

## Assessment Report

# Level 2 Chinese 2017

Standards **91108** **91111**

### Part A: Commentary

Quality answers in these standards were based on evidence in the texts and not based on prior knowledge and unrelated opinion; they included answers which contained inferential details and examples.

Those candidates answering in Chinese, across both standards, were successful when they provided enough detail to show they have clear or thorough understanding of the texts and the questions being asked.

Candidates benefitted from developed examination technique, which allowed them to access the level of detail expected in answers for Excellence, Merit, and Achievement; how to allocate time evenly for completing and proof reading answers; and how to interpret texts for inferred or layered meaning.

### Part B: Report on standards

#### **91108: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Chinese texts on familiar matters**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- could provide few relevant details from the texts
- wrote some basic responses to questions
- understood some basic level lexical items, but misunderstood some.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- showed little understanding of the texts
- misunderstood the questions
- created responses based on their own thoughts or opinions rather than what they had heard.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- used listening notes boxes effectively
- responded accurately to the questions, providing detail

- integrated relevant evidence into their answers.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- provided implied meanings from the texts
  - responded fully to each part of the question
  - successfully understood high frequency vocabulary
  - provided supporting detail from the spoken texts to fully justify conclusions made in their answers.
- 

## **91111: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Chinese texts on familiar matters**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed some understanding of the texts and could extract key words in their answers
- provided basic answers without evaluation or explanation using supported evidence from the text.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misunderstood some key words in the text, especially around “wool”, “rice ##” and “noodle##”
- used their own prior knowledge to answer questions with no reference to the text
- failed to demonstrate understanding of basic ideas and concepts in the text.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated clear understanding of the texts and could draw relevant information to support their answers
- made conclusions and showed analytical opinion but did not provide sufficient details in answers.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- successfully demonstrated thorough understanding with supporting evidence from the texts including subtle details
- demonstrated an ability to analyse and evaluate texts, and develop their own opinions in response to inferences in the texts.

## **[Chinese subject page](#)**

### **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

---