

Marking notes
Remarques pour la notation
Notas para la corrección

May / Mai / Mayo de 2021

Chinese / Chinois / Chino B

Higher level
Niveau supérieur
Nivel Superior

Paper / Épreuve / Prueba 1

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2021

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2021

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

Chinese B – Simplified version

Chinois B – Version simplifiée

Chino B – Versión simplificada

Criterion A: Language

How successfully does the candidate command written language?

- To what extent is the vocabulary appropriate and varied?
- To what extent are the grammatical structures varied?
- To what extent does the accuracy of the language contribute to effective communication?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<p>Command of the language is limited.</p> <p>Vocabulary is sometimes appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Some basic grammatical structures are used, with some attempts to use more complex structures.</p> <p>Language contains errors in both basic and more complex structures. Errors interfere with communication.</p>
4–6	<p>Command of the language is partially effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is generally appropriate to the task and varied.</p> <p>A variety of basic and some more complex grammatical structures is used.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate for basic structures, but errors occur in more complex structures. Errors at times interfere with communication.</p>
7–9	<p>Command of the language is effective and mostly accurate.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used effectively.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Occasional errors in basic and in complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>
10–12	<p>Command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and nuanced and varied in a manner that enhances the message, including the purposeful use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used selectively in order to enhance communication.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>

语言

考官应该记住不是所有的错误都有同等的重要性。有些错误严重影响意思上的沟通，有些并非如此。有些错误显示出缺乏语言的基本掌控，有些错误只是一时疏忽所致。

偶尔犯错：有不同难易度的错误，但只是偶尔发生的，比方考生平常可以表达过去时态，但偶尔疏忽犯错。

经常犯错：经常犯同样语法结构的错误，比如过去时态经常写错，不可靠，而且可能有语言基础上的混淆。（比方过去时态不同于现在完成）。

差距：某些句构很少写对，或者从来没出现过，比方需要表达过去时态，但并没出现。

Criterion B: Message

To what extent does the candidate fulfil the task?

- How relevant are the ideas to the task?
- To what extent are ideas developed?
- To what extent do the clarity and organization of ideas contribute to the successful delivery of the message?

The “descriptor unpacked” explain the assessment criteria in greater detail. Where a candidate’s response does not correspond exactly to a single mark band, the statements in bold should be used as a guide for the ‘best fit’ approach.

Marks	Level descriptor	Descriptor unpacked
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	
1–3	<p>The task is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Few ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are stated, but with no development.</p> <p>Ideas are not clearly presented and do not follow a logical structure, making the message difficult to determine.</p>	<p>The link between the response and task tends to be unclear; the reader has difficulty understanding the message.</p> <p>The response touches upon some aspects of the task but there is also much unrelated information.</p> <p>The response addresses the task in a simple manner, and supporting details and/or examples barely feature, if at all.</p> <p>The ideas do not link well together; inadequate or inappropriate use of cohesive devices confuse the message.</p>
4–6	<p>The task is generally fulfilled.</p> <p>Some ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are outlined, but are not fully developed.</p> <p>Ideas are generally clearly presented and the response is generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is mostly detectable; the reader’s general understanding of the message is not impeded, despite some ambiguity.</p> <p>The response covers some aspects of the task, or touches upon all aspects but superficially.</p> <p>The response includes some supporting details and examples.</p> <p>The ideas are organized in a logical way; some cohesive devices are used appropriately to aid the delivery of the message, although there may be areas of confusion at times.</p>
7–9	<p>The task is fulfilled.</p> <p>Most ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are developed well, with some detail and examples.</p> <p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical manner, supporting the delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is clear; the reader has a good understanding of the message conveyed.</p> <p>The response covers all aspects of the task, despite losing focus at times.</p> <p>The response uses supporting details and examples to clarify the message.</p> <p>The ideas are organized well; a range of cohesive devices are used appropriately to deliver the message with little or no ambiguity.</p>
10–12	<p>The task is fulfilled effectively.</p> <p>Ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is precise and consistently evident; the reader has a clear understanding of the message conveyed.</p> <p>The response covers all aspects of the task fully, and maintains focus throughout.</p>

	<p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical and coherent manner that supports the delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The response uses well-chosen supporting details and examples to illustrate and explain ideas persuasively.</p> <p>The ideas are organized well; a range of cohesive devices are used appropriately to deliver the message with clarity and ease.</p>
--	--	--

Note: When marking candidate responses, keep in mind that neither the **factual accuracy** of the information presented, nor the **validity** of the candidates’ personal opinions, are being assessed. Therefore, scripts that are factually inaccurate should not be marked down, provided the ideas presented have coherence and are sufficiently developed.

Criterion C: Conceptual understanding

To what extent does the candidate demonstrate conceptual understanding?

- To what extent is the choice of text type appropriate to the task?
- To what extent are register and tone appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task?
- To what extent does the response incorporate the conventions of the chosen text type?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<p>Conceptual understanding is limited.</p> <p>The choice of text type is generally inappropriate to the context, purpose or audience.</p> <p>The register and tone are inappropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task.</p> <p>The response incorporates limited recognizable conventions of the chosen text type.</p>
3–4	<p>Conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated.</p> <p>The choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The register and tone, while occasionally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task, fluctuate throughout the response.</p> <p>The response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type.</p>
5–6	<p>Conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated.</p> <p>The choice of text type is appropriate to the context, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The register and tone are appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task.</p> <p>The response fully incorporates the conventions of the chosen text type.</p>

Note: Examiners must balance all three elements in criterion C (choice of text type, appropriateness of tone and register, and use of text type conventions) to arrive at the final mark.

Question specific guidance (Criterion B and C)

问题一

最近你吃了很多不健康的快餐和垃圾食物，结果身体感到不适，所以你决定去看医生。说说自己目前的身体状况，怎么吃才能更健康以及摄取均衡饮食的重要性。

信

访谈

演讲稿

Criterion B:

- “不健康的快餐和垃圾食物”可由考生自己定义或举例，但必须明确地指出是这些食物造成了身体的不适，如何不适（如心跳加快、上吐下泻等）。
- 虽泛谈快餐和垃圾食物对身体的影响是可接受的，但原则是吃了“很多”不健康的快餐和垃圾食物。
- “怎么吃才健康”（比如烹饪的方法或不暴饮暴食等）和“摄取均衡饮食的重要性”（比如不同饮食/维生素对身体的好处等）的两个方面都需涵盖。这两个方面可一起讨论，但不可只谈到一个方面。

Criterion C:

文本类型选择:

	文本类型	说明
Appropriate	访谈	此文本类型适合两个人面对面交流，从一问一答的互动中得到问题的解答。
Generally appropriate	演讲稿	此文本类型适合表达对某种议题的个人看法，但必须有特定的受众，因此对受众的清楚界定至关重要（如受众是谁，为何他们是受众）。
Generally inappropriate	信	此文本类型可将个人讯息传达给特定的受众（如受众是谁，为何他/他们是受众）。信通常不是大众传媒文本。

注意：如果回答清楚说明了写作的情境、受众和目的，并且这些内容符合题目的要求，则可以将“通常适当”的文本类型视为“适当”，或将“通常不适当”的文本类型视为“通常适当”。

语体和语气:

- 半正式/正式语体;
- 语气认真，有时相对轻松。

请参阅附录所列出的文本类型格式。

问题二

你申请到了两个暑期实习工作机会。你非常兴奋，但只能选一个。比较这两个工作的优点与缺点，以及你最终决定的理由。

访谈

博客

日记

Criterion B:

- 介绍两个暑期实习工作，且两者之间应有其不同之处。
- 相对平均地讨论两个实习工作的优点与缺点，给出具体的例子。
- 说明最终决定的理由，具有说服力。
- 可接受考生将最终决定的理由和其所选工作之优点相结合。

Criterion C:

文本类型选择:

	文本类型	说明
Appropriate	日记	此文本类型适合表达个人在日常生活所遇到的问题或抒发个人的情感。
Generally appropriate	博客	此文本类型适合表达个人对某议题的看法以及提出建议，一般没有特定的受众。
Generally inappropriate	访谈	此文本类型适合两个人面对面交流，但必须有特定的受众，因此对受众的清楚界定至关重要（如受众是谁，为何他是受众）。访谈通常不是个人文本。

注意：如果回答清楚说明了写作的情境、受众和目的，并且这些内容符合题目的要求，则可以将“通常适当”的文本类型视为“适当”，或将“通常不适当”的文本类型视为“通常适当”。

语体和语气:

- 非正式/半正式语体；
- 语气相对理智果决，但可略显鱼与熊掌的两难。

请参阅附录所列出的文本类型格式。

问题三

每个国家都有移民。有人欢迎移民，也有人反对移民。谈谈你朋友的正面移民体验，以及分析移民对一个国家的利与弊。

博客

演讲稿

日记

Criterion B:

- 清楚描述朋友的正面移民体验，应有具体的细节。
- 分析移民对“一个国家”的利与弊，而非对“个人”的利与弊，否则属于不切题。但可同时分析移民对国家和个人的利与弊，前提是必须分析对国家的利与弊。
- 客观地分析移民的利与弊时，给出对等且充足的理由，且言之有物。

Criterion C:

文本类型选择:

	文本类型	说明
Appropriate	博客	此文本类型适合针对一般广大读者/受众表达对某议题的个人看法。一般没有特定的受众。
Generally appropriate	演讲稿	此文本类型适合针对某特定群体/受众表达对某议题的个人看法，对受众的清楚界定至关重要（如受众是谁，为何他们是受众）。
Generally inappropriate	日记	此文本类型适合表达个人在日常生活所遇到的问题或抒发个人的情感。日记通常不是大众传媒文本。

注意：如果回答清楚说明了写作的情境、受众和目的，并且这些内容符合题目的要求，则可以将“通常适当”的文本类型视为“适当”，或将“通常不适当”的文本类型视为“通常适当”。

语体和语气:

- 半正式/正式语体;
- 语气相对严肃。

请参阅附录所列出的文本类型格式。

Appendix: Text type conventions (Criterion C)

以下为文本类型最常见和可识别的格式要求

信 - 正式信函

- 开头得有称谓
- 很清楚的开头（问候语、写信目的）、信的主要内容和结束语（重申写信的目的）
- 结尾附上祝语、署名及日期

例如：

尊敬 / 敬爱的校长：

此致 / 敬祝 / 祝

敬礼！ / 教安！ / 工作顺利！

学生
署名
年月日

访谈

采访稿：

- 相关的标题 / 题目
- 作者姓名
- 清晰的前言与总结，清楚呈现访谈重点
- 以记者报导的形式，吸引读者阅读

演讲稿

- 第一人称（“我”作叙述），强调与受众的互动
- 开始能吸引听众的注意力，最后简洁地总结所述
- 开头有称谓，结尾表示感谢
- 运用演讲相关的语言、技巧，如提问及反复等

博客

- 相关的题目
- 博主的姓名、日期及时间
- 第一人称
- 具有与读者互动的意识

日记

- 开首一行写（年）月、日 / 星期 / 天气情况
 - 第一人称（“我”作叙述）
 - 写作方式是随性的
 - 有一个总结，如“今天就写到这里了”
-

Chinese B – Traditional version

Chinois B – Version traditionnelle

Chino B – Versión tradicional

Criterion A: Language

How successfully does the candidate command written language?

- To what extent is the vocabulary appropriate and varied?
- To what extent are the grammatical structures varied?
- To what extent does the accuracy of the language contribute to effective communication?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<p>Command of the language is limited.</p> <p>Vocabulary is sometimes appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Some basic grammatical structures are used, with some attempts to use more complex structures.</p> <p>Language contains errors in both basic and more complex structures. Errors interfere with communication.</p>
4–6	<p>Command of the language is partially effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is generally appropriate to the task and varied.</p> <p>A variety of basic and some more complex grammatical structures is used.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate for basic structures, but errors occur in more complex structures. Errors at times interfere with communication.</p>
7–9	<p>Command of the language is effective and mostly accurate.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used effectively.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Occasional errors in basic and in complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>
10–12	<p>Command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and nuanced and varied in a manner that enhances the message, including the purposeful use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used selectively in order to enhance communication.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>

語言

考官應該記住不是所有的錯誤都有同等的重要性。有些錯誤嚴重影響意思上的溝通，有些並非如此。有些錯誤顯示出缺乏語言的基本掌控，有些錯誤只是一時疏忽所致。

偶爾犯錯：有不同難易度的錯誤，但只是偶爾發生的，比方考生平常可以表達過去時態，但偶爾疏忽犯錯。

經常犯錯：經常犯同樣語法結構的錯誤，比如過去時態經常寫錯，不可靠，而且可能有語言基礎上的混淆。（比方過去時態不同於現在完成）。

差距：某些句構很少寫對，或者從來沒出現過，比方需要表達過去時態，但並沒出現。

Criterion B: Message

To what extent does the candidate fulfil the task?

- How relevant are the ideas to the task?
- To what extent are ideas developed?
- To what extent do the clarity and organization of ideas contribute to the successful delivery of the message?

The “descriptor unpacked” explain the assessment criteria in greater detail. Where a candidate’s response does not correspond exactly to a single mark band, the statements in bold should be used as a guide for the ‘best fit’ approach.

Marks	Level descriptor	Descriptor unpacked
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	
1–3	<p>The task is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Few ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are stated, but with no development.</p> <p>Ideas are not clearly presented and do not follow a logical structure, making the message difficult to determine.</p>	<p>The link between the response and task tends to be unclear; the reader has difficulty understanding the message.</p> <p>The response touches upon some aspects of the task but there is also much unrelated information.</p> <p>The response addresses the task in a simple manner, and supporting details and/or examples barely feature, if at all.</p> <p>The ideas do not link well together; inadequate or inappropriate use of cohesive devices confuse the message.</p>
4–6	<p>The task is generally fulfilled.</p> <p>Some ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are outlined, but are not fully developed.</p> <p>Ideas are generally clearly presented and the response is generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is mostly detectable; the reader’s general understanding of the message is not impeded, despite some ambiguity.</p> <p>The response covers some aspects of the task, or touches upon all aspects but superficially.</p> <p>The response includes some supporting details and examples.</p> <p>The ideas are organized in a logical way; some cohesive devices are used appropriately to aid the delivery of the message, although there may be areas of confusion at times.</p>
7–9	<p>The task is fulfilled.</p> <p>Most ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are developed well, with some detail and examples.</p> <p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical manner, supporting the delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is clear; the reader has a good understanding of the message conveyed.</p> <p>The response covers all aspects of the task, despite losing focus at times.</p> <p>The response uses supporting details and examples to clarify the message.</p> <p>The ideas are organized well; a range of cohesive devices are used appropriately to deliver the message with little or no ambiguity.</p>
10–12	<p>The task is fulfilled effectively.</p> <p>Ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples.</p>	<p>The link between the response and the task is precise and consistently evident; the reader has a clear understanding of the message conveyed.</p> <p>The response covers all aspects of the task fully, and maintains focus throughout.</p>

	<p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical and coherent manner that supports the delivery of the message.</p>	<p>The response uses well-chosen supporting details and examples to illustrate and explain ideas persuasively.</p> <p>The ideas are organized well; a range of cohesive devices are used appropriately to deliver the message with clarity and ease.</p>
--	--	--

Note: When marking candidate responses, keep in mind that neither the **factual accuracy** of the information presented, nor the **validity** of the candidates’ personal opinions, are being assessed. Therefore, scripts that are factually inaccurate should not be marked down, provided the ideas presented have coherence and are sufficiently developed.

Criterion C: Conceptual understanding

To what extent does the candidate demonstrate conceptual understanding?

- To what extent is the choice of text type appropriate to the task?
- To what extent are register and tone appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task?
- To what extent does the response incorporate the conventions of the chosen text type?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<p>Conceptual understanding is limited.</p> <p>The choice of text type is generally inappropriate to the context, purpose or audience.</p> <p>The register and tone are inappropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task.</p> <p>The response incorporates limited recognizable conventions of the chosen text type.</p>
3–4	<p>Conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated.</p> <p>The choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The register and tone, while occasionally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task, fluctuate throughout the response.</p> <p>The response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type.</p>
5–6	<p>Conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated.</p> <p>The choice of text type is appropriate to the context, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The register and tone are appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task.</p> <p>The response fully incorporates the conventions of the chosen text type.</p>

Note: Examiners must balance all three elements in criterion C (choice of text type, appropriateness of tone and register, and use of text type conventions) to arrive at the final mark.

Question specific guidance (Criterion B and C)

問題一

最近你吃了很多不健康的快餐和垃圾食物，結果身體感到不適，所以你決定去看醫生。說說自己目前的身體狀況，怎麼吃才能更健康以及攝取均衡飲食的重要性。

信

訪談

演講稿

Criterion B:

- 「不健康的快餐和垃圾食物」可由考生自己定義或舉例，但必須明確地指出是這些食物造成了身體的不適，如何不適（如心跳加快、上吐下瀉等）。
- 雖泛談快餐和垃圾食物對身體的影響是可接受的，但原則是吃了「很多」不健康的快餐和垃圾食物。
- 「怎麼吃才健康」（比如烹飪的方法或不暴飲暴食等）和「攝取均衡飲食的重要性」（比如不同飲食/維生素對身體的好處等）的兩個方面都需涵蓋。這兩個方面可一起討論，但不可只談到一個方面。

Criterion C:

文本類型選擇：

	文本類型	說明
Appropriate	訪談	此文本類型適合兩個人面對面交流，從一問一答的互動中得到問題的解答。
Generally appropriate	演講稿	此文本類型適合表達對某種議題的個人看法，但必須有特定的受眾，因此對受眾的清楚界定至關重要（如受眾是誰，為何他們是受眾）。
Generally inappropriate	信	此文本類型可將個人訊息傳達給特定的受眾（如受眾是誰，為何他/他們是受眾）。信通常不是大眾傳媒文本。

注意：如果回答清楚說明了寫作的情境、受眾和目的，並且這些內容符合題目的要求，則可以將「通常適當」的文本類型視為「適當」，或將「通常不適當」的文本類型視為「通常適當」。

語體和語氣：

- 半正式/正式語體；
- 語氣認真，有時相對輕鬆。

請參閱附錄所列出的文本類型格式。

問題二

你申請到了兩個暑期實習工作機會。你非常興奮，但只能選一個。比較這兩個工作的優點與缺點，以及你最終決定的理由。

訪談

博客

日記

Criterion B:

- 介紹兩個暑期實習工作，且兩者之間應有其不同之處。
- 相對平均地討論兩個實習工作的優點與缺點，給出具體的例子。
- 說明最終決定的理由，具有說服力。
- 可接受考生將最終決定的理由和其所選工作之優點相結合。

Criterion C:

文本類型選擇：

	文本類型	說明
Appropriate	日記	此文本類型適合表達個人在日常生活所遇到的問題或抒發個人的情感。
Generally appropriate	博客	此文本類型適合表達個人對某議題的看法以及提出建議，一般沒有特定的受眾。
Generally inappropriate	訪談	此文本類型適合兩個人面對面交流，但必須有特定的受眾，因此對受眾的清楚界定至關重要（如受眾是誰，為何他是受眾）。訪談通常不是個人文本。

注意：如果回答清楚說明了寫作的情境、受眾和目的，並且這些內容符合題目的要求，則可以將「通常適當」的文本類型視為「適當」，或將「通常不適當」的文本類型視為「通常適當」。

語體和語氣：

- 非正式/半正式語體；
- 語氣相對理智果決，但可略顯魚與熊掌的兩難。

請參閱附錄所列出的文本類型格式。

問題三

每個國家都有移民。有人歡迎移民，也有人反對移民。談談你朋友的正面移民體驗，以及分析移民對一個國家的利與弊。

博客

演講稿

日記

Criterion B:

- 清楚描述朋友的正面移民體驗，應有具體的細節。
- 分析移民對「一個國家」的利與弊，而非對「個人」的利與弊，否則屬於不切題。但可同時分析移民對國家和個人的利與弊，前提是必須分析對國家的利與弊。
- 客觀地分析移民的利與弊時，給出對等且充足的理由，且言之有物。

Criterion C:

文本類型選擇：

	文本類型	說明
Appropriate	博客	此文本類型適合針對一般廣大讀者/受眾表達對某議題的個人看法。一般沒有特定的受眾。
Generally appropriate	演講稿	此文本類型適合針對某特定群體/受眾表達對某議題的個人看法，對受眾的清楚界定至關重要（如受眾是誰，為何他們是受眾）。
Generally inappropriate	日記	此文本類型適合表達個人在日常生活所遇到的問題或抒發個人的情感。日記通常不是大眾傳媒文本。

注意：如果回答清楚說明了寫作的情境、受眾和目的，並且這些內容符合題目的要求，則可以將「通常適當」的文本類型視為「適當」，或將「通常不適當」的文本類型視為「通常適當」。

語體和語氣：

- 半正式/正式語體；
- 語氣相對嚴肅。

請參閱附錄所列出的文本類型格式。

Appendix: Text type conventions (Criterion C)

以下為文本類型最常見和可識別的格式要求

信 - 個人信件

- 開頭得有稱謂
- 要有很清楚的開頭（問候語、為什麼寫這封信）、信的主要內容和結尾
- 結尾附上祝語、署名及日期。例如：

親愛的XX：
祝
生日快樂！

署名（避免連名帶姓）
年月日

- 日期可以只標上月、日，但是次序不可顛倒
- 很清楚地看出這封信是寫給誰

訪談

採訪稿：

- 相關的標題 / 題目
- 作者姓名
- 清晰的前言與總結，清楚呈現訪談重點
- 以記者報導的形式，吸引讀者閱讀

演講稿 / 口頭報告

- 第一人稱（「我」作敘述），強調與受眾的互動
- 開始能吸引聽眾的注意力，最後簡潔地總結所述
- 開頭有稱謂，結尾表示感謝
- 運用演講相關的語言、技巧，如提問及反復等

博客

- 相關的題目
- 博主的姓名、日期及時間
- 第一人稱
- 具有與讀者互動的意識

日記

- 開首一行寫（年）月、日 / 星期 / 天氣情況
 - 第一人稱（「我」作敘述）
 - 寫作方式是隨性的
 - 有一個總結，如「今天就寫到這裡了」
-