# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2024 Italian (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

This subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 assessment cycle, gives 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. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025, these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 subject assessment advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation and online process by:

* ensuring all audio files or source materials and task sheets are submitted
* ensuring the task description for both the oral and written IDS tasks are uploaded
* thoroughly checking that all assessment tasks have been labelled correctly
* thoroughly checking all files have been uploaded correctly
* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct
* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible and interactions and oral presentations are audible.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The folio includes:

* Interaction
* Text Production
* Text Analysis.

The more successful folio responses commonly:

* demonstrated a wide and sophisticated range of skills (written, analytical, and oral), such as the appropriate use of rhetorical questions
* elaborated on ideas by giving opinions and different points of view, demonstrating depth in the response
* provided very detailed and clear responses to text analysis tasks, allowing for a deeper analysis of language and style in texts.

Interaction

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a variety of complex vocabulary and authentic Italian sentence structures, showing a high level of fluency
* used a wide variety of sentence openers, conjunctions, and connective devices
* demonstrated a high level of initiative and confidence during interactions by consistently elaborating on responses, including giving opinions
* demonstrated effective stress and tone, creating highly engaging and interesting interactions
* engaged the listener or reader with relevant details.

The less successful responses commonly:

* had a reliance on teacher help and longer hesitations
* were based on rehearsed patterns and lacked engagement and interest
* had more frequent linguistic errors
* ideas were not developed as well.

Text production

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* included idiomatic expressions and a number of appropriate cohesive devices
* used a wide range of structures accurately and effectively
* used the subjunctive accurately
* ideas were well developed and clearly expressed
* created responses that were interesting, using a variety of authentic expressions with relevance to cultural context.

*The less successful responses:*

* were based on rehearsed patterns, lacking engagement and interest
* had more frequent linguistic errors, which at times impeded meaning
* lacked well developed ideas
* used simple sentence structures lacking in connectives and conjunctions.

Text analysis

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated effective analysis and reflection relevant of the text types
* comprehensively explored the author's use of language and stylistic choices as relevant to the context and purpose of the text
* were able to successfully draw conclusions and identify concepts, perspectives and ideas represented in the source texts
* effectively incorporated relevant evidence from the texts to support answers.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* were limited in their ability to identify and explain main concepts and ideas
* provided only limited, or no, analysis of the authors language and stylistic choices
* did not support or justify their answers and interpretations with sufficient and/or relevant evidence from texts.

General comments or observations

Schools can improve the moderation process by ensuring samples submitted include the required audio and source materials.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* showed a high level of knowledge and passion for the chosen topic
* chose topics, whether contemporary or historical, that allowed for the use of a wider range of resources to showcase learning
* selected topics that allowed for depth of analysis and reflection, e.g. Contemporary Italian Rap lyrics, Italian Politics - North/South Divide
* were creative with the choice of oral presentation format
* allowed for different aspects of the topic to be explored in the written and oral responses
* were able to reflect on the information gained and express how it challenged their thinking.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included an oral response which contained information that was very similar in content to the written Italian response
* demonstrated limited use of expression and interest in the topic, which impacted the students’ ability to engage the audience
* included inaccurate oral expression with errors and/or frequent pauses which, at times, proved to be a distraction to the oral presentation
* provided overly simple reasons for selecting their topic and did not fully elaborate on what was learnt
* included reflections that mostly recounted the research process involved in undertaking the in-depth study and limited students’ ability to demonstrate personal reflection on the information gained and the ways on which it challenged their thinking
* lacked depth and breadth due to the use of overly simple language, expressions, and content.

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

1. The exam consists of two assessments, an oral examination, and a written examination.

Oral Examination

The oral examination of approximately 15 minutes comprises a general conversation and a discussion of the student’s in‑depth study. In the conversation, students converse with the examiners about their personal world.

General observations

Students generally understood the questions and were able to construct coherent, relevant sentences, imparting a good degree of detail. They used a wide range of pertinent vocabulary and expressions, demonstrating a solid grasp of tenses and agreements. Students were able to express the subjects taken this year (even correctly omitting the definite article), as well as their year level.

Section 1: Conversation

The more successful responses commonly:

* were able to use the conditional correctly (Mi piacerebbe andare in Europa)
* were able to show a good understanding of subjunctive and se clauses
* were well-prepared and knew what to expect for the section
* allowed the conversation to flow naturally, even when students repeated memorised answers
* was able to share detailed information about their chosen topic effectively
* demonstrated passion for their topic through thorough research
* used the opportunity at the end of the oral exam to share additional information not previously discussed
* were able to give opinions using the subjunctive
* demonstrated a strength in remaining relevant
* were able to understand and respond to the questions asked.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* did not always respond to the questions asked, but rather relied on memorised and overly rehearsed responses that were not always relevant to the question
* were unable to respond to unexpected questions or answer related or follow-up questions that required expansion from memorised answers
* had variations in vocabulary which were noted, such as "studi dei bambini" versus the more correct "studi dell'infanzia."
* had incorrect pronunciation and used various incorrect words which at times impeded meaning.

Section 2: Discussion

The more successful responses commonly:

* discussed topics with multiple clauses
* were able to expand without needing to wait for examiners to ask follow-up questions

Example: "Ho studiato... ma la mia materia preferita era chimica siccome..."

* had mostly clear expression and pronunciation
* used a range of grammar structures and applied familiar phrases accurately and with confidence
* showed depth, provided opinions, and varied information for most focus areas of their topic
* were able to provide personal reflection on their learning in relation to their topic.

The less successful responses commonly:

* shared only limited and/or general information about their chosen topic
* listed points on their In-depth Study sheet that they were not prepared for and therefore were unable to effectively address all aspects of their research
* generally provided simple one or two sentence responses without expanding or providing support for opinions and ideas
* had responses which were often short, overly rehearsed sentences
* were limited in their ability to expand on their answers and waited for examiners to ask follow-up questions
* had grammatical inaccuracies such as noun-adjective agreements and articulated prepositions that at time impeded meaning.

Written examination

Overall, the exam questions allowed most students to succeed in demonstrating what they know and can do in Italian. Students are encouraged to work on elaborating their ideas and supporting their opinions. Students should also be encouraged to focus on their tenses, conjugations, and agreements to further improve grammatical accuracy and clarity of expression.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

There were two texts in Italian varying in length and nature. Students were generally able to identify the context, purpose, and audience of each text. The more successful students were able to analyse aspects of the language in the texts.

Text 1

Question 1(a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly identified the festival's duration.

The less successful responses commonly:

* confused the duration with the number of days it runs
* showed limited understanding of ordinal and cardinal numbers in this context.

Question 1(b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly stated the expression in English as an event for the whole family
* included at least one example each for activities aimed at both children and adults.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked supporting details, such as specific activities
* were limited in their ability to fully explain why the event was family-friendly.

Text 2 (audio)

Question 2 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified Gianna's interest in checking out the new shopping centre
* recognised that she wanted to go with Mario.

The less successful responses commonly:

* confused the destination, thinking it was the "citta" instead of the shopping centre in the city
* wrote about going to restaurants
* found identifying key information challenging when there were many details.

Question 2 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified that Marco wished to explore the new shopping centre
* recognised the range of activities Marco wished to participate in:
* to meet up and have breakfast
* to see all the new shops, especially those selling brands not previously available in Italy
* to get advice on changing his style and buying new clothes
* to have lunch in one of the many restaurants in the new centre.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not comprehend that Marco wanted a new style
* did not understand that he wished to see brands not previously available in Italy.

Question 2(c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* understood that Marco's mother needed him on Saturday morning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* thought it was an appointment.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

The majority of students demonstrated a solid understanding of the main ideas and key concepts of the source material. Although some students found providing relevant examples to support their answers, overall comprehension of the text was a consistently high standard. The overall results indicate a strong foundational understanding of written Italian.

Part A

Text 3

Question 3 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* expressed the title correctly in English as "Italy on the World Stage."
* identified the proud, enthusiastic tone
* referenced the recent sporting success of the tennis player
* noted that this success ignited broader interest in sport in Italy.

Question 3(b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified the impact of Marco Rossi's sporting success in Italy:
* reigniting pride in sport after a decline in recent years
* inspiring the younger generation to be active and get off their devices
* serving as a positive role model for perseverance, humility, and strong values.

The less successful responses commonly:

* confused "campi sportivi" with sports camps, rather than sports fields.

Question 3 (c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly identified three techniques
* provided an example translated into English for each technique
* explained the impact of the technique on the reader:
* example: rhetorical questions like "But what has caused the renaissance of this sport? Who has inspired us?" invite the reader to discover more about changing attitudes towards sports.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated that the text had not been fully understood
* showed limited depth of understanding of content
* demonstrated limited use of relevant examples from the text to support answers
* were not able to identify and/or explain some of the linguistic techniques or used incorrect language.

General Advice and Comments

Students are reminded to include revision of common language techniques that can be found in the range of text types they may encounter. This includes aspects such as titles, inclusive language, emotive language, rhetorical questions, imperative language, anecdotal evidence, statistical data/facts etc.

Part B

The more successful responses commonly:

* followed email conventions and addressed prompts in the source text with relevant responses.

For example, some stated they were not at university yet but hoped to go.

* understood that they needed to give advice about part-time work, and also provided suggestions.

For example:

* Suggested taking a gap year.
* Gave advice on a university course, finding an apprenticeship, or doing a technical diploma.
* followed the structure of the source text and directly addressed the main points
* used correct expressions, including correctly conjugated verbs.

The less successful responses commonly:

* mistook the prompt about university studies and wrote about finishing Year 12
* were confused about the presentation Paolo listened to, thinking he had presented it
* provided information in the response that, while related to the overall topic, was not relevant to the prompt.

Section 3: Writing in Italian

Question 5

Option 1

This was a popular option among students.

The more successful responses commonly:

* wrote about an exciting gift (e.g. a ticket to Italy, a puppy, a kitten, a SMEG mixer, a cookbook)
* explained why the gift was significant to them
* clearly expressed their thanks
* incorporated a good range of idiomatic expressions
* followed the conventions of a letter and elaborated on their ideas.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* had errors in expression, especially tenses and verb conjugations which impeded meaning
* wrote a response that did not address the question prompt or did not address both requirements.

Option 2

This was the least popular option amongst students.

The more successful responses commonly:

* adhered to the conventions of the text type and directly addressed the reader
* wrote an effective and engaging review, effectively expanding on and supporting their ideas and opinions
* used humour effectively to create interest
* clearly identified and explained the impact of the unexpected element (either positive or negative)
* provided a recommendation as a part of their review
* used a wide range of grammatical expressions with a generally high level of accuracy.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth in their response with limited expansion of ideas and opinions which limited the engagement with the intended audience
* did not address anything unexpected about the concert in their review
* provided a re-count of the concert rather than a review
* included grammatical errors which at times impeded meaning.

*For example:*

* + incorrect use of essere/avere.
	+ incorrect auxiliary verbs.
	+ lui/lei conjunction instead of io, or vice versa.
	+ confusion with indirect object pronouns (IOPs) and when to use "tu" vs. "te" (e.g., "anche te" vs. "ti ringrazio").

Option 3

This was also a popular option among students.

The more successful responses commonly:

* followed the conventions of a speech
* used persuasive language effectively for the intended audience
* identified key benefits of exchange programs
* linked benefits to personal experiences
* effectively addressed the benefits for teachers as well as students
* used creativity in their writing to engage the reader
* displayed accurate use of cohesive devices and text type conventions.

Less successful responses commonly:

* highlighted the need for students to review and check their responses to ensure all points of the question are covered
* did not refer to the benefits for teachers in their response
* included errors in expression, especially tenses, noun-adjective agreements, and verb conjugations, that may have impeded meaning. For example:
* incorrect avere conjugations (e.g., "ho leggo")
* included common mistakes in noun-adjective and singular/plural agreements.