# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2023 Japanese (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 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.

# 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
* giving 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
* showed a real interest and enthusiasm to engage in Japanese.

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 and text type
* 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 demonstrated 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 2023 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
* used correct vocabulary related to their chosen topic.

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
* lacked research into their chosen topic
* used incorrect words related to their chosen topic.

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
* encouraging 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
* showed depth of reflection of own practices, and impact of the study was evident and thoughtful
* discussed changes regarding cultural understanding.

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
* showed limited reflection of own practices and impact of the study.

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

183 students attended the 2023 Japanese (continuers) oral examination, which is a 22% increase in the number compared to the previous year.

Oral Examination

Overall, students performed better in Part 1: Conversation with 32% achieving an A grade. About 27% achieved an A grade in Part 2: Discussion. In the discussion, a lack of preparation was evident among less successful students. To facilitate the discussion, teachers should ensure the in-depth study outline form is submitted to SACE by the due date.

Part 1: Conversation

The more successful students commonly:

* listened to the examiners carefully and comprehended questions thoroughly
* did not reply with memorised answers
* handled less-expected questions well
* comfortably went beyond the minimum answer by giving an appropriate amount of detail and information which led to deeper conversation
* presented well-thought-out opinions and ideas supported with reasons
* gave interesting answers and engaged in follow-up interaction comfortably
* expressed complex ideas accurately and effectively
* demonstrated a sound knowledge of vocabulary and grammar (e.g. relative clause) expected for this level
* spoke in complete sentences
* consistently spoke in the expected (i.e. formal) register, avoiding casual expressions such as ごめん、めっちゃ
* understood and used basic sets of respectful and humble terms e.g. お名前 vs. 名前, ご家族vs. 家族, お兄さんvs. 兄 etc.
* spoke clearly, at an appropriate pace and volume
* sought help and/or clarification effectively when needed
* knew more than a single way to ask for help/clarification (e.g. すみません、…は何ですか、…のいみが分かりません)
* maintained the natural flow of conversation e.g. using fillers, confirming questions, and thanking the examiner when receiving help.

The less successful students commonly:

* did not fully understand the questions and gave irrelevant answers
* unsuccessfully tried to guess the meaning of a question instead of asking for help or clarification
* did not understand when the same questions were asked in different ways (e.g. なぜ/どうして, どのぐらい/何回ぐらい/何時間ぐらい, 何で/どうやって, 学校で何を勉強して/学校のかもく)
* could only answer simple questions
* gave many short and minimal responses with little or no information/content (e.g. wordです)
* were reluctant to extend or elaborate
* heavily relied on prepared and rehearsed answers
* gave excessive answers through the use of long prepared answers, taking over the conversation
* demonstrated insufficient knowledge of Stage 2 vocabulary and grammar
* made frequent errors that impeded meaning (e.g. tense, particles)
* poorly handled wh-/how questions
* used English words
* spoke hesitantly with many unnatural pauses
* used an excessive number of fillers (e.g. ええと、えっと、あのう).

Part 2: Discussion

The more successful students commonly:

* had chosen a suitable topic (i.e. manageable and sufficiently challenging) for their in-depth study
* demonstrated good understanding of their topic
* provided solid evidence of research (e.g. clear interpretation of content of books/websites used, not just the title of them)
* made use of appropriate and authoritative sources for research (i.e. not just Wikipedia)
* could relate to their topic in a relevant way
* presented careful and insightful reflection on Japanese and own cultures, values, and practices
* effectively presented reflection on their own learning
* thoroughly comprehended examiners’ questions and gave relevant answers in their own words
* talked about their main points in the outline form effectively (e.g. more specific and concise with example/s)
* were able to respond to questions for which they did not have rehearsed answers
* took part in a genuine discussion in a relaxed manner, without panicking, without evading by repeatedly saying 分かりません or それについては勉強しませんでした, 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 (i.e. not directly copying from source materials)
* engaged the audience (examiners) using effective body language, eye contact, and intonation.

The less successful students commonly:

* 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 in-depth discussion
* were unprepared/underprepared to talk about their main points as listed on their outline form
* were unable to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of their topic
* were unable to understand key terms related to their topic, including those that appeared in their in-depth study outline form
* did not demonstrate sufficient evidence of research
* did not listen to questions in their entirety, rather picked out key words (often from their dot points) and gave irrelevant responses
* did not understand or use common expressions expected for the in-depth study 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、社会、かんけい、考え、いみ、ちがい、ちがう、おなじ)
* used memorised answers that did not always match the questions being asked
* were unable to sustain conversation when questions were not understood
* used それについてはしらべませんでした to avoid/evade answering questions that they did not understand, including questions related to their stated subtopics
* provided minimum answers to some reflection questions e.g. おもしろかった、むずかしかった without being able to elaborate (i.e. what they found interesting/difficult etc.).

Written Examination (Online)

Students’ results were spread over a wide grade range. Overall results demonstrated students’ sound knowledge and understanding of the Japanese language at the SACE Continuers level.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

Question 1

This question was handled well, with nearly 40% of students achieving marks between 80–100%. Most students were able to identify basic information, but less successful students relied on identification of familiar words that they heard in the text and incorrectly guessed the answer.

Question 1(a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly identified six or more pieces of information about Alex including those that were relatively harder to identify (e.g. age, date of birth, juku on Monday).

The less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to accurately capture specific information in the text
* stated that Alex liked games.

Question 1(b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* accurately identified what the speakers were planning on the 10 December.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified simple information only, often guessed from common words (e.g. karaoke, J-pop)
* misunderstood context and details.

Question 2

This question proved the most challenging for some students. Nearly 30% did not receive any marks for this question, while 17% achieved the full marks. The mean score was 2.2 out of the possible 5. Less successful students struggled to capture the details of the conversation that were required to understand this text.

Question 2(a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified why the soccer coach telephoned Ben and included relevant details.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided incorrect details, most commonly Ben being asked to be the captain.

Question 2(b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* displayed a comprehensive understanding of how Ben was persuaded to play in the game tomorrow despite his initial hesitancy and lack of confidence.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to include all the relevant details
* provided incorrect information.

Section 2: Reading and Responding (Part A)

Question 3

This question was challenging for many students. More than half of the students received a score of 5 or lower, with only 6% achieving the full 10 marks. While most students were able to identity some basic information in the text, less successful answers did not accurately capture the details required to make a comparison between the two writers.

Question 3(a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* accurately identified how both Hana and Ken spent New Year’s Eve.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to recognise relevant details and answered with incorrect information.

Question 3(b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified what was common about the way both writers spent New Year’s Day with accuracy in detail.

The less successful responses commonly

* provided incorrect information (e.g. both writers are travelling, away from their family)
* misunderstood the question and wrote how they spent New Year’s *Eve*, instead of New Year’s *Day*.

Question 3(c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* Provided a thorough comparison of how Hana and Ken value the traditional ways of spending Japanese New Year with sufficient evidence from the text
* wrote a coherent and well-structured answer e.g. main argument supported with examples.

The less successful responses commonly

* failed to process relevant information in the text (e.g. key terms, Kanji words)
* answered with incorrect information (e.g. Ken ate osechi at a restaurant; Hana values traditional ways of celebrating as she ate osechi)
* did not provide sufficient evidence from the text (e.g. video call and card writing were often missed out)
* lacked structure/coherence in writing a comparative analysis – wrote a random list of examples without comparing Hana and Ken.

Section 2: Reading and Responding (Part B)

General advice

In Reading and Responding Part B, students are required to demonstrate their understanding of the stimulus text in their answer. It is crucial that they first carefully read the stimulus text to understand its context and purpose while identifying key points to respond to.

Students are also encouraged to write to the maximum of the word count (250ji). Shorter answers can often miss key points that are required to be addressed to formulate a successful response. Punctuation marks are *not* included in the word count. As a general guideline, students can safely write 20-25 ji after the system counts 250 characters.

Question 4

Students’ results were spread over a wide grade range. Most students (42%) received a grade in the B or C range, while 15% achieved an A grade. 38% received a D or E grade, while 6% did not receive any marks.

The stimulus text was an email sent to you in response to your original job application. Students were required to write an email in reply, indicating whether they wished to continue with the application process.

Key points to respond to included: how much/less you know about Kyoto; job experience in customer service; willingness to work after the summer holidays, especially in the busy autumn season; a response to a company car not being possible; if would like to, and are able to, attend the group interview scheduled for next week; and an indication of whether you are continuing with the application or not.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a good 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. articulating unique job experience, landmarks/cultures/memories in Kyoto in relation to one’s willingness to work there)
* were able to express information and feelings effectively using a wide range of expression with a high degree of accuracy
* were structured well
* observed the conventions of the text type (email) and the register (formal)
* conveyed complex ideas effectively and concisely, e.g. using Kanji and nominalisation
* contained fewer grammatical and/or typing errors.

The less successful responses commonly:

* displayed partial understanding of the stimulus text (e.g. はじめまして; 夏休みの間はいそがしいから)
* did not respond to the questions/key points in the stimulus text
* conveyed only basic information in simple and often fragmented sentences
* copied from the stimulus text without elaborating
* contained irrelevant content and exceeded the character limit
* contained frequent grammatical errors that impeded meaning (e.g. tense, particles)
* contained many typing errors including incorrect Kanji of same/similar sounds with different meaning
* contained inaccurate expressions and relied on English (e.g. 仕事を働く、あなた).

Section 3: Writing in Japanese

Question 5

This section was generally handled well, with 21% of students receiving an A grade. 42% received a grade in the B or C range. However, with 30% of results in the D range, the mean score for Question 5 was 16 out of the possible 30.

Option 1

You are an Australian student who participated in a school trip in Japan. Your Japanese teacher asked you to write a diary entry about an unforgettable day on the trip. Explain what happened and how it impacted you.

*あなたはオーストラリアの学生で、学校の日本旅行にしました。あなたの日本語の先生が旅行でれられない思い出についてを書きなさいと言いました。何があったのか、そしてそのことであなたはどんなをけたのかしなさい。*

The more successful responses commonly:

* effectively recorded an unforgettable day, including vivid descriptions of the events and their impact, which evoked clear images and feelings
* applied a range of relevant expression with higher degrees of accuracy
* created a smooth flow and cohesion by using appropriate cohesive devices
* contained errors at times, but those errors did not significantly impede meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were limited to a description of *any* day during the Japan trip without being able to elaborate on what was ‘unforgettable’ and how it impacted them
* contained many basic errors that impeded meaning (e.g. tense, particles, plain form, conjugation – especially of adjectives, misspelling, wrong Kanji), requiring constant effort from the reader for comprehension
* were short and/or incomplete.

Option 2

You are a Japanese student living in Australia. You have started a part-time job, but your parents in Japan are concerned. Write a letter to them explaining about the job and reassuring them about their concerns.

*あなたは日本人学生で、オーストラリアに住んでいます。あなたはアルバイトを始めましたが、日本のはそのことについてしています。両親が安心するように、仕事について手紙を書きなさい。*

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a clear understanding of the purpose of the letter – i.e. to convince parents that having a part-time job while living and studying overseas (Australia) will not be a problem
* described the positive aspects of the job in detail (e.g. work environment/conditions, friendly and supportive co-workers/boss)
* were persuasive – explored parents’ concerns sincerely, explained why they were working (e.g. to save to travel), while reassuring them that there was no need to be worried
* applied a range of expressions with a high degree of accuracy
* contained errors at times, but those errors did not significantly impede meaning
* were well-structured with appropriate greetings, address terms, and closing expressions.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were limited to a description of the job, failing to establish that there was no need for their parents to be concerned
* wrote more about daily life in Australia (e.g. school) rather than focusing on the job
* contained a limited range of expression
* contained many basic errors and incorrect selection of words, including wrong Kanji, requiring constant effort from the reader for comprehension
* did not understand how to address own parents (e.g. 父と母へ、あなたたち)
* did not observe the text type
* were short and/or incomplete.