



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Chinese (1CNo)
Paper 1H: Listening and
understanding in Chinese

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

Summer 2024

Publications Code 1CN0_1H_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

As in previous recent years, only vocabulary listed on the Minimum Core Vocabulary (MCV) list was used in preparing the examination paper, and topic areas tested were drawn from across the specification. As is usual at this level, most candidates handled the 'crossover' questions (1-4) very well, with questions 6, 7 and 9 (those that require a written answer) presenting more of a challenge to candidates; this was often not because of a failure to comprehend, but because of the standard of English used, meaning that answers were not clear enough or were open to misinterpretation.

There follow comments on the individual questions, where it is thought these might be useful to teachers/candidates preparing for future examinations:

Q1-4 ('crossover')

Firstly, a couple of general points about these 4 tasks that one would have thought unnecessary, given the relative familiarity that teachers and candidates must have with this specification by now:

- in questions 1 and 4, use **only** the words given as options, and only give **one** answer.
- in question 3, do **not** mark more than three answers. In cases where unsure, there is no sense in marking fewer than three: you might as well guess!

Q1

Some candidates chose answers that made no sense in English when read after the given stem; this is one exercise where the reading time could be used to quickly mark which answers are possible for which sub-question. It is true that several options would work for (c), but (e), for example, only has two possibilities. In sub-question (b), many candidates seemed to confuse 春天 and 秋天, but the mention of spring was, in fact, a distractor: it was the reference to Christmas that, through inference, gave the actual answer (winter).

Q2

Parts (ii) and (iv) were the most challenging parts of the question, probably due to the inferential nature of the tasks. In part (ii) candidates had to deal with a conditional situation 如果 and the implied wish in 我会更高兴. Part (iv) was in some ways a 'holistic' question, needing the listener to have understood Meiyang's comments throughout the dialogue.

Q3

Even amongst those at the higher end of the ability range, the average score for this question was 2 (out of 3). Many appeared to misunderstand 从小 as meaning when a teenager, as opposed to when she was a child.

Non-crossover questions

Q5

For the cohort as a whole, this multiple-choice question was a relatively 'easy' task, despite the fairly long phrases in (i) and (ii). For the candidates at whom this question was aimed, most of the vocabulary should have been familiar; it was simply a matter of 'converting' what was heard into something that matched the possible answers.

Q7

As this is a question that needs written answers, some candidates struggled to formulate their answers clearly, but despite this, overall many achieved a good mark on the question. Most recognised 大学..毕业 in answer to (a), although there was considerable variation in the spelling of 'graduation'!

It was important to note that (e) asks what Dawei's comment **shows** about the restaurant, not what he **says**. Thus, to say that the restaurant was famous or that you had to wait until next year to get a table was not the answer as this is clearly stated in what Dawei says.

Q8

For candidates familiar with vocabulary around the theme of environment, this task should not have been too demanding (and in fact, across the cohort as a whole, the statistics class this question as 'easy'). The format (multiple-choice) is also easier to deal with than that of the preceding and following questions. At all ability levels, part (b) was answered more successfully than part (a). This was perhaps because in (i) and (iii) of part (a) in particular, candidates were not given the necessary information directly, but had to infer the answer from what was said.

Q9

This question is aimed at the higher end of the ability range and as such, it is not surprising to find that most candidates achieving a 4/5 grade on this paper gained very few marks on this task. Even for those working at grade 7 level, the average mark was 1-2 for each section.

(It should be noted that candidates for whom the geography of the situation was perhaps unfamiliar were not penalised for muddling up Shenzhen and Guangzhou.)

Part (a)

Answers to sub-question (iv) frequently demonstrated that in a question like this that needs a written answer, it is very important to read the question properly before answering. Many candidates wrote something like 'he does not need to show his passport', but this was only correct for Shenzhen, not Hong Kong. Another common error was to use a verb like 'check' which can apply to the immigration officer, but **not** to the speaker himself.

Sub-question (v) also gave rise to answers that were not clear enough: answers such as 'cup of tea' or 'drink a cup of tea' did not make clear the link between the time taken to drink a cup of tea and the duration of the journey. (Answers that turned the tea into coffee were also rejected!)

Part (b)

In sub-question (iv) candidates needed to make the comparison clear: it was not enough to say the trip to Hong Kong (by train) was 'faster than driving' as this could mean driving to Hong Kong and that is not the comparison being drawn here. It was important to clarify that the train journey to Hong Kong was being compared to driving to (a shopping centre in) Guangzhou. (As stated above, Shenzhen was not penalised here.)