

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Japanese
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91133, 91136

General commentary

The assessments were at an appropriate level and covered a variety of topics, allowing candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the texts fairly and in various ways. Candidates who understood the context and what the questions were asking for demonstrated higher-level thinking. These candidates were able to select relevant information by breaking down these requirements and show advanced thinking skills beyond providing simple responses.

Candidates need to use all parts of the texts to craft clear and concise responses. They need to actively look for connections between information and ideas provided. Candidates who linked relevant information in each section and used whole passages to draw conclusions provided stronger answers. While candidates can use personal knowledge of Japan and Japanese culture, they need to connect this knowledge to the texts and justify their responses with specific evidence to show their understanding of the texts.

Candidates were more successful when they had a good understanding of both Level 1 and Level 2 vocabulary and grammar and used this understanding to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the texts.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The examination included three questions drawn from listening passages. The passages contained information, ideas, and opinions about events and experiences familiar to candidates. To achieve well, candidates were required to express understanding of the passages beyond direct translation. They needed to select relevant information for each question, rather than every detail, to support their interpretations of ideas and information. Candidates needed to have a strong knowledge of the vocabulary and grammar corresponding to Level Seven of the NZC.

Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated generally detailed and well-structured responses. Attempted answers were evident even when candidates were unsure, indicating engagement with the assessment. Responses used identifiable grammar patterns and vocabulary to support meaning and demonstrate understanding of the text. Vocabulary knowledge was generally sound.

Some responses crafted plausible answers by drawing on recognised key words, even when overall meaning was not fully demonstrated. Some responses did not address both parts of multi-part questions, with some focusing only on the first part.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- gave bullet point style answers that indicated a surface-level understanding of the passages without specific details
- identified key factual information to answer the questions

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

- showed a clear understanding of not just key details, but the overall meaning of the text
- structured responses to show cohesion and a clear understanding of the texts
- used supporting detail from the passages to provide justification of their responses
- demonstrated some understanding of specific grammar patterns from the text and reflected these in their responses.

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

- fully engaged with the passages and questions to provide comprehensive answers with supporting details from the passages that justified and supported their response
- used supporting details to communicate implied meanings and connected them to the bigger picture.

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

- did not communicate general meaning of the passages
- relied on the images provided as a prompt for a response with little connection to the texts
- provided responses that were based around understanding of one or two key words but overall showed little to no understanding of the texts.

Achievement standard 91136: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Japanese text(s) on familiar matters

Assessment

The examination included three questions drawn from three written texts and supporting images. The texts contained information, ideas, and opinions about events, people, places, and experiences that were familiar to candidates. To achieve well, candidates were required to demonstrate understanding of the texts beyond directly translating them. Their responses needed to draw on evidence from the texts to support and justify their responses. Candidates needed to have strong knowledge of the vocabulary and language structures associated with Level Seven of the NZC.

Commentary

Candidates responded effectively when they rephrased the question and ensured their responses directly addressed it. Responses were successful when they used specific evidence from the texts to justify ideas. Where candidates relied on personal knowledge or experience it resulted in responses that demonstrated only partial understanding of the general meaning.

Candidates were more successful when they supported references to images with textual evidence. Some responses relied on the やたい image to construct a narrative or used images of the capsule hotel and ryokan without reference to the text, which limited communication of the general meaning.

Candidates demonstrated a strong level of vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. Responses showed greater depth when grammatical knowledge was used to add nuance and justify ideas. Candidates need to ensure they carefully read the texts to avoid misreading vocabulary. For example, misreading おとうと as おとうさん led some responses incorrectly identifying Kayla's father rather than her younger brother.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided generic responses that showed a superficial understanding of the overall intent of the text without specific details selected from the text
- identified key details and information within the text without making connections to other parts of the text
- responded with translations of relevant information.

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

- responded clearly with specific details from the texts to support their statements and answers
- selected relevant evidence and connected them together to show a clear understanding of the text overall
- gave examples specifically drawn from the texts.

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

- directly answered the questions, engaging with the passages to provide comprehensive answers with supporting evidence
- showed a thorough understanding of the passages and their nuance based on evidence, recognising underlying meaning through connections and well-supported conclusions
- identified the intended meaning of vocabulary with multiple definitions, demonstrating comprehensive understanding of nuance
- used supporting details to communicate implied meanings and connected them to the bigger picture.

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

- gave responses that showed limited understanding based around a few key words and missed the general meaning of the texts
- did not attempt to answer all questions
- relied solely on the images provided to come up with a narrative that was not supported by evidence from the written text
- provided parts of an answer, which showed limited understanding or gave irrelevant and/or incorrect information
- did not communicate the general meaning of the texts.