

CHINESE LANGUAGE

Paper 8681/02
Reading and Writing

www.PapaCambridge.com

General comments

The majority of candidates performed well or extremely well on this paper. They engaged with the texts and were able to show good understanding of the information and ideas these contained. Although the quality of language demonstrated in written responses was generally good, there was some inappropriate use of expressions and grammatical structures.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a), (c) and (e) were usually answered correctly by candidates. (b) and (c) proved more demanding.

Question 2

Candidates had few problems coping with (a) and (b), but (c) proved more difficult.

Questions 3 and 4

Although the majority of candidates were able to show good levels of comprehension, there was a tendency for some to answer questions from general knowledge. These reading comprehension questions are intended to test the extent to which candidates have understood the texts on the question paper. Therefore marks were only awarded for information taken from these texts.

It is important that candidates try, wherever it seems reasonable, to use their own words when phrasing their answers and avoid merely lifting chunks from the original text.

Question 5

There were many excellent answers, where candidates were able to draw material from both texts in response to the summary element and add to this a convincing personal response.

Where candidates did not do as well, this was usually because they did not write a summary as required for (a) – instead they discussed their own ideas on the subject – or because they failed to provide the personal opinions required by (b).

CHINESE LANGUAGE

Paper 8681/03

Essay

General comments

Overall, the performance was satisfactory. The majority of candidates demonstrated their ability to write in Chinese and to argue their case in a convincing and logical manner. Most could write fluently and showed good mastery of Chinese characters.

With regard to use of language, the highest marks were awarded to candidates who used varied vocabulary and more sophisticated language, such as idioms, in order to engage the reader's interest.

As far as content is concerned, attention should be paid both to the quality of the ideas and the organisation of these ideas. In some instances, candidates had interesting ideas, but these were presented almost at random, with not enough attention given to presenting a coherent argument