2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Chinese
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91108, 91111

General commentary

The Level 2 Chinese listening (91108) and reading (91111) assessments required candidates to demonstrate high-level thinking skills, reflecting a strong understanding of both the context and the questions. Successful candidates were able to identify and select relevant information and demonstrate advanced analytical skills, rather than providing basic or surface-level responses. Candidates who addressed the questions precisely and showed understanding of the complete text(s), including implied meanings, achieved stronger results.

In addition, candidates performed more successfully when they had a solid command of NCEA Level 1 and Level 2 vocabulary and grammatical structures, enabling them to demonstrate a thorough and accurate understanding of the texts.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91108: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Chinese texts on familiar matters

Assessment

The assessment consisted of three passages, each accompanied by a question (some questions were divided into two or three parts). All the topics, including information, experiences, events, ideas, and opinions, were familiar to candidates. Candidates were expected to make as many connections as they could between the evidence and the question. Furthermore, quality answers had to be based on evidence in the texts rather than using irrelevant personal opinions or experiences.

Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated a good level of understanding of Chinese in this standard, and the majority of candidates achieved at Merit or Excellence levels. Candidates who demonstrated general comprehension of the passages achieved with Merit. At Excellence level, candidates demonstrated thorough interpretation, an understanding of implied meanings, and an ability to draw conclusions, all of which were supported by evidence from the passage. For instance, some native speakers produced near-perfect translations or clear conclusions that demonstrated understanding, but did not include sufficient evidence to reveal deeper meanings. In such cases, candidates were awarded Merit. In other instances, candidates provided evidence and inferred some meaning but did not explicitly address the question. These distinctions constituted the key differences between Merit and Excellence.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided basic information that indicated a surface-level understanding
- demonstrated limited awareness of the vocabulary or structures used in the passages
- responded with very few accurate details drawn from the passages.

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

- showed clear understanding of the passages, and were able to provide most of the detailed information from the passages
- demonstrated an ability to use supporting information with some justification
- understood the main ideas but did not fully grasp the inferences required for a comprehensive response.

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

- responded with accurate details and supporting evidence, incorporating some inferencing skills
- showed clear and insightful understanding and implied meanings from the passages
- showed awareness of intercultural knowledge that informed their analysis and allowed them to identify relevant points of contrast
- drew accurate conclusions supported by a wide range of fully integrated and comprehensive evidence from the passages.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not attempt the questions or gave little evidence in their responses, despite providing a few keywords
- showed limited or no understanding of the listening passages, with inconsistent or contradictory information.

Achievement standard 91111: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and / or visual Chinese text(s) on familiar matters

Assessment

The assessment consisted of three written texts and supporting images, each accompanied by a question (some questions were divided into two parts). All the topics, including information, experiences, events, ideas, and opinions, were familiar to candidates. To achieve successfully, candidates were expected to demonstrate understanding of the texts rather than directly translating them, or using irrelevant personal opinions or experiences. Furthermore, candidates were advised to fully address the question with sufficient supporting evidence from the texts.

Commentary

In general, a high number of candidates achieved this standard, and the majority were awarded Merit or Excellence. Candidates achieved at Merit level when they showed a sound level of comprehension of the text. At Excellence level, candidates demonstrated thorough interpretation, an understanding of implied meanings, and an ability to draw conclusions, all of which were supported by evidence from the text. A significant number of candidates did not fully address the question and instead repeated facts from the passage. For example, when asked, "How does NZCLW impact

students?" many failed to state whether the impact was positive or negative, and instead described what students did during NZCLW.

Furthermore, some candidates failed to use relevant information from the texts, opting instead to focus on their personal experiences. As a result, they did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the text. Conversely, other candidates copied the texts verbatim without paraphrasing, which also failed to show deeper comprehension. This issue was especially common among native Chinese speakers, who often quoted the original text rather than offering their own interpretation.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed limited understanding of each text
- provided responses with basic information from the texts
- contained irrelevant responses, and the key textual details were sometimes omitted, although some responses included were correct.

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

- answered with most of the correct facts from the texts
- demonstrated clear understanding of the texts, providing relevant details to support their responses
- integrated their opinions with some justification based on the texts
- understood the main ideas in the text but did not demonstrate a thorough understanding of the required inferences.

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

- showed a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the texts, and identified implied meanings
- included all the relevant evidence and provided a concise conclusion
- used relevant information from the texts to give concise, reasoned responses
- answered questions clearly and accurately, employing logical reasoning and well-structured expression.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- showed little to no understanding of the general meaning of the texts
- misinterpreted or misunderstood key ideas in the texts
- failed to incorporate relevant information from the text, relying instead on personal opinions or assumptions.