Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
in Chinese (4CN0/02R)
Paper 2R: 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

International GCSE Chinese
Paper 2R 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 3a. 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 the food they like eating. 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 "Can you cook it?" or misunderstood the bullet point.

Question 5: Candidates were expected to read a longer passage and to respond to a series of questions. 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 were not assessed in this question. Question 5(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) were generally well handled by candidates. Question (g) was managed well by the majority of the candidates. However, a few candidates misunderstood the question and gave irrelevant answers. Question (h) carried two marks and acted as an important discriminator. Correct answers relied on the understanding of the causal relationship conveyed in the text. Most candidates were able to unravel this causal relationship, but some struggled with it and consequently lost marks.

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. 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 are 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 candidates 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 activities they do online and why they enjoyed doing them. Some weaker candidates only managed to write some simple sentences; using "有趣", "有意思" as justifications for their opinions frequently. These were not very informative responses and risked the candidates' responses becoming monotonous.

Task (b): As in task (a), the bullet points also discriminated between the writing abilities of candidates. The stronger candidates responded to the bullet points with detailed information about their towns or cities. However, a few candidates neglected the third bullet point. They simply wrote '学校有各种各样的课外活动'.

Task (c): Most candidates performed well on this task with full responses to the bullet points. Candidates were given the opportunity to express their ideas and the stronger candidates could demonstrate their grasp of different structures and vocabulary with weak candidates also responding to the bullet points with simple sentences. However, a few candidates forgot to mention why they enjoyed the weekend, and hence dropped marks in terms of their content score for the fourth bullet point.

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