Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

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

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

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 Question 3 (a) 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.

As the question was linked to question 3 (a) and also the ideas were given in the text boxes, it became more accessible for the candidates. Most candidates answered the question very well, which showed their ability to describe one of their hobbies. Even the weaker candidates performed reasonable 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. Very few candidates failed to attempt the task this year.

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.

Question (b) was also generally well handled. Many candidates scored full marks.

Question (c) was managed well by majority of the candidates.

Question (d) was managed well by the majority of the candidates, but few candidates still gave wrong answers such as "写信", "工作".

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

Question (f) was handled well in general but a few candidates gave answer such as "看节目", "买书" instead of "看电视节目学做菜", "看书学做菜'.

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 all the first three bullet points. They completed the bullet points, employing a wide variety of vocabulary and sentence structures in terms of language. Even less able candidates 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 number of mistakes in characters, but mostly they were still recognisable. Very few candidates failed to attempt the task this year.

Task (a)
The bullet points differentiated the writing abilities of candidates. The able candidates managed to give detailed information about their mobiles, such as the brand, the size and the colour as well as developing their writing by giving reasons why they were given a mobile, when they used it at school and whether their mobile was useful. While few weak candidates managed to write some simple sentences such as "我有手机", "它有用" etc. The reasons which they gave were typically: "因为我生日", "因为我喜欢" 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 their favourite extra curriculum activities. Some good answers described the activities which were both creative and original. However, regarding the last bullet point, some candidate wrote about the importance of their favourite activity rather than the importance of the extra curriculum activities in general.

Task (c)
Most candidates performed quite 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 "when is the best time to visit you? Why?", 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