

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
in Chinese (4CN0/02)
Pearson Edexcel Certificate
in Chinese (KCN0/02)

Paper 2: Reading and Writing

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2015

Publications Code UG041132

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

International GCSE/ Edexcel Certificate Chinese
Paper 2 Reading
Examiners' Report

This paper was composed of six questions. Candidates were allowed one hour and thirty minutes to complete the tasks.

Question 1, 2, 3a and 4: These questions aimed to assess candidates' abilities in comprehending and utilising information from a range of texts. Tasks were based on matching basic vocabulary to pictures, selecting the correct answers to multiple choice questions and answering comprehension questions on a passage. Successful communication was the only criterion that was used in assessment of the answers. Performance in these questions was excellent with many candidates scoring full marks, showing their ability to recognise some basic vocabulary within the specification as well as identify and note main points.

Question 3b: Candidates were required to write approximately 50 characters on a topic related to the reading passage in question 3(a). In addition, candidates were given several bullet points of content to include in their responses. There were given in both English and Chinese. Candidates' responses were assessed in terms of their communication and language (both application and accuracy). As the topic of the question was linked to 3a and guidance was provided for content, this writing task proved accessible. Most candidates answered the question very well, which showed their ability to write about a tour they had joined. Even the weaker candidates performed reasonably owing to the reading passage and the English in the bullet points both being potential aids. However, a small minority of candidates failed to use full sentences, instead copying the questions out and answering them in note form. The main problem seen in the able candidates was carelessness, in that they simply forgot to respond to one of the bullet points such as "What did you buy? Why?"

Question 5: Candidates were expected to read a longer passage and to respond to a series of questions. A few questions were important discriminators, requiring candidates to possess an awareness of the full flow of the text, as opposed to simply zooming in on sentences with phrasing similar to the questions. There were some candidates who answered the questions in full sentences with no grammatical mistakes at all. Quality of Language was not assessed in this question. Question 5(a) was generally well handled by candidates although a few candidates answered "大卫" instead of "大卫一家". Question 5(b) was also well handled. However, some candidates listed the food cooked by the group rather than the food prepared by Mingming's mum. Question 5(c) was managed well by majority of the candidates. However, some candidates lost marks by failing to provide more detailed information ('爸爸' rather than '明明爸爸'). Question 5(d) was managed well by the majority of the candidates. Candidates generally managed to get full marks in questions 5(e) and 5(f). In question 5(g), candidates generally performed well. However, some candidates omitted the verb '用', providing the nonsensical answer '刀叉吃饭'. Though grammar was not assessed, this omission of a verb renders the resulting

response a nonsense, and it was decided that no marks would be awarded for it. Candidates generally managed to get full marks in questions 5(h) and 5(i).

Question 6: Candidates selected one writing task from a choice of three. Candidates were expected to write a continuous response of between 100 and 150 characters. The three tasks were equally favoured. Most candidates did well, responding fully to all the first three bullet points, employing a wide variety of vocabulary and sentence structure. With even less able candidates tried to put down some detail. A small minority of candidates turned the bullet points into questions and answers rather than linking their writing into a continuous piece of composition. The fourth bullet point carried more content marks and was designed to allow candidates to express their opinions and points of view. Though not a large-scale problem, a small number of responses are submitted each year which do not seem to respond to the demands of the question. They are often rambling, lacking a clear structure and in the worst cases appear pre-learnt. Such answers cannot be properly assessed in relation to others' work as they often end up being about wildly different subjects. As such, these candidates will not receive a good mark for their response. If the candidate produces work completely unrelated to the tasks and demands of the question, no marks are awarded. There were a number of mistakes in characters, but mostly they were still recognisable. A few students did not attempt the question at all and left their paper blank.

Task (a): The bullet points differentiated the writing abilities of candidates. The able candidates managed to give a detailed description of the festival they like the most and why they like it. The weakest candidates just managed to write some simple sentences; as justification, the typical such candidates phrases used were “有趣”, “有意思” which were not productive responses.

Task (b): As in task (a), the bullet points also discriminated between the writing abilities of candidates. The strong candidates responded to the bullet points with detailed information about the present they bought for a friend. However, a few candidates neglected the third bullet point.

Task (c): Most candidates performed well on this task with full responses to the bullet points. Candidates were allowed to express their ideas with various writing skills; even the weak candidates were also able to respond to the bullet points with simple sentences. However, some candidates wrote about a specific lunch rather than lunch in general and hence dropped marks.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE