2022 Japanese (Continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 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. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

Across the Assessment Types for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students should not speed-up the recording of their videos excessively in an attempt to condense more content into the maximum time limit.

From 2023, if a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, schools will be requested to provide a transcript and markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit.

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* 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 that interactions and oral presentations are audible.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The folio must contain 3–5 tasks and must include one of each of the following:

* Interaction
* Text Analysis
* Text Production.

Interaction

The Interaction is to be between 5–7 mins in length. The choice of topics is determined by the teacher.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* individualising questions for each student rather than giving all students the same questions
* give students a range of open, as well as closed questions.

The more successful responses commonly:

* allowed students to discuss topics in depth and express and give opinions
* were maintained in polite form
* included a range of complex grammatical structures
* were fluent and spontaneous
* responded accurately using the correct tense and with correct use of particles
* used a variety of communication strategies to maintain conversation
* showed flexibility and spontaneity in responding to questions
* demonstrated engagement in the interaction by actively offering additional details
* used a wide range of cohesive devices effectively to elaborate their responses
* included a variety of linguistic structures when responding
* responded with clear pronunciation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included closed questions that did not allow for depth in the response
* followed a specific set of questions rather than following the natural flow of the conversation or the interest of the student, which did not encourage or allow for spontaneous discussion
* included long periods to process questions and formulate answers
* began with a self-introduction, which was not an interaction
* included frequent basic particle and tense errors
* used very basic vocabulary and very few linguistic structures in their responses
* used English to answer the questions
* used learnt responses which were not relevant to the initial question or did not come across as a natural response.

Text Production

The text production is a written text in Japanese. The text type, topic and length of the text production are chosen by the teacher. The text can be handwritten or typed.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* allowing students to be creative within the text production topic
* encouraging students to use polite form when writing text, unless very confident with the use of plain form.

The more successful responses commonly:

* allowed students to explore the topic in depth and be creative
* included an extensive range of complex grammatical structures and demonstrate accuracy in their use, with the structures used appropriately and naturally
* clearly demonstrated the purpose and audience (which was also made clear through the task design)
* used a variety of cohesive structures to link ideas
* used a variety of vocabulary.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth in ideas
* included only basic grammatical structures
* included many grammatical errors, including tense, spelling and particle errors
* did not include prescribed Kanji characters as listed in the Subject Outline
* did not use connective devices to link ideas, but instead used a number of simple sentences
* relied heavily on google translate/dictionary and meaning was unclear due to incorrect word choice
* did not include prescribed SACE grammar structures, but instead used difficult words and simple sentences to convey meaning
* included grammar that was not used appropriately and naturally.

Text Analysis

Students analyse a text in Japanese. This could be a written or spoken text. Questions relating to interpretation as well as language analysis must be included.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring that questions about the text include questions about the language used, the text type and the purpose of the text.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included responses to language analysis questions where students were able to discuss text types, the purpose of the texts and the style of language used in the texts
* used language examples and evidence from the text to support their findings
* demonstrated depth and breadth in their interpretation of meaning in texts.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not include analysis of language in texts (questions to address this assessment design criteria may not have been included)
* did not use evidence from the text as examples to support their findings
* included only responses to questions from past examinations papers (interpretation questions only)
* were marked on a number scheme, rather than assessed using the performance standards.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

The In-depth Study must include:

* Oral presentation in Japanese
* Written response in Japanese
* English reflection.

Each task must differ in context, purpose and audience. Common topics in 2022 included anime, sumo, Japanese food, tourist attractions, and geisha.

Oral Presentation in Japanese

The Oral Presentation is 3–5 minutes long.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* encouraging students to choose topics they are interested in
* encouraging students to research interesting subtopics within the main topic of research.

The more successful responses commonly:

* discussed the chosen topic in depth, using current statistics, interesting information and current issues related to the topic.
* demonstrated a deep understanding of the researched topic
* were well structured in their presentation of the topic
* included an extensive range of complex grammatical structures from the prescribed list as detailed in the Subject Outline.
* were presented fluently, with very good pronunciation and intonation
* demonstrated clear and accurate pronunciation of more sophisticated vocabulary specific to the topic
* discussed interesting topics related to the main topic of investigation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided basic and well-known information on the chosen topic
* presented with pronunciation and intonation errors which impeded meaning
* used unfamiliar or ‘difficult’ words indicating a lack of understanding of their meaning, which sometimes led to pronunciation and intonation errors.
* exceeded or did not sustain the 3 – 5-minute time limit
* presented with frequent pauses.

Written Response in Japanese

The Written Response in Japanese has a maximum character count of 600 characters. The text can be handwritten or typed.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* encouraging students to include more depth of ideas in their written response.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included in-depth information on their chosen topic in the written response
* included an extensive range of complex grammatical structures
* used a range of cohesive devices to link ideas
* wrote with excellent control of language
* wrote in diary form and expressed feelings about their experiences after the event
* explored the chosen In-Depth Study topic in a different context and text type, so that information could be shared differently to the Oral Presentation
* included interesting information and depth of ideas about the chosen topic
* adhered to the text type. (e.g. diary — was written in diary form and followed the conventions of the text type).

The less successful responses commonly:

* included little information relevant to the chosen topic
* did not write with accuracy
* did not include a variety of grammatical structures
* did not include a variety of cohesive structures to link ideas
* were very similar, or in some cases the same in content and context to the Oral Presentation in Japanese
* expressed information about their chosen In-Depth Study topic in a very simple way and lacked in depth and breadth
* did not follow a clearly designed structure or follow text type conventions
* exceeded the character limit of 600 characters.

English Reflection

The English Reflection is a maximum of 600 words in written form or an oral presentation of 5-7 minutes.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* encouraging students to reflect on their own culture and compare it to the Japanese culture
* encourage students to choose an article about a current issue related to their chosen topic.

The more successful responses commonly:

* reflected critically on how cultures, values, and beliefs were represented in texts
* made connections between their own cultural backgrounds, values and practices as explored through the texts used
* critically analysed texts and drew comparisons or differences between cultures
* reflected on a current issue associated with their chosen topic
* depth of reflection of own practices and impact of the study was evident and thoughtful.

The less successful responses commonly:

* based their reflection on the content of what they had learnt through the chosen topic
* described their own values, without making connections with those represented in texts
* discussed content researched about their chosen topic rather than reflected on cultures and values within their chosen topic
* reflected mainly on their own learning and the research process rather than on cultures and values
* exceeded the 600 word or 5–7 minute time limit
* limited reflection of own practices and impact of the study.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

150 students attended the 2022 Japanese Continuers Oral Examination. Overall, students demonstrated good conversation and discussion skills, with approximately 34% achieving an A grade.

Part 1: Conversation

The more successful students commonly:

* listened to the examiners carefully and comprehended questions thoroughly
* gave relevant responses in their own words
* did not reply with memorised answers
* comfortably went beyond the minimum answer by giving an appropriate amount of detail and information
* presented well thought-out opinions and ideas with reasons
* gave interesting answers and engaged in follow-up interaction comfortably
* expressed complex ideas accurately and effectively
* handled less-expected questions well
* Demonstrated a sound knowledge of vocabulary and grammar expected for this level
* spoke in complete sentences
* sought help/clarification effectively when needed
* spoke clearly in an appropriate pace and volume
* maintained the natural flow of conversation e.g., using fillers, confirming questions, and thanking the examiner when receiving help
* understood and used the formal register appropriately. (e.g. お名前 vs. 名前, ご家族 vs. 家族, お兄さん vs. 兄, すみません、もういちどおねがいします vs. もういちど？)

The less successful students commonly:

* did not fully understand the questions and gave irrelevant answers
* relied on the question list from the SACE Board website and used rehearsed answers
* gave excessive answers through the recitation of long prepared answers, taking over the conversation
* unsuccessfully tried to guess the meaning of a question instead of asking for clarification or help
* demonstrated insufficient knowledge of Stage 2 vocabulary and grammar
* did not have strategies to deal with unexpected questions and often ended up saying 分かりません。
* could answer simple questions only
* gave short and minimum responses with little or no information/content
* spoke hesitantly with many unnatural pauses
* used an excessive number of fillers and were unable to present content. (e.g. ええと、あのう)
* made frequent grammatical errors that impeded meaning. (e.g. tense and particles)
* did not understand when the same questions were asked in different ways. (e.g. どのくらい/何回/何時間, 何で/どうやって, なぜ/どうして, ほうかご/じゅぎょうが終わってから, 学校で何を勉強して/学校のかもく)
* poorly handled who, what, where, why when, how questions.

Part 2: Discussion

The more successful students commonly:

* had chosen a suitable (i.e. manageable and sufficiently challenging) topic for their In-depth study
* demonstrated good understanding of their chosen topic
* provided solid evidence of research (e.g. clear interpretation of books/websites used, not just the titles)
* made use of appropriate and authoritative sources for research
* presented careful and insightful reflections on Japanese and own cultures, values, and practices
* effectively presented reflection on their own learning
* presented their main points of study accurately and effectively in the outline form (e.g. more specific and concise than general and broad)
* thoroughly comprehended examiners’ questions and gave relevant answers in their own words
* effectively responded to questions for which they did not have rehearsed answers
* took part in genuine discussion in a relaxed manner, without panicking, without evading by saying 分かりません, and without being overly concerned about making minor grammatical errors.
* displayed a good understanding of topic-specific vocabulary
* used a wide range of expressions, both simple and complex, accurately, and effectively
* spoke in their own words rather than reciting memorised texts written by someone else
* engaged the audience (examiners) well using effective body language, eye contact and intonation.

The less successful students commonly:

* did not fully understand the examination procedures and requirements
* had chosen a topic that was too challenging for their language level
* had chosen a topic that was too broad or too simple to allow for depth in discussion
* were unprepared/underprepared to talk about their main points as listed on the outline form
* were unable to display sufficient knowledge of their topic
* provided only information or facts on their chosen topic, failing to answer interpretation and reflection questions
* did not provide sufficient evidence of research (e.g. could not provide explanation of the sources used)
* did not listen to entire questions, picked out key words (often from their dot points) and gave irrelevant responses
* did not understand basic expressions for IDS discussion (e.g. どうやって, どうして, 学びました, しらべました, 分かりました, 変わりました, 多い, 少ない, 文化, かんけい, いみ,ちがい/ちがう etc.)
* did not know how to handle more challenging and/or less-expected questions and terminated the interaction saying 分かりません or しらべませんでした。
* relied heavily on memorised answers, which were too often long and irrelevant to the questions asked
* provided limited answers to reflection questions. e.g. おもしろかった、むずかしかった without being able to say what, why and/or how.

Written Examination (Online)

141 students sat the 2022 Japanese Continuers Written Examination. Students’ scores were spread over a wide range, with all questions discriminating students’ levels well. Overall results show the students’ sound knowledge and understanding of basic Japanese language at the SACE Continuers level.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

Question 1

The scores were widely spread for Question 1. Approximately 20% of the students achieved the full marks, while the same number scored none. Most students were able to identify basic information, but less successful students appeared to have relied on identification of familiar words heard in the text and incorrectly guessed the answer.

The more successful responses commonly:

* fully identified Tom’s problem
* displayed comprehensive understanding of the context, and correctly identified the ways in which Mika offered to help Tom.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only partially identified or were unable to identify Tom’s problem
* provided incorrect details (e.g., Tom wants to return a book, forgot his homework, went to café for coffee)

Question 2

This question proved challenging for many students. The scores clustered around the lower end of the scale. Only 10% of students achieved full marks. Most students were able to successfully identify some basic information, but at times were unable to recognise and include the finer and deeper details accurately. The responses of less successful students misunderstood the context completely.

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly identified at what time of year the festival begins
* fully identified what the festival traditionally celebrates
* displayed comprehensive understanding of how the festival has changed over time and why.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only partially identified relevant information
* did not explain why the festival has changed over time
* contained Japanese expressions without English translations or explanations
* displayed a lack of knowledge of more complex expressions (e.g. しか・・・ない).

Section 2: Reading and Responding (Part A)

Question 3

This question required not only careful interpretation of the meaning of words and sentences in the text, but also text analysis skills to connect the provided information in order to comprehend the text as a whole. This proved challenging for many students. The mean score for this section was 4.2 marks out of a possible 10 marks.

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly identified why Suzuki decided to make Japanese food for themselves
* correctly identified whether Suzuki cooks Japanese food often or not, and supported their answer with evidence from the text
* fully identified what Suzuki says about Japanese foods in Australia, describing accurately how Japanese foods have changed in Australia over the last 30 years
* displayed comprehensive understanding of Simon’s table and how it supports Suzuki’s blog.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only partially identified relevant information
* contained incorrect information
* did not carefully read the whole text, including the heading of Simon’s table
* were unable make the connection between Simon’s table and Suzuki’s blog
* contained Japanese expressions without English translations or explanations of meaning
* did not use their dictionary effectively (e.g., guessed unknown words, were not able to effectively to identify verb stems). It is strongly recommended that students learn how to use dictionaries effectively and efficiently.

Section 2: Reading and Responding (Part B)

Question 4

Students’ scores were spread broadly for this section, but most were clustered around the mean score (7.7 out of a possible 15). Most students were able to demonstrate sufficient reading and responding skills in Japanese at a continuers level.

The stimulus text was an advertisement to call for camp leaders to assist at a summer camp for the local kids’ club. Students were required to gather information from the text to construct their own experiences as a camp leader the previous year and relate those experiences in order to encourage their friend to apply. Key points to respond to included: mostly positive experiences as a camp leader, advice about how to make the most of this experience, and encouragement to participate in the same event as camp leader.

The more successful responses commonly:

* displayed accurate understanding of the question (e.g. context, audience, and purpose)
* identified and responded to relevant points in the stimulus text
* created the desired interest by elaborating on ideas beyond the obvious (e.g. 「子供会」→しょうらい小学校の、先生になりたいんでしょう、「ほとんどの経験はいい経験でした」→　ちょっとたいへんだったのは、・・・。でも、・・・。)
* included a wide range of effective expressions with high degrees of accuracy (e.g. Vてみたら、V なければならなかった、～と思う、Vことができる、V-potential form、V たがった、～そう、～かもしれない、ばconditional)
* displayed effective use of cohesive devices (e.g. けど、だから、 から/ので、それに、 それから、たら、 ても)
* were structured well, using paragraphs effectively and observing the conventions of the text type
* conveyed more complex ideas effectively and within the character limit
* contained limited grammatical and/or typing errors that did not impede meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* displayed only superficial understanding of the stimulus text (e.g. neglecting the context and purpose  
  いっしょにキャンプに行きたい)
* did not clearly identify the relevant points in the stimulus text
* conveyed only basic information in simple or fragmented sentences
* copied and pasted sentences from the stimulus text without elaborating
* contained irrelevant content and were over the character limit
* contained frequent grammatical and spelling errors
* contained repetitive spelling errors
* contained wrong choices of Kanji
* contained inappropriate expressions relying on English (e.g. ゲームをあそぶ)

Section 3: Writing in Japanese

Question 5

As many as 68% of students received a grade in the B or C range, while 14% of students successfully achieved an A grade.18% received D+ or lower. The mean score was 17.1 out of possible 30.

Option1

You are on exchange in Japan and the newspaper at your host school is doing a feature on the environment. They have asked to contribute an article about environmental issues in Australia and what Australians do to take care of their environment. Write the article.

あなたのの日本の学校新聞がについてのをんでいます。あなたはオーストラリアの環境と環境のためにオーストラリアの人々がしていることについてするようにたのまれました。そのを書きなさい。

The more successful responses commonly:

* described in detail examples of environmental issues in Australia
* effectively outlined things that are being done in Australia to take care of the environment
* applied a range of relevant expression, including technical terms related to environmental issues
* created a good flow and cohesion by using conjunctive adverbs effectively
* were structured well with introduction and concluding paragraphs
* Effectively conveyed information and ideas within the character limit
* contained limited grammatical and/or typing errors that did not impede meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* contained basic grammatical and spelling errors that impeded meaning (e.g., tense, particles, plain form)
* relied heavily on expressions from the dictionary
* were short and/or incomplete.

Option 2

You live in Japan and have decided to apply to participate in a talent show on television. Write an application letter to Ms Mori, the talent show coordinator. Introduce yourself, detailing what you can do and why you want to participate.

あなたは日本に住んでいて、テレビのタレント・ショーに出ることにしました。ショーのコーディネーターのさんに、自分のと、何ができるのか、なぜ出たいのかとめて、の手紙を書きなさい。

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a clear understanding of the purpose of the letter and its recipient
* effectively but briefly outlined who the writer is and why they are writing
* detailed the talent that they hope to demonstrate on the show, along with reasons for wanting to participate in the show
* conveyed enthusiasm and passion, thereby engaging the reader
* were well-structured and observed the conventions of the text type (formal letter)
* applied a range of expressions effectively and accurately
* contained limited grammatical and/or typing errors that did not impede meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were limited to a description of who they are (self-introduction) and what they can/like to do
* were lacking in impact and did not persuade the reader to include the writer in the show
* contained a limited range of expressions
* contained errors and incorrect selections of words from the dictionary that impeded meaning
* did not observe the text type conventions of a formal letter.

Option 3

You are a Japanese person living in Australia and you have just started a new job. Write a letter to your former high school teacher about your job.

あなたは日本人で、オーストラリアに住んでいます。始めたばかりの新しい仕事について、日本にいた時の高校の先生に手紙を書きなさい。

The more successful responses commonly:

* described the new job in detail, including challenges and highlights
* effectively established the context (e.g., why they are writing to their past teacher about their new job)
* created an interesting story about their new job, relating it to their experience at high school in Japan
* included how the writer perceived the benefit of having had this teacher
* observed the formal language conventions of writing a letter to a respected senior person
* contained a range of relevant expressions
* contained limited grammatical and/or typing errors that did not impede meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were limited to a description of their daily routine at their new job
* failed to establish any grounds for writing to their past teacher in Japan about their new job in Australia
* Displayed limited control of accuracy with grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structures
* were short and/or incomplete.