

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Chinese Level 1 90868, 90871

## Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

Candidates were awarded Achieved has the basic understanding of Chinese used in the texts of most immediate relevance. The language, expressions and structures match the NCEA Level One standard. The majority of candidates who were awarded with a Merit or Excellence show clear or thorough understanding of both spoken and written texts and they are able to respond to questions with relevant details, inferences supported with examples. Pure translation or information based on guessing with little extracting from texts would not be counted as relevant information. They would be ignored to contribute to the result of the relevant questions.

Candidates must select relevant information from the text to justify their explanation or view point. A candidate who answered in their own words, but did not then back up their answer by selecting relevant information from the text to show thorough understanding, will not achieve Excellence. Just answering the question in your own words, without providing specific evidence from the text does not show that you have really understood the nuance of the language.

The Explanatory notes in the Achievement Standards and the Evidence Statements in the Assessment Schedules provide very clear guidance about what “thorough understanding” looks like.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 1. Assessment Report for 90868: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Chinese texts on areas of most immediate relevance

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>showed some understanding of the texts and able to extract key words in their answers.</li> <li>provided basic answer without evaluation and/or explanation supported by evidence from the text</li> <li>had some inconsistencies in the details they provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>gave very short answer with inaccurate information, or did not attempt all questions in the paper</li> <li>misunderstood key words in the text and interpret key words with their own understanding based on cultural knowledge</li> <li>failed to demonstrate basic understanding of details, ideas and concepts in the standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrated in-depth and clear understanding of the text and were able to provide detailed information and evidence from the text</li> <li>understood main ideas in the text but not fully understood inferences required for thorough understanding</li> <li>showed ability to provide some evidence showing clear understanding and drew accurate conclusions based on the passages.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrated successfully thorough understanding with supporting evidence inferred from the text</li> <li>demonstrated clear understanding of inferences written in the texts and subtle details</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• were fully aware of intercultural knowledge which influences analysing of information and provides points of contrast</li> <li>• were able to draw accurate conclusion based on a wide range of and fully integrated comprehensive evidences from the passage in supporting their answers.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	For 90868, 180 out of 653 candidates answered questions in Chinese, either traditional or simplified Chinese. Some native speakers might have answered in English. The high numbers of Merit, and low number of Not Achieved have reflected this. The low number of Excellence can be explained as most native speakers would demonstrate clear understanding of the text, but failed to understand the inferences and implied meaning for excellence.

## 2. Assessment Report for 90871: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of Chinese texts on areas of most immediate relevance

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• showed some basic understanding of the texts and able to extract key words in their answers</li> <li>• provided basic answer without evaluation and/or explanation supported by evidence from the text</li> <li>• had some inconsistencies in the details they provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wrote very short answer with inaccurate information, or did not attempt all questions in the paper</li> <li>• misunderstood key words in the text and interpreted key words with own guessing based on cultural knowledge</li> <li>• failed to demonstrate basic understanding of details, ideas and concepts in the standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrated in-depth and clear understanding of the text and were able to provide detailed information and evidence from the text</li> <li>• understood main ideas in the text but not fully understand inferences required for thorough understanding in question</li> <li>• showed ability to provide some evidence showing clear understanding and drew accurate conclusions based on the passages.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• successfully demonstrated thorough understanding with supporting evidence drawn from the text</li> <li>• demonstrated clear understanding of inferences written in the texts and subtle details</li> <li>• were fully aware of intercultural knowledge which influences analysing of information and provides points of contrast</li> <li>• were able to draw accurate conclusion based on a wide range and fully integrated comprehensive evidences from the passage in supporting their answers.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	For 90871, 134 out of 670 scripts were answered in Chinese at native speaker fluency. It can be predicted at least 20% of the candidates for this standard were native speakers. This might be part of the reason of the high numbers of Merit and Excellence. It is not a new issue in 2016.