

# ***Research on Writing Teaching Strategies of International Chinese Education under the Background of Changes in the Guidelines of HSK***

Rui Wang<sup>1,a</sup>, Binbin Chen<sup>1,b,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Humanities, Beibu Gulf University, No.12, Binhai Avenue, Qinzhou, Guangxi, 535011, China

<sup>a</sup>mani-wang92@foxmail.com, <sup>b</sup>chris-chen23@outlook.com

\*Corresponding author

**Keywords:** HSK; Writing Pedagogy; International Chinese; Chinese as a Second Language; Learning Strategies

**Abstract:** The Chinese proficiency test HSK 2.0 (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi) has been implemented since 2010, and its reference standard <Chinese Language Proficiency Scales for Speakers of Other Languages>, have revealed limitations through practical application. The 2021 release of *Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education* heralds HSK 3.0's arrival, introducing enhanced requirements for language competency, including detailed specifications for characters, vocabulary, and syntax. The new standards emphasize comprehensive writing abilities across various genres and academic domains, while incorporating Chinese cultural elements. This transition between assessment generations presents significant challenges for international Chinese writing instruction, particularly given diverse teaching contexts. Consequently, an adaptive, learner-centered pedagogical approach with teachers as facilitators is recommended, emphasizing student autonomy in the learning process.

## **1. Introduction**

Language functions as a decoder of cultural codes and a medium for cross-cultural communication, fundamentally shaping national and ethnic identities. As a UN working language, Chinese plays a vital role in cultural dissemination and international dialogue. With increasing global engagement, Chinese, representing millennia of cultural heritage, has gained prominence in international organizations. The language's global reach is evidenced by over 30 million overseas learners, with approximately 200 million total users<sup>[1]</sup>, and its integration into 85 national education systems<sup>[2]</sup>.

Chinese language promotion facilitates cross-cultural understanding and access to Chinese technological advancement. The HSK, China's standardized proficiency test, has evolved significantly since its 1984 inception. Following its 1992 national-level designation, HSK 2.0 was implemented in 2010 with a six-level framework. The 2021 release of the *Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education* introduced a "three stages, nine

levels" system, culminating in HSK 3.0's launch in 2022 with advanced levels seven through nine.

Writing proficiency remains crucial in contemporary communication, conferring social prestige despite increasing digital media prevalence <sup>[3]</sup>. It serves as a fundamental metric for language competency assessment and learning progression <sup>[4]</sup>. In second language acquisition, writing enhances linguistic skills while fostering target language cognitive patterns <sup>[5,6]</sup>. While writing comprises one-third of advanced HSK 2.0 scoring, research in Chinese second language writing assessment requires further development. This study examines HSK 2.0 writing assessment methodologies, second language writing theories, and international teaching practices during this transitional period.

## 2. Changes in Chinese Proficiency Test Reference Standards

### (1) Introduction to HSK 2.0 and 3.0 Reference Standards

The 2007 *Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages* <sup>[7]</sup>, implemented in 2009, established a communication-focused framework for Chinese language assessment. Based on international standards like CEFR and CLB, it delineated five proficiency levels across multiple linguistic dimensions.

HSK <sup>[8]</sup>, primarily targeting adult learners, has become a high-stakes examination crucial for academic admission and professional advancement. The 2010 HSK 2.0 framework introduced six standardized levels, though its alignment with the *Proficiency Scales* showed discrepancies, particularly in advanced levels.

The 2021 *Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education* <sup>[9]</sup> expanded the framework to "three stages and nine levels," introducing translation assessment while maintaining communication-based evaluation. This revision established clear alignment between HSK 2.0 (levels 1-6) and introduced advanced levels (7-9), providing detailed quantitative indicators for syllables, characters, vocabulary, and grammar.

HSK 3.0's implementation in 2022 <sup>[10]</sup> prioritized the introduction of advanced levels while maintaining existing lower levels, ensuring gradual transition. The advanced examination adopts a digital-only format with single-test level determination, emphasizing complex academic and research-oriented communication tasks. These levels require "fluent and appropriate" language abilities, aligning with international standards for advanced academic purposes, similar to IELTS's approach.

### (2) Comparison between Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages and Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education

The transition between HSK reference standards reflects accumulated experience in Chinese second language education. This analysis examines writing proficiency requirements across the <Proficiency Scales>, <CEFR>, and <Grading Standards> to inform pedagogical strategies.

While the <Proficiency Scales> initially aligned with <CEFR>, the newer <Grading Standards> establishes an independent framework specifically tailored to Chinese language learning characteristics. The <Proficiency Scales> levels 1-4 correspond directly to <CEFR> A1-B2, with level 5 corresponding to both C1 and C2. Analysis focuses on advanced writing requirements in HSK 2.0 levels 5-6, which align with <CEFR> C-level proficiency.

A key distinction emerges in assessment scope: <CEFR> provides comprehensive writing scenarios spanning daily, professional, and academic contexts, with detailed requirements for specific genres at C-level. In contrast, the <Proficiency Scales> offers more limited task examples across its levels, from basic form completion (Level 1) to reading reflections and work reports (Level 5), demonstrating less extensive coverage of language use scenarios compared to <CEFR>.

The assessment frameworks reveal distinct emphases: <CEFR> prioritizes language achievement,

including stylistic appropriateness, discourse organization, and effective use of connectives. Conversely, the <Proficiency Scales> emphasizes communicative task completion with less focus on linguistic sophistication. Critical disparities emerge at advanced levels (Table 1). While <CEFR> C1-C2 requires independent viewpoint expression on complex issues and author-reader relationship awareness, <Proficiency Scales> level five primarily focuses on information transmission accuracy. The latter's reduced emphasis on logical expression and critical thinking assessment explains HSK 2.0's limitations in evaluating advanced writing proficiency.

Table 1 Correspondence Between Overall Written Expression Ability in CEFR and Written Expression Ability in Chinese Language Proficiency Scales for Speakers of Other Languages

CEFR		Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages	
A1	Can write isolated phrases and sentences.	Level 1	Can write simple social expressions correctly, such as greetings on cards and addresses on envelopes. Can copy and record time, names, numbers, or prices. Can fill in forms with basic personal information using simple words.
A2	Can write simple phrases and sentences, using basic connectors such as "and", "but", "because" to link sentences.	Level 2	Can express gratitude, apologies, congratulations, and farewells using simple vocabulary or sentences. Can record, fill in, or copy basic information closely related to oneself, family, or daily life. Can briefly answer simple questions closely related to personal life.
B1	Can write coherent texts on various topics within familiar fields, forming paragraphs with a series of straightforward sentences.	Level 3	Can write brief messages about familiar topics in general social situations. Can record, copy, or fill in factual or explanatory information. Can provide simple narratives about personal and family-related matters, or other very familiar events, stories, and plans.
B2	Can write clear, detailed texts on a broad range of topics within their area of interest, capable of evaluating and synthesizing information and arguments from different sources.	Level 4	Can write texts of appropriate length and format on common topics in daily life, study, or social interactions, conveying or expressing information appropriately. Can record important information from listening or reading materials, and can take simple notes based on brief oral reports or reference materials. Can describe, explain, or narrate personal experiences or familiar topics with generally coherent sentences and clear expression.
C1	Can write well-structured texts on complex subjects, emphasizing relevant salient points, presenting rigorous arguments with appropriate supporting evidence and examples, and drawing reasonable conclusions.	Level 5	Can compose practical writings or general work documents for common situations or within certain work contexts, with correct format and clear, fluent language expression. Can summarize listened or read materials, writing explanations, abstracts, or brief reports in an organized manner.
C2	Can produce well-structured, logically organized texts that are fluent and stylistically appropriate, with a clear line of argument that effectively helps readers identify significant points.		Can compose general articles to describe, interpret, or explain concrete or general abstract topics, using appropriate vocabulary and fluent expression. Can accurately reflect objective situations and express personal views.

The <Proficiency Scales> demonstrates limited coverage of creative and academic writing genres, prioritizing communicative function due to Chinese language's initial learning challenges. While this approach aimed to maintain learner motivation, it affected HSK 2.0's reliability as a

high-stakes assessment tool. The high pass rates in multiple countries, including among young learners (Center for Language Education and Cooperation, 2023), underscore the inadequacy of HSK 2.0 and <Proficiency Scales> in assessing advanced language proficiency. These limitations in proficiency levels and usage scenarios ultimately prompted the development of the <Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards> and HSK 3.0.

The *Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards* introduces enhanced requirements across HSK levels 1-6, expanding character and vocabulary scope (Table 2). This revision emphasizes character-word relationships and includes more derived and functional vocabulary. The framework anticipates comprehensive assessment modifications, including translation components, as demonstrated in levels 7-9 implementation.

Table 2 Vocabulary Requirements Comparison between New HSK 2.0 and Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education

HSK 2.0			Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards		
	Characters	Vocabulary		Characters	Vocabulary
Level 1	150	150	Level 1	300	500
Level 2	300	300	Level 2	600	1272
Level 3	600	600	Level 3	900	2245
Level 4	1000	1200	Level 4	1200	3245
Level 5	1500	2500	Level 5	1500	4316
Level 6	2500	5000	Level 6	1800	5456
			Level 7-9	3000	11092

The primary modification to the <Proficiency Scales> involves implementing a three-stage, nine-level system. HSK 3.0 levels 7-9 align with the <Grading Standards>, while levels 1-6 correspond to existing standards. The expanded framework addresses previous limitations in advanced language proficiency, particularly in academic contexts. Advanced writing requirements now encompass complex topic discussion across disciplines, demanding standardized expression and logical coherence, while emphasizing Chinese cultural comprehension.

Table 3 Writing Proficiency Level Standards in Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education

Level 1	Can master 100 characters from the elementary handwriting character list. Has basic understanding of character stroke rules, stroke order, and most common punctuation usage. Can copy characters correctly at a minimum speed of 10 characters/minute. Possesses fundamental written expression ability to use simple vocabulary and basic sentences, fill in basic personal information, and write notes.
Level 2	Can master 200 characters from the elementary handwriting character list. Has good command of character stroke rules, stroke order, and common punctuation usage. Can copy characters accurately at a minimum speed of 15 characters/minute. Demonstrates preliminary written expression ability to use simple sentences and write at least 100 characters within given time about personal life or study-related information.
Level 3	Can master 300 characters from the elementary handwriting character list. Shows proficiency in character stroke rules, stroke order, and common punctuation usage. Can copy characters correctly at a minimum speed of 20 characters/minute. Possesses general written expression ability for basic written communication, capable of writing emails, notices, and narrative short essays of at least 200 characters within given time. Sentences are basically coherent with clear expression.
Level 4	Can master 100 characters from the intermediate handwriting character list.

	Understands basic character structure features. Can express in paragraphs using simple sentence patterns, completing narrative and expository writings of at least 300 characters within given time. Uses generally correct vocabulary with some sentence variation, complete content, and relatively clear expression. Can complete common practical writing with basically correct format.
Level 5	Can master 250 characters from the intermediate handwriting character list. Can analyze common character structures. Can express in paragraphs using relatively complex sentence patterns, completing general narrative, expository, and simple argumentative writings of at least 450 characters within given time. Uses appropriate vocabulary with correct sentence patterns, complete content, and fluent expression. Can complete general practical writing with correct format and standard expression.
Level 6	Can master 400 characters from the intermediate handwriting character list. Shows proficiency in analyzing character structures. Can express in paragraphs using longer and more complex sentence patterns, completing common narrative, expository, and argumentative writings of at least 600 characters within given time. Uses appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence patterns, complete content, and fluent expression. Can apply common rhetorical devices and complete various practical writings with correct format and standard expression.
Level 7	Can handwrite characters required by advanced language quantitative indicators. Can compose practical writings, expository essays, argumentative essays, and professional papers of certain length. Shows basically clear viewpoints, organized structure, fluent sentences, correct format, appropriate expression, and logical coherence. Can correctly use various rhetorical devices.
Level 8	Can handwrite characters required by advanced language quantitative indicators. Can compose longer practical writings, expository essays, argumentative essays, and professional papers. Demonstrates clear viewpoints, organized structure, fluent expression, correct format, appropriate style, and logical clarity. Can correctly use rich idioms, conventional expressions, and various rhetorical devices.
Level 9	Can handwrite characters required by advanced language quantitative indicators. Can complete thesis writing and various styles of composition. Shows clear viewpoints, coherent discourse, correct format, appropriate expression, and strong logic. Can correctly use various complex sentence patterns and comprehensively apply multiple rhetorical devices with substantial content and literary grace.

Analysis of Table 1 and Table 3 shows the <Grading Standards>' significant improvements over the <Proficiency Scales> in Chinese writing assessment. The enhancements include specific character count requirements and detailed language skill criteria for each level, facilitating more effective teaching and assessment. Notably, the standards now encompass genre-specific writing requirements, addressing format, syntax, and stylistic elements. The evolution from <Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages> to <Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards> represents a comprehensive upgrade in Chinese language education, reflected in HSK 3.0's implementation, with levels 1-6 reform pending. This necessitates adaptation in international Chinese writing instruction.

### (3) HSK 2.0 Level 5 and 6 Writing Tasks and Scoring Guidelines (Explanation)

HSK 2.0's decade-long implementation has revealed limitations stemming from the <Proficiency Scales>' imprecise ability definitions, particularly in writing assessment. This has led to inconsistent teaching practices and examination-oriented approaches.

HSK 2.0 (see Table 4) Level 5 writing comprises two sections: sentence construction and essay writing (80 characters each, using given vocabulary or images). Level 6 requires a 400-character

summary without opinion expression. Level 5's open-ended format creates assessment challenges due to response variability, while Level 6's requirements contradict the <Proficiency Scales>' expectation for personal viewpoint expression.

The scoring criteria emphasize language standardization over content and argumentation. This contrasts with comparable tests like CET-4, which evaluates both linguistic accuracy and logical coherence. The assessment framework reveals a disconnect between the <Proficiency Scales>' objectives and actual implementation in HSK 2.0 <sup>[11]</sup>.

Table 4 Scoring Guidelines for Writing Tasks in HSK Level 5 and Level 6

Level 5 (Part 1)	<p>0 points: Blank response.</p> <p>Low range: Not all 5 required words used; incoherent content with grammatical errors; numerous character mistakes.</p> <p>Middle range: Content is coherent and logical but contains grammatical errors; OR coherent and logical but contains few character mistakes; OR coherent and logical but insufficient length.</p> <p>High range: All 5 words used correctly, no character mistakes, no grammatical errors, content is rich, coherent, and logical.</p>
Level 5 (Part 2)	<p>0 points: Blank response.</p> <p>Low range: Content barely relates to the picture; incoherent content with grammatical errors; numerous character mistakes.</p> <p>Middle range: Content relates to picture and is logical but contains grammatical errors; OR relates to picture and is logical but contains few character mistakes; OR insufficient length.</p> <p>High range: Content relates well to picture, no character mistakes, no grammatical errors, content is rich, coherent, and logical.</p>
Level 6	<p>0 points: Blank response.</p> <p>Low range: Content barely relates to provided materials; incoherent content with grammatical errors; numerous character mistakes.</p> <p>Middle range: Content basically corresponds to provided materials but contains grammatical errors; OR basically corresponds but contains few character mistakes; OR insufficient length.</p> <p>High range: Content corresponds well to provided materials, has reasonable structure, coherent expression, no grammatical errors or character mistakes.</p>

### 3. Research Questions

Through analysis and comparison of the <Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages>, <Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education>, <CEFR>, New HSK Test Scoring Guidelines, HSK 2.0 levels five and six, and CET-4 writing questions, numerous issues in both the design and implementation of the <Proficiency Scales> and HSK 2.0 become apparent.

The Chinese Proficiency Test design principle emphasizes "integration of testing and teaching," aiming to "promote teaching through testing" and "promote learning through testing" through coordination between examinations and international Chinese teaching materials <sup>[8]</sup>. However, current implementation makes these objectives difficult to achieve. Regarding writing ability, most official international Chinese teaching materials and HSK structures follow the <Proficiency Scales>, but vague training objectives make it challenging to "promote teaching through testing" and "promote learning through testing." Frontline teachers generally conduct teaching activities

based on personal experience or institutional training objectives. Furthermore, official materials for syllabi, textbooks, and examinations are insufficient, particularly in curriculum design, making it difficult to find evidence of "testing-teaching integration." Additionally, relying solely on summative one-time HSK assessments for each level, without supporting staged practice and testing for individual components, fails to achieve these objectives. Official bodies or associations should propose specific implementation pathways for "testing-teaching integration."

HSK's static writing assessment format has fostered test-oriented learning practices. Current HSK 2.0 writing requirements inadequately align with both the <Proficiency Scales> and <CEFR> standards, particularly in evaluating critical thinking and expression skills. The emphasis on form over content contradicts core language ability requirements specified in multiple frameworks.

With the implementation of <Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards> and HSK 3.0 (levels 7-9), comprehensive reform is approaching. While higher levels currently meet the new standards, the transition raises questions about optimal writing instruction strategies for both domestic and international Chinese language education.

#### 4. Construction of International Chinese Writing Pedagogy Theory

##### (1) Review of Mainstream Writing Teaching Paradigms

The <Proficiency Scales> and <Grading Standards> promote "integrating testing and teaching" principles, reflecting Chinese educational philosophy's teacher-centric approach. This contrasts with Western educational paradigms that emphasize student-centered learning. Chinese education, influenced by Confucian thought, prioritizes teacher authority and knowledge transmission, while Western approaches focus on student autonomy and active participation <sup>[12][13]</sup>. Recent research shows successful integration of student-centered methodologies in international Chinese classrooms <sup>[14,15]</sup>, suggesting the need for role transformation in Chinese language education towards more learner-centered teaching and assessment approaches.

Assessment for Learning (AfL), or learning-oriented assessment in Chinese context, represents a student-centered approach in second language education. This methodology aims to bridge the gap between current and desired learning outcomes through feedback mechanisms and active student engagement. It requires teachers to design progressive tasks that guide learners in understanding their current position, goals, and development path <sup>[16]</sup>.

Assessment as Learning (AaL), a component of AfL, emphasizes assessment's integration into the learning process rather than post-learning evaluation. It positions students as active participants who utilize assessment for self-reflection and metacognitive development, connecting new information with existing knowledge <sup>[17]</sup>. In second language writing learning, it refers to the continuous development of students' cognitive and metacognitive abilities to actively self-regulate learning through self-assessment and/or self-reflection within classroom assessment paradigms <sup>[18,19]</sup>.

Learning-oriented Assessment (LoA) is popular in the United States, Canada, Asia-Pacific regions and countries. Its theoretical core integrates Assessment for Learning, Assessment as Learning, and Assessment of Learning (AoL). Achieving AfL, AaL, and AoL objectives simultaneously during teaching is nearly impossible, and LoA's primary motivation and task is to achieve balance among the three <sup>[20]</sup>. The Learning-oriented Assessment (LoA) framework facilitates student autonomy through metacognitive development. Students engage in goal-setting, strategy selection, progress monitoring, and feedback utilization. This process enhances self-regulation skills by integrating metacognitive tools within subject-specific tasks, enabling learners to connect new knowledge with existing understanding while adjusting learning approaches <sup>[21]</sup>.

## (2) Comparative Analysis of Writing Teaching Paradigms

Table 5 Comparison of Core Teaching Paradigms: Content and Requirements

	AoL	AfL	AaL	LoA
Aspect	Summative Assessment	Formative Assessment	Self-Assessment	Integrated Assessment
Focus	Evaluates final learning outcomes and achievement of course objectives.	Teachers monitor student progress, emphasizing feedback, learning strategies, and instructional adjustments.	Students understand their learning methods, strategies, and progress through reflection and evaluation.	Emphasizes the relationship between assessment and learning, aiming to create a positive learning environment for comprehensive development.
Assessment Goals	Summarizes acquired knowledge and skills over a specific period for final grading..	Provides timely, targeted feedback to help students improve during the learning process.	Encourages autonomous self-assessment participation and develops metacognition.	Focuses on student achievement, motivation, engagement, learning outcomes, metacognition, emotional and social skills, and career development.
Participants	Teachers design and implement assessment tools for end-of-term evaluation.	Teachers and students collaborate, with emphasis on timely feedback and strategy adjustment.	Learners and peers engage in self-assessment and reflection.	Teachers and students jointly participate in assessment design and implementation through practical tasks.
Content	Measures students' mastery of key concepts, knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to course objectives.	Monitors individual progress and learning needs related to course objectives.	Examines students' learning reflection, strategies, and improvement mechanisms.	Evaluates real-time feedback, autonomous learning, metacognitive development, and collaborative assessment.
Purpose	Ranking and reporting to demonstrate proficiency levels.	Promoting learning and determining the next steps.	Developing deep learning and learning-to-learn capabilities.	Integrating assessment with learning process to promote deep learning.
Timing	Regular reporting, typically at term end.	Continuous feedback throughout the learning process.	Ongoing reflection during the learning process.	Combination of continuous and periodic assessment.
Methods	Traditional exams, tests, and project assignments.	Group discussions, self-evaluation, teacher feedback.	Reflection journals, learning logs, self-assessment tools.	Task-based projects, practical applications.
Application Scenarios	End-of-term examinations, final project evaluations.	In-class quizzes, discussions, homework feedback.	Learning journals, self-evaluation tools.	Project work, practical tasks emphasizing deep learning.

This section synthesizes recent research findings on the aforementioned teaching paradigms [12,17,20–29], examining in detail the similarities and differences among AfL, AaL, LoA, and AoL in terms of their connotations, assessment objectives, purposes, and operational practices (see Table 5). Among these, Assessment of Learning (AoL) is not a teaching method but purely an assessment

method, referring to summative assessment (SA) at the end of a learning phase, which is tested in the conventional sense.

## 5. Selection of International Chinese Writing Teaching Strategies

Table 5 reveals distinct characteristics among assessment-integrated teaching strategies. While Assessment of Learning (AoL) serves purely evaluative purposes, AfL, LoA, and AaL differ in participant roles and purposes. AfL and LoA involve both teacher and student participation, with AfL being teacher-directed and LoA featuring collaborative task development. AaL uniquely focuses on student autonomous learning.

AfL emphasizes teacher-guided feedback processes, where instructors provide targeted support while gathering evidence for instructional adaptation. Teachers must establish clear expectations, offer detailed feedback, and differentiate instruction based on curriculum alignment. In AaL, students become self-assessors, developing critical learning approaches through consistent self-reflection and monitoring. The focus shifts from finding correct answers to understanding learning processes. LoA synthesizes AoL, AfL, and AaL, balancing structured feedback with autonomous learning. Beyond metacognitive development, it uniquely incorporates social and career skill development.

Second language writing instruction faces unique challenges in international Chinese teaching contexts, given diverse classroom cultures ranging from autonomous to passive learning environments. To develop universal writing strategies, role transformation is essential, shifting from teacher-centered "integrating testing and teaching" to student-centered "integrating testing and learning". While Assessment as Learning (AaL) aligns with this transformation, its suitability for international Chinese writing instruction requires examination.

Currently, many overseas universities offer Chinese majors, and Confucius Institutes and Classrooms have expanded to more countries, with increasing Chinese learners. However, viewing language proficiency, this group shows a short pyramid distribution, with beginners forming the majority<sup>[30,31]</sup>. Both AaL and LoA emphasize student initiative in learning, requiring students to independently determine tasks, expectations, complete tasks, form reflections, and provide self-feedback. Students need strong self-discipline, great interest in learning, and various learning skills to complete activities required by both paradigms. This is unrealistic for beginners. More importantly, for elementary stages of Chinese as a second language learning, teacher output is essential for phonetics, characters, and grammar. Given that even HSK 2.0 level six learners have significant room for writing improvement, international Chinese writing instruction cannot separate from teacher pre-guidance and post-feedback.

Based on Chapter Two's analysis, HSK 2.0's assessment methodology shows misalignment with <Chinese Language Proficiency Scales> and <CEFR> standards regarding written expression evaluation. The introduction of HSK 3.0 and <Grading Standards> indicates a shift toward comprehensive standards incorporating Chinese linguistic and cultural elements, while aligning with international frameworks like <CEFR>. This transition poses significant challenges for both instructors and learners, particularly concerning the reconciliation between test requirements and standard specifications.

The Assessment for Learning (AfL) framework emphasizes autonomous learning through continuous formative assessment rather than summative evaluation. Within this paradigm, proficiency standards, curricula, and assessments function as directional tools rather than definitive measures. Implementation requires teachers to establish clear objectives, provide stage-specific resources, and deliver targeted feedback to facilitate student self-directed learning. For writing instruction specifically, this necessitates structured subsidiary tasks, systematic feedback

mechanisms, and collaborative learning approaches through classroom discussions and guided practice.

## 6. Conclusion

HSK 2.0's writing assessment demonstrated inconsistencies with <Chinese Language Proficiency Scales>, while the latter showed limitations compared to <CEFR> in system comprehensiveness, language application contexts, and proficiency evaluation criteria. The introduction of <Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education> and HSK 3.0 presents enhanced ability descriptors and elevated skill requirements. This transition poses significant challenges for writing instruction, where proficiency standards' complexities are most evident. The optimal pedagogical approach aligns with Assessment for Learning principles, emphasizing learner autonomy and teacher facilitation in navigating between examination requirements and standard specifications.

## Acknowledgements

This article is partially supported by the grant of Collaborative Talent Cultivation Program of China's Ministry of Education 230706424125253.

## References

- [1] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. (2023, April 20). Regular Press Conference by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Wang Wenbin. Retrieved December 31, 2024, from [https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/wjdt\\_674879/zcjd/202304/t20230420\\_11062419.shtml](https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web/wjdt_674879/zcjd/202304/t20230420_11062419.shtml)
- [2] Wang, H., & Zhou, Z. (2023, December 20). The Global Influence of Chinese Language is Strengthening. People's Daily. Retrieved December 31, 2024, from <http://world.people.com.cn/n1/2023/1220/c1002-40142971.html>
- [3] Klimova, B. F. (2012). The importance of writing. *Paripex - Indian Journal of Research*, 2(1), 9-11.
- [4] Zhao, C. G., & Llosa, L. (2008). Voice in high-stakes L1 academic writing assessment: Implications for L2 writing instruction. *Assessing Writing*, 13(3), 153-170.
- [5] Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- [6] Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 229-243.
- [7] Office of Chinese Language Council International. (2007). *Chinese Language Proficiency Scales For Speakers of Other Languages*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [8] Hanban. (2009). *New HSK Test Syllabus*. The Commercial Press.
- [9] Center for Language Education and Cooperation. (2021). *Chinese Proficiency Grading Standards for International Chinese Language Education*. Beijing Language and Culture University Press.
- [10] Chinese Testing International. (2022, October 20). Introduction to HSK (Levels 7-9). Retrieved December 31, 2024, from [http://mp.weixin.qq.com/s?\\_\\_biz=MzI0NTYyMjg2NA==&mid=2247506337&idx=2&sn=17fcdd668bf08a91863ae227ba919568](http://mp.weixin.qq.com/s?__biz=MzI0NTYyMjg2NA==&mid=2247506337&idx=2&sn=17fcdd668bf08a91863ae227ba919568)
- [11] National College English Test Committee. (2016). *National College English Test Band 4 and 6 Syllabus (2016 Revision)*. Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.
- [12] Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R. J., Chappuis, S., & Arter, J. (2020). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right--using it well*. Pearson.
- [13] Yang, J. (2019). Understanding Chinese language teachers' beliefs about themselves and their students in an English context. *System*, 80, 73-82.
- [14] Sun, P. (2015). Discussion on the Reclassification, Design and Implementation of CSL/CFL Classroom Teaching Strategies in International Context. *Research and Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language*, 1(2).
- [15] Liang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Han, J. (2018). Research on Chinese Teaching Mode for Foreigners under the Background of "Internet +". *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 7(2), 337-361.
- [16] Cambridge International Education Teaching and Learning Team. (2024). *Getting started with Assessment for Learning*. Retrieved December 31, 2024, from <http://cambridge-community.org.uk/professional-development/gswafl/index.html>

- [17] Earl, L. M. (2012). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Corwin Press.
- [18] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1999). *Assessment for learning: Beyond the black box*. *Assessment*, 1, 1-12.
- [19] Earl, L. M. (2013). *Assessment for learning; Assessment as learning: Changing practices means changing beliefs*. *Assessment*, 80, 63-71.
- [20] Manitoba Education. (2006). *Belonging, learning, and growing kindergarten to grade 12 action plan for ethnocultural equity*. Government of Manitoba.
- [21] Mysen, T. (2013). *Towards a framework for controls as determinants of export performance: A review and analysis of empirical literature 1995-2011*. *European Business Review*, 25(3), 224-242.
- [22] Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2004). *Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 8-21.
- [23] Fenwick, T. J., & Parsons, J. (2010). *The art of evaluation: A resource for educators and trainers*. Thompson Educational Publishing.
- [24] Gibbons, S. L., & Kankkonen, B. (2011). *Assessment as learning in physical education: Making assessment meaningful for secondary school students*. *Physical & Health Education Journal*, 76(4), 6.
- [25] McNamee, G. D., & Chen, J. Q. (2005). *Dissolving the Line between Assessment and Teaching*. *Educational Leadership*, 63(3), 72-76.
- [26] Schraw, G. (2001). *Promoting general metacognitive awareness*. In *Metacognition in Learning and Instruction* (pp. 3-16). Springer.
- [27] Sparks, D. (1999). *Assessment without victims: An interview with Rick Stiggins*. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20, 54-56.
- [28] Stiggins, R. (2005). *From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 324-328.
- [29] Taras, M. (2005). *Assessment—summative and formative—some theoretical reflections*. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(4), 466-478.
- [30] Yang, X. (2018). *Research on the "Three Teaching" Issues of Chinese Teaching in Brazil*. Wuhan University Press.
- [31] Huang, S. (2019). *Analysis and Countermeasures of the "Pyramid-shaped" Development Status of Chinese Language Talents Training in Confucius Institute of Royal Academy of Cambodia*. *Journal of Hubei University of Economics (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 16(11), 131-134.