

# **Vietnamese (Background Speakers)**

2011 Assessment Report



Government  
of South Australia

**SACE**  
Board of SA

# VIETNAMESE (BACKGROUND SPEAKERS)

## 2011 ASSESSMENT REPORT

### OVERVIEW

Assessment reports give an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

### SCHOOL ASSESSMENT

#### Assessment Type: Folio

##### Interaction

Interaction tasks, ranging from conversations to speeches followed by questions and answers, were presented in an appropriate and accessible format for moderation, along with supporting documentation such as marks schemes.

Teachers should ensure that each student in the moderation sample is clearly identifiable, as outlined in the subject operational information for this language (available under Key Materials on the Stage 2 subject page on the SACE website, [www.sace.sa.edu.au](http://www.sace.sa.edu.au)).

An interaction in which students give a talk or speech should allow sufficient opportunity for students to demonstrate evidence of their ability to interact in Vietnamese.

##### Text Production

A range of text types (e.g. diary entry, text of a talk, report) were used for the text production tasks, and students appropriately differentiated the context, purpose, and audience.

Most tasks were completed under direct teacher supervision. Teachers are encouraged to consider using the flexibility of the assessment scope to design tasks with varying word lengths and assessment conditions to cater for student needs.

##### Text Analysis

It was pleasing to see a range of stimulus texts used for text analysis in the Folio, including some from past examination papers. However, some tasks did not provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate their learning in relation to Evaluation and Reflection. Teachers are advised to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning in relation to ER2 in their text analysis tasks.

Text analysis tasks provide the opportunity for students to demonstrate not only their bilingual skills in moving between Vietnamese and English, but also their ability to analyse and reflect on how authors use language for different purposes. The assessment scope and conditions are flexible, to allow tasks to be designed to focus on particular specific features of the assessment criteria, and teachers are advised to make use of this flexibility.

##### Task design advice

Teachers are advised to design assessment tasks carefully, so that students have the opportunity to demonstrate their learning against the specific features being assessed. Appropriate assessment conditions can also support student achievement.

For interaction tasks, teachers are reminded that interaction is the focus. Therefore, in a task such as a presentation followed by questions and answers (the interaction), teachers should ensure that enough time is allowed for the students to interact. In cases where this was not taken into account, there was a lack of evidence to support the teacher's assessment decision. Regular practice in the classroom supports students in developing the necessary balance of skills and in becoming confident with spontaneous interactions, to the best of their ability.

Regarding text production tasks, teachers are advised to ensure that the context, purpose, audience, and text type are appropriate and clear, and that students have the opportunity to produce the range of prescribed text types during their studies.

### **Assessment Type: In-depth Study**

The in-depth study allows students to personally engage in research that relates to a contemporary issue, and teachers should take care to ensure that the three individual tasks are designed to provide this engagement. Students who performed well went beyond describing and recounting facts, and included reflection and analysis of diverse perspectives about the issue of the study. This study of contemporary issues differentiates the continuers and background level speakers programs of study, and it is important that a range of different perspectives is explored.

Students should be encouraged to choose suitable topics, which will allow them to give opinions and comment on the significance of the topic. As the term 'in-depth' implies, students should demonstrate more than generalisations and general knowledge. Although it may be appropriate that students draw on personal experience, the three tasks should also allow them to demonstrate their research.

Teachers are advised to familiarise themselves fully with the requirements for packaging and submitting materials for final moderation to support the moderation of the school assessment component. This information is provided in the subject operational information for this language (available under Key Materials on the Stage 2 subject page on the SACE website, [www.sace.sa.edu.au](http://www.sace.sa.edu.au)).

Teachers should use the addendum to the learning and assessment plan to record variations to their planned assessments, when applicable, and should ensure that all tasks are presented for moderation in a format that is easily accessible for the moderators and in accordance with the advice provided in the subject operational information for this language. Materials should be clearly labelled and all non-written tasks should be submitted in the appropriate format.

## **EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT**

### **A. Oral Examination: Discussion**

Many students dealt well with the discussion. A range of topics were chosen and the three most popular contemporary issues this year were, in order of popularity:

- arts and entertainment (e.g. contemporary film)
- environmental issues
- the changing roles and values of women, men, families, and young people.

The standard of discussion was very high this year and the language used was often at a sophisticated level. Candidates had clearly prepared thoroughly for this section, and most students presented interesting and well-researched topics. The available time-limit was generally used well.

## **B. Written Examination**

### **Section 1: Listening and Responding**

Candidates generally answered questions satisfactorily in this section. Students found questions that required them to interpret information and analyse language more challenging than those requiring them to extract information.

#### *Part A*

Q. 1 (a): Few students gave the correct answer to the question as the younger generation's view on marriage in Vietnam. The rest responded around the key word 'marriage'.

Q. 1 (b): Most students answered the question correctly.

Q. 1 (c): The majority of students answered this question satisfactorily, and very few students provided an incomplete response.

Q. 1 (d): This was the most challenging question and required students to answer in their own words. Students who performed well provided an explanation of the speaker's concerns with appropriate supporting evidence from the text.

#### *Part B*

In this section, students were required to use information from the texts to write an article as part of a discussion in an online forum. The most successful responses demonstrated an understanding of the texts by using information accurately and expressing this information appropriately for the task.

An article usually has an eye-catching title, but only a few students provided a suitable title. Some students wrote a letter to the editor instead of an article for the *Voice of Vietnam's* online forum.

The more successful students demonstrated the ability to produce an original text in Vietnamese. Their ideas were relevant and well developed, and fluency was not hampered by errors in grammar and structure. The better responses addressed the requirements of context, purpose, and audience and followed the appropriate conventions of the text type.

### **Section 2: Reading and Responding**

#### *Part A*

Most students gave relevant responses to all parts of Question 3. Markers commented that few students included all of the specific details required to achieve full marks for this section.

In a few cases, a student's English was not accurate enough to express the answers clearly. When students are asked to provide evidence from the texts, they should answer in the language specified.

In this section there was some confusion over the use of:

- chạnh lòng (deeply moved)
- bồi hồi (mixed feeling)
- ngỡ như ngày hôm qua ('it's like yesterday')
- dâng một nén hương (offering incense)
- gây quỹ (fundraised)
- cải thiện sức khỏe cho người Úc bản địa (to improve the health of Indigenous people).

Effective use of dictionaries is an important skill to teach students, and it was clear that many students were not able to use dictionaries to correctly interpret words in the given contexts.

## Part B

Most students coped well with the task. The more successful candidates presented their ideas and opinions based on the information in the text. Most agreed with the ideas in the text rather than presenting an opposing argument.

The more successful responses presented their suggestions for looking after the environment effectively in Vietnam and clearly stated their ideas regarding the issue, rather than repeating the ideas included in the text.

As the response was a letter addressed to the editor of the newspaper, it was appropriate to use a standard register rather than informal one. Markers felt that it was inappropriate to address the editor as *thân mến*, for example. Students should be aware of different forms of address, as this is an important part of knowing the language and culture.

Other misunderstandings and common errors included: Nhận được sự phản hồi (instead of hồi đáp); Chính phủ Việt Nam nên có một chứng kiến riêng (instead of ý kiến); Kính thưa Ngài chủ bút- Kính gửi was put at the end of the letter.

The most impressive letters picked up and included many aspects from the provided text. Responses in Part B were generally of the required length, and the better responses adhered to the features of the text type, with an appropriate salutation and conclusion.

### Section 3: Writing in Vietnamese

Most students planned their use of time well enough to write a response of appropriate length in this section.

Question 8 was the most popular question, chosen by more than half of the students, followed by Question 6, chosen by approximately one-third, and Question 7, chosen by approximately one-fifth of students. Question 5 was the least popular choice.

Most students responded appropriately to the question they chose. However, some who chose Question 8 did not argue either for or against the need for ongoing integration. The more successful students, reading the question carefully, provided appropriate depth of treatment. A small number of students did not demonstrate the conventions of the text types, and only a few referred to the texts they studied during the year to support their response.

Students are reminded not to write in pencil.

Across the questions in this section, some students made incorrect use of *ch/tr; t/ch; i/y; kh/k; n/ng; d/v; điều/điều*.

Writing in Vietnamese is a complex and demanding task that requires creativity and familiarity with a range of text types, as well as linguistic competence. Students should also check that their response takes into account the context, purpose, and audience of the questions and incorporates the features of the text type.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

Overall student performance in the school assessment and external assessment components reflected a sound understanding of the assessment scope and requirements described in the subject outline.

Chief Assessor  
Vietnamese Background Speakers