



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In Chinese (4CN0) Paper 02

edexcel 

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 2017

Publications Code 4CNO_02_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

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

The aim of this part was to assess candidates' abilities to comprehend and utilise information from a range of texts which included matching basic vocabulary to pictures, selecting the correct answers to multiple choice questions and answering comprehension on a passage. Answers were only assessed for communication. Grammatical accuracy was not assessed in these parts of the paper.

Overall, candidates performed very well in these questions with many scoring full marks, showing their ability to recognise some basic vocabulary within the syllabus as well as identify and note main points.

Question 3b

Candidates were required to write about 50 characters on the topic, which was related to the Question 3a reading passage. In addition, candidates were given some ideas in both English and Chinese in the text boxes. This response was assessed for communication and language.

Most candidates answered the question very well, which showed their ability to describe one of their favourite subjects. Even the weaker candidates performed reasonably well due to the fact they could get some support from the reading passage and English supporting questions. However, the main problem for some able candidates was that they simply failed to respond to all the bullet points.

Question 5

Candidates were expected to read a longer passage and to respond to a series of questions. The candidates were required to show the ability to manipulate the language of the original text and to use their own words and phrases to express ideas from the text.

The nature of open questions offered optimum opportunity for candidates to show what they had understood from the text and reiterate the answers in their own words. We did come across some candidates who answered the questions with full sentences with no grammatical mistakes at all. The questions also served as good discriminators between candidates of different abilities. Quality of Language is not assessed in this question.

Question (a) was generally well handled by candidates although a few candidates answered “**關**” instead of “**關**”

Question (b) was also generally well handled.

Question (c) was managed well by majority of the candidates, but some candidates still gave wrong answers such as “**惹**”

Question (d) was managed well by the majority of the candidates. Many candidates scored full marks.

Question (e)i) was very well handled by many candidates to get full marks.

Question (e)ii) was handled well in general but a few candidates gave answer such as “~~游~~”

Question (f) was handled very well. Many candidates scored full marks.

Question (g) was answered well, but a few candidates copied the last paragraph verbatim.

Section C

Candidates could select 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 by the candidates. Most candidates did well, responding fully to the first three bullet points. They completed the bullet points, employing a wide variety of vocabulary and sentence structures in terms of language. The less able candidates even tried to put down some details. Very few 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 which allowed candidates to express their opinions and points of view. There were a number of mistakes in characters, but mostly they were still recognisable.

Task (a)

The bullet points differentiated the writing abilities of candidates. The able candidates managed to give detailed information about the meet-up, such as the place, the date and the time as well as developing their writing by giving reasons to get together and what activities they could do. While a few weaker candidates managed to write some simple sentences such as “~~我加~~” “~~我票~~” etc; the reasons which they gave were typically: “~~因精~~” “~~因想~~” “~~因好~~” which did not lead onto candidates being able to elaborate on their ideas and demonstrate their abilities.

Task (b)

As with 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 themselves. Some good answers described their hobbies and ideal jobs which are both creative and original. However, a few candidates missed the last bullet point.

Task (c)

Most candidates performed very well on this task with full responses to the bullet points. Candidates could express their ideas with various writing skills: even weak candidates were able to respond to the bullet points with simple sentences. However, a few candidates forgot to mention about “how

much time you spend on reading”, and dropped marks for their content score for the omitted bullet point.

Grade Boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>