



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Japanese - L2

Assessment Report

Level 2 Japanese 2016

Standards [91133](#) [91136](#)

Part A: Commentary

Successful candidates related their answers to the texts, selecting relevant information that demonstrated their understanding, and justified their opinions or conclusions with reference to the texts.

To be awarded Achievement with Excellence, candidates needed to show an understanding of the implied meaning or nuances within the texts. However, the implied meaning or nuance must be based on what is contained within the text, not on the candidate's own knowledge, experiences or desires, some of which bore no relation to the texts. A thorough comprehension of the initial text is paramount as this then forms the basis for the higher-level thinking that is required to show understanding of any implied meaning or nuance.

Where a candidate does not have sufficient room to write an answer, they must remember to indicate on their answer paper that an answer is continued somewhere else.

Part B: Report on Standards

91133: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Japanese texts on familiar matters

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated understanding and made meaning of the relevant information, ideas and / or opinions from the passages
- gave only basic information
- connected vocabulary together to get the general meaning of the passage
- had difficulty understanding details
- were confused about which of the two sushi shops was more expensive, demonstrating a lack of understanding of the grammar point ほど

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- showed no or limited understanding of the passages
- had some lexical information correct but did not understand the main idea of the passage
- did not give enough relevant information and / or gave irrelevant information
- wrote answers based on their general knowledge instead constructing answers based on the passages
- had insufficient vocabulary knowledge
- thought that 先週 (last week) was 選手 (athlete), in question 1
- thought the passage was about the party, in question 2
- thought the passage was about a date, in question 3

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- understood most of the main ideas and answered with some detail
- gave some clear key factual answers to the information sought
- had a good knowledge of the general vocabulary and complex language structures required at level 2
- worked out the correct answers with some details
- included key detail, related words such as 'usually' or 'heard that'
- listed the pros and cons of each sushi shop, but did not state which sushi shop the person should buy from
- explained about the differences in learning style between Physical Education and Rangi's other subjects, but were not able to provide sufficient details as to what those other subjects were (History and Physics) and thus did not demonstrate thorough understanding
- wrote a description of what happens at a marae when the Māori prayer is given, rather than clearly stating the similarities between a 'kanpai' and the Māori prayer.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- understood all the complex words and sentences
- understood the implied meanings and nuances not stated in the passage.
- gave details and explanations and / or justifications supported by information from the passage
- gave comprehensive key factual answers to the information sought
- synthesised the information to clearly state the similarities between a 'kanpai' and the Māori prayer. The best answers included phrases such as "they both ..." or "Just as with the kanpai, the Māori prayer also ...".

Standard-specific comments

The listening notes were divided into sections with guidelines as to what to expect for each section. Candidates who used these listening notes well often were awarded higher grades.

Vocabulary knowledge was crucial to understanding this standard. Thus candidates who did not have a good working knowledge of level 2 NCEA vocabulary struggled.

Candidates generally appeared to understand the main idea of the passages but answers often lacked the required amount of detail from the texts. At level 2 the standard requires candidates to justify their answers.

Many candidates did not read the questions carefully enough, and thus their answers provided a description of what they heard rather than answering the questions that were asked.

Over half the candidates were unable to spell the word 'marae' correctly, and although this wasn't penalised, it was surprising.

91136: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Japanese texts on familiar matters

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- had inconsistencies in their answers
- often confused the kanji for numbers in times and dates, and those for days of the week
- did not use sufficient supporting detail thereby only conveying some of the general meaning
- had difficulty in conveying or misunderstood the grammar point *しか～ない*
- talked about what kind of place they, as the candidate, would prefer, rather than assess the suitability of the place for Rangi and Yuki
- explained why they did not select 1 of the 2 other date locations, rather than both
- misunderstood *かえります* (return) for *きます* (come), which impacted on the rest of the answer
- thought the issue was the time difference between Japan and New Zealand, which impacted on how they answered the entire question.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- got details incorrect to the point that they were not able to show a general understanding of the text
- did not understand the general meaning of the texts
- gave a logically inconsistent response due to misunderstanding of the text
- reiterated the same ideas for all parts of the question
- only attempted parts of the question
- had very limited knowledge of NCEA level 2 vocabulary and language features
- often simply "made up" what the candidate considered to be a suitable answer
- often answered in the first-person singular "I", rather than in the third- person.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated a clear understanding by selecting relevant information, ideas and opinions from the texts and communicated them unambiguously
- included relevant detail from the texts
- showed that they understood the meaning of the text without fully understanding every nuance
- inferred meaning from the text but did not support their inferences with sufficient relevant data from the texts. For example, in question 1, they explained about date venues, but did not say why the points they had listed made it a suitable location for the date
- inferred meaning from the text but their answer had inconsistencies which meant that they were not able to display a “thorough understanding” of the text required for Excellence.
- had a very good knowledge of NCEA level 2 vocabulary and language features.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- gave relevant information, ideas and opinions with supporting details which were expanded on
- showed an understanding of nuance and meaning not obviously stated in the text
- justified the implied meanings and / or conclusions with details from the text
- gave reasoned answers based on information from the text, rather than from their own experience
- linked the positives and / or negative to the dating experience to justify their conclusions
- explained fully how Skype or talking online was a poor substitute to being there in person and linked that to Rangi’s experience missing his brother’s wedding
- explained why he looked forward to (楽しみ) using his phone rather than he just enjoyed (楽しい) using his phone.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates found the layout of the questions easy to follow. Reading boxes were provided to help students unpack the text. Those that used the reading boxes well were often able to provide more thoughtful answers and gain higher grades.

The amount of space allocated for a question is a guideline to the amount of detail that is required in the answer. Candidate who leave half of the space blank are unlikely to have included enough detail for a Merit or Excellence answer.

[Japanese subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority