrect auxiliary with the present perfect *ho andato* or left out the auxiliary altogether, eg *io mangiato* or *tu visitato*.

Candidates are reminded to listen to the whole question before responding and to ask in Italian for the question to be repeated, if required. They should also try to answer in the tense appropriate to the question asked rather than simply respond in the present tense.

Written examination

Section I – Listening

In better responses, candidates provided appropriate information in order to fulfil the requirements of the question. These candidates paraphrased the information accurately rather than literally translating slabs of irrelevant information from the text.

Candidates must remember to transfer their responses from the Candidates' Notes section into the lines provided for the answer.

Candidates are reminded to use their dictionaries to find the meaning of words in the context of the text, if they are unsure of the meaning.

Question 1

The majority of candidates identified that guitar lessons are being promoted.

Question 2

In better responses, candidates provided a full explanation of Giulia's plans.

Question 3

In better responses, candidates identified the different days and modes of transport in order to give a full explanation of how the two speakers' travel plans differed.

Question 4

In better responses, candidates provided a full explanation of how the woman persuaded her husband, ie she would record the soccer game for him and prepare his favourite meal for dinner as well as watch the game with him.

In weaker responses, candidates did not understand the word registrar and interpreted it as 'to sign up for soccer'. In these responses, candidates did not understand who was recording the program.

Question 5

In better responses, candidates clearly stated that it would appeal to people who liked skiing and that they would have to have a car or be willing to drive. They also indicated that the discount offer was only for the coming weekend, so people had to be free that weekend.

Question 6

In weaker responses, candidates heard *cuscino* as *cugino*. They also were not clear regarding the meaning of *vestito*.

Question 7

In better responses, candidates gave a full explanation of how Marino persuaded Sandra to reconsider her career. These candidates pointed out the negatives of nursing, ie irregular hours

that would affect her social life and that the course was very long, whereas if she enrolled in a TAFE course' it would take less time to complete so she would earn money sooner and have more time for her friends. In weaker responses, candidates thought that *ospedale* was hospitality.

Question 8

In better responses, candidates clearly stated that Maria was likely to attend the event again next year because her experience had been positive. The acoustics were good, she saw her favourite bands and she had good, close seats. On the other hand, Lorenzo's experience had been negative. It was too crowded, he could not see the performers and the tickets were too expensive.

In weaker responses, candidates did not understand that Maria and Lorenzo were talking about an event that had already taken place. Some thought *acustica perfetta* referred to a singer not to Maria's ability to hear the music.

Question 9

In better responses, candidates included a detailed explanation as to why Signor Rinaldo, the Environment Minister, was being interviewed (ie to answer questions about the local recycling programme, the importance of keeping parks and beaches clean and informing the listeners about the Council's initiatives regarding graffiti).

In weaker responses, candidates thought that *domande* meant demands and did not understand that *municipio* means the local council.

Question 10

In better responses, candidates described changes in both the father's and daughter's position, in particular the father moving from being against to accepting that university could wait for a year and the daughter moving from being undecided to more certain of her actions.

In weaker responses, candidates did not understand the *legge* means law.

Section II – Reading skills

Candidates are reminded to use their dictionaries if they do not know the meaning of a word or expression. Candidates need to contextualise the meaning from the choices given in the dictionary, ie candidates should ensure that they have found the appropriate word and meaning in the context of the text.

It is not necessary to provide quotes directly from the text in Italian. Candidates should paraphrase in English, information contained in the passage that addresses the requirements of the question. It is also inappropriate to translate large irrelevant parts of the passage in the response.

Question 11

In better responses, candidates provided a full explanation: that Elisa left the message to tell her aunt when she was arriving and to ask if she could be picked up from the airport.

In weaker responses, candidates did not understand *prendermi dall'aeroporto*. These candidates thought *Zia Liliana* was a friend.

Question 12

- a. In better responses, candidates correctly identified that a new gym was opening and there were special offers.

In weaker responses, candidates did not see the importance of *nuova* in relation to the gym. These candidates did not understand that *cento* means 100 and that the special offers were for the first 100 subscribers. They understood *Sconto famiglia* as meaning suitable for a family rather than a family discount.

- b. In better responses, candidates clearly indicated that Marco would be more interested in the advertisement. They justified their choice by noting that Marco was more likely to join because the gym is near his home so he could easily go after work and he would also get the family discount because his sister was interested in joining as well.

In weaker responses, candidates confused the names and the *da* and *a* of the email; consequently their responses were not clear.

Question 13

- a. In better responses, candidates indicated that Matteo is being interviewed because he had applied for a work/study programme in Bologna.

In weaker responses, candidates interpreted *la tua domanda* as Matteo asking a question.

- b. In better responses, candidates provided a comprehensive explanation of how Matteo would benefit from the program. It would help advance his career, improve his knowledge of Italian and he would be able to fulfil his dream to work in Italy. The program also included board, lodging and tuition and that this would enable him to travel with the money he saved from his weekly pay.

Question 14

- a. In better responses, candidates identified that a holiday near the sea was being advised.
- b. In better responses, candidates indicated that the Boar/*Cinghiale* would experience the greatest success at work because they identified that a promotion and an increase in salary was forecast.
- c. In better responses, candidates understood that the Dragon would face difficulties at work throughout the year whereas the Rat would be offered a new position in the first half of the year although the second half would prove difficult. They pointed out that the year was not favourable for the Dragon's personal relationships but conditions were favourable for the Rat's. These responses also included a comment about health. The Dragon would be tired and listless during the first months of the year but the Rat would feel quite well.

Question 15

- a. In better responses, candidates indicated the topic being discussed. In weaker responses, candidates did not understand *raggiungerla*.
- b. In better responses, candidates gave a thorough comparison of the Lucia's and Chiara's different attitudes towards happiness. They showed that, for Chiara, happiness comes from single events such as finishing her HSC examination while, for Lucia, happiness is a deeper feeling that comes from living and appreciating every moment of one's life. Lucia takes a more long-term approach to finding happiness.
- c. In better responses, candidates explained the extent to which Davide agrees with Michele on how to attain happiness. They showed that, while Davide did agree that money can make life better, he feels that it does not necessarily make you happy. Davide thinks Michele is materialistic to think that happiness is earning money to buy everything you want. For Davide happiness is spending time with family and friends, watching his favourite team playing and experiencing the joy of becoming a father. Davide believes Michele's attitude is wrong and that happiness comes from being rather than having. Some candidates thought that *Michele* is Michael and not Michelle.

Section III – Writing in Italian

In better responses, candidates used a variety of language structures and vocabulary and demonstrate that they could use complex structures correctly. They manipulated and produced original and accurate language, demonstrating a sophisticated knowledge of vocabulary and grammatical structures.

Part A

Question 16

In better responses, candidates adhered to the text type of a postcard and clearly addressed the recipient as well as signed off at the end of the postcard. These candidates addressed all parts of the question and adhered to the word limit. In weaker responses, candidates did not use the verb *stare* to express how they felt saying *sono bene* instead of *sto bene*. These responses included incorrect spelling of Italian cities and incorrect use of preposition *in* for cities instead of *a*. They also did not use most articulated prepositions correctly. Candidates are reminded to use the correct auxiliary with the *passato prossimo* and say *sono uscito/a* instead of incorrect *ho uscito*.

Question 17

In better responses, candidates wrote an email asking for advice on a particular problem that they were facing. These candidates sequenced their response coherently and maintained communication.

Common errors included the incorrect spelling of *aiutare* and not using it in the imperative form *aiutami*, the incorrect conjugation of the verbs *volere* and *potere*, the incorrect use of *ho bisogno di* and not placing *non* before the conjugated verb in negative statements.

Part B

Question 18 (a) and (b)

In better responses, candidates wrote a letter saying what had happened at either the Principal's office or at a special family event. These candidates wrote mainly in the past, using correct auxiliaries, modal verbs and agreements. They made their letter flow, using a variety of language structures, connectors, vocabulary and idiomatic expressions while adhering to the word limit of the task. In these responses, candidates addressed the letter appropriately to a friend or their grandparents and also signed off their letter appropriately the familiar, informal form.

In weaker responses, common errors were:

- incorrect conjugation of the verb according to the subject
- incorrect agreements in number and gender between nouns and adjectives
- omitting the auxiliary when using the present perfect eg *io ballato, noi mangiato*
- using incorrect auxiliary for the verb used eg *ho stato*
- not using correct word order to show ownership, eg saying *Jessica compleanno* instead of *il compleanno di Jessica* or *Andrea casa* rather than *la casa di Andrea*.

Candidates also had many spelling errors of basic Italian words, writing *mumma, pappa* or *ristaurante* instead of *mamma, papa* or *ristorante*. These candidates did not use *preside* for principal despite the word appearing in the question.

CONTINUERS

Oral examination

Most candidates interacted confidently with the examiner and expected to be redirected by the examiner in order to cover a range of topics relating to their personal world. They provided relevant responses to questions on a range of topics.

In better responses demonstrated a high level of grammatical accuracy, were able to move easily across the relevant tenses and showed ability to provide depth to their responses by providing opinions, reflecting and/or justifying.

They elaborated confidently and fluently showing an ability to correctly manipulate language structures in most situations. These candidates also used complex language structures correctly to express opinions, reflections and comments on a range of topics in an authentic and spontaneous way using correct intonation and pronunciation in Italian. They explored a topic beyond what was rote learned and manipulated the language using a range of vocabulary and language structures according the question asked. They also conjugated verbs in the conditional tense correctly and used the subjunctive mood.

In weaker responses, candidates tended to repeat the examiner's question without re-conjugating the verb. They were unable to answer beyond what they had rote learnt or were unable to manipulate the language.

Candidates are reminded that they need to be prepared to discuss and elaborate within each topic showing some depth and a range of ideas rather than simply answering *si* or *no*. They need to give reasons why they have done or have not done something or why they are interested or not interested in any particular activity.

Candidates should expect to be asked questions that seek to elicit a response in the *lui, lei, loro, noi* forms of conjugations in all tenses and not just expect to speak in the first person singular form.

In weaker responses, candidates limited their responses to learnt and prepared responses without tailoring it to the specific cues of the question. Others simply provided a list or just responded with a statement in the affirmative or the negative. These candidates often resorted to using dialect and/or English words or syntax. Candidates are reminded they should be prepared to add depth to a topic by justifying and/or expanding on their comments and opinions.

Common errors were:

- incorrect noun and adjectival agreements both in gender and number, in particular nouns and adjectives ending in *e* in the singular that need to change to *i* in the plural
- using *bene* – well, *buono* – good and *bravo* – well-behaved inappropriately
- using *mi piace* for both singular and plural instead of *mi piacciono* when more than one thing is liked
- interchanging countries for nationalities and vice versa
- not using appropriate possessives with singular family members
- using reflexive verbs with appropriate reflexive pronouns
- not using direct and indirect preceding object pronouns correctly
- not using *avere* with age
- saying *sono diciassette anni* instead of *ho diciassette anni*
- interchanging adverbs of time such as *scorso, prossimo, oggi* or *giorno* inappropriately
- not using the imperfect tense when needed in the context.

In weaker responses, candidates did not conjugate verbs at all but responded in infinitives and had difficulty pronouncing some cognates such as *università*, *televisione* or *strumenti*. These candidates did not know that a scholarship is *una borsa di studio*.

Written examination

Section I – Listening and responding

Question 1

In better responses, candidates stated that the two speakers were discussing that Massimo was seen at the movies and that both speakers did not like that film. The speakers then discussed going to the movies together next time since they seemed to have similar taste in films. In weaker responses, candidates translated *noioso* as annoying rather than boring.

Question 3

In better responses, candidates explained the importance of the dates. They stated that the teacher was available to help with job applications on 14 November, that the latest date to hand in CVs was 21 November and that the job interviews would commence on 23 November.

In weaker responses, candidates found *colloquio*, *domanda di lavoro* and *entro* challenging vocabulary.

Question 4

In better responses, candidates justified that Rosanna would likely take Bruno, the exchange student, to the party because she wants to have a good time. At that moment Rosanna was fighting with her boyfriend. She said that they did not have much in common and he did not understand her. Also Bruno would be a good contact to have in Italy when she goes to Bologna.

In weaker responses, candidates understood *non ne parliamo* as we are not talking to each other but did not understand *mi farebbe comodo*.

Question 5

In better responses, candidates wrote an email and explained the dilemma surrounding the accommodation issue if Alessia, Salvatore's host sister, and her family were to come to Australia the following year. They explained that there would be a family of six wanting to stay with them and that Salvatore's house was too small. They understood that when Salvatore asked his mother what she thought, he was really hoping that she would say it was possible for them to accommodate such a large group in their little house.

Question 7

In better responses, candidates justified, with reference to the text, if they thought Amando was or was not a good interviewer for Signora Monti.

Candidates who believed that Armando was not a good interviewer stated that he was very passionate about the environment and was not able to detach himself from the fact that he disagrees with the idea of building a shopping centre in the park. They justified their stance

by saying that Armando was rude, interrupted Signora Monti and did not let her finish and also ended the interview abruptly in a cynical tone by playing an environmental song.

Candidates who believed that Armando was a good interviewer said that he was passionate about the environment, that he challenged Signora Monti and did not accept her reasons/justifications for building the shopping centre in the park. These candidates showed that Armando was a good interviewer because he showed that building a shopping centre in the park was not good for the environment. These responses also acknowledged however, that it was inappropriate that Armando was rude and dismissive towards Signora Monti and did not allow her to express her point of view.

Question 8

In better responses, candidates understood that Stefania's tone and language reflected a negative view of Italy while her tone and language towards Australia reflected a positive view of this country. They showed that Stefania felt resentment and disappointment towards Italy because, although she had a degree, it was meaningless and she could not get paid work. Rents were high and she was obliged to rely on her parents. On the other hand, she had a real job in Australia and was filled with enthusiasm. She could earn money, be independent and free to do what she wanted. In better responses, candidates showed in English how expressions like *Italia puo` aspettare, che barzellatta, te la sogni, nemmeno un grazie* reflected Stefania's view of Italy.

Section II – Reading and Responding

Part A

Candidates are reminded to proofread what they have written to make sure that the English response makes sense. If they are justifying their response with reference to the text, they should paraphrase in Italian text in English and not just use the Italian without any explanation.

Question 9

- a. In better responses, candidates identified what happened at Alberto's school: students formed a group on the internet to make fun of a teacher and the student who organised the group was expelled.

In weaker responses, candidates misunderstood the text and thought that all the students had been expelled. *Cacciato* was misinterpreted to mean hunted down.

- b. In better responses, candidates summarised the main points: the students' behaviour was unacceptable and all should be punished, the school should be teaching students the correct way to treat people, it is not right to humiliate people and just expelling the student who organised the group would not teach how to behave towards others.
- c. In better responses, candidates stated that Alessandra disagreed with the punishment and justified her attitude. Alessandra believed that the punishment was too harsh. Even the teacher who the group had made fun of had laughed. They also gave the example that, when a similar incident happened at her school, no one took any notice and the best way to discourage others from behaving badly on the internet is to ignore the behaviour and not give them the attention they seek.

Question 10

- a. In better responses, candidates stated that the two letters were chosen by the editor in response to an article that appeared in their magazine the previous week on young people and politics. These two letters were chosen because the two young people showed a certain level of awareness towards politics and they represented different cultural backgrounds and perspectives.
- b. In better responses, candidates gave a clear explanation of the comment. They stated that the discussion of politics was not part of his personal world. It was not discussed with his friends, family or at school. They said that the boy now realised that, as he was almost 18-years old and eligible to vote, he needed to inform himself because political decisions would affect his future.
- c. In better responses, candidates showed that politics was part of everyday life for the Italian girl. She had to face the consequences of political decisions daily and her school was involved in a protest due to new school reforms that they disagreed with. She was aware of the effect of high taxes on her family and commented on the condition of public transport made worse by strikes. She felt that, even if one is cynical about how much one can do to solve the problems that face Italy and the world, young people need to get involved to make a difference for the future.
- d. In better responses, candidates referred to both the Australian boy's and the Italian girl's level of maturity. They stated that, while the boy had no previous experience of or interest in politics, he now wanted to inform himself because he saw that he had a responsibility to be fully aware if he was going to vote. He had a more idealistic view. The girl was more realistic and even cynical towards politics because she had been more aware of its effect on her everyday life. However, they were both committed to making a difference and thought that it is the responsibility of young people to be politically informed because political decisions will affect their lives and the future of the planet.

Part B

Question 11

In this task, candidates needed to identify, analyse and respond to the main points raised by the blog posts. They needed to respond to issues raised by both people involved. In responding to the information, questions, ideas and opinions contained in it, candidates needed to show a good global understanding of the text as a whole.

In weaker responses, candidates did not address issues raised by both bloggers. They also did not address Benson_ Prof in the *Lei* Form. These candidates used entire sections from the text and did not meet the word limit requirement of the task.

The following were common grammatical and language errors:

- using the articulated preposition with the demonstrative pronoun eg *nel questo*
- using the interrogative *chi* instead of the relative pronoun *che*
- confusing *dovrebbe* and *potrebbe*
- confusing *e`* and *e*.

In better responses, candidates elaborated and suggested opinions and ideas. They responded with a good range of authentic expressions and approached the task with creativity.

In weaker responses, candidates also tended to focus on one aspect of the text and did not respond to the whole text. The poorer responses lacked variety and correct use of vocabulary, syntax, grammar and punctuation, and displayed a lack of good dictionary skills. These responses also contained many errors in agreement, conjugation of verbs and the use of appropriate tenses and register.

Section III – Writing in Italian

Question 12

In better responses, candidates responded confidently to this question by referring to a memory of a special event, as the task required. These candidates wrote effectively and manipulated the language creatively using the appropriate features pertinent to the text type of a short talk. These candidates used rhetorical questions, addressed the audience using the pronoun *voi*, used the correct greeting at the start and the correct closure to the short talk. They demonstrated a competent use of the present perfect and imperfect tenses and used idiomatic expressions, authentic vocabulary and complex sentence structures appropriately.

In weaker responses, candidates wrote in the incorrect text type or misunderstood the instructions for the question. They wrote a dialogue or conversation text type rather than presenting the script of a speech. They also did not use correct verb conjugations. In these responses, candidates did not describe the significance of the special event.

Candidates are advised to learn correct conjugation of verbs and subject verb agreements and to use dictionaries correctly, checking that the translations are meaningful and appropriate for the context. They should cross-reference words from the English-Italian dictionary with its complement in the Italian-English Dictionary.

Candidates are also advised to write a plan for their response so that they can address all the requirements of the question. Candidates are reminded to adhere to the 75-word limit.

Question 13

Candidates are reminded to adhere to the text type and the word limit of approximately 200 words.

In better responses, candidates wrote in the appropriate text type and manipulated the language authentically and creatively by using a variety of tenses, expressions and idioms. They sequenced and structured ideas and information coherently and effectively. They used persuasive language and followed a plan.

In weaker responses, candidates wrote prepared responses and did not fully address the requirements of the question.

- a. In better responses, candidates tried to persuade the grandparent to start using more modern means of communication and provided a number of relevant examples. These candidates addressed the grandparent directly by asking rhetorical questions and using encouraging language. Better responses included persuasive language such as *Sarebbe bello, Che ne pensi? Ma dai!* or *Che ne dici?* These candidates also used the conditional and the imperative form of the verbs correctly as well as other complex grammar structures.

In weaker responses, candidates only discussed the advantages of the Internet and repeated their ideas and vocabulary and did not attempt to persuade.

- b. In better responses, candidates gave good reasons why a family member should change their ideas about their future career and explained why they would benefit from the change. They gave opinions: *Secondo me dovresti* or *sarebbe una buona idea*. These candidates used idiomatic expressions, sequenced and structured ideas and used the conditional and imperative effectively to convince the family member to change.

Candidates are reminded not to overuse idiomatic expressions. If they are used sparingly and correctly in the context of the question, they have a more significant effect. Some common errors were incorrect adjectival agreements, incorrect plural endings, misuse of pronouns and a lack of verb conjugations.

EXTENSION

Oral examination

General comments

In better responses, candidates presented a well-structured monologue in approximately three minutes using examples to support their argument. They used a range of vocabulary at an appropriate level of sophistication. These responses reflected an in-depth knowledge of the issues set for study. These candidates also delivered their responses using complex structures with a high level of accuracy, using correct intonation and pronunciation. These candidates went beyond a simplistic response to include a certain degree of reflection in expressing their point of view. They presented a coherent monologue by developing and linking ideas pertinent to the question.

In weaker responses, candidates made errors in grammar, verb conjugation and syntax. At times pronunciation detracted from the overall flow of their presentation of ideas. They discussed issues related to the topic but did not relate them specifically to answer the question and they did not give concrete examples.

Candidates are advised to clearly state their position in the introduction and support their argument with a range of relevant, well-developed examples. They must address all aspects of the question rather than only parts of the question. Candidates are also advised to use linkers to connect ideas in order to present a coherent monologue. They are reminded of the importance of preparing good, well-structured notes during their preparation time. Candidates are advised to plan their argument and ensure they refer to the question being answered. They should also avoid repetition. Candidates are reminded to adhere to the time limit of three minutes allocated to this section of the examination when presenting their monologue.

Question 1

In better responses, candidates addressed all parts of the question, focusing on the key words *razzismo*, *vivo* and 'in Australia'. These candidates presented and supported their point of view in a logical and coherent way. They presented a robust discussion supported by appropriate examples of racism in Australian society. They also supported their argument by referring to their personal experience. They reflected on the extent of racism in Australian and in some cases offered explanations and/or solutions.

Question 2

In better responses, candidates covered all parts of the question. They gave examples to substantiate their discussion.

In weaker responses, candidates did not address the second part of the question. Candidates are advised to use a variety of synonyms and not repeat the wording of the question throughout the monologue.

Written examination

Section I – Response to prescribed text

Part A

Question 1

- a. In better responses, candidates explained the quote *Il silenzio è il grido più forte* in the context of the scene. These candidates explained the circumstances in the scene that led the character of Zio Eliseo to give the quote in response to Guido's question *Ma perche' non hai gridato?* and in reference to the intruders' attack.

In weaker responses, candidates tended to give an explanation of the quote in relation to the film as a whole without adequate reference to the context of the scene.

- b. In better responses, candidates discussed how this scene relates to developments later in the film. They perceptively highlighted the connection between the discriminatory nature of the attack on Zio Eliseo at this point of the film and the increasing episodes of discrimination as the film progresses and the political climate changes. They gave various valid examples. They also connected this episode to other themes in the film, such as the significance of the house represented in the scene as a haven for love and family relationships.
- c. In better responses, candidates commented on the use of a variety of images and colour throughout the scene.
- d. In better responses, candidates explained how the director succeeded in lifting our spirits throughout the film by exploring the resilience of the human spirit. In this scene it was noted how, through the character of Zio Eliseo and his dignified response to the discriminatory attack he had just suffered, human resilience played a part in lifting our spirits. In this potentially negative scene, Zio Eliseo was able to rise above the event itself and welcome his guests with warmth, kindness and good humour, leaving the audience in a positive state of mind.

Other suitable scenes were discussed from various perspectives, once again with a focus on how the director lifted the audience's spirits through characterisation, dialogue and settings that highlighted resilience as a positive human trait.

In weaker responses, candidates did not project their explanation further than merely storytelling in connection to the characters involved in the chosen scenes. They failed to show how the director used characters, dialogue and settings to celebrate resilience in the face of adversity and the effect this can have on the audience. In these responses, candidates did not choose appropriate scenes to explain their point of view and merely attempted to make the scene they chose fit their explanation.

Part B

Question 2

In better responses, candidates wrote as if they were Dr Lessing. They demonstrated knowledge of the film by providing a perceptive and insightful reflection on the relationship between Guido and Dr Lessing.

They also reflected on the two meetings Guido and Dr Lessing had inside the concentration camp, one being the medical check-up, the other in the dinner scene. These candidates imagined Dr Lessing going through a process of change and remorse after the war, in an attempt to come to terms with his inability or unwillingness to save Guido and his family.

In weaker responses, candidates only provided a superficial recount of some events of the film, not always correctly or in the correct time sequence and did not offer a reflection on the relationship between the two men from Dr Lessing's point of view.

These candidates did not manipulate language authentically and accurately. They translated the word camp incorrectly as *campeggio*, the word 'riddle' incorrectly as *dovinello* or *riddolo* or even *barzilletta*. They did not know the Italian word for Jewish and did not use their dictionaries to find a translation. These candidates did not use the formal register correctly and consistently throughout the letter or could not maintain it throughout the letter, switching from the familiar to the formal and vice versa.

The text type conventions of a letter were only partly adhered to. They also used inappropriate opening and closing expressions such as *ciao Dora, come stai?* or *baci e abbracci*.

Section II – Writing in Italian

Question 3

In better responses, candidates adhered to the text type of an article and included an appropriate title, an introduction, a development of ideas and a conclusion. Better responses included an informative style of language with examples, backup arguments, statistics and rhetorical questions addressed to the readers.

In weaker responses, candidates wrote a speech.

In better responses, candidates provided informed reflections on the plight of the homeless and society's responsibilities towards them. These candidates discussed the many reasons why a person could become homeless and referred to important literature such as the Declaration of Human Rights. These candidates developed a sophisticated and coherent argument and justified their point of view convincingly.

In weaker responses, candidates did not to develop and sustain an argument.

Many candidates used the present and imperfect subjunctive even when it was not required. The if clause, with the hypothetical in particular, was over used and incorrectly formed. Candidates are strongly advised to use the sequence of tenses and syntax appropriately. In terms of lexicon usage, a certain degree of fluctuation with word formation was noted in many instances, for example the correct word for homeless, *i senzatetto*, was often rendered as *i senzatetti* or even *i senzatette*, which means something entirely different.

In weaker responses, candidates often resorted to using anglicised words and made-up words as well as English word order.

Question 4

In better responses, candidates presented their ideas with flair and a variety of interesting examples that they used to enrich their arguments against wishing to appear on a reality television show. These responses also demonstrated a high level of grammatical accuracy, a good range of vocabulary and idioms.

In weaker responses, candidates mainly focused on reasons for not wanting to be part of the show because they did not want to be away from home or because they did not have the time to devote to this enterprise. These responses focussed on recounting the experiences gained through watching reality shows such as Big Brother.

In better responses, candidates argued the merits or the challenges of such public exposure as being in a reality television show. They discussed in the article the consequences in the short term and long term and gave perceptive reasons for turning down the offer.