



BOARD OF STUDIES  
NEW SOUTH WALES

---

# 1998 HSC

---

## EXAMINATION REPORT

### NAFLaSSL Languages

Arabic

Armenian

Croatian

Czech

Dutch

Filipino

Hindi

Hungarian

Khmer

Korean

Latvian

Macedonian

Maltese

Persian

Polish

Portuguese

Russian

Serbian

Slovenian

Swedish

Turkish

Ukrainian

© Board of Studies 1999

Published by  
Board of Studies NSW  
GPO Box 5300  
Sydney NSW 2001  
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

September 1999

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 4337 9

## Contents

Arabic . . . . .	5
Armenian . . . . .	8
Croatian . . . . .	9
Czech . . . . .	11
Dutch . . . . .	12
Filipino . . . . .	14
Hindi . . . . .	15
Hungarian . . . . .	17
Khmer . . . . .	20
Korean . . . . .	21
Latvian . . . . .	25
Macedonian . . . . .	28
Maltese . . . . .	29
Persian . . . . .	33
Polish . . . . .	34
Portuguese . . . . .	38
Russian . . . . .	39
Serbian . . . . .	40
Slovenian . . . . .	41
Swedish . . . . .	42
Turkish . . . . .	44
Ukrainian . . . . .	45



## NAFLaSSL Examination Reports

### Arabic

#### Speaking Examination

##### *Conversation*

The standard of oracy was high this year, with the majority of students displaying a depth of training and preparedness to answer the questions required of them. It was evident that students, on the whole, were familiar with examination requirements and most used or attempted to use modern standard Arabic.

Most students conversed fluently in modern standard Arabic. Poorer responses were characterised by the use of simple language structures, while the better responses demonstrated use of more complex language structures and a broader range of vocabulary. Most students demonstrated the ability to go beyond a minimal response and responded to the full range of topics presented by the examiner.

##### *Report and Discussion*

Examiners were pleased to note the range of interesting topics as diverse as ‘Cloning’, ‘Terrorism’ and ‘Children in Modern Society’. In general, the topics had been well-researched and students were well-prepared to respond without hesitation to a range of questions posed by the examiners.

Although most available resources were in English, the students’ ability to make use of these resources by translating and interpreting the required information was impressive.

Students and teachers are reminded that:

- students must undertake appropriate research and not rely simply on their general knowledge of a topic
- reports should not exceed the 1–2 minute examination time limit (see also the assessment criteria for this task).

On the whole, it was noted that the level of student preparation was higher in this section than in the Conversation section.

#### Listening and Written Examinations

##### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Most students handled this part of the paper very well. They showed an ability to use relevant information to answer the questions.

### Passage 1

Questions 1 and 2 were generally answered well. Some students did not answer question 3 correctly. They mentioned the name of the Arab athlete rather than mentioning the seven gold medals that were won in 1996.

### Passage 2

Questions 1 and 3 were generally answered well. Poorer responses in question 2 did not include the duration of the school holidays. They only mentioned that the holiday will be increased to 3 weeks.

### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

In general, this part was handled well. Almost all students observed the conventions of the letter discourse form. The better students were able to select relevant information from the spoken passages and organise this into a meaningful sequence. These students demonstrated good control of the language and some of them were able to show some degree of independence from the original texts.

Weaker students selected very limited information, their ideas were not properly linked and they tended to use the wording of the original spoken passages instead of using their own expressions. The language used by these students was poorly structured and some spelling errors were detected.

Few students used general knowledge rather than information from the spoken passages.

Students are reminded that they should:

- read instructions and questions carefully before starting the task
- use relevant linking words/expressions in order to process and organise their information into a meaningful sequence
- use only the information from the spoken passages and not to rely on general knowledge
- use the appropriate discourse form.

Some students tended to end their writing task when they realised that they had exceeded the word limit required and ignored the correct format for ending the letter.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Arabic*

The most popular tasks were number 1, an article for a local newspaper on the role of school and parents in educating children and number 5, a letter to a friend living in an Arab country about the sender's escape from a horrifying accident.

The writing task was generally well handled by the majority of students. They demonstrated a good control of syntax and linguistic elements and were able to organise content appropriately.

Common weaknesses were:

- poor spelling
- grammatical errors in regard to verb endings, incorrect use of hamzah, negative form, dual and plural
- use of colloquial language rather than modern standard arabic
- lack of variety in sentence structure, eg use of only simple sentence structures
- limited vocabulary relevant to the topic
- failure to use the required discourse form.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Most students handled this task reasonably well. The most able students selected and reorganised the relevant information in a meaningful way. They demonstrated a high degree of independence from the wording of the original text and a good control of the language required in the task. Some difficulties, however, arose in the following areas:

- a few students ignored the information provided and produced their own piece of writing
- some students copied information verbatim from the passages, consequently their degree of independence from the wording of the text suffered, and caused them to score badly on other criteria
- a small number of students used a limited and repetitive range of linking words to relate the relevant information
- some students failed to adhere to the required discourse form
- some used a limited range of vocabulary and sentence structures, and their spelling was poor
- there were some instances of colloquial language instead of modern standard Arabic.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

Most students attempted Theme 1, which was ‘Women in Arabic Literature’. In the best responses to question 1, students discussed the quotation ‘Divorce in the Arab world is always at the discretion of the male’ by referring to the resources they had studied. Most students tended to agree with the quotation and illustrated their answers with references to the resources. A few students found references that supported an opposing view and showed that when a woman had the power to divorce her husband, it was only on certain terms such as having to leave her children behind.

Question 2 was not as well handled by students. Accordingly most did not discuss the quotation ‘The Arab woman’s place is in the home, raising children’ in relation to the resources studied. The students tended to illustrate examples drawn from the resources of women who were successful in the work place or home, but did not relate this specifically to the quotation.

Some students who attempted Theme 2 tended to write about the topic from a personal perspective with little or no reference to resources. Others tended to give many reasons for migration but did not discuss the affect of migration on people’s lives or the difficulties associated with assimilation.

Students are reminded that they should:

- refer specifically to resources studied in their responses
- refer to either one oral and one written or two written resources (not just oral resources)
- restrict comment to two resources in order to demonstrate ‘depth of treatment’
- read the question carefully, answer the question asked and not to respond using pre-prepared material.

## **Armenian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

Examiners commented that students’ standard of fluency and their confidence continues to improve. Most students responded fluently and accurately, and seemed at ease in this part of the examination. A few students were rather hesitant and needed a degree of prompting to enable them to respond adequately.

#### *Report and Discussion*

While some students were well prepared for this part of the examination, others had prepared inappropriate topics or were insufficiently prepared. Students should be aware that they are expected to deliver a report based on research and that this forms the basis of discussion with the examiner. In some cases, reports had been rote learned and students were unable to discuss the topic after the report had been delivered.

Autobiographies proved particularly popular. Teachers and students are advised to explore a range of topic areas that lend themselves to the report and discussion mode of presentation.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Questions were generally well handled with no particular vocabulary or language structure problems.

##### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

In general, the conventions of the text type were observed, but some students did not have a clear sense of the audience. Some of the terminology was not considered appropriate for the particular audience.

In some cases, examiners observed an over-reliance on the stimulus material. In general, students selected relevant material from both texts and reorganised the material well.

Students demonstrated a good range of vocabulary and structures.



## *Paper 2*

### *Part A: Writing in Armenian*

The most popular questions were 6, followed by 5 then 4. Students demonstrated the capacity to deal with the chosen topic well. Some problems with syntax were evident, there was also some evidence of translation of structures directly from English. Students are advised to work on vocabulary extension.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Few students handled this part well. Students were able to select relevant information, but some students resorted to copying slabs of material directly from the written texts.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

In general, students did not handle paper 3 well. There was little evidence of depth of treatment in the responses. Students frequently used their own knowledge rather than evidence from the resources. Students recalled facts, but did not engage in any meaningful discussion of these facts in relation to the questions asked.

## **Croatian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

Overall, students performed well in this section of the examination. The best students demonstrated a high degree of accuracy in the use of linguistic elements, with clear pronunciation and expression.

Most students were able to sustain a conversation and go beyond a minimal response.

There was some evidence of English or German or Serbian influence on items of vocabulary. Some students did not use the *vi/ti* forms appropriately and had difficulty with case endings.

#### *Report and Discussion*

The best students demonstrated a thoroughness of preparation and research, with reports covering a number of aspects of the chosen topic. There were some excellent choices of report topics, with some linked to Croatian culture. Students had drawn information from a wide range of sources including the Internet.

The poorer reports revealed a lack of relevance and preparation, and, in some cases a reliance on general knowledge or students' personal at experience unsupported by any research.

## Listening and Written Examinations

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

This task was generally well done. The better responses demonstrated students' ability:

- to select and process relevant information
- to use the appropriate conventions of the designated discourse form, which was in this case, the newspaper article requiring a heading, introduction, date and name of newspaper/magazine, byline and the use of polite form
- effective linking and sequencing that included the appropriate use of paragraphs
- effective control of language including use of a rich and varied vocabulary and complex language structures.

The less successful students did not select appropriate information and wrote without reference to the conventions of the discourse form. Ideas and information were presented in a casual or confused manner. There were errors in cases, case ending and punctuation. In addition, scripts showed evidence of English language interference and an absence of paragraphing.

Students are strongly reminded to include only information contained in the texts and not to include ideas or information from their own experience or their personal knowledge of the topic.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Croatian*

This section of the Paper was generally handled well. All the questions were attempted by students, the most popular being question 5, followed closely by question 4. Those students who responded to the stimulus picture (question 5) tended to include some slang and dialect expressions and their responses showed evidence of foreign language intervention. In general, the responses to questions 1 and 3 demonstrated a higher level of control of linguistic elements than the other responses.

The poorer responses demonstrated only limited control of syntax and language accuracy, a limited command of the conventions of the chosen discourse form and weaknesses in organising the content.

#### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

The majority of students satisfied the form and organisation criteria of the task and selected relevant information from the stimulus material, however not all students referred to all three texts. The best responses demonstrated an ability to use the interview form effectively and creatively, especially in the choice and structure of the questions posed. In the poorer responses, questions were repeated, students included sections of the stimulus material verbatim and demonstrated only limited control of linguistic elements.

Students should be made fully aware of the assessment criteria for this task.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The task was generally well completed. The more successful students demonstrated an extensive understanding and appreciation of the works, making effective reference to the resources studied. They also showed depth and maturity in completing the task by linking resources and included information that was relevant and appropriate to the task. The responses were well organised, reflecting ideas and a depth of understanding of the resources. The language used was sophisticated and varied, and a rich vocabulary and a range of sentence structures were evident. These students also displayed a good understanding of the conventions appropriate to the chosen discourse form.

The less successful students, however, demonstrated some understanding of the resources studied but did not refer to these resources appropriately or did not address the requirements of the question asked. In some cases, students simply retold the story.

In the poorer responses there was evidence of poor structuring and organisation of ideas (poor paragraphing and sentence construction/repetition of ideas) and limited knowledge of discourse conventions.

Most students answered questions relating to the theme – Marriage.

## **Czech**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation and Report and Discussion*

The standard of oracy was high this year, with the majority of students demonstrating a high level of preparation. Most students demonstrated the ability to go beyond a minimal response and could respond to the full range of topics presented by the examiner. The topics for the reports were well-chosen and maintained audience interest.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

The task was generally well done. All students understood the texts and selected appropriate and relevant information.

##### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

In general, students selected appropriate information, but some did not follow the conventions of the discourse form of *article*. There was also some evidence of weaknesses in language structures and grammar.

## *Paper 2*

### *Part A: Writing in Czech*

Task 1 was the most popular followed by tasks 3 and 5. In most cases students responded imaginatively to the tasks and were well able to maintain reader interest with an appropriate use of the discourse form. In the poorer responses there were some weaknesses in grammar, endings, vocabulary. In the best responses these elements were handled excellently and included a good range of vocabulary and expressions. Those students who chose the dialogue demonstrated a good use of colloquial expression appropriate for this task. (In some cases this was quite colourful).

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

The majority of students selected relevant information, but few students followed the discourse form sufficiently well to address the audience appropriately. The poorer responses lacked independence from the wording of the original texts and demonstrated only limited control of linguistic elements — grammar, syntax and sentence structure.

## *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

This section was well handled by all students who demonstrated a good knowledge of the resources. The responses were coherent, well-structured and interesting. Some of those students who chose the radio program did not fully satisfy the discourse form requirements in appropriately addressing the intended audience.

Students are reminded that in responding to the requirements of the task they must make specific references to the resources studied in the body of their response.

## **Dutch**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation and Report and Discussion*

On the whole, students who presented themselves for this exam were well prepared and the topics chosen were well researched.

The students presented their reports in a well-structured way and were able to answer the questions posed by the examiners without hesitation or difficulty.

#### *General Comments*

Most students dealt satisfactorily with the written material. However, some candidates wrote too much rather than being selective. In addition, it was obvious that some candidates' responses to the questions indicated that the questions were not read carefully before attempting the answer.

For candidates to perform well they have to:

- be familiar with the criteria in the syllabus
- prepare carefully for each task
- know in depth the basic structure of the Dutch language

- improve vocabulary by reading and writing more in Dutch
- respond in their own words rather than transcribe the question
- reflect the type of discourse
- practise careful analysis of the question
- adhere to the required word limit.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

Most candidates extracted the relevant information and presented this information in the appropriate discourse form. A very good standard was shown by at least 30% of the candidates and the majority of the candidates used independent wording when answering the questions. However, ‘note taking’ during the tape’s playing appeared to be poorly done by the majority of candidates.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A – Writing in Dutch*

Students’ responses ranged from satisfactorily to excellent and candidates responded with a suitable depth of treatment of the materials. However, it was evident that some candidates had a limited vocabulary and were not familiar with the more complicated structures of the Dutch language. Candidates need to be careful to make sure that the type of discourse form chosen is reflected in their responses. The candidates who displayed a breadth of treatment and range of expression in their answers were also excellent in reflecting the types of discourse.

#### *Part B – Reorganising Written Information*

Candidates who achieved good results organised and linked the material carefully and expressed themselves in clear and concise Dutch. Some candidates were not able to extract the relevant information and tended to just copy sections from the materials given with little interpretation and reorganisation of their own.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

In a few cases, the responses were of an extremely high standard in this paper. Some candidates wrote far too much and tended to ‘ramble on’. It was also obvious that some candidates dealt with the topics solely from their own experience. It is important that candidates read and digest the resources adequately, and use it in their response.

## **Filipino**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

The overall standard in Filipino was high this year and all students appeared well prepared. Students spoke fluently and demonstrated an ability to sustain conversation and discussion.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Students had, on the whole, selected diverse, interesting topics. The topics had been well-researched using a variety of resources and students were very well-prepared to respond confidently to a range of questions posed by the examiners.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Questions were generally well handled with no particular vocabulary or language structure problems. The better responses provided all relevant details, as required in passage 1, question 4, or gave a precise analysis of the message of the poem.

##### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

In general, students were able to select appropriate information from the texts, they were able to observe the conventions of the discourse form and to address the audience effectively. Students are reminded:

- not to identify themselves or their schools
- to sequence ideas logically
- to avoid copying from the texts.

Most students identified well with the task.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Filipino*

Overall, the writing task was well handled by students. Students are reminded that there is no need to rephrase or rewrite the question in their introduction. The most popular tasks were the diary entry and the dialogue. Students demonstrated a good control of language and the discourse forms. The writing was well-sequenced and a range of vocabulary and structures was evident in the best responses.

##### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

All students selected relevant information from the texts to complete the task. Some students were not familiar with the demands of a formal business letter, especially in terms of register

and style. Despite this, responses were generally clear and accurate, and demonstrated a good range of vocabulary and structures.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The questions were generally handled well with clear references to the resources studied. However, a number of students wrote a general response based on their own opinion rather than relating the question to the resources studied.

## **Hindi**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

The overall standard in Hindi was high this year and all students appeared well prepared. Students spoke fluently and demonstrated an ability to sustain conversation and discussion.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Students demonstrated a considerable amount of research, evidenced when they quoted sources such as magazines and newspaper articles. It was pleasing to note that students had not been limited by a lack of readily available resources in Hindi.

The majority of students demonstrated a knowledge of a range of vocabulary and structures, and accuracy of pronunciation and expressions.

#### *General Comment*

Generally, students performed very well in the written examination and received very good grades. However, there appears to be a need for greater emphasis on spelling, punctuation and grammar, since students continue to make mistakes in these areas. Most students were able to pick up relevant points from the spoken passages, but some students had difficulty in combining them to present a report based on these points. The variety of writing in Hindi was much better this year, as students wrote on a wider range of topics. However, knowledge of features of various discourse forms was still a problem because several students did not show them in their writing.

Generally, students adhered to the word limit. Some students went to extraordinary lengths to shorten their work by cutting out a major part, and thereby losing the main thrust of their writing.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

Most students chose relevant information from the two spoken passages and attempted to use this information effectively. However, other students had difficulty in picking up the relevant information, as it was not presented in exactly the same order as required for entering notes under given headings. They expected the information in the two columns for taking notes to follow the oral presentation in the same sequential order. This was not the case. Students were

supposed to listen to the entire passage before writing their responses. Some students appeared confused with the two dates mentioned in the spoken passages and used them interchangeably. Most students were able to select relevant points from both passages. However, others omitted important information from part A, unused in part B, perhaps in the belief that the information selected in part A should not be repeated in part B. Some students also used extraneous information in part B. Responses should be based solely on the information in the resources provided.

The discourse form for part B was a magazine article. Most students showed that they understood this discourse form. Generally, students were able to link related ideas and performed well. However, other students had difficulty in relating the concepts of Independence Day and Republic Day, and their work showed this confusion.

Most students were able to organise the information from both sources into a meaningful sequence, presenting the information logically and convincingly.

The standard of language used was generally very good. However, there were many students who showed careless or poor use of linguistic elements. Spelling errors were quite common. Conjunctions were often used inappropriately. Some examples of misspelt words are given below. Correct forms are indicated in brackets:

There was a tendency to repeat the information from the original sources, but many students

दुहम-दुहम (धूम-धाम), कुच (कुच्छ), गरहा (गहरा), दिल्ली (दिल्ली),  
दूनया (दुनिया), बी (भी), भड़ (बढ़), बड़िया (बढ़िया), मर्ने (मरने)

attempted and were successful in presenting the information in their own words. Their work flowed more smoothly than students who tried to cut and paste information obtained in part A.

## *Paper 2*

### *Part A: Writing in Hindi*

There was great variety in student responses this year. They wrote on different topics and chose a wide range of discourse forms. The quality of writing was generally good. Students wrote interesting, informative and entertaining pieces in Hindi that maintained reader interest. However, there were some instances where students disregarded instructions for a particular discourse form. For example, in one case the student decided to tell the history of Taj Mahal rather than using the information provided to write an advertisement. Fortunately, such cases were rare.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Some students presented arguments both for and against the topic, although instructed to take one side only. Also, it appears that some students did not know how to begin the debate.

Most of the writing was culturally appropriate. It is important to note that the finished piece of writing should be self-contained and should not look like a 'cut-and-paste'. It should flow smoothly and keep to the prescribed word limit.

Most students were able to organise and present information in a well-structured manner. In some cases, students had difficulty in linking the various parts of their writing. The use of transition sentences connecting various paragraphs in writing needs to be emphasised.



Control of the language required by the topics varied. Often, inaccuracies in the use of linguistic elements detracted from the quality of the work. One of the common mistakes was the incorrect use of conjuncts; for example, नदि instead of नदी and मीला instead of मिला, अधिक instead of अधिक, टिम for टीम (दल). Also, some of the students confused the letters द and ड . They wrote मदल instead of मडल (पदक) Some of the other mistakes were as follows: (Correct forms are given in the brackets) सुत्रा (सुधरा), तरा (तरह), कयुकी (क्योकि).

Some students also had difficulty in changing singular verb forms to plural verb forms.

A few students employed a limited range of vocabulary and sentence structures and achieved low scores, but most students did very well.

Most students were able to select relevant points but some students included irrelevant information or points taken from extraneous sources.

The task in part B required students to write the script of a debate. Very few students seem to know how to address the chair and the audience, or how to start and conclude a debate. This indicates the necessity of teaching a variety of discourse forms. Students who achieved well, gave arguments for or against the topic. The content of the material presented by most students was culturally appropriate. They were able to link and organise the selected information into a meaningful sequence.

There was considerable variation in scores. Often, inaccuracies in the use of linguistic elements detracted from the quality of the work. One of the common errors was in the nasalisation of verbs; for example, writing है w instead of है, मै w instead of में. Also, it appears that some students transposed letters and words from their native language. For example, some students wrote letters and words from Gujarati, another Indian language, in place of their standard Hindi equivalents. Others used English words when they had difficulty in finding Hindi equivalents. This practice needs to be avoided.

Good students were able to present the information available in their own words, but weaker students merely rephrased the information or transcribed from the written texts.

## **Hungarian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation, Report and Discussion*

Students were able to respond appropriately in Hungarian. The better students used a wide range of vocabulary and complex structures. Apart from occasional linguistic errors, the major weaknesses related to a limited range of vocabulary. This was also in evidence in the Discussion where some students who did not have sufficient command of specific lexical areas relied heavily on paraphrase.

Most students had prepared their reports well. The overall standard was high, with the best students displaying a richness of vocabulary and expressions. The weaker students did not demonstrate adequate knowledge of specific vocabulary items.

### *General Comment*

A fairly wide spectrum of abilities characterised the written Paper of 1998. Lack of originality was the prevailing shortcoming of part 2: paper B, Reorganising Written Information; students shied away from rephrasing the written material in their own words. Diacritics were conspicuously absent.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

Most students selected the relevant information to answer questions on both texts well, scoring very highly. Students are reminded that they must answer questions in either Hungarian or English, not mixed.

The stated discourse form was an introduction to a catalogue. Some students did not make this sufficiently clear in their responses. Most students focused on the data supplied in the listening component and wrote accurately. Unfortunately, nearly all students failed to address the main issue; that is, why Herend china (*különleges*) is special. Some students only referred to *különleges* in passing, instead of focusing on this aspect. Responses ranged from why the china is famous and beautiful, how it came into existence, where it came from or provided a potted history of the china factory.

Generally, clarity of expression was reasonable, although accuracy of grammar and syntax left much to be desired. Allied to an abundance of spelling mistakes was the omission of the diacritic that can alter the meaning of words.

Conspicuous mistakes are the omission of t for the objective case; the lack of apposition between constituent parts of a compound sentence, and lack of agreement between verb and subject (for example, with numerals, no plurals for numerals). Weaknesses were most apparent in the usage of verbs. Personal suffixes were often omitted; only the stems of verbs were used, or conjugation was incorrect, for example, *díszítjék, ásik, folyikni* etc.

The degree of independence from the wording of the original text was weak, except for the best students. Skills in learning how to vary information from the original wording of the text need to be further developed.

Agreement between subject and predicate was neglected, for example, ... *képzett munkások kézzel festi reá* (sic). Many students were not clear about when prefixes should be separated from the verbs and when to join them. For example,

... *el volt nevezve a királyniról* instead of *a királyniról nevezték el*

... *óvatosan vannak elkészítve* instead of *óvatosan készítették*

... *el vannak lopva* instead of *ellopták*.

Further, the rules which govern the usage of the double consonants were not consistently observed: *kézel* instead of *kézzel* or *evell* instead of *evvel*, or *ével* instead of *évvel*.

Some examples of grammatical and syntactical errors included: *alapult* instead of *alakult*; *nekifogták díszíteni a porcelánt* instead of *elkezdték díszíteni...*; *melett* instead of *mellett*; *technik-lya* instead of *technik-ja*; *magyar csin-lj-k kézel*, instead of *kézzel díszítik a magyar mesterek*; *álapították* instead of *alapított-k*; *madr-k* instead of *madarak*; or *Látos Matyi* instead of *Ludas Matyi*.

Some examples of very poor expression included: *A Herendi porcelánok a leg finomabb porcelánok gyártás ban mert a nyers anyagot kétszer égetik; az első égetés után kékre kézzel befestik és a második égetés után lila és zöldre és ezért néznek anyira jónak..*

*A Herendi porcelánok mind kézzel vannak csinálva és kézzel festve. A Herendi porcelánok a legjobb porcelán mert a tehetség a legjobb.*

*megkésztte kivitelni a porcelánokat, jött a kínai országból Kínából jött.*

## Paper 2

### Part A: Writing in Hungarian

All tasks were attempted by students, with number 6 proving the most popular, and numbers 3 and 4 the least popular.

The letter to the animal welfare organisation was successfully handled, given the broad interest in, and awareness of ‘green’ and related issues. Responses to this task usually maintained the reader’s interest. Most letters were properly addressed and paragraphed.

The imaginary event of task 6 gave free rein to the writer’s imagination, resulting in some fluent, well-expressed and well-constructed texts, and a kind of escalating tension with skillful denouement which sustained the reader’s interest.

Writing on ‘Everything that glitters is not gold’, one student produced a delightful, well-structured piece of anecdotal content very close to the requirement of the task, as did the writer on ‘work for the dole’, infusing the topic with solid argument and persuasive skill, while observing the discourse style. Both pieces of writing had natural rhythm, flowing with ease and vocabulary that befitted the type of discourse.

Weaknesses in endings that denoted their function in a sentence were evident. Attempts at compound sentences, especially with subordinate clauses, were frequently confused, eg *sok állatok nem értjék hogy miért hallják és mink lövészel álat.*

The instrumental of *-val, -vel* assimilates with the preceding consonant, needed more attention as did the suffixes of the object *t* and the native of *-nak, -nek* which are regularly omitted.

Vocabulary in most cases was adequate.

### Part B: Reorganising Written Information

Most students selected the relevant information well and none had trouble with the discourse form (travel diary). Although the language of the written sources was straightforward, nearly every student faithfully reproduced the sentences of the text; even the best students failed to paraphrase. In this way, ability to use language effectively and accurately could not be displayed. Only one or two students answered the question *tratózkod·sod alatt tanultakat.*

Many had difficulties in using the plural correctly, eg *rengeteg vendéglik, több képek, sok templomokat, van sok festmények.*

Spelling was poor and careless in weaker students’ work, frequently confusing the signs of the accusative and the past tense, eg *étkészlett, tudot, egészett.* These students also mixed up the sibilants *s, sz, z*, eg *sikla* instead of *szikla*, *j-tso* instead of *j-tszom*, *mérgesz* instead of *mérges*, *esztett* instead of *ezt* and *mászik* instead of *másik*.

Some words were misspelt, eg *nyidta* instead of *nyitotta*, *bösörö* instead of *búsuló*, *dolgozmány* instead of *munka*, *mindik* instead of *mindég*.

Other words were spelt correctly, but used in the wrong context; eg *imádja* instead of *szereti*, *kitaláltam* instead of *megtudtam*, *gyönyörét* instead of *szépségét*, *visszafeleselt* instead of *visszafelelt*, *hogy m<sup>o</sup>ködik a karácsony* instead of *hogy a a karácsonyt*

## **Khmer**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation and Report and Discussion*

Almost all students performed very well and were able to convey information confidently and effectively. A variety of interesting topics was chosen, and students had prepared themselves well. Most students were able to discuss their ideas clearly and use a broad range of vocabulary throughout this assessment procedure. Most students scored well against the criterion of ‘cultural appropriateness’.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Most students scored very well in this part of the examination, with many achieving very high scores. Listening skills were of a very high standard. However, a number of students had difficulty describing the four skills of people in the Angkor period in passage 1, question 2.

##### *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

In general, students performed well in this task. Responses showed clear understanding of the topic, and students selected appropriate information well. It was noted that some students had difficulties with spelling certain words. A number of students did not follow basic conventions of letter-writing, while a few had difficulty in organising and sequencing information.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Khmer*

The most popular topic was writing a story based on a series of pictures. The next most popular topic was writing a letter. Weaknesses were generally related to spelling, sentence structure and sequencing of ideas. A number of students had difficulty following the conventions of writing a story, in response to question 5. The most successful students wrote well-structured responses with clear and logical conclusions.

##### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Some students described the library but did not respond to the question, ie they did not talk about the benefits of reading and of library use. A number of students had difficulty selecting and then using relevant information. Some students copied sentences directly from the texts. A few problems were experienced with spelling and accentuation. However, a number of responses to this section were clear, coherent, and of a very high standard.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

Most students attempted question 1, with a smaller number responding to question 2. There were no responses to question 3, and just one response to question 4.

A number of responses were outstanding. The most successful responses avoided generalisations and supported all statements with examples from the texts studied.

A number of students did not make adequate reference to texts studied. Teachers and students are reminded that responses must be based on works studied. References to the works must be used to substantiate all statements and conclusions.

Students are expected to demonstrate ‘understanding and appreciation of the works’ in their responses, as well as ‘depth of treatment’. The content of their responses must also be ‘relevant to the demands of the task’. That is, all aspects of the question must be answered. Some students retold a part of the story without drawing any conclusions or making any links between the works they had studied and the question they were answering.

A number of students based their responses more on personal experience than on the works studied. Teachers and students are reminded that they must provide evidence of preparation and research by showing how the theme that the question relates to is illustrated in the resources studied.

Students who chose question 1 generally used a style consistent with that of a magazine article. The most successful responses drew all key statements together in a clear, coherent conclusion.

Some students who responded to question 2 had difficulty writing in the style of ‘the text of a talk’, and some responses lacked an introduction or a conclusion. However, the most successful responses to this question demonstrated a very high level of understanding and appreciation of the works studied.

Difficulties experienced in the writing were generally related to structure rather than expression, that is limited use of paragraphs and punctuation. Most students used a satisfactory to wide range of vocabulary.

Most students listed resources referred to in the ‘resources used’ box. A few students summarised the storyline of the resources in the ‘resources used’ box, but did not link the body of their response to the resources.

## **Korean**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

On the whole, students performed well in this section. Students were able to understand and engage in a conversation. Most students demonstrated the capacity to go beyond a minimal response with clear pronunciation. Their responses were relevant and culturally appropriate to the various topics encountered.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Students had prepared their chosen topics thoroughly and presented them clearly and logically.

Most students demonstrated the ability to convey information well by using a broad range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures in the report. However, it was obvious that discussing their own opinions and ideas proved challenging to many students. Students are advised to practice discussing their ideas and opinions on their chosen topics.

Some of the topics that proved successful were Places to Visit in Korea, Places to Visit in Australia and Festivals and Celebrations in Korea.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Most students performed well in this section, and they were able to select and use most relevant information.

#### Passage 1

##### **Item 1**

Most students performed very well, however, some of the weaker responses were ‘Saturday’ and ‘one week’ instead of ‘approximately 2 weeks ago’.

##### **Item 2**

This item was handled extremely well by most students.

##### **Item 3**

This question proved challenging to students. Students are advised to familiarise themselves with both Korean numbers and sino numbers. Many students wrote ‘12’, ‘7’, ‘6’, and ‘5’ instead of ‘10’ in reference to the subjects taught in Year 12 in Korea.

##### **Item 4**

The weaker responses listed general activities Australian that students do after school such as ‘read books, rest at home and do homework’, instead of responding with relevant information from the passage.

##### **Item 5**

Better responses included both ‘go to the swimming pool’ or ‘go to the beach with friends to swim’.

##### **Item 6**

This item was well handled by most students.

## Passage 2

### **Item 1**

This item was handled extremely well by most students.

### **Item 2**

This item was generally well answered.

### **Item 3**

This item proved challenging to some students.

### **Item 4**

Most students answered this item well.

### **Item 5**

This item was handled extremely well.

## *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

Generally, students performed well in this part. However, those students who copied the original text without reorganising the information from both passages into a meaningful sequence were penalised.

It is a requirement of this section that students select and use **ONLY** relevant information from the two spoken passages to complete the task. Those who included additional non-relevant information were penalised. Students are advised **NOT** to create information that they have not heard in two spoken passages.

The better responses:

- demonstrated conformity to the discourse form including the letter format, style and cultural appropriateness
- demonstrated good control of syntax and showed some variation from the original wording of the passages.

The poorer responses:

- did not demonstrate adequate control of register, eg addressee, greetings and dates, etc
- wrote their own future plans instead of those of Jenny
- said that Jenny was in year 12 studying for the university entrance exam this year, however, according to the two spoken passages Jenny is in year 11 this year
- demonstrated only limited control of linguistic elements such verb endings and spelling. Many spelled the words phonetically
- wrote about general differences between Australian and Korean schools and leisure activities Australian students do rather than using information from the passages.

## *Paper 2*

### *Part A: Writing in Korean*

Most students attempted item 1 or item 2. Item 4 was the least favoured item. The standard of the responses to this section was satisfactory. Generally, the better responses included all aspects of requested information in depth, while maintaining the reader interest.

#### **However, poorer responses:**

- did not observe the conventions of the discourse form
- used only familiar and predictable items of vocabulary
- used only simple sentence structures and too many colloquialisms
- often contained errors relating to syntax, verb endings and spellings.

Students are advised not to use liquid Paper, as some students forgot to rewrite what they had intended after using liquid Paper. If a mistake is made, students are advised to just simply cross it out with a pen.

#### **Task 1**

Most students performed very well in this task. However, some responses did not include the dates in the diary form.

#### **Task 2**

Most students handled this task well. However, students are advised to be consistent in their sequencing of information. Some weaker responses said that it was their first time writing to the pen-friend in the introduction and yet in the body they wrote it as if they had been writing to each other for quite some time. Often 'Australian students' was misinterpreted as students who are studying in Australia.

#### **Task 3**

In general, students performed satisfactorily even though this task proved challenging to some. It was obvious that some students were unfamiliar with the dialogue form. Some poorer responses simply retold the telephone conversation in monologue.

#### **Task 4**

This was the least favoured task. This task was the most challenging one for students, as many of them were unfamiliar with the discourse form of the formal job application letter in facsimile transmission form.

#### **Task 5**

This was handled satisfactorily. However, the weaker responses simply described life in Australia from a migrant students perspective rather than writing the task in a newsPaper article.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

On the whole, part B was handled well by most students. The better responses selected and organised relevant information from all three different items of written information into a meaningful sequence.



The weaker responses:

- showed evidence of text copied almost verbatim from the three items
- listed the information on where to go, package available for the period, cost involved in each package rather than describing their holiday using the given information
- described their own personal holiday to Queensland
- created their own new information
- often wrote the letter as if they went to Queensland during their winter holiday, ie between 30 June to 31 July. However, at the end of the letter they wrote the date of the exam
- stated that they went to the Korean BBQ restaurant on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, whereas the restaurant is only open on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

Students are advised:

- to read the passages carefully
- to use only the relevant information from the given passages
- not to identify themselves or their schools in any way.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

Most students attempted questions 1 and 2 from theme 1. Theme 2, questions 3 and 4 proved challenging to those students who attempted them. However, the standard of the responses in the *Discussing a Theme* was very high.

Most students demonstrated a good knowledge and thorough understanding of the chosen topics and resources. It is also pleasing to note that most students wrote the names of the resources correctly. However, students need to further develop their skills in referring to resources and in the use of quotations.

Students are also reminded to support their responses by using references and relevant examples from resources they have studied.

## **Latvian**

### **Speaking Examination**

The general impression gained from the Latvian examination was that students have reached a pleasing level of achievement in both the preparation and the presentation of their work. There was the usual spread of results ranging from excellent to adequate.

It was pleasing to note that students observed the criteria (eg length of response, type of genre, particular language) for the various tasks.

### *Conversation and Report and Discussion*

Students all showed evidence of sound preparation for their report topics.

Thorough research gave students confidence in their presentation and they did not have to search for appropriate vocabulary or other expressions. They presented their reports with a certain amount of ease under examination conditions.

Answers to examiners' questions were adequate, and many students contributed to the flow of conversation. The quality of language skills varied, and most students were able to converse fluently without recourse to English words. In most cases, students demonstrated an adequate range of vocabulary.

The intrusion of an Australian or English accent is becoming more and more evident in the speech of students. This was most pronounced with the plosive 't' and certain English intonation in the whole sentence (sometimes because of the sentence structure). Teachers and students are advised to focus attention on conventions of Latvian pronunciation and intonation.

## Listening and Written Examinations

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

All students performed satisfactorily in Part A. Students gave accurate but fairly short answers to the questions, indicating that they had little difficulty understanding spoken Latvian. Students are reminded to select and use all relevant information in their answers. Nearly 80% of students answered this part in Latvian.

#### *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

The responses of students ranged from high to satisfactory. Most students failed to compare how the summer solstice was celebrated in Latvia in the past with how it is celebrated in Australia in the present. Instead they compared activities in both countries in the present. (The text spoke of activities in Latvia in the past, and some mention should have been made of the passing of time.)

Most students coped well with the discourse form, namely a letter. However, teachers should encourage students to follow the conventions of letter-writing:

- the place of the address in a handwritten letter
- the use of the capital letter in *Tu* — 'you'
- dates should be written according to the Latvian convention.

The more successful students wrote about the issues in the spoken texts rather than filling up their pages with platitudes about well-being and the weather, which does not enable them to meet the criterion 'ability to select and choose relevant information'.

The more successful students showed a sound understanding of the spoken passages. They knew which information to choose and were able to reorganise it well.

Common grammatical mistakes included:

- disagreements between gender and cases and singular and plurals (eg *Es domā, ka ir divains svinēt vasaru svinība ziemā. Latvijas laukus būtu skaisti Jāņu laikā, jo Latvijas vasaru nevarētu būt tik karsts un sauss kā Australijas vasaru.*)
- slang expressions (eg *forši*)
- attempts at creating new words (eg *mēs uzkopām latviešu sajūtu ar tautas dejām*).
- misspelt words which gave a completely different meaning or no meaning (eg *lūdzu aprakstīt man* instead of *lūdzu atrakstīt man*).

Teachers and students are advised to pay particular attention to addressing these aspects of Latvian grammar.

## *Paper 2*

### *Part A: Writing in Latvian*

Students had a choice of five questions, each requiring a different genre in the response. About 30% of students chose question 1 — a narrative about a holiday that one would rather forget. Approximately 30% chose question 2 — a creative piece of writing in the form of a dialogue between two friends, starting with the expression ‘You’ll never believe it . . .’ Approximately 15% chose question 3 — a creative piece of prose about smuggling in which the writer finds a parcel with the inscription ‘Beware, smuggler!’ Approximately 15% chose question 5 — a facsimile of complaint about a too-demanding reporter. No student attempted question 4.

Most students performed very well in this section. They chose the topic that interested them and they had sufficient vocabulary to write about it. The ideas that students expressed were imaginative, interesting, and exciting; some were taken from television, but others seemed to be personal or to be taken from reading. Generally, students did not paint themselves into a corner by relating some outlandish experience with which they could not cope.

Students coped well with their chosen discourse form and paragraphing was done well. There were some errors in agreements as in the previous Paper, and humorous phrasings. Verb endings were sometimes non-existent, eg

*es šeit stāv šodien* or *Es jau zināja, ka tu tā teiks.*

On the positive side, however, it was most gratifying to see that the word *kuļūst* was used correctly as ‘become’. This word is commonly misused in spoken language in the Latvian community and it is very pleasing that teachers and students are using it correctly.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Most students coped well with the task. They understood the two texts and the photograph and could link the ideas expressed in them and produce well-structured answers. Most students were able to select the relevant information and use it in their answers. The more successful students were able to discard the irrelevant information so that their resulting pieces of writing were concise and correct.

Students are reminded that they must use information from all texts in their response.

Students were required to write an article on the fact that ‘Sport is all a matter of money’ for a sports magazine. Generally the students coped well with the discourse form, with some attempting a sensational heading for their article.

### *Paper 3: Discussing A Theme*

Question 6 was the most popular question, chosen by 40% of students, followed by questions 1, 3, and 4. No student attempted question 5.

Most students could write about their chosen question and explain the relevant issues in depth and at length. They seemed to comprehend the question and its ramifications. A small number of students were unable to reply to the question in depth — perhaps they lacked an understanding of the topic.

All students were reasonably well prepared and the responses reflected thorough knowledge and understanding and a command of appropriate language structures. The more successful students included quotations from several of the relevant texts, and all students mentioned the sources for them. All students have become accustomed to filling in the ‘resources box’, and many mentioned more resources than were strictly required.

Students were able to cope well with the discourse forms. Some students used very sophisticated language successfully.

Some students did not indicate the question number at the beginning of their writing. Students are reminded that they must indicate the number of the chosen question so that markers will know which question is being answered.

## **Macedonian**

### **Speaking Examination**

Generally, students were well-prepared and demonstrated a high standard of oral fluency and most used a culturally appropriate form of address.

#### *Conversation*

Students appeared relaxed and most spoke fluently and accurately.

#### *Report and Discussion*

In general, students were well prepared and a good range of topics was presented. Students need to be reminded that they cannot rely solely on their linguistic ability as an essential element of the discussion section is research. Students are therefore advised to choose topics that interest them. Although students are advised to practise delivering their reports, students are to be discouraged from rote learning them. Students are further advised to consider the questions asked before answering them.

The best students demonstrated a richness of vocabulary and structures and accuracy in their pronunciation and expressions.

#### *General Comment*

This year student responses were of a very high standard in most areas of the Paper. Responses demonstrated a high level of understanding of the material presented. Overall, most students understood the task and responded appropriately in the correct discourse form.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Most students completed this part of the Paper with accurate responses, thereby indicating a clear understanding of the task requirements.

#### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

Most students performed well. Their responses showed a clear understanding of the material heard. They were able to select appropriate information, although in some instances it was clear students had difficulty grasping the meaning of some of the words.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Macedonian*

Many students chose topics that enabled them to show they could express ideas and opinions clearly and logically. They maintained high reader interest throughout their writing and were able to express themselves convincingly while also maintaining good language control so as to communicate their ideas and opinions effectively. However, some grammatical errors intruded into their writing.

#### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Most students were able to demonstrate a high to very high standard of comprehension. They used the information provided and wrote their own logical and coherent texts.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a theme*

It was good to see all students respond and demonstrate very good to excellent knowledge of the resources studied. Most students were well prepared for this Paper.

## **Maltese**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *General Comments*

Most students were well prepared for this CAT and they all coped well with the stringent time structure. This year's students were a mixture of native and non-native speakers. The quality of their responses ranged from medium to very high.

#### *Conversation*

Overall, the students' ability to engage in spontaneous conversation was very good. The vast majority of utterances were relevant. Most students covered three different areas and elaborated on at least one area in a way which was indicative of previous preparation. Some students demonstrated more previous reflection than others by expanding with comprehensive and elaborate responses. These students earned high scores.

### *Report and Discussion*

All students chose reports which were suitable bases for discussion. Most of them used an introduction, body and conclusion structure and delivered their report in an ‘impromptu’ manner, rather than in a style which suggests the regurgitation of a rote-learned text. Some students were careful to sequence their ideas and opinions in a logical way so as to provide a sound framework for the entire report. A few scored very well because in addition to these features, the quality of the information they included and the ideas and opinions they expressed provided relevant support material which developed and enhanced the content of the report.

Although most reports engaged and maintained the audience’s attention, the high-scoring students accomplished this task very skilfully.

Most students conveyed information and developed ideas and opinions during the discussion of the report. They expressed between two to three main ideas and elaborated on at least one of them. Most students communicated well making appropriate responses during the interaction. The difference between the medium and the high-scoring students was that the students in the latter group explained themselves more clearly and showed a capacity and a willingness to influence the direction of the discussion.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

The students’ overall performance in this paper was very encouraging, with responses ranging from medium to very high. Generally, students understood the requirements of the task and the criteria, responding appropriately. All students used the correct discourse form, and most of them adhered to the required word limit. Generally, the responses were accurate, indicating that students had little (if any) difficulty in selecting and using the relevant information. However, in general terms, most students were too faithful to the wording and the sequential order of the main points, without adapting the resources to fit the new task.

#### *Part A*

Overall, students selected and used relevant information well. Students would have achieved better had they been more attentive when listening to spoken Maltese and in linking the information.

#### *Part B*

Generally, students selected and used relevant information well. The higher-scoring students, however, put points together to **draw their own conclusions**, only using information contained in the recorded passage. For instance, one student wrote that it was imperative that students show interest in the scholarship by applying for it, otherwise the Maltese Government might withdraw it. On a slightly different note, another student also tried to make a personal inference by writing that the winner of the scholarship was shy whilst in Malta, and that she could not wait to come back. These two pieces of information were not included or even hinted at in the spoken passage. While students are encouraged to draw their own conclusions, they need to remember that they can only do this by using information contained in the spoken passage.

Students observed most of the features of this discourse form. However, it was disappointing to see that so many students failed to give a title to the article. It is standard practice to give a piece of writing a heading so that prospective readers know what the article is about.

Notwithstanding this most common oversight, all articles were culturally appropriate. The degree of clarity varied from medium to very high, depending on structure and vocabulary.

Most students linked the information contained in the recorded passage appropriately. Few students, however, linked these ideas in a logical manner to build up to the argument for their article. A significant number repeated the same information, in the same order, and in the same context. This approach would have been very appropriate for a memory test. Students need to remember that the whole purpose of the task is to assess their ability to elicit important information and to use it to create a new piece of work. For instance, one student appealed to the readers of the newsletter by elaborating on Susan's last point. In the recorded passage, Susan said 'If no one goes to Malta next year, the work that has already been done will be wasted'. The student paraphrased this point and told his readers that 'if students do not apply for the scholarship, the Maltese Government is very likely to stop funding it'. This is a prime example of a student who has 'processed spoken information' and completed the task 'using only information contained in the passage'.

Most students demonstrated good language control and completed the task well. The medium-scoring students could have achieved a better result had they expressed themselves more clearly, using a wider range of vocabulary. In addition to sound expression, higher-scoring students were also more accurate in the use of linguistic elements.

In general terms, students tended to follow the original wording closely. A few were very good at paraphrasing, but a very small number seem to have taken editorial licence by including additional information that was not on the recording. For instance, one student wrote that while in Malta on her scholarship placement, Susan was homesick and could not wait to come back. The higher-scoring students, however, stuck to the information included in the passage, paraphrased it and used it to write their letter to the editor of the group's newsletter.

## *Paper 2*

Most students understood the requirements of the task and did not seem to have any major difficulty. The quality of the work submitted was good overall, with some students doing particularly well. The higher-scoring students seem to have understood or perhaps followed the criteria better, were somewhat daring with their responses and showed initiative and creativity in their responses.

### *Part A : Writing in Maltese*

The breadth of treatment of the chosen topics varied. Most students fitted comfortably in the medium category, demonstrating a good understanding of the task at hand. The higher-scoring students covered the topic by drawing on more points to transmit their final message.

All the students engaged and maintained reader interest. However, students would have done better had they used appropriate techniques to construct their writing in a way that reached a climax, a surprise or a well thought-out punch line at the end.

Most students:

- Observed the conventions of the discourse form required for this task in a culturally appropriate way, with only one student not adhering to the word limit requirement (thereby preventing the inclusion of all the relevant points).
- Followed the introduction, body and conclusion model, and organised the content well.

- Demonstrated a good command of the Maltese language as indicated by the overall ability to communicate, and better students showing good use of linguistic elements.

Overall, students could have used a wider range of vocabulary and sentence structure. The higher-scoring students showed a better understanding of the subtleties and nuances of Maltese vocabulary, which was used effectively.

### *Part B : Reorganising Written Information*

As far as selecting and using relevant information, students overall did better in this part of Paper 2 than in Paper 1. They were not as creative as in Paper 1, and used information not included in the original text. This might have something to do with the fact that the information was in front of them on hard copy, rather than as a recorded spoken passage where the information had to be remembered and reconstructed.

It was disappointing to see that many students failed to observe some of the basic conventions of the discourse form, a talk. The most common oversight here was the lack of acknowledgment of the audience at the beginning of the talk to the students and teachers. Very few students went through the procedure correctly by greeting the audience, introducing themselves and the topic, delivering their talk and finally thanking the audience.

Most students linked related ideas to formulate their talk. However, in most instances the information was reproduced in the same order and in the same context as it was stated in the written text. Besides suggesting lazy thinking, this approach denies the students the opportunity to be creative and repackage the information provided. After all, as the title of the paper states, the whole purpose of the exercise is to re-organise written information, not to regurgitate it.

Most students demonstrated good control of the linguistic elements necessary for the completion of the task. Greater clarity of expression and linguistic control gained better results.

In general, students tended to stick to the original wording to complete the task. Again, this ‘cut and paste’ approach represents lazy thinking that denies the students the opportunity to re-organise the information supplied. The higher-scoring students related the same ideas in a paraphrased fashion, demonstrating their ability to move away from the original text and to express themselves independently.



### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The students' overall performance in this paper was good, with responses ranging from medium to very high. Generally, students understood the requirements of the task and associated criteria, and responded appropriately. Most students adhered to the required word limit. Their responses were comprehensive, indicating that they had used and understood the resources well.

Overall, students well understood and appreciated the works, as indicated by the inclusion of information contained therein to construct their writing to reach their desired conclusion. The higher-scoring students, however, gained extra marks for using this information in a personalised way to either lead to or to substantiate their point.

In general the level of treatment of the works was shallow, as indicated by the students' overall use of the information. The medium-scoring students simply used the quotations and took them at face value. The higher-scoring students, however, used the quotations and elaborated on them by deconstructing them and delving into a depth permissible within the word limit, to address some of their underlying assumptions and implications.

Most students structured their work well, using an introduction, body and conclusion model. The medium-scoring students would have gained extra marks had they augmented this structure with a solid argument through the logical sequencing of ideas, the use of a key sentence in every paragraph, and the linking of paragraphs to lead the reader through the argument. In some cases, the information was not used to its full potential and so diminished the overall effectiveness of the finished piece.

Generally, assessors are pleased with the standard of student performance. It was noted that students tended to follow the written word (in re-organising written information) more closely than the oral word (in processing spoken information). One plausible explanation may be that, in a general sense, students used the vocabulary that was already in front of them, rather than paraphrasing it to complete their task. Although this is acceptable, students need to remember that there is a specific criterion which awards points for the degree of independence from the wording of the original information.

Interestingly, students seemed to understand the oral text less well than the written text. Given that speech producing is a much faster cognitive process than producing written information, future students are encouraged to invest more time in listening to the spoken word.

## **Persian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

Students handled this section of the examination well. However, students are reminded that the language of the syllabus and therefore the language of the examination is modern standard Persian and not a regional dialect.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Students are reminded to choose topics carefully and that students are required to research the topic and not just offer a personal opinion.

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### **Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages**

Part A was done very well. Although the passages and the accompanying questions were quite demanding, nearly all students scored very well against the criterion ‘the capacity to select and use relevant information’.

Some students responded in both English and Persian. Students are reminded that both tasks in this part need to be completed either all in Persian or all in English.

#### *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

Most students had no difficulty in selecting and using relevant information; however, many failed to demonstrate ‘a degree of independence from the wording of the original information’.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Persian*

The most popular choice was question 1, closely followed by questions 4 and 2. Overall performance in this part was pleasing.

Students had well prepared and generally demonstrated a good understanding of discourse forms. Weaknesses were mainly related to control of the language, in particular, sentence structure.

#### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Some students simply copied the information from the text. However, a number of students selected and used relevant information and produced some excellent responses demonstrating independence from the wording of the original material.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The choice between the questions was fairly evenly divided.

Overall, responses showed sound evidence of preparation and a good knowledge of resources studied throughout the year. A few students failed to list resources in the space provided. Some students did not base their response on resources studied and simply wrote their own opinions, which does not demonstrate ‘understanding and appreciation of the works’ they have studied or ‘depth of treatment’ or ‘content relevant to the demands of the task’.

## **Polish**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation and Report and Discussion*

##### *Conversation*

Although students were able to respond fluently and accurately to the questions asked, students are encouraged to go beyond a basic response and to regard their role as a ‘partner in a discussion’.

### *Report and Discussion*

The majority of the reports was of a high standard, with evidence of research and thorough preparation. Students who had researched their topic thoroughly were able to demonstrate a richness of vocabulary and expression. Most students structured their reports well.

The weakest students were those who had little preparation and appeared to be relying on their linguistic knowledge of Polish.

Care should be exercised in the selection of topics so that a balance is reached between very broad topics where students may not be able to cover all relevant material and those that are so specific that opportunities for questions are limited.

### *General Comments*

There was a noticeable improvement in students' ability to cope with the discourse forms, although some students seemed to ignore discourse forms completely. Overall the students performed well and demonstrated that they had worked hard to reach the required standard.

Successful students:

- had a broad vocabulary
- handled grammatical structures capably
- answered written and oral questions logically and accurately
- spoke with confidence and interacted with examiners
- showed evidence of careful preparation.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

This task focuses on students' ability to comprehend and use spoken information. The two recorded passages concentrated on the first settlements in Poland, specifically describing the oldest village, Biskupin, and the way of life of people of that time.

The passages were quite demanding, requiring students to concentrate while listening, and then to use the details, such as where the old villages were built, how people protected themselves from the enemy, how people occupied themselves, and what the settlement would have looked like.

Most students were able to select and use relevant information in Part A, but in Part B they had some difficulties in scoring well against the criterion 'observation of the conventions of the discourse form'.

### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Part A consisted of three questions on each passage. The responses were to be written either all in Polish or all in English. All students followed these instructions carefully. Some students had difficulty distinguishing between the words *ksiądz* — priest, and *książe* — prince.

Overall students scored well on the criterion 'capacity to select and use relevant information'.

### *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

In Part B, students were asked to write the text of a talk in Polish to be given to their class on ‘The lives of people who lived in the first Polish villages’.

Students gave much relevant information in their description; however, against the criterion ‘form and organisation’, they received lower scores because they concentrated more on the information than on the discourse form.

Students who scored poorly against the criterion ‘effective expression’ (control of the language) revealed an inability to use appropriate vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure. Some students had difficulties with the declension of nouns through cases and conjugation of verbs, specifically past tense, plural, third person, eg

*Mieszkańcy się zabezpieczali przed murkiem, która czymała forse głęboka ogromna wode or Dzieci ciężko pracowali... Kobiety zbierali grzyby i rośliny.*

Many students also had difficulties in spelling in Part B.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Polish*

Questions 1, 3, and 4 proved to be the most popular questions and question 2 the least popular. Responses to question 5, picture descriptions, were unimaginative. In some cases the story was based only on the first picture and students did not use the series of pictures.

Responses to question 1 were generally innovative and humorous. The instructions for the question used the word *pamiętnik*, which the students translated and wrote their response as a diary or a journal. Because these words are very similar in form and meaning, no marks were deducted against the criterion ‘observation of the conventions of the discourse form’.

In question 3 the students provided interesting arguments, but had difficulties with grammar and spelling, eg

*W życiu ludziach sport jest bardzo ważna... Wszystkie te działaności pozwala ćwiczzenie naszych chała i czanse spotcach inne ludzie w tym samym czasie... Jak ludzie chcą dłużej żyć bez różne problemy na przykład atak serca albo troszke przytyć, to najlepiej to przeminać jest sport w swoim życiu.*

When writing a letter for question 4, students concentrated mainly on the dishes that were already on the table and omitted the preparations in the kitchen for the festive season. As well as difficulties with grammar and sentence structure, colloquial language was used occasionally.

Weaknesses were generally related to control of the language required by the topics, including accuracy in the use of linguistic elements. Mention must be made of spelling and grammatical mistakes, which were frequent this year. Spelling mistakes usually concerned soft consonants, eg *ciwiczenia*, *mieci*, *zasiedliśmy* separate and joined writing of negatives, eg *niziele* (*nieźle*) *nienapadli*.

Frequent grammatical mistakes occurred in the agreement of two related parts in a sentence, eg *Ja zawsze myślałam że ryba jest mięso... Balam się jeść uszki bo nie wiedziałam kogo te uszki byli.*

Perfect and imperfect verbs were also used inappropriately, eg

*Matka cały czas musiała zrobić barszcz*

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Most students performed well in this part of the examination and wrote more than the suggested length, because there was so much information in the texts.

Several students drew information only from texts 1 and 2 and completely ignored the map in text 3. These students scored poorly against the criterion ‘the capacity to select and use relevant information’.

As in the previous parts of the examination, many students had difficulties with control of the language required to complete the task ó there were many grammatical and spelling mistakes. Some students tried to combine their own words with sentences in the texts, resulting in nonsense sentences. Such cases were rare and most students demonstrated a satisfactory level of coherence.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

This task requires students to respond to a task on one of the two themes that they had studied throughout the year, using the resources listed in the syllabus.

Generally, students performed very well in this section. Their responses showed sound evidence of preparation and good knowledge of resources studied throughout the year. Responses were linked to resources and examples were well chosen. A few students failed to list resources in the space provided.

There were also a few instances in which resources used were not listed in the syllabus. Unfortunately, these were not linked well enough to the theme to enable students to give relevant responses. It is important that resources are either selected from the syllabus or a request to use alternative resources is submitted to the host authority by the prescribed date.

Very few students did not base their work on any resource material but responded from their own opinions and experience, hence they scored very poorly against the criterion ‘understanding and appreciation of the works’. Some students ended up ‘waffling’, or mixing up the names of characters or authors of the materials studied.

The most popular choices were questions 1 and 3, followed by question 4. In question 4, students mentioned general features that they would like to see in an ideal friend, rather than features that were found in the resource material. In question 3, students wrote that friendship is important but did not explain why and therefore lost marks against the criterion ‘content relevant to the demands of the task’.

Most students fulfilled the requirements of the discourse forms. The standard of responses to this part of the examination has been steadily improving.

## Portuguese

### Speaking Examination

#### *Conversation*

Examiners were pleased to note a better standard of oral fluency than in previous years. Most students demonstrated an ability to link with the conversational partner and sustain conversation. Most students spoke fluently with accuracy of pronunciation and clarity of expression. Weaker students' responses were characterised by a difficulty in comprehending questions, limited and/or inappropriate vocabulary and structures, and intrusion of English words.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Most students were well prepared. A few students appeared to have insufficient preparation, with reports of less than one minute, which these students could not then discuss at any length. There was some evidence of rote learning and some students seemed unaware that the report would be followed by discussion.

Care should be exercised in the selection of topics that are so specific that opportunities for questions are limited.

### Listening and Written Examinations

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

The relationship between the task about the 'Portuguese maritime discoveries' and the responses by the students was very good. They were able to incorporate many details they had heard, and to express the points in their own words.

For most students, the capacity to select and use information relevant to the tasks on the two spoken passages did not present a difficulty in Part A.

Sequencing still presented a problem in Part B, showing that students had difficulty in organising their notes from Part A. Grammatical and spelling errors were numerous with verb control showing the greatest weakness.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Portuguese*

The most popular tasks were numbers 4 and 5. Nevertheless, there was a wide range of responses, and even the two favourite tasks were treated in very different ways, always keeping the reader interested.

In terms of the conventions of the discourse forms, students were still not able to demonstrate an understanding of the main conventions of a newspaper article. The range of vocabulary was vast and appropriate, but the linguistic elements were not well handled, in particular the verbs and the article–noun–adjective agreements.

##### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Students did not select relevant information from the material provided. As a consequence, the

sequencing was poor, the conclusion was unclear, the format of a speech was quite often not followed, and the degree of independence from the wording of the original text was minimal.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

Evidence of student research was far greater than in the previous years.

Some students who chose to write in English still made spelling and grammatical errors.

The preferred theme was ‘Women in Portuguese-speaking countries’ and students produced some intensely moving newspaper articles and strong speeches.

## **Russian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

The standard of oracy was generally very high and pronunciation was generally excellent.

Some students did not sustain a conversation beyond a minimal response. Some interference of English words and expressions was evident with several students.

Most students were well-prepared and were able to demonstrate a capacity to:

- present and convey information
- discuss opinions and ideas
- use Russian to link with the conversational partner.

Teachers are advised to cover vocabulary associated with the prescribed themes in a variety of contexts, so that students are exposed to a range of relevant vocabulary.

#### *Report and Discussion*

The best students had prepared well-researched reports in a range of interesting topics.

Students advantage themselves by selecting topics that engage and interest them, as this facilitates the discussion following the report. Students should also bear in mind that the presentation is oral, therefore it should not be something learnt off by heart nor full of facts and figures as might be expected in a written report. It is better for students to focus on issues, ideas and their own opinion of them.

### **Listening and Written Examinations**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Students were able to select the information and answer all questions adequately. Some students had difficulties with words with which they were unfamiliar and some had problems with grammatical structures.

### *Part B: Task Drawing on Both Passages*

The task was to write an article for a community newspaper, explaining why it is essential to save Lake Baikal. All students did this successfully, although some punctuation was omitted and there were weaknesses in coordination of case endings.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Russian*

The most popular question was question 4, 'Write a letter to a friend about organising an end-of-school party', followed by question 1, 'Why it is prohibited to smoke in public places'. Some students chose question 2, advice for young people on finding a job. Only one student wrote about the Olympic Games. No one chose to write a dialogue.

Most students showed good control of sentence structure, ability to hold the reader's interest, and ability to observe the conventions of the discourse form. Coordination of case endings in nouns was a problem for some students.

Students are reminded that they must answer all aspects of the question they choose.

##### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Students were asked to reorganise information from six texts. The results were satisfactory, although in some cases vocabulary was limited and coordination of case endings presented some difficulties. Students coped well with the discourse form of 'a letter to a friend'.

Students also showed the ability to reorganise and use relevant information. Coordination of numbers and noun endings in the genitive case caused problems for some students.

#### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The most popular question was question 2 — an essay on how mothers tend to react to being neglected by their children. Questions 1, 4, and 5 were attempted by approximately equal numbers of students. Very few students attempted question 6 (the opening speech for a debate on 'True love never dies'). No student attempted question 3.

Most students were able to refer to texts studied and demonstrated an ability to discuss issues and support opinions. Most students had prepared well for this section of the examination. They were able to cope with most discourse forms, but essays were the preferred form. The English writing skills of some students were not satisfactory.

Although handwriting is not assessed, students are advised to ensure that their handwriting is legible so that markers will know exactly what students intended them to read. A few students used very colloquial forms of expression.

## **Serbian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

The overall standard of oral fluency was high with all students able to sustain a conversation. All students demonstrated reasonable accuracy of pronunciation and clarity of expression.



### *Report and Discussion*

On the whole, reports were well prepared. Students are advised:

- to choose topics carefully that can be researched and which afford opportunities for discussion with the examiner
- not to rote learn reports
- to research their topics well and not to rely on personal experience.

Excellent topics this year included: History of Belgrade; The Internet – development, advantages and disadvantages; Evolution of computer-generated special effects; The ozone layer.

### **Listening and Written Examination**

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Questions were generally well handled with no particular vocabulary or language structure problems evident.

##### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

Some students had difficulty in selecting relevant information to complete the task.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Serbian*

Generally this section of the Paper was well handled by most students.

##### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

In general, this section was well handled although some students demonstrated only limited knowledge of the conventions of the chosen discourse form.

Students are advised to:

- read the instructions for the task carefully;
- use only the relevant information from the given passages and not to include information not contained in them.

#### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

This section was generally well handled by students. However, students are reminded to refer directly to the resources studied in the body of their response.

## **Slovenian**

### *Conversation*

The overall standard of oral fluency was high with all students able to sustain a conversation. All students demonstrated reasonable accuracy of pronunciation and clarity of expression.

### *Report and Discussion*

The majority of students had learnt their reports off by heart and some then had difficulty in the ensuing discussion. There was a marked difference in weaker students between the richness of vocabulary and structures in the report and that of the subsequent discussion.

There was pleasing evidence of thorough preparation by some students. Students should, however, be aware that linguistic ability in Slovenian is insufficient on its own for this examination. Students should prepare their topics thoroughly to enable them to then present and discuss their ideas.

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Overall, students performed well, demonstrating an excellent capacity to extract the required information.

#### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

Most students selected appropriate information for the task and used observed the conventions of the discourse form required. There were some weaknesses with expression, particularly in the area of syntax.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Slovenian*

A variety of tasks was selected by students. They generally dealt with the chosen topic well and all used the appropriate discourse form. The better responses demonstrated sophistication and variety in sentence structure, using complex sentence structures and a range of vocabulary effectively.

#### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Some responses indicated a weakness in selecting and reorganising information. The task required students to discuss the effects of television on society. The better responses demonstrated the ability to discuss the topic and to sequence and structure their response effectively. The poorer response tended to itemise rather than discuss the effects.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

Students are reminded not only to cite the resources referred to in the space provided in the examination Paper but to refer to these resources in their response to the task.

## **Swedish**

### **Speaking Examinations**

#### *Conversation, Report and Discussion*

The standard of oral communication was very high. Students were well-prepared for this exam. The topics had been well-prepared and well-researched with a lot of relevant information presented.

The weaker students were able to communicate but demonstrated weaknesses in grammar and expression.

Students are advised to choose a topic of interest to them so that they can address the topic with interest and enthusiasm.

### *General Comments*

This year the majority of students complied with the requirements of the written examination. Most students dealt satisfactorily with the written material.

## **Listening An Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

Most students demonstrated an ability to gather relevant information in the passage and then process and present it in the appropriate form required by the task. The general standard was good, and about a third of the students handled the task very well. This year fewer students had difficulty in distancing themselves from the phraseology of the original and in using independent wording than in previous years.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Swedish*

Overall, the students' responses ranged from satisfactory to very good. Most were aware of the importance of selecting topics, which they could handle. As in Paper 1, some performed with a breadth of scope and a suitability of expression, whereas others indicated a confined vocabulary and a limited knowledge of the structures of the Swedish language. Because of the variety of responses, it was hard to pinpoint specific tendencies, but in general the teachers are urged to continue to build up a thorough grasp of the major patterns of Swedish nouns, verbs and adjectives.

Students are strongly advised against preparing a few topics by heart and then attempting to reproduce these in the examination in response to a particular question.

#### *Part B: Re-organising written information*

In general, the standard was high, slightly improved from that of last year. The weaker responses demonstrated a limited vocabulary range and dependence on the wording of the original text.

The better students organised and linked the material carefully and expressed themselves in clear and simple Swedish.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

This year the responses in Paper 3 were better than last year's, some equating with a tertiary standard. Nevertheless, there were still a few who did not use their sources as a substantial basis of their report. Students who select the Swedish school system are especially reminded that they must avoid responding personally but must restrict their response to the sources studied.

## Turkish

### Listening and Written Examinations

#### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

##### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Responses to the listening comprehension exercises in Part A were generally accurate. However, expressions used were close to the original text. Generally, information was well selected and relevant to the task but the use of language was poor. Some students wasted time by attempting to complete both the English and Turkish whereas they were required to respond to either one or the other. Instructions should be carefully read or studied in order to avoid time loss caused by unfamiliarity with the format of the Paper(s).

##### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

Information conveyed in the task response to Part B was often excessive but usually relevant. In a few cases, it was evident that students were unfamiliar with the basic features of the discourse form.

Related ideas were adequately linked. However, the variety of words and phrases was often limited. Although most students accurately selected the main points, some included unnecessary and irrelevant information.

Use of vocabulary and expressions was not adequate in some cases. While the best students used complex sentences with a variety of linking words, those with fewer skills only produced very simple statements. Some students' expressions suffered from attempting to write very long sentences. Some words were phonetically written. Syllables ending with the 'soft' g, r and l were often misspelt.

Spelling errors were mostly due to insufficient familiarity with the Turkish alphabet. Umlauts over u's and o's used with front rounded vowels were often omitted totally or overused creating differences in meaning and awkward expressions.

In quite a few cases, the morphology rules of Turkish were not carefully followed, especially in noun cases, tense agreements and sentence structure.

Although some expressions were directly copied from source materials, most students attempted to construct their own sentences when responding to the task.

#### *Paper 2*

##### *Part A: Writing in Turkish*

All topics were almost equally selected. The least popular topic being the book summary.

Handling of the topics was adequate although some task responses were not of a high enough quality to capture the attention and interest of the reader. There was unfamiliarity with the main features of discourse forms selected, although a few students were able to satisfy the criteria of the discourse forms adequately. Paragraphing in most cases was poorly handled.

Vocabulary and grammar mistakes were often repeated. Some sentences lacked a variety of structural forms and tended to be simple and monotonous.

### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

Many students in this section did not observe the features of the discourse form, for example, the script of the interview should have been in the form of a dialogue. Some sentences were directly copied from the text. In many cases, too much redundant information was included. Vocabulary used by some students lacked enough variety to express the content adequately and there were a number of grammatical errors. For example *-mis* and *-misti*; *-de*, *-da* and *ki* were often misused. Other general grammatical mistakes stemmed from inadequate knowledge of consonant assimilation and small and great vowel harmony.

### *Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

One of the most common weaknesses in the responses, was poor use of references. Some students who listed particular references did not refer to these in their responses. Some of the references cited were irrelevant or vague like ‘class discussions’ and ‘lesson notes’.

The language used was very basic and the linguistic expression was poor. When responding in English, students made spelling mistakes and used colloquialisms, for example, words like ‘cool’ meaning ‘good’ were used, when the register was supposed to be formal. Some students’ work lacked clarity – their vocabulary limited to the level of everyday speech. Some sentences suffered from being too simple and basic with many clauses connected with ‘and’. However, some students were well prepared showing evidence of having covered the materials dealt with during the year, making proper references to them and complying with all requirements of the task. They indicated that they understood the writers’ intention and generally wrote excellent responses.

## **Ukrainian**

### **Speaking Examination**

#### *Conversation*

The overall standard was good, with all students able to link appropriately with the conversational partner and sustain conversation.

#### *Report and Discussion*

Topics were generally well chosen. Students presented the material well and were very well prepared for the discussion that followed.

Students are advised to select report topics that do not have significant overlap with each other or with the areas of general conversation.

## **Listening and Written Examinations**

### *Paper 1: Processing Spoken Information*

#### *Part A: Tasks on the Two Spoken Passages*

Students are reminded:

- to read each question carefully
- to practise dictionary skills ie the first meaning of a word in a dictionary is not always the most appropriate one for a particular context
- to practise recognising numerals aurally (The markers did note this year an improvement in the recognition of written numerals).

#### *Part B: Tasks Drawing on Both Passages*

The excellent responses demonstrated the students' ability to extract appropriate and relevant information and to present this information accurately and fluently.

The poorer responses were marred by:

evidence of irrelevant material or material not found in the texts

poor grammar and spelling.

Students are reminded to review a range of discourse forms in order to confidently write using the appropriate conventions.

### *Paper 2*

#### *Part A: Writing in Ukrainian*

In this part there were some excellent responses with some students employing very good turns of phrase appropriate to the task. Some students demonstrated good ideas and a good control of the conventions of the chosen discourse forms but the control of grammar and spelling was poor.

Students are reminded to:

- ensure that the spelling of those words found in the texts are reproduced faithfully
- read questions carefully to avoid any possible misinterpretation of the question.

#### *Part B: Reorganising Written Information*

The best responses demonstrated students' ability to select and reorganise relevant information in a meaningful way with a high degree of independence from the wording of the original text and a good control of the language required in the task. Some difficulties, however, arose in the following areas:

- Some students copied extensively from the items and did not demonstrate their ability to reorganise the material
- Some students did not adhere to the required discourse forms. (Note that in the Paper two forms were required – an introductory address and a commentary)
- Students were expected to talk about types of dances and not categories of dance

- Students need to select only the relevant material as there was more information than was required in the texts.

*Paper 3: Discussing a Theme*

The majority of students answered question 1. In many cases students did not refer to the ‘Dumy’ as a literary genre. Instead they concentrated on the story at the expense of the genre. Students were required to respond to the question asked and not to retell some of the stories. There was some evidence of pre-learned material that related to questions from previous examinations.

ISBN 0 7313 4382 4



9 780731 343829