

# Commentary on candidate evidence

## Candidate A

The evidence for this candidate has achieved **18 marks** for the Portfolio component of the course assessment component.

The candidate performed satisfactorily across the three categories: content, style and organisation.

The candidate chose 三国演义 as the literary reading, and specifically chose the character 曹操.

The candidate's choice of title "*How has Cao Cao's representation changed throughout history?*" does not elicit a critical or analytical response, although the candidate does demonstrate some features of an analytical and critical approach in the essay, with some attempt at developing an argument.

The work has some sense of structure by quoting the three accounts but the work is more descriptive than critical.

The candidate demonstrates some understanding of the focus of the study, such as at the end where the candidate summarised Cao Cao as still a very smart man, but that he doesn't cower away from confrontation. However, this doesn't expand on and provide analysis on how Cao Cao has changed throughout history. The work lacks coherence in places which impacts on the overall argument presented.

Nevertheless, there is some evidence from sources to support the conclusions made. Overall the work merits a mark of 18 but it would need more a lot more critical reflection to move to a higher pegged mark.

## Candidate B

The evidence for this candidate has achieved **6 marks** for the Portfolio component of the course assessment.

The candidate does not respond well across the three categories: content, style and organisation.

The candidate chose 中国二胎政策 as the topic to study and research.

The title "*What is the Chinese TWO-CHILD POLICY actual effect?*" is too general and is lacking in that it does not elicit a critical or analytical response. It doesn't provide a narrow enough focus to allow for deeper analysis.

The candidate adopts a merely informative approach and does not use critical terminology. The candidate has done a lot of research and also quoted some research online, but some of the work is not relevant to the title and it lacks his/her own opinion and analysis. The candidate wrote a lot about the reasons for having a 'two child' policy but demonstrates only a superficial understanding of the area of study.

## Candidate C

The evidence for this candidate has achieved **12 marks** for the Portfolio component of the course assessment.

The candidate chose 中国合伙人, a film to study. They supported their work with some online literacy. The essay title – *Achieving Prosperity after Times of Despair* -doesn't generate debate or critical analysis.

Inclusion of quotations in Chinese in this essay to support the arguments was good. However, the candidate has difficulty going beyond a merely informative approach. There was too much of a “story-telling” approach and insufficient critical analysis or evaluation. The candidate demonstrates some understanding of the study but it is like 观后感 rather than deeper analysis.

## Candidate D

The evidence for this candidate has achieved **15 marks** for the Portfolio component of the course assessment.

The candidate chose 三国演义 as the literary reading, and specifically, chose the character 诸葛亮.

First of all, the title "*How has Zhuge Liang's representation changed throughout history?*" The candidate choose a title that does not give rise to a critical or analytical response, although the candidate does show some features of an analytical and critical approach in the essay with some attempt at developing an argument.

The structure of the Portfolio is not clear enough. There is some evidence from sources to support the conclusions made, such as the film "Red Cliff". However, as the secondary source the film takes over the primary source. This essay offered little critical reflection.

The candidate demonstrates some understanding of the focus of the study, but a lot more critical terminology would be needed to support the candidate's own conclusion.