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## Overview

This Chief Assessors’ reports give an overview of how students performed in their external assessment 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.

For general information and feedback regarding school assessment and the oral examination, please refer to the Nationally and Interstate Assessed Languages at Background Speakers Level Chief Assessor’s Report on the subject minisite.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Written Examination: General Comments

In 2015, more than 100 students sat for the Persian Background Speakers written examination.

By and large, the markers noted no specific grammatical, spelling, or sentence structure issues. However, some differences were identified in the way that students used language to present their point of view (e.g. use of vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, strategies specific to the text type). In some cases, this may have been the result of linguistic background. In other cases, however, the student’s level of literacy and their limited schooling may have played a part.

Reading responses in the papers appeared to be problematic on some occasions. This was due to students using very pale pens and/or pencils, or their handwriting being illegible at times. It is recommended that teachers encourage students to use a dark coloured, clearly visible pen and work on maintaining legible handwriting, to avoid these problems.

Written Examination: Discussion

Section 1: Listening and Responding — Part A

In general, students were able to identify the main points and analyse information presented in the text. All responses demonstrated evidence of understanding the basis of the question and explanations consistently made reference to the specific evidence in the text.

The expression in English responses was not to a high standard, but overall this did not impede the meaning from being conveyed.

In total, 20 students scored more than 8 marks out of 10 and approximately 40 students scored between 5 and 7 marks.

Section 1: Listening and Responding — Part B

Overall, students performed well in this section. Many students were able to select the required information from both texts. Even those with developing language abilities were able to identify key information from the texts. More than 70% of students scored between 8─14 marks.

Section 2: Reading and Responding — Part A

Many students were able to identify the main points, but their capacity to discuss and analyse information was varied.

Question 3(c) proved to be the most challenging question. Some confusion may have arisen because the text was referring to the actor’s inability to connect with her audience, and the question was looking at how successful she was in achieving her role. Students were prompted to infer the level of success based on the information provided in the text. It is important to note that inference questions are designed to gauge students’ analytical and high-order thinking capabilities. Teachers are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to practise analysing texts throughout the school year so that they are well prepared to respond to questions and texts in this section.

Question 3(a): The majority of responses received an average result.

Question 3(b): Most students understood the question and responded to it appropriately.

Question 3(c): This question appeared to pose the most difficulty. Many students had difficulty answering this question at a satisfactory standard.

Question 3(d): The majority of students performed well in this question. Answers to this question demonstrated that students had a good grasp of the proverb in the text. More than 20 students scored full marks.

Question 3(e): It was noted that a few students experienced some confusion about the meaning of the poetic background of the director of the movie. However, the majority appeared to understand the question and responded accordingly.

Section 2: Reading and Responding — Part B

Students generally coped well with this section of the examination.

The stronger responses were able to identify and evaluate information and display a deep understanding of the questions raised in the text. In contrast, there was a group of weaker responses that could refer to the text but did not evaluate the information and develop a logical argument.

Section 3: Writing in Persian

The most popular choice this year was question 5. The few students who chose questions 6 or 7 responded very well. For those who chose question 5, the better responses to the question had depth and breadth in the treatment of the topic. This showed a good knowledge of contemporary society in Persian-speaking countries, as well as an understanding of the current problems and expectations of young people. In contrast, weaker responses were composed of a few hundred words lacking logical and sequential structure and demonstrating little or no use of the appropriate conventions of the text type.

## Operational Advice

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. Teachers’ assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. Teacher grades/marks should be evident on all student school assessment work.
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