2022 VCE Dutch oral external assessment report

General comments

Students were assessed on their knowledge and skills in using spoken language. The examination had two sections – a conversation of approximately seven minutes, during which students conversed with the assessors about their personal world, and a discussion of approximately eight minutes.

In both sections, students were assessed in these areas:

* communication (the capacity to maintain and advance the exchange appropriately and effectively)
* content (relevance, breadth and depth of information, opinions and ideas in the conversation and their capacity to present information, ideas and opinions on their chosen subtopic in the discussion)
* language (the accuracy of their vocabulary and grammar, the range and appropriateness of their vocabulary and grammar, and the clarity of their expression).

Students who engaged in higher-scoring conversations and discussions:

* demonstrated an excellent level of understanding by responding readily and confidently, used highly effective repair strategies, and carried conversation forward with spontaneity
* presented an excellent range of information, opinions and ideas clearly and logically with highly relevant responses, were able to clarify, elaborate on and defend opinions and ideas very effectively, and demonstrated excellent preparation for the conversation and of their subtopic
* used sophisticated vocabulary and structures accurately and appropriately, and were usually able to self-correct
* used an excellent range of vocabulary, structures and expressions, and consistently used highly appropriate style and register
* had excellent pronunciation, intonation, stress and tempo.

Students ranged from proficient speakers who presented complex ideas confidently in sophisticated Dutch with few errors to those who provided simplistic information in limited Dutch.

Section 1 – Conversation

Assessors engaged with each student in a general conversation about the student’s personal world, for example, school and home life, family and friends, interests and aspirations.

Most students performed well in the conversation. They felt at ease talking about topics from their own experience and were able to volunteer additional information to carry the conversation forward. Students often used appropriate vocabulary and had a strong grasp of the appropriate structures, tones and registers.

Communication

Students felt comfortable to talk at length about aspects of their own lives. Students who were well prepared demonstrated the ability to discuss certain topics and were able to present relevant and detailed information.

Students were mostly able to expand on their initial answers to the assessors’ questions, thereby demonstrating an ability to elaborate and reflect on information, ideas and opinions.

Students responded readily to questions and carried the conversation forward in a natural way. Often students involved the assessors in their answers, for instance, by posing rhetorical questions or rounding off their response in such a way that there was a clear path forward for an assessor to ask a follow-up question.

Students generally communicated effectively and required little support. Where students did not immediately respond to a question or lost their train of thought, they demonstrated effective repair strategies that allowed them to continue with little disruption to the flow of the conversation.

Content

Students mostly discussed ideas and opinions that were relevant to the conversation and were able to expand on these in sufficient depth and breadth. They were generally well-prepared, which allowed them to converse on various topics of conversation. Suggested topics of conversation to prepare for include hobbies, school, aspirations for the future, the Netherlands, and part-time work.

Areas for improvements include:

* preparing for more elaboration of any points students discuss with the assessors
* practising conversing about a wide range of possible subtopics that reaches beyond the above suggested examples
* volunteering more information on a particular subtopic, rather than waiting for follow-up questions from assessors.

Language

Students on the whole used an appropriate range of vocabulary, grammar and sentence structures. Most students demonstrated a well-developed vocabulary to discuss everyday subtopics in the conversation and they also employed grammatically correct and suitable sentence structures.

Students generally spoke clearly and confidently, with very good pronunciation, intonation, stress and tempo. Students who spoke at a measured pace, projected their voice and enunciated words clearly were highly intelligible.

Areas for improvements include:

* expanding vocabulary
* being careful to use the correct singular specific article – i.e. ‘de’ or ‘het’
* limiting conjugation errors
* learning Dutch idioms and expressions to avoid incorrect anglicisms.

Section 2 – Discussion

Each student gave a one-minute introduction of their subtopic to their assessor, who then engaged the student in a discussion exploring their subtopic. Students also provided assessors with any objects, such as photographs, maps or diagrams, brought to support the discussion. The discussion was an opportunity to explore aspects of the language and culture of communities in which Dutch is spoken.

The majority of this year’s students performed well in the discussion, conversing confidently and fluently on a specific subtopic. Those students who struggled to discuss their topic for the duration, often lacked the vocabulary to discuss more complex ideas.

Communication

Students interacted with assessors in a natural and confident way. Some students successfully made reference to their and the assessors’ shared experiences as Dutch speakers or to their mutual understanding of Dutch history and traditions.

For the most part, students communicated effectively and required little support. Most students were capable of keeping the exchange flowing and had effective repair strategies. Some students struggled to expand on their initial responses and would benefit from practising providing longer responses to likely questions from assessors.

Content

Most students provided a suitable and in-depth range of information, ideas and opinions. Students had prepared for this section of the examination by studying multiple sources relating to their chosen subtopic. Students who scored highly had either absorbed a lot of information from a few select sources or consulted a wide range of sources for a wide-ranging understanding of the subject matter.

Students frequently could answer an assessor’s immediate question and then elaborate on their response with more information or by presenting their own opinion or conclusion of the matter at hand. Some students had not prepared deeply or widely enough on their chosen subtopic and were unable to answer slightly more specific or questions. These students would benefit from conducting additional research into their subtopics.

Language

Students generally employed an appropriate range of vocabulary, grammar and sentence structures and a suitable style and register in the discussion. Most students were capable of discussing the subtopic in a suitably formal and evaluative manner. Some students successfully employed Dutch idioms to emphasise an idea or opinion.

Students pronounced words clearly and spoke at an appropriate rhythm. Students who spoke confidently and at a measured pace often demonstrated the greatest clarity of expression.

Some students experienced issues with pronunciation, vocabulary, conjugation, syntax and article use.

Areas for improvements include:

* expanding vocabulary
* being careful when using the correct singular specific article – i.e. ‘de’ or ‘het’
* limiting conjugation errors
* learning Dutch idioms and expressions to avoid incorrect anglicisms
* avoiding lapsing into English of unsure of a Dutch word or expression.

Students should note the following language issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Incorrect use** | **Correct use** |
| het tijd (the time – wrong article) | de tijd (the time – correct article) |
| like (English word) | zoals/bijvoorbeeld (like/for example) |
| zij was mensen (they was people – conjugation error) | zij waren mensen (they were people) |

More information

Refer to the [VCE Dutch study design](https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/curriculum/vce/vce-study-designs/dutch/Pages/Index.aspx) and [examination criteria and specifications](https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/assessment/vce-assessment/past-examinations/Pages/Dutch.aspx) for full details on this study and how it is assessed.