

# 2000 HSC Notes from the Examination Centre Chinese

© Board of Studies 2001

Published by  
Board of Studies NSW  
GPO Box 5300  
Sydney NSW 2001  
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9262 6270

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 4841 9

*Job Number 200151*

# Chinese

## 2/3 Unit NBS

### Speaking Skills

#### Question 1

The passage was well read by the majority of candidates. Misreading of tones was a common error, and candidates had difficulties in pronouncing the letters “q” and “c”.

#### Question 2

Part (a) Common errors included describing their fellow candidates instead of saying what they like about him/her, and describing their neighbours.

Part (c) In most cases, candidates gave reasons why they like the sport without addressing the question.

Part (e) Common errors were :

- \$ 350 was read as \$3500
- describing a job instead of what to do with the income.

#### Question 3

- Candidates said “last Friday” and “last Sunday” incorrectly in parts (a) and (b).
- The words “some” and “really” in parts (a) and (b) were omitted.
- In part (c), candidates failed to use the word “would like” correctly. A large number of them used *hui* (can).

### Listening Skills

This paper was generally attempted well.

- Candidates did not know the difference between school oval and school centre. Mother worked as train driver and not a mechanic.
- Some candidates could not spell the *Hanyu Pinyin* correctly nor did they put the correct tones on them when Pinyin was used.

## Section I – Core

### Writing Skills

#### Question 1 (a)

The best responses:

- contained a variety of ideas relating to the topic
- used a variety of grammatical structures
- conformed to the format required
- remained within the word limit.

The poorest responses:

- did not conform to the format required (this was particularly evident in the conclusion of the letter)
- used *pinyin* in place of prescribed characters
- exceeded or were well below the required word limit
- diverged from the topic.

The choice of essay topic was evenly distributed except for part (iii), which was attempted by very few candidates.

#### Question 1 (b)

This question was generally well answered, although some candidates did not observe the topic subheadings.

### Question 2 – Reading Comprehension

- (a)
- (i) This question was well answered by most candidates.
  - (ii) Most candidates answered this question correctly.
  - (iii) Results were mixed for this part. In some cases not all relevant information was given.
- (b)
- (i) The majority of candidates answered this question well. Some interpreted *cháng qúnzi* as “long pants”, “shorts”, or simply “clothes”.
  - (ii) This question was not well answered – more accurate detail of Xiao Yue’s opinion was necessary.
  - (iii) Most candidates answered this question well.

### Question 3 – Language Study

- (a) This question was well answered by all candidates.
- (b) Some candidates did not use tone marks and some used capital letters only – negating the use of them. Some candidates did not understand the rules about combining words or the use of capital letters.
- (c) This question was generally well answered.
- (d) This question was generally well answered.

- (e) This question was generally well answered.

## **Section II – Options**

### **Option 2 – Tourism**

#### **Question 6**

- (a) This question was generally well answered.
- (b) This question required the letter format, which was not always adhered to. Some candidates wrote tours for places other than China. Some candidates did not explain why they should be employed as travel guides.

#### **Question 7**

This question was not well answered. Very few candidates actually used the brochure format. Many candidates did not include reference to the point of encouraging tourists to leave the major tourist destinations.

### **Option 3 – Literature**

#### **Question 8**

In general, this question was well answered with most candidates including the main points required for both questions. Better responses reflected a broader understanding of society during this time. Weaker responses failed to link ideas with appropriate examples or were poorly structured.

#### **Question 9**

Most candidates answered part (a) of Question 9 with few candidates answering part (b). In part (a), some candidates seemed to only have a superficial understanding of the message in telling the story of the ‘Tail’ and could not explain clearly, how it linked to the ‘meeting’.

Good answers included examples from the story that justified the candidates’ opinions and drew links with the social conditions during the time the story was written.

### **Option 4 – Film**

#### **Question 10**

- (a) In general, this question was answered satisfactorily. Candidates who answered this question well usually included examples of lighting and colour that were dominant in the film and at the same time reflected the theme and use of colour/lighting in relation to the main characters in certain scenes. The best responses included a well-sequenced argument in relation to the question.
- (b) Only a few candidates chose this question. Most candidates agreed with Li Renzhong’s opinion but did not create a coherent argument.
- (d) This question was not generally answered well. Responses did not make reference to intellectuals in society at the time the film was made.

## 3 Unit (Additional) NBS

### Speaking Skills

#### Question 1

This question was reasonably well attempted.  
Candidates read *Nanjing* as *Beijing*.

#### Question 2

- Part (a) Those who attempted this part only described a part-time job and did not include reference to the reasons.
- Part (e) Those who attempted this part were confused between the visitor who couldn't speak English and the one who could.
- Part (f) Candidates only named different sporting activities and did not elaborate on how these could help you unwind and relieve stress.

### Listening Skills

#### Item 1

- Part (a) Candidates did not understand the phrase *jia qi* (holiday)
- Part (b) Candidates attempted this part well.
- Part (c) This part was not attempted well. Most candidates responded only to the part concerning accommodation.
- Part (d) Candidate's answers on this part were mostly incomplete.

#### Item 2

- Part (a) Candidates did not give complete answers in this part.
- Part (b) Candidates misunderstood the words "feeling" and "thinking".
- Part (c) Candidates did not include the reference to "hot" tea.
- Part (d) Candidates did not include "going out for a stroll" as part of their response.

### **Question 1 – Reading Comprehension**

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates. However, some candidates did not provide sufficient details for part (d).

### **Question 2 – Writing Skills**

The majority of candidates answered parts (b) and (d). Part (a) was also generally well answered with fewer candidates attempting parts (c) and (e), and only one candidate attempting part (f).

The good responses generally kept to the topic and used a wide range of vocabulary and sentence structures.

Poorer responses tended to use a smaller range of vocabulary and sentence structures and were less likely to keep to the topic. These responses also made numerous errors when writing Chinese characters or used vocabulary incorrectly.

## **2/3 Unit BS**

### **Speaking Skills**

The majority of the candidates attempted Part (a).

Candidates who attempted Part (d) misunderstood the question.

### **Listening Skills**

The majority of the candidates attempted this paper reasonably well.

Candidates misunderstood a few phrases and hence answered the questions incorrectly.

## **Section I – Core**

### **Question 1 – Writing Skills**

#### **Part A**

Candidates' main weakness concerned the misinterpretation of the topics.

- (i) Candidates only wrote about camping experiences and did not reflect on themselves.

- (ii) Some candidates did not fully understand the reference to “cultural background” and wrote about Chinese people in different professions and from different regions.
- (iii) This part required candidates to write creatively on a science fiction theme and most had difficulties in describing life under the sea.
- (iv) This part was attempted reasonably well and the content was fine. However, there were some problems with organisation and sequencing.

In general, candidates displayed difficulties with the use of vocabulary and sentence structures. Their writing lacked structure and did not include the use of supportive examples.

### **Part B – Literature**

- (i) Candidates did not compare the two texts as specified in the question. Most candidates talked about the personalities of the characters instead of the relationships between them. Candidates stressed Chun Tao and “I” as the only main characters in the texts “*Chun Tao*” and “*Fan Jiang*”. Some candidates concentrated on the relationship between the main characters, but forgot to use that to reflect on the people in general and society at that time as the question asked. Candidates stressed Chun Tao’s rebellion against social moral standards, while the question was asking candidates to comment on the relationships.

Some candidates misunderstood and confused some details of the texts. For example, Li Mao lost his legs in the Vietnam War, Wang Li Fa sold his daughter to Pang Tai Jian, etc. Some candidates did not understand the meaning of “relationship” in the question. They interpreted it as the relationships between the characters e.g. husband and wife, etc.

- (ii) Some candidates did not comment on the writing techniques, but merely retold the stories. Some candidates did not know how to comment on the features and techniques of the writing. For example, they said “... the play ‘Tea House’ used dialogue to show the personalities of the characters”, which did not provide any insight into their knowledge of writing.

Many candidates analysed the characters, neglecting the social problems. Many candidates commented on writing techniques without any reference to social problems.

### **Question 2 – Reading Comprehension**

The majority of candidates attempted this question fairly well.

Candidates who attained higher marks were able to express information and ideas well in their own words.

The following are some weaknesses which were identified:

- Misunderstanding the text.
- Lack of organisation – many copied the text but failed to compare.
- Lack of self expression.
- Many used incorrect spelling for words pronounced the same. Some even failed to copy the correct word from the text.

- Some failed to extract correct information from the whole passage.
- Some candidates stated historical facts which were not listed in the text.

## **Section II – Option**

### **Question 3 – Film**

#### **Part (a)**

Many candidates misunderstood the question. Most candidates did not attempt to show how the director portrays the character with film techniques.

#### **Part (b)**

The majority of the candidates merely retold the story of the characters and did not analyse the change in the character's life. Most candidates could give enough evidence but failed to analyse and support this evidence in their arguments.

### **Question 4 – Tourism**

#### **Part (a)**

Some candidates failed to answer this question correctly. They focussed on introducing tourist spots in China instead of offering suggestions to the travel agent. Some candidates did not include the date as part of the letter format.

#### **Part (b)**

Quite a number of candidates misunderstood the question and did not introduce the tourist spots in the two cities required.

### **Question 5 – Commercial Purpose**

Only very few candidates attempted this question. Those who did seemed to lack the appropriate knowledge. Most candidates did not provide appropriate explanations for part (a) and some did not attempt question (a) at all. Some candidates did not use appropriate commercial terminology to answer part (b).

## **3 Unit (Additional) BS**

### **Question 1**

#### **Candidates' Performance**

##### **Knowledge and Understanding**

Generally speaking, candidates were able to understand the content of questions well. Some candidates however, were not able to cover the points required by the question, which included a wide range of information from the four chapters studied.

##### **Sequence and Structure**

Many candidates had difficulty organising facts and ideas in a logical sequence. Some candidates had difficulty supporting ideas and opinions with facts in the texts. Only a small proportion of candidates were able to use the correct structure.

##### **Use of Language**

Candidates' performance ranged from highly sophisticated use of vocabulary and structure, to limited use of language.



### **Length of Answer**

Many responses exceeded 250 words, some writing up to 1000 words. A few answers used facts, which were irrelevant to the question and referred to details outside of the two prescribed chapters. A small number of candidates did not attempt the question at all.

### **Comments on the Question**

The question was at an appropriate level of difficulty. Candidates were confident in their responses.

The word “Compare” (at the beginning of the question) confused some candidates who thought they needed to compare the two novels. Comparison should not be included in the question at this level.

### **Question 2**

Some candidates did not quite comprehend the requirements of the question and therefore did not approach the question on the right track. Some candidates tended to repeat the plots of the stories instead of dealing with the question in an analytical way.

Generally speaking candidates performed better this year than in previous years. Some candidates displayed a good understanding of the question and their responses featured well-organised structure and impressive articulation. However, some candidates provided answers, which were obviously prepared and therefore did not answer the question.

Some candidates had difficulty answering the question set in essay format, which needed to be structured with an introduction, body and conclusion. Some submitted one long paragraph, reflecting their poor knowledge of the format required in an essay.

The number of non-attempted examination papers increased. Some candidates were not aware of the word limit, which was to be no less than 250 words. Some responses were too concise with less than 100 words while some were more than 2000 words with a lot of repetition.

Most candidates’ character writing was well-presented. Only a few candidates submitted responses with illegible handwriting. Some candidates did not show a good understanding of the two novels studied, which was reflected by their confusion of the characters in the two novels.

### **Question 3**

Most candidates were unable to analyse the question accurately. Instead of discussing the advantages and disadvantages, they commented on the quotation itself.

Most candidates were able to comment on aspects of advantage, but many were unable to deal with those of disadvantage. A large number of candidates misunderstood the character “*bi*” (disadvantage).

It was clear that a large number of candidates answered the question from memory of what teachers prepared in class, and therefore failed to address the necessary points. Only a few candidates were able to attempt the question with appropriate arguments and examples. Two candidates did not attempt the question at all.