

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Chinese Level 2 91108, 91111

## Part A: Commentary

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

In the 91108 listening standard, candidates who were awarded Achievement or higher demonstrated the ability to carefully read questions and fully understand the requirements of the questions. They were also able to write clear and detailed answers in English, Chinese or a mixed use of Chinese and English, candidates who obtained Achievement and above demonstrated a good foundation of the vocabulary and structures expected at NCEA Level 2, and therefore displayed sound comprehension of the texts. As the exam questions required candidates to select suitable and relevant information, ideas and/or opinions from the texts to answer the questions, candidates who only provided general statements without supporting evidence limited their opportunities to show clear and thorough understanding of the texts. It was therefore essential for evidence to be based on the listening passages and integrated into answers for explanations, advice, predictions and analysis as required by the questions.

In the 91111 standard, candidates were given opportunities to demonstrate their abilities to justify, interpret and explain information extracted from the passages and hence show their understanding of the texts. Candidates showed various levels of performance. As questions were scaffolded and broken into sections, candidates who only attempted the first part of the question were unable to obtain higher grades as they showed limited understanding of the texts; candidates who attempted all parts of the questions were more likely to demonstrate clear and thorough understanding and hence obtain higher grades. In the 91111 exam, there were no right or wrong answers as long as candidates were able to select relevant and detailed information from the texts to support their arguments. The examples given in the marking schedule were served as guidelines only. It is therefore essential for candidates to judge the suitability of evidence by considering if the evidence could enable and support detailed interpretation. For example, questions which required candidates to provide suggestions or imagine what could happen allowed room for candidates to construct their own arguments as long as the evidence is carefully chosen from the texts and appropriately interpreted to meet the purposes of the questions. On the contrary, candidates who used irrelevant information or information which was not based on the texts were unable to demonstrate their ability to select suitable evidence. Candidates who obtain Achieved or higher were more likely to link and integrate evidence from the whole passage to support their answers. In order to obtain Excellence, candidates were required to go beyond simply copying and translating quotes from the texts and interpret relevant evidence in their own words to show thorough understanding of the passages.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 1. Assessment Report for 91108: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Chinese texts on familiar matters

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>Achieved</b>     | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>answered questions without showing links among sentences and key vocabulary.</li> <li>provided basic answers without analysis, evaluation and/or explanation supported by evidence from the spoken texts</li> <li>demonstrated basic understanding of ideas and vocabulary in the spoken texts by providing details in questions that required descriptions.</li> <li>made general statements that showed basic understanding but were unable to provide details from the spoken texts to support their answers</li> <li>attempted only parts of the paper and lacked consistency in their answers across passages.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Not Achieved</b> | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>showed limited effort in note-taking and did not attempt all questions or sections</li> <li>lacked understanding of key vocabulary and ideas in the spoken texts and left parts of the section unanswered</li> <li>provided short answers to questions or misunderstood what the questions were asking</li> </ul>  |

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>failed to provide details or evidence from the spoken texts and used solely their personal experience or background knowledge.</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 clear understanding of ideas from the spoken texts by providing details or evidence to explain or justify their opinions</li> <li>showed effective note-taking skills to assist them with answering questions</li> <li>had the ability to select key information or evidence from the spoken texts and showed clear understanding of passages did not always sufficiently integrate evidence into question sections that required evaluation, prediction or justification based on the spoken text.</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>articulated differences or similarities of viewpoints, perspectives and/or possibilities based on evidence from the spoken text</li> <li>selected, integrated and synthesised relevant information or evidence from the spoken text to demonstrate thorough and in-depth understanding of the passages</li> <li>made strong links between texts and their analysis and demonstrated understanding of inference in the spoken text</li> <li>had the ability to use their own words to fully answer the questions by providing evaluations, analysis, predictions, advice and/or explanations based on the passages</li> <li>demonstrated thorough understanding of ideas and concepts in the spoken text by integrating a wide range of evidence to support their answers.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Standard specific comments</b> | <p>There are appeared to be over 200 native speakers of Chinese who participated in the exam out of the total of 509 candidates. Around 70 of them used traditional Chinese characters. The number of native speakers was estimated based on their choice of languages used to answer the questions in the exam. Many of the assumed native speakers of Chinese showed a lack of abilities to answer questions with depths. They provided basic answers without or with very little analysis, evaluation and/or explanation supported by evidence from the spoken texts.</p> <p>The exam was over 60 minutes and therefore affected candidates concentration span. It is suggested that the 91108 2016 exam should cut down the number of questions and length of the passages.</p> <p>It is suggested that the exam questions could be written in English without Chinese translation to avoid discrepancies between English and Chinese translation as well as show fairness to all candidates.</p> |

## 2. Assessment Report for 91111: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Chinese text(s) on familiar matters

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <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 were able to extract key words from the texts to support their answers</li> <li>provided largely accurate but basic information basic answer without evaluation and/or explanation supported by evidence from the text</li> <li>showed some inconsistencies in the details 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 answers with inaccurate information, or did not attempt all sections of the questions</li> <li>misunderstood key words in the texts and interpreted key words with their own understanding based on cultural assumptions</li> <li>failed to demonstrate basic understanding of details, ideas and concepts as required by the standard</li> <li>lacked coherence of ideas expressed in the answers.</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 texts</li> <li>were able to select and provide detailed information and evidence from the text, but did not interpret the information in their own words to show thorough understanding</li> <li>showed the ability to provide some evidence showing clear understanding and drew coherent conclusions based on the passages.</li> </ul>                            |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Achieved with Excellence</b></p>   | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• successfully demonstrated thorough understanding of the texts with supporting evidence from the texts</li> <li>• thoroughly interpreted the texts and subtle details in their own words based on suitable information</li> <li>• were fully aware of intercultural knowledge which had a bearing upon the depths of analysis</li> <li>• drew coherent conclusions based on a wide range and fully integrated comprehensive evidence from the passages to support their answers.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Standard specific comments</b></p> | <p>In the 2015, 91111 exam, over 40 percent of exam papers included answers in Chinese. Out of the 509 candidates who sat this standard, 221 papers were answered in either traditional or simplified Chinese. These candidates were likely to be native speakers of Chinese. The number did not account for suspected native speakers who answered in English. As a result, there were high numbers of Merit and low number of Not Achieved and Excellence. This can be explained as most native speakers would demonstrate clear understanding of the text, but failed to interpret evidence in their own words with reference to cultural knowledge.</p> |