



Implementation of Kanji Learning Outcome Assessment During the Covid-19 Pandemic

Amira Agustin Kocimaheni^(✉), Djodjok Soepardjo, Joko Prasetyo,
Nise Samudra Sasanti, and Parastuti

Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
amiraagustin@unesa.ac.id

Abstract. Since the beginning of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has hit the world which has resulted in changes in the offline learning model that was commonly applied before the COVID-19 pandemic, into an online learning model or distance learning (PJJ). This change certainly requires adaptation for both teachers and students, including in learning Japanese characters. The purpose of this study is to qualitatively describe how the Japanese language assessment practice was carried out by Japanese language teachers, especially at the Shokyu Hyoki Course which was carried out by the teacher during the covid-19 pandemic. The analyzed practice of assessing learning outcomes were from formative assessment and summative assessment during the covid-19 pandemic. The results showed that there was a change in the form of the assessment implementation, assessment technique, and correction techniques for Japanese alphabet learning outcomes between before and during the covid-19 pandemic. Constraints faced during the implementation of online learning outcomes assessment are the internet network that is less supportive and students' honesty in taking the test. The solution is to ensure the availability of the internet network during the online assessment of learning outcomes and apply a strict time limit during the online assessment and require students to activate the zoom camera/google meet during the test.

Keywords: Covid-19 pandemic · Shokyu Hyoki · Implementation · Assessment of learning outcomes · Formative assessment · Summative assessment

1 Introduction

Since the beginning of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has swept the world. Directly or indirectly, the pandemic has an impact on all aspects of life, including aspects of education and learning. The offline learning model, which was commonly applied before the COVID-19 pandemic, has turned into an online learning model or distance learning (PJJ). This change also occurs in the scope of universities that teach Japanese. This change certainly requires adaptation for both teachers and students.

In accordance with the demands of the online learning model, the teacher must also prepare an appropriate assessment model, especially regarding practices that aim to measure whether or not the learning objectives are achieved in each course. The

ability to develop and use assessments is a key construct of professional development for language teachers because they are often involved in summative assessment and formative assessment in their teaching environment [1]. Previous studies have shown that the assessment practice carried out by language teachers is influenced by contextual factors and experiential factors [2, 3].

With the shift in the Japanese language learning model to PJJ during the COVID-19 pandemic, this shift will also have a long-term impact on classroom-based assessment practices even after the pandemic. It is something new for Japanese language teachers to teach and conduct online assessments. Thus, it is important for teachers to understand the practice of online assessment and the factors that influence its implementation, not only for teachers of assessment courses or for trainers in the field of assessment (assessment trainers), but also important for language teachers and policy makers regarding language learning curriculum. Japan and also in the field of Applied Linguistics (Applied Linguistics).

Distance learning (PJJ) or online is a learning activity that uses interactive learning media and manages the content provided to students with a view to improving the quality of learning [4]. Meanwhile Dabbagh and Ritland [5] states that online learning is an open and distributed learning system using pedagogical tools (educational aids), made possible through the internet and network-based technology to facilitate the formation of learning processes and knowledge through meaningful action and interaction.

Teachers and students are directed to understand basic technology so that they are accustomed to dealing with the online learning process, especially in problem solving. With an understanding of technology, the interaction between teachers and students will still be carried out. The interaction in question is the interaction between teachers and students who do not meet face-to-face as well as ordinary learning carried out in classrooms. Interaction in PJJ is not done face-to-face directly, but the teacher and students are in different places, and can even be separated by a very long distance.

In learning Japanese, the sorting of material is based on material related to (1) letters, (2) vocabulary, (3) sentence patterns, (4) expressions, (5) reading skills, (6) writing skills, (7) skills speaking, and (8) listening skills. For this reason, Japanese language learning in universities is adjusted to the sorting of the material. For example, there are Japanese alphabet courses (hyouki), reading skills courses (dokkai), writing skills courses (sakubun), and others. With this sorting, the implementation of the assessment is different. In addition, with the Covid-19 pandemic, the assessment practices carried out by teachers have also changed according to the online learning model applied.

In this study, it is focused on assessing learning outcomes in Japanese letters (Hyoki) courses, namely, in particular on MK Shokyu Hyoki programmed by first-year students. This focus was taken because the MK of Japanese characters is the basis of mastering the Japanese language, namely by learning and mastering Japanese characters, both hiragana, katakana, and kanji. If Japanese learners do not master these letters, it will be difficult to master the use of Japanese. Almost all Japanese textbooks intended for foreign students are written using these letters. Learning Japanese letters emphasizes writing kanji properly and correctly, how to read kanji, the order of writing kanji, and writing the meaning of kanji.

Assessment is a series of activities to obtain, analyze, and interpret data about student learning processes and outcomes. The assessment is carried out systematically and continuously, with the aim of being able to provide meaningful information in making decisions regarding student learning outcomes. Teachers as managers of learning activities can find out the abilities of students, the accuracy of the teaching methods used, and the success of students in achieving the competencies that have been determined through assessment. Based on the results of the assessment, the teacher can make the right decisions to determine the next steps to take. The results of the assessment can also motivate students to perform better [6].

The purpose of carrying out the assessment as described by Uno & Koni [7] are: (a) so that teachers can find out the achievement of students' competency levels, (b) teachers can provide feedback to students, (c) teachers can monitor student learning progress, (d) results of continuous monitoring of process progress and learning outcomes can be used as feedback to improve methods, approaches, activities, and learning resources in accordance with the material needs and needs of students, and (e) the results of the assessment can provide information to parents and the community about the effectiveness of education.

The assessment implementation technique is divided into two, namely test techniques and non-test techniques. In the test technique there are two types of tests, namely standard tests and teacher-made tests. As for the non-test technique, it can be in the form of performance assessment, product assessment, project assessment, portfolio, and attitude assessment [7–9].

Assessments in learning activities are generally divided into two types, namely formative tests and summative tests. Formative tests are tests that are carried out to measure students' understanding at the end of each level of mastery of competencies/subjects. Another term for formative tests is Daily Assessment (PH). Formative tests can be done at each meeting or after one competency/subject has been taught. With formative tests, student learning outcomes can be known and follow-up actions can be taken in the form of enrichment or remedial programs. While the summative test is a test conducted to measure the understanding of students at the end of each level of the learning program. If the summative test is carried out in the middle of one level of the learning program, it is called a sub-summative test. The term commonly used for sub-summative tests is the Mid-Semester Examination (UTS), while the summative test is the Final Semester Examination (UAS).

Before the pandemic, all Japanese language learning including Shokyu Hyoki course was done in offline classes. Teachers can give examples of writing kanji directly to students, as well as teachers can make corrections directly to students when they practice writing kanji in class. Errors related to writing kanji letters are detected and can be minimized by the physical presence of teachers and students in the same room. This can also be applied during the implementation of the assessment of learning outcomes. However, since the pandemic and the change in learning models to online, of course, some things have changed due to adjustments.

Language learning basically includes four language skills, namely listening skills, speaking skills, reading skills, and writing skills. The four skills can be categorized into

receptive skills (listening and reading) and productive skills (speaking and writing) [10–12]. Each skill has its own learning and assessment strategy. In learning Japanese, one of the characteristics it has is the use of hiragana, katakana, and kanji letters. In addition, the grammar used is also different from Indonesian. Therefore, learning Japanese in schools involves the ability goals, namely (1) mastery of hiragana, katakana, and kanji letters, (2) mastery of grammar, (3) mastery of vocabulary, (4) listening skills, (5) speaking skills, (6) reading skills, (7) writing skills (composing), and (8) translating skills [13]. Based on the purpose of these abilities, the practice of assessing Japanese learning outcomes also follows this sorting.

Several studies on the assessment of Japanese language learning that have been carried out have become the basis for the implementation of this research. Paramitasari research results [14] shows that the Kanji teacher uses the formative test model more. There are two factors that determine the test model used by Kanji lecturers, namely general factors and special factors. General factors are factors from the syllabus and Learning Implementation Plan (RPP), while special factors consist of five important aspects, these aspects are aspects of the beauty of writing Kanji, how to read, order of Kanji, writing the meaning of Kanji, writing Kanji properly and correctly, and complete the gaps. Furthermore, Sutiyarti et al. [15] explained that the implementation of formative assessments by teachers had been carried out properly in accordance with the provisions of the main requirement, which was to provide feedback on tests given to students, even though online learning.

Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this study is to qualitatively describe how the practice of assessing Japanese language learning outcomes, especially at the Shokyu Hyoki Course, was carried out by teachers during the covid-19 pandemic. The practice of assessing learning outcomes analyzed is for formative assessment and summative assessment during the covid-19 pandemic. In addition, obstacles and solutions were also analyzed during the practice of implementing the learning outcomes assessment. The benefits of this research are the documentation of the implementation of the Shokyu Hyoki Course's learning outcomes assessment during the pandemic, a recapitulation of obstacles in the practice of learning outcomes assessment and solutions made by teachers in the implementation of Shokyu Hyoki's Course's learning assessment practices during the pandemic.

2 Method

This research is descriptive qualitative research with a case study approach [16]. The research subjects were two lecturers at a university who taught Shokyu Hyoki course.

Data were collected using research aids in the form of interview guide sheets. Interviews were conducted with two respondents individually and recorded. The results of the interview recordings were then transcribed and then analyzed.

The data analysis technique was carried out by transcribing the results of the interviews. The transcription results were then analyzed using qualitative data analysis techniques [17], namely starting with (1) summarizing the data (data condensation) where the data is designed in presentation, then determining which data is entered, and in what form according to the research theme, (2) presenting data (data display) which is

a collection of information organized and compact that is easy to understand, and (3) draw conclusions (concluding drawings/verification) where interpretation is carried out without a pattern, statement, explanation then presented in the form of a description to answer the research objectives.

3 Results and Discussion

Based on the results of interviews conducted with two respondents, namely Respondent One (R1) and Respondent Two (R2), the following exposure was obtained. The interview questions contain about the implementation of the test on the Shokyu Hyoki course which was carried out before the pandemic and during the pandemic. The types of tests here include formative tests and summative tests. Both respondents took formative tests and summative tests according to the lesson plans that each respondent had prepared at the beginning of the semester.

3.1 Formative Test

The implementation of formative tests carried out by R2 in learning before the pandemic and during the pandemic is the same and consistent, namely carried out at every meeting. In this formative test, respondents measure and assess the students' ability to read Japanese characters, the ability to understand the meaning of Japanese letters and the ability to write Japanese characters. The tests given before the pandemic were in the form of a written test (paper-and-pencil test) and during the pandemic in the form of an online test using applications such as google form, quizziz, and the Learning Management System (LMS) developed by the institution where R2 worked. Meanwhile, R1 carried out the provision of formative tests differently, namely before the pandemic the formative tests were carried out at every meeting, but during the pandemic the implementation was random and not specifically scheduled. The form of formative test before the pandemic was a written test (paper-and-pencil test), while during a pandemic the written test was combined with an oral test, namely R1 gave questions orally to students during online meetings and had to be answered orally by students as well. For the frequency of implementation of formative tests, R2 carried out 14 times because formative tests were carried out at each class meeting both before the pandemic and during the pandemic. Meanwhile, R1 conducted formative tests at each meeting before the pandemic so that it was 14 times, but during the pandemic the frequency of the tests was reduced to only six times. R2 carried out 14 times because formative tests were carried out at each class meeting both before the pandemic and during the pandemic. Meanwhile, R1 conducted formative tests at each meeting before the pandemic so that it was 14 times, but during the pandemic the frequency of the tests was reduced to only six times. R2 carried out 14 times because formative tests were carried out at each class meeting both before the pandemic and during the pandemic. Meanwhile, R1 conducted formative tests at each meeting before the pandemic so that it was 14 times, but during the pandemic the frequency of the tests was reduced to only six times.

The technique used in the formative test by R1 before the pandemic was to give a written test for a maximum of 30 min with the type and number of questions adjusted to

the number of kanji the students had studied. During the pandemic, the implementation technique changed to using an oral test form, namely R1 giving a test to read kanji in the form of sentences or discourses to determine students' ability to memorize kanji. A similar technique was also carried out by R2 before the pandemic, namely the paper-and-pencil test with a more detailed technique, namely 1) asking students to write down the meaning and reading of the letters and Jukugo shown, 2) asking students to write down the letters and the meaning of the words. Words as well as Jukugo spoken in Japanese, and 3) asking students to write down the letters as well as Jukugo and how to read the words spoken in Indonesian. During the pandemic, the technique used is still the same, it's just changed to an online test.

After the completion of the test, of course, there will be correction activities. Both R1 and R2 both involved students in joint correction activities. In general, joint correction activities aim to shorten the correction time, train students to make corrections and corrections, and to increase learning motivation among students. However, specifically for the application of online tests by R2 using applications such as google forms, automatic corrections can be made so that joint correction activities are eliminated. Feedback on the results of the formative test is directly carried out by R1 and R2 after the correction is complete, especially for the questions with the highest number of errors. Both respondents also did not carry out remedial programs for formative test results because the tests carried out were always related to the previously tested material.

The obstacle faced by respondents in implementing formative tests before the pandemic was the limited time of respondents to prepare questions according to the material that had been given. The number of assignments, both academic and non-academic, reduces the time to prepare for formative test questions. Meanwhile, during the pandemic, another obstacle was the disruption of the internet network at the time of the test, both on the part of respondents and students. In addition, there are obstacles in the form of supervising the implementation of online tests which are difficult to ensure students' honesty in working on test questions without using any tools/assistance.

The solution to this problem is to arrange formative test questions at the beginning of the semester, ensure a schedule for the implementation of the test so that respondents and students can prepare for the availability of the internet network well, randomly ask students to write letters and jukugo during the discussion of questions and increase the practice of writing letters on sheets. shared work.

3.2 Summative Test

The summative tests carried out by R1 and R2 before and during the pandemic were the same, namely during the Mid-Semester Examination (UTS) and the Final Semester Examination (UAS). The form of the summative test before the pandemic was in the form of a paper-and-pencil-test and the application of an online test during the pandemic. In accordance with the characteristics of the summative test, the scope of the material being tested is wider and more abundant than the formative test. After the summative test, R1 and R2 immediately made corrections without involving students as in formative test corrections. Giving feedback and also remedial programs to students were not carried out by the two respondents in the summative test.

The obstacles faced in the implementation of online summative tests are the same as the obstacles in the implementation of online formative tests, namely the existence of internet network disturbances during the implementation of the test, both on the part of respondents and students. Another obstacle is the difficulty in supervising the implementation of online tests to ensure students' honesty in working on test questions without using any tools/assistance. The solution taken by R1 and R2 was similar, namely ensuring the availability of the internet network during the online summative test. Meanwhile, for students' honesty problems.

4 Conclusion

Based on the results of the research that has been presented, it shows that there has been a change in the form of assessment implementation, assessment techniques, and correction techniques for assessment of Japanese learning outcomes between before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Significant changes are found in the form of the implementation of the assessment of Japanese letter learning outcomes, namely from an offline test form to an online test. This also changes the assessment technique used, namely from paper-and-pencil tests to optimal use of online test forms using LMS. The technique of correcting the assessment results, which was done manually by the teacher before the pandemic, turned into an automatic correction using google forms, especially in the form of multiple-choice assessments.

The obstacle faced during the implementation of the assessment of kanji learning outcomes during the covid-19 pandemic was that the internet network was not supportive, both from the teacher's side and from the student side. In addition, there are obstacles related to students' honesty in working on test questions without using any tools/assistance.

The solution to the problems related to the unsupported internet network is to ensure the availability of the internet network during the online assessment of learning outcomes. As for the problem of student honesty, the solutions made by R1 and R2 are the same, namely providing a strict time limit for carrying out the test and implementing video capture during online tests by requiring students to activate the Zoom/Google Meet camera which shows students who are working on the test.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to acknowledge the Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya which has funded this present research.

Authors' Contributions. AAK writes the draft of the article, JP collects the data, DS reviews the article's draft, NSS analysis the data and P make the instruments of the research.

References

1. C. Zhang, X. Yan, and J. Wang, "EFL Teachers' Online Assessment Practices During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Changes and Mediating Factors," *Asia-Pacific Education. res.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 499–507, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00589-3>.

2. X. Yan, C. Zhang, and JJ Fan, “‘Assessment knowledge is important, but . . .’: How contextual and experiential factors mediate assessment practice and training needs of language teachers,” 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.003>.
3. D. Crusan, L. Plakans, and A. Gebril, “Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and practices,” *Assess. Write.*, vol. 28, pp. 43–56, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.03.001>.
4. CL Chang and M. Fang, “E-Learning and Online Instructions of Higher Education during the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Diseases (COVID-19) Epidemic,” *J. Phys. conf. Ser.*, vol. 1574, no. 1, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1574/1/012166>.
5. N. Dabbagh and BB Ritland, *Online Learning, Concepts, Strategies, and Applications*. Ohio: Pearson, 2005.
6. Mahdiansyah, MS Sembiring, T. Supriyadi, I. Ulumudin, and S. Fujianita, *Educational Assessment System for Learning Outcomes and Teacher’s Ability Carrying Out Assessment Based on the 2013 Curriculum*. Jakarta: Research Center for Educational and Cultural Policy, Balitbang, Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017.
7. HB Uno and S. Koni, *Learning Assessment*. Jakarta: Earth Literacy, 2014.
8. AM Yusuf, *Educational Assessment and Evaluation*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2015.
9. TG Ratumanan and I. Rosmiati, *Lesson Planning*. Depok: Rajawali Press, 2019.
10. Iskandarwassid and D. Sunendar, *Language Learning Strategy*. Bandung: Rosdakarya Youth, 2008.
11. B. Nurgiyantoro, *Competency-Based Language Learning Assessment*. Yogyakarta: BPFE Yogyakarta, 2014.
12. F. Azies and AC Alwasilah, *Teaching Communicative Language Theory and Practice*. Bandung: Rosdakarya Youth, 2002.
13. D. Sutedi, *Evaluation of Japanese Language Learning Outcomes (Theory and Practice)*. Bandung: UPI Press, 2019.
14. KA Paramitasari, DMS Mardani, and GS Hermawan, “Assessment of Kanji Courses in the Department of Japanese Language Education,” *J. Educator. language Japanese Undiksha*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 72, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbj.v4i1.14951>.
15. U. Sutiyarti, K. Kisyani, M. Mintowati, and Y. Hapsari, “Implementation of Formative Assessment of Japanese Language Subjects in East Java During the Covid-19 Pandemic,” *J. Japanese Lang. Educ. Linguist.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 63–82, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.18196/jjlel.v5i1.10568>.
16. SB Merriam and EJ Tisdell, *Qualitative Research A Guide to Design and Implementation*. California: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Brand, 2016.
17. MB Miles, AM Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2014.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

