



JUNIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION

2000

ITALIAN

HIGHER and ORDINARY LEVELS

CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT

HIGHER LEVEL

Total number of candidates: 86

Grade	A	B	C	D
Number	32	22	26	6
%	37.20	25.60	30.20	7.00

GENERAL COMMENTS

There was a very high percentage of A's, but this was probably due to the fact that 19 of these candidates came from single-script centres, which would suggest either candidates of Italian origin or candidates who had lived in Italy for long periods.

The number of candidates sitting the exam this year has decreased dramatically—86 against 140 in 1999.

As regards the performance of the candidates, students and teachers are advised to do more tape work and concentrate more on numbers and cultural awareness, which the candidates appear to lack. More work also needs to be done on extending the students' vocabulary, which appeared to be fairly limited.

Teachers should direct their students to use pen, not pencil, as this makes marking very difficult.

PART I: LISTENING COMPREHENSION

This is the biggest component of the examination, with 44% of the total mark allocated to it. Nobody failed the aural. The lowest mark awarded this year was 49%. Nine students achieved full marks in this section.

The first couple of questions always present difficulties, as students have not yet adjusted to the sound of the tape. It would help if the first few listening excerpts were shorter and easier than the others.

A

In Question 3(a), *anziché* proved a problem. In Question 4, not all candidates knew the word *borsa* and they said "purse". In Questions 5 and 6 candidates did not understand the numbers correctly.

B

In (i) Question 3 and (ii) Question 2, candidates had problems with the numbers. In (ii), Question 4, few understood *in contanti*.

PART II: READING COMPREHENSION

A

This passage appeared to be too difficult for the average candidate.

1. Confusion between *ragazzo* and *ragazza*.
2. Very few correct answers. Many candidates did not answer at all.
3. Many interpreted the question as what mood he was in as he left.
4. *I vicini di casa* not understood by most.

B

In this section, words like *vitto*, *alloggio* and *accompagnatore* were not understood.

C

1. Few understood *orario*, *sciopero*, *voli*. Many read *guidare* as *guardare*.
2. Odd-word-out: *Piazza* was read by some as *pizza*. *Caffè* was interpreted as *café*.
3. Mostly well answered. The words *davanti* and *prenotazioni* caused some confusion.
4. (a) *estive* not known by some. (b) Both “Thursday afternoon” and “9th to 14th August” were accepted. (c) *consegna a domicilio* not understood
5. Wine was not considered part of *bevande*. Few gave “live music”, most simply answered “music”, and this was accepted.
6. (a) was answered well by most. (b) *spiaggia a pagamento* was not understood. (c) *la doppia* was generally not understood.

PART III: WRITTEN EXPRESSION

A - Letter

The letter was generally well done. Most candidates seemed well prepared and some wrote a lot about self, family, personality and hobbies.

B - Note

This task was done well by those candidates who could express themselves well in the present, past and future tenses. The weaker candidates could just about get their message across, but structure and grammar were poor.

C - Language Awareness

1. Candidates had problems with the present tense of the verbs *piacere* and *preferire*, as well as with the past tenses in general.
2. This was generally well done, most candidates getting six or more questions correct. This enabled candidates who did not do well in C1 to pick up extra marks.

ORDINARY LEVEL

Total number of candidates: 44

Grade	A	B	C	D
Number	2	20	16	6
%	4.50	45.50	36.40	13.60

GENERAL COMMENTS

The number of candidates sitting the exam this year has decreased dramatically—44 against 107 in 1999.

There were no failures at this level. Candidates did best in the Listening Comprehension, and the lowest mark achieved in this section was 54%. The written section presented problems to most candidates. Perhaps consideration should be given to revising this part of the examination, as most candidates fail this component every year. In general, candidates' vocabulary is very limited at this level. Many candidates also have problems in understanding numbers. The advice to teachers would be to do more work in class on numbers, vocabulary and listening comprehension.

PART I: LISTENING COMPREHENSION

A

1. Generally well answered.
2. Few answered "magazine". Most ticked "book".
3. (b) numbers a problem here.
4. (a) poorly answered.
5. (b) numbers a problem here.
6. (b) problems with numbers and also days of the week.

B

- (i) Questions 1, 2 and 3 generally well answered. A variety of answers for Question 4.
- (ii) Question 2: problems with numbers again. Question 3: a variety of answers.

PART II: READING COMPREHENSION

A

1. Most answered correctly.
2. This presented some difficulty. Most candidates only got two answers correct.
3. Generally well done.
4. (a) Few answered "on a train"; most said "in a restaurant".

B

1. Some candidates found the letter difficult and they did not understand *mia madre aspetta un bambino*. In Question (e), “she wants to send them a card” was accepted, as nobody had understood *l’ho perso*.
2. The filling in of the form was generally well done, with the exception of *firma*, which few understood.

PART III: WRITTEN EXPRESSION**A - Postcard**

Many candidates left this section blank. Few candidates knew the layout of a letter, and most left out the salutation and the conclusion.

B - Language Awareness

1. This question was answered better than Question 2. All statements that made sense were accepted.
2. (b) was the only sentence written correctly by candidates who attempted this question.

**STATISTICS IN JUNIOR CERTIFICATE ITALIAN,
ORDINARY LEVEL, 1998-2000**

Percentage breakdown of candidates by grades:

Year	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	NG
1998	60	3.30	18.30	40.00	35.00	1.70	1.70	0.00
1999	107	2.80	10.30	32.70	45.80	7.50	0.90	0.00
2000	44	4.50	45.50	36.40	13.60	0.00	0.00	0.00

**STATISTICS IN JUNIOR CERTIFICATE ITALIAN,
HIGHER LEVEL, 1998-2000**

Percentage breakdown of candidates by grades:

Year	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	NG
1998	90	25.60	24.40	17.80	23.30	6.70	2.20	0.00
1999	140	18.60	32.90	24.30	17.10	7.10	0.00	0.00
2000	86	37.20	25.60	30.20	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00