

# GENERAL PAPER

---

Paper 8001/11

Paper 11

## General comments

The best essays were written in a fluent style and demonstrated the use of appropriate idiom. They were grammatically correct, with good paragraphing and few shortcomings in punctuation and spelling. There was welcome evidence that candidates in some Centres had edited their English thoroughly and systematically before handing in their work. This avoids the loss of marks for careless, avoidable errors.

The improvement in the structuring of essays has been maintained by the majority of Centres. Introductions now usually prepare the ground for what is to follow with clarity and without unnecessary detail. Conclusions are, however, less well written. They are inclined to repeat the main points of the essay, often in the style of a shopping list, without sufficient reference to major points and without pulling the threads of the argument together. This often leads to the personal view of the candidate being glossed over or even omitted.

The following points embracing Use of English, essay technique and content are presented in bullet points style in the hope that this will make them more accessible to candidates and therefore easier to remember.

- take time to read **all** questions very carefully **before** making your choice
- scrutinise the **wording** of the chosen questions
- If you are not **absolutely** sure of the **precise** meaning of the question, do **not** attempt it
- do **not** write all you know about the topic - **answer** the question
- prepare an essay plan which remains **focused** on the question as set
- ensure the plan shows that you have sufficient/knowledge to meet the **requirements of the question**
- check and edit the essay **structure** regarding introduction, main body and conclusion
- illustrate your **major** points with appropriate **examples** (local/national/international)
- leave **enough** time to check your work
- ensure you have answered the question **as set** without superfluous **digression**
- check your English **systematically** correcting any **careless** errors.

Examiners saw a number of poorly presented scripts. Deficiencies included scarcely legible handwriting, no margins on the answer paper and no question numbers being provided. Rough work was sometimes not crossed out.

## **Use of time**

No candidates encountered problems coping with the time allowance on this syllabus. Candidates should remember that the recommended length of essays is about 500 words. Essays of fewer than 375 words have marks deducted proportionally for the Use of English. Candidates should also leave sufficient time towards the end of the examination to check for careless errors in the English. A minority of candidates do not plan properly. They write chunks of prose and then cross it out if they are unhappy with it or they start questions and then change their minds and start again on a different question.. This is obviously very poor utilisation of precious time

## **Use of English**

Some candidates have virtually full operational command of the language and therefore score highly in the Use of English mark, but the weakest candidates are unable to express themselves with any real accuracy which often means that the content can be obscured.. In most cases, even if the English is not totally accurate or the idiom is sometimes not fully appropriate, there is no real problem following the points that the candidate is attempting to make.

Some candidates often have a wide range of vocabulary at their disposal but are not always able to use these words appropriately in the correct context.

Use of English Marks can be lost all too easily through basic errors, examples of which are listed below:

- subject/verb non-agreement
- missing endings on plural nouns because of carelessness and/or poor checking
- the pronoun 'one' can not be followed by 'they'/'their'
- frequent incorrect use of definite and indefinite articles
- confusion between their/there, to/too, here/hear, crisis/crises and practice/practise
- incorrect use of apostrophes
- incorrect comparative forms such as more easier/more richer/more harder
- incorrect use of commas leading to loss and/or ambiguity of meaning
- words not separated e.g. 'alot' 'infact' 'aswell'
- use of 'etc.'
- misused idiom such as 'fingercounted'
- 'in a nutshell' is colloquial and not suitable as the opening of the concluding paragraph
- e.g. incorrectly rendered as 'for e.g.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

This was a fairly popular question. Stronger answers took the cost of wars into account but were also able to point out the errors made in the sub-prime and banking sectors and the failure of regulatory bodies to control the amount of debt being incurred. Weaker answers failed to mention irresponsible lending and borrowing at individual, corporate and governmental levels but focused on the cost of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

#### **Question 2**

A popular question and usually well answered. Candidates were aware of the various benefits e.g. inflowing foreign currency, employment creation, and gains in local and national income. They were also conscious of environmental degradation caused by crowds of visitors to some natural attractions. Most candidates responded to the key words 'your country' and did not digress into a general discussion on tourism.

#### **Question 3**

Not very popular and not done particularly well. Many candidates made scant reference to religion and those that did were unable to provide much in the way of convincing examples to support their main points. A minority of candidates completely lost their way on this question and tended to be repetitive rather than developing a logical argument.

#### **Question 4**

Reasonably popular with some good answers comparing public and private transport in their respective countries. Due attention was paid to economic and social issues with cost being a major factor. There was a tendency in a few answers to confuse 'efficiency' and convenience and a rather naïve assumption that public demand will always produce the best service.

#### **Question 5**

A moderately popular topic, but not always well answered. A sizeable minority of candidates were content to state at length everything they had heard about global warming which they saw as an incontestable truth. These candidates did not make any convincing link to population growth. Better responses focused fully on how population growth, particularly in developing countries, could cause such things as poverty, a severe depletion of resources and destruction of habitats. It was emphasised that all these negative aspects could potentially become a greater problem if substantial climate change should take place.

#### **Question 6**

There were very few answers to this question and good responses were rare. Most essays lacked detail and illustrative examples and therefore tended towards superficiality. The focus on 'language' in the question was ignored by most. Very few demonstrated that mathematicians can understand and communicate with

colleagues through equations and formulae even if they are unable to communicate in their respective native languages.

#### **Question 7**

Quite a popular question which was reasonably well answered. Most candidates presented the more obvious but relevant points about saving time and money and they rightly stressed the immediacy of the contacts avoiding all the stressful aspects of international travel. The best answers showed how video conferencing works best when the participants have already established a personal, social relationship emanating from mutual trust.

#### **Question 8**

There were very few takers for this question, but a number of very good answers were read. These successful candidates gave a variety of relevant examples on valuable knowledge that had been gained thanks to observatories and telescopes e.g. the nature of black holes, the nature of matter and energy, and the more detailed information gleaned from the imaged recorded by the Hubble telescope.

#### **Question 9**

This question was quite popular. Weaker responses were largely descriptive of what was on offer in their particular country without developing any critical analysis leading to a judgement on the quality of the TV programmes, which the set question was requiring. They were generally not well illustrated. Better answers focused on the question and points were illustrated by apt examples. They expressed personal opinions based on the range of choice with a sensible balance between such elements as light entertainment, educational and informative programmes sport, soaps and unbiased, uncensored news reporting

#### **Question 10**

The few answers to this question were, with few exceptions, of a high standard. The best responses featured 'art' in the widest sense to include music, graphics, photography and story-telling. Points were well developed and supported by memorable examples. Thus the majority of candidates succeeded in arguing that advertising really can be an art form.

#### **Question 11**

This was a very popular choice. Good responses gave the reader a real feel for the particular qualities of the chosen composer and selected relevant examples of their work to demonstrate the nature of the often emotive appeal. Unfortunately, quite a few candidates did not seize the chance to probe deeply into why they favoured a certain composer. They provided few illuminating examples although this question cries out for relevant examples.

#### **Question 12**

This was not too popular, but the percentage of satisfactory to good answers was high. Most candidates identified a number or reasons for the growing popularity of digital photography. These included steadily falling purchase prices for digital cameras despite ever improving technical specifications, cost effectiveness/ease of use, compatibility with computers for storage and cropping/reshaping, instant previews of pictures with delete facility and easy transmission by email.

# GENERAL PAPER

---

Paper 8001/12

Paper 12

## General comments

The improvement in the structuring of essays has been maintained. Introductions now usually prepare the ground for what is to follow with clarity and without unnecessary detail. In too many responses however, conclusions are still not well written. They are inclined to repeat the main points of the essay, often in the style of a shopping list, without sufficient reference to major points and without pulling the threads of the argument together. This often leads to the personal view of the candidate being glossed over or even omitted.

The standard of English seen this year covered the whole range. The best essays were written in a fluent style and demonstrated the use of appropriate idiom. They were grammatically correct, with good paragraphing and few shortcomings in punctuation and spelling. Weaker scripts contained errors of all kinds so that it was often difficult or at times impossible, to deduce the meaning.

There was welcome evidence that some candidates had edited their English thoroughly and systematically before handing in their work. This avoids the loss of marks for careless, avoidable errors.

The following points embracing Use of English, essay technique and content are presented in bullet points style in the hope that this will make them more accessible to candidates and therefore easier to remember.

- take time to read **all** questions very carefully **before** making your choice
- scrutinise the **wording** of the chosen questions
- If you are not **absolutely** sure of the **precise** meaning of the question, do **not** attempt it
- do **not** write all you know about the topic - **answer** the question
- prepare an essay plan which remains **focused** on the question as set
- ensure the plan shows that you have sufficient/knowledge to meet the **requirements of the question**
- check and edit the essay **structure** regarding introduction, main body and conclusion
- illustrate your **major** points with appropriate **examples** (local/national/international)
- leave **enough** time to check your work
- ensure you have answered the question **as set** without superfluous **digression**
- check your English **systematically** correcting any **careless** errors

There were a number of poorly presented scripts this year. Deficiencies included scarcely legible handwriting, no margins on the answer paper and no question numbers being provided. Rough work was sometimes not crossed out.

## **Use of time**

Almost all candidates coped well with the time allowance. The vast majority of responses also adhered to the guidelines as regards length. Unfortunately, a number of candidates did not check their work for careless errors in the English. Most candidates planned their work properly, but some wrote chunks of prose and then crossed everything out. Some started questions and then changed their minds and started again on a different question.

## **Use of English**

Some candidates showed a full operational command of the language and therefore score highly in the Use of English mark. In most cases, even if the English was not totally accurate or the idiom was sometimes not fully appropriate, there was no real problem following the points that the candidate was attempting to make. Some, however, were unable to express themselves with any real accuracy. In turn, that often meant that their arguments were obscured.

Some candidates often have a wide range of vocabulary at their disposal, but are not always able to use these words appropriately in the correct context. A systematic eradication of these rudimentary errors, examples of which are listed below, is the quickest and surest route to higher marks for the use of English element.

- subject/verb non-agreement.
- missing endings on plural nouns because of carelessness and/or poor checking
- the pronoun 'one' can not be followed by 'they'/'their'
- frequent incorrect use of definite and indefinite articles
- confusion between their/there, to/too, here/hear, crisis/crises and practice/practise
- incorrect use of apostrophes
- incorrect comparative forms such as more easier/more richer/more harder
- incorrect use of commas leading to loss and/or ambiguity of meaning
- words not separated e.g. 'alot' 'infact' 'aswell'
- use of 'etc.' to be avoided
- misused idiom such as 'fingercounted'
- 'in a nutshell' is colloquial and not suitable as the opening of the concluding paragraph
- e.g. incorrectly rendered as 'for e.g.'

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

Moderately popular. There were some strong answers to this question which focused on National Parks and National Heritage sites, naming them and exploring how they had been and were being developed. Several answers showed a lack of understanding of eco-tourism and produced answers on tourism in general. The "Eco" of "Ecotourism" was misunderstood by some candidates to mean "economic tourism", which led to answers which explored "business travellers" which was difficult to make relevant. Other answers examined "holiday tourism" which frequently contained tangential material.

#### **Question 2**

Not many takers for this question. Those who explored what the phrase meant and related it to examples tended to be more successful. The word 'opium' has many implications - which led to some interesting explorations in several answers. Few answers focused on the word 'accusation' in the question. Many answers, however, lacked a clear focus on the phrase 'opium of the people'. Instead, their essay explored religion in general – which was not the question set.

#### **Question 3**

A reasonably popular question. There was evidence of a good understanding of the question, some candidates found the terms of the question difficult to explore and there was either a failure to specify "civilisation" or there was a very muddled interpretation. A number of general answers saw the question as an opportunity to discuss all the elements where equal opportunities are not evident in their society and what can be done about this. This approach did not directly focus on the key terms of the question.

#### **Question 4**

Did not attract many candidates. This question allowed candidates to explore the idea of democracy, although many answers used this as an opportunity to write about democracy compared to dictatorships and did not explore the concepts of democracy being 'imposed' or growing 'naturally' and what exactly this could mean. Many explored how democracy can affect society in a positive and a negative manner, such as the role of the media and the lengthy process of getting anything done in a democracy, which was an interesting approach.

### Question 5

This question was very popular and produced a wide range of answers, some of which were excellent in detail and quality; others lacked real understanding of what the question was asking. The more successful answers explained the typical characteristics of developing countries, including China and Pakistan, and gave some good examples of what industries they had which were contributing to the current worldwide environmental concerns. These answers assessed clearly 'to what extent' these countries could limit their industrial output and how fair this was compared to what the so-called developing countries, such as the US and the UK, were doing. Candidates sometimes struggled with the concept of 'developing countries' with one suggesting USA as an example. A number of candidates missed the moral and ethical issues underlying this topic and did not raise the question of the controversial stance of western developed countries which generate very high levels of pollution per capita and more subtly, "export" high levels of pollution by buying manufactured products from less developed countries, whilst preaching economy and prudence. This limited responses to frequently well informed essays on the methods available to limit environmental damage, often failing to examine "to what extent" and "should".

### Question 6

There were very few answers to this question. Successful responses explored more than one mathematician and their contribution, not only to mathematics, but answered the question which focuses on how they have 'greatly influenced the modern world'. Favourite choices included Galileo and Pythagoras. The less successful answers chose one mathematician and merely narrated vague details of what they did, with some unclear examples of how this affects our world today.

### Question 7

This was a very popular question and there were many successful answers that explored the kind of technology that facilitates the transmission of news, with the focus being on speed and the debate of how accurate such information was. 'News' meant many different things from international affairs, to more localised stories to family news and even issues such as music. Some answers began to include irrelevant material about Internet pornography and illegal activities such as terrorists communicating using Twitter, Facebook and mobile phones.

A small number of candidates chose to argue about the pros and cons of technology, which was not what the question was asking. A number of other responses did not focus on the 'news' aspect of the question at all, which led to vague and irrelevant answers.

### Question 8

This was a very popular question. Those candidates who responded well had a good knowledge of recent disasters. Candidates, for example, discussed the Pakistan 2005 earthquake and 2010 floods. Many others discussed recent tsunamis, hurricanes and landslides.

Some essays were off the point, exploring the "impact of the greenhouse effect on global warming and the subsequent effect on climate, weather and subsequent natural disasters", rather than all types of natural disaster.

### Question 9

Better answers explored a variety of contexts where it is important to write and speak using good grammar, such as in formal situations, whilst more 'chatty' grammar was seen as more appropriate when speaking to friends. Some answers merely looked at the written word and not at spoken grammar and vice versa. Many answers lacked specific examples to illustrate the valid points being made.

### Question 10

Few candidates chose this and few wrote an answer to the question set. Some explored music and other forms of expression such as poetry that could not be justified as 'art'. Several wrote about the value of works of art, but did not consider their monetary worth. Answers that did not name any specific examples of works of art that are worth large amounts of money could not score well.



### Question 11

This was a very popular choice. There were a good number of successful responses which were full of examples. A number selected one genre of music and offered detailed, personal insight, perception with a well-informed exploration of illustrations which were selected in support of their argument. A number of less successful answers did not mention any specific examples of artists or pieces of music/songs, and tended to range through a vast array of different genres of music, which defeated the purpose of the question which was to focus on the 'most appealing' type of music. Many answers were about the general appeal of music and not the candidates own personal choice. Those that did focus on 'slow music' or 'rock' hardly mentioned any artists or songs. Some choices were so wide as to be meaningless; one candidate had chosen the genre 'classic' and included Schoenberg and Michael Jackson. Few candidates seemed able to give reasons beyond 'relaxing', 'relieved stress', 'made them feel like dancing'.

### Question 12

There were not many answers to this question. Better answers explored crafts still practised in their society, such as basket weaving, pottery and rug making, whilst others only generally mentioned 'crafts' without specifically exploring what these were and ignored the second part of the question completely. Almost all who answered this question did focus on their own society, but not all answers looked at how these crafts were being 'maintained and supported' either by the government or by the public in general. Those that did explore how tourism affects this industry and how the government provides subsidies were more successful.

# GENERAL PAPER

---

Paper 8001/21

Paper 21

## General comments

**Question 2** was the most popular this year. Next came **Question 3** while **Question 1** was tackled by only a handful of candidates. There was a slight rise in the number attempting more than one question, with the weakest selecting bits and pieces of all three n- teachers are asked to remind their candidates that they must answer only one question on this paper. There was no evidence that any candidate was pushed for time. The length of an answer remained a serious issue, however, with many candidates exceeding the word-limit before they had established more than one relevant point. Anything that is written beyond the word limit cannot receive any credit. Where rough work had been undertaken, it seemed to have led to more effective answers. Marks, however, were frequently lost when the precise requirements of an assignment had not been fully ascertained. As regards use of English, most answers were carefully expressed so their meaning was seldom in doubt. Almost every candidate wrote in continuous prose, as required. Candidates seemed far more prepared to use their own words than on some previous occasions. That was most pleasing to see. Once in a while, however, poor handwriting posed problems of legibility.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

Candidates needed to interpret the material provided and be persuasive in their answers. Most answers were, however, only paraphrases or summaries of that material, reproduced without any attempt to interpret it or be persuasive. Whereas the bare bones of the account in 'The Weekly Sentinel' of the course and aftermath of the Kurebo Holocaust were reproduced accurately enough, nuances in the dialogue between Inwo and Jubka were often missed. As a result, most responses to virtually every question were superficial.

- (a) What was said by Inwo and Jubka was generally taken at face value. For example, Inwo's outburst against the irresponsible or ignorant farmers was explained in terms of what they had done or not done, without any light having been shed on his hardline attitude or inflexible character. Most candidates realized how gullible Inwo was when it came to the pronouncements of the media. Not so many spotted what lay behind the caveats of the complex and subtle Jubka.
- (b) Every candidate was able to identify some spheres in which the Kurebo authorities had done well in response to the bush fires. Most answers, however, remained strictly matter-of-fact, with no flavour of the judgemental. Such paragraphs were composed as a plain narrative, with no hint of how they might appear in an official report.
- (c) The more obvious shortcomings of the authorities were usually highlighted, such as their failure to regulate potentially dangerous farming practices or make adequate provision for the outbreak of widespread fires. Some candidates, however, sometimes made totally unreasonable stipulations, such as that firemen should be on the scene and in action before any conflagration had occurred. As with **Question 1 (b)**, facts sometimes eclipsed conclusions.
- (d) Candidates were more at home with specific instances of Hermes' dereliction of duty than with any kind of reasoned refutation of his claim that immediate priorities came first. Hermes' motives, however, were sometimes called into question. Only one candidate contrasted the magnitude of the bush fires with the insignificance of the misadventure to the cooking pot. One candidate quoted general principles such as 'orders are orders.'



## Question 2

Most candidates found much material to use that was accessible in the information provided on all three members of the Senior Management Team. As a result, many points were well made and relatively few totally misinterpreted. In consequence, most candidates scored quite well in the first two assignments (unless marks had been thrown away because of extensive 'lifting' from the text or through blatant flouting of word-limits). Some got themselves into difficulties through careless reading of the wording of the third assignment. In an exercise such as this, candidates need to study the material carefully before they decide they are going to answer the question because they will need that overall and detailed understanding for every sub-part question.

- a)** Most candidates were inclined to jettison Henry Ordoma and retain Felix Momsenta. The more astute considered Ordoma's age in the context of impending retirement and, in view of his previous track record, concluded, perhaps somewhat cynically, that he would put up the least opposition to being made redundant. Some candidates, however, tended to confuse poor time-keeping with his absenteeism whilst some exaggerated the effects of his fondness for gossip. Much emphasis was rightly placed on his resistance to change. On the other hand, the difficulty of replacing him as a traditional craftsman was sometimes overlooked by those who claimed that there were lots of youngsters who could take over his job. As in the next question, some candidates wasted words by trying to balance Ordoma's merits and defects instead of concentrating on the strongest reasons to ask him to go.
- (b)** Almost without exception, candidates realized that the price of sacking Felix Momsenta was too high, once his family connections had been taken into account. If they maintained that he would be a substantial source of future investment, they overlooked how seriously he had been affected by the recession. Their gloss on his character also could be challenged when they assumed that he would work all hours of the day to recoup his losses. Still, the Managing Director's sour comment that Felix Momsenta played too much golf was quite often successfully rebutted on the grounds that his partners on the links might be existing or potential customers. Some candidates had not appreciated that his great grandfather, the founder of the firm, was, in all probability, long since dead.
- (c)** Identifying one obviously irrelevant comment is a common task on this Paper. Some candidates realized that having children in the Armed Forces was purely a family matter. Quite a few dismissed Grace Nautienne's biscuits as an optional extra, whilst others suggested that Henry Ordoma should be at liberty to do what he wanted in his spare time without feeling that it was any concern of the firm. A less convincing case could have been made for several other comments having little or no bearing on the situation under consideration. What was remarkable, though, this year, was that a remarkable number of candidates overlooked the use of the singular verb 'has' in 'Which of the thirty comments... has... the least relevance...?' and proceeded to select two, three or even nine remarks for their attention.
- (d)** Most sound answers outlined the way in which a local business, such as a chocolate-manufacturer or tourist attraction, could struggle or become bankrupt once it ran out of income, credit, stock in trade, workforce and customers. In such instances, judicious use was made of effective detail. Exceptional candidates legitimately described the positive effects of the recession on a firm that had profited from the financial problems faced in the area in which it was located. Many answers talked about issues not directly related to recession, such as laziness, incompetence, corruption or counterproductive promotions, or to revert to obviously prepared textbook material on general economic causes and effects within a national or international context.

## Question 3

Almost no candidates showed any difficulty in dealing with the subject matter or vocabulary of the piece set for comprehension. Most candidates coped fairly well with questions calling for identification or explanation of individual words or phrases. When they had to summarize, interpret or react to more substantial passages, however, some were less successful.

- (a)** Almost every candidate picked out the references to Google and the Big Bang while they usually tracked down 'our Neanderthal cousins' as our humanoid predecessors. A few pushed Darwin and Galileo into prehistory. Not many, however, worked out that the only evidence for the article having

been written towards the end of 2008, rather than at the start of 2009, was the mention of 'this August.'

- (b) Weaker answers only quoted from the text, despite the injunction to use their own words, when hunting for clues to suggest that the swift advance of science was by no means a foregone conclusion. Some referred rather vaguely to government laws or financial difficulties without specifying what these were.
- (c) A pleasing number of candidates methodically worked through the whole article to establish how much of it directly related to Darwin and Galileo. On the other hand, some wasted precious time producing long lists of developments when one example would have sufficed at every stage. A key requirement here was to use relevant detail. Not everyone seemed to understand that and wrote a very general answer.
- (d) A candidate with, for example, a genuine concern over an inherited disease which might, one day, be diagnosed and treated more effectively, was bound to score well. On the other hand, prepared material on, for instance, how the nations might be coping with global warming or replacing shrinking fossil fuels was never going to score well. Equally, those who did not write about how a particular sphere of research might affect them personally in the future could not score many marks.
- (e) (i) and (ii) The question asked for six definitions, but gave answers to eight.. Such answers could not gain any credit for their two extra answers, and wasted precious examination time.
- (i) An interesting range of acceptable definitions were produced for 'alleviate' and 'prestige', but not so many for 'coherent' and 'fusion.' Answers that did not work included 'machines' for 'devices' and 'opposing views' for 'controversies.' Most candidates resisted the temptation to define 'wealth' in this particular context as 'riches.'
- (ii) Reading the question is essential in every examination. Marks were sacrificed by some candidates because they illustrated 'controversy' instead of 'controversies' and 'device' instead of 'devices.' A significant number accidentally composed two simple sentences when they were aiming to produce one that was complex. Had they used a colon or semi colon rather than a comma at the critical juncture, they would probably have passed muster. The most common mistake, however, was to employ a chosen word in a perfectly natural way but without making its meaning absolutely clear, as in 'The prestige of the firm was at stake' where 'survival' or 'viability' would have made as much sense as 'prestige.'



# GENERAL PAPER

---

Paper 8001/22

Paper 22

## General comments

All three questions attracted a high number of responses. This is very pleasing because, the comprehension question used to attract the majority of answers. With the other two questions just as popular now, candidates are giving more thought to their choice of question and responding to the one that suits them best. This is very welcome because consideration of all possibilities is in the interest of each candidate.

Very few candidates attempted more than one question. There seemed few if any instances of candidates running out of time. There was a welcome improvement in English usage. Many candidates wrote fluently and with a width of vocabulary. The majority had at least a fairly clear understanding of the text. Most also composed their own sentences – the reduction in cases of candidates “lifting” material from the question paper was especially pleasing.

Teachers can help their candidates to save precious examination time by making clear that writing the question or providing an introduction of several sentences is a waste of time. No credit is given for either. The need for economy is of paramount importance in this paper. The other basic message to get across concerns the importance of the word limit often set in questions. Too many candidates failed to follow the instructions on this. If a candidate writes a two hundred word answer when only one hundred words are required, half of their work will not receive any credit.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A*

#### **Question 1**

Many understood that the focus of the question was the appeal or otherwise of the four speakers, although a few thought that it dealt with the issue of honesty.

- (a) and (b)** These two parts are dealt with together as they stand as reverse sides of each other. Whilst D had the most popular appeal to candidates and B the least appeal, these two parts of the question were generally understood and responded to in the terms of the material given. It is pleasing to note that, apart from a number of candidates who exceeded the word count, these two parts of the question were generally well answered. Very few referred to the other three speakers.
- (c)** It was pleasing to see a general conclusion of hypocrisy for Speaker A. A few seemed not to be able to work out what Speaker C was saying. A number of candidates dealt only with one speaker or, because of length, covered only one speaker in the prescribed c.100 words.
- (d)** Generally, the best answers used A's comments on the young man's dirty shoes or B's attempt to interest the interviewer in the 'Bargain of the Month'. The question directed candidates to use relevant remarks made during the course of the interviews, but a number of candidates used the notes instead and some ignored 'least relevance'.

#### **Question 2**

Candidates who observed the word limits usually scored well, especially on the first two parts. The thrust of the points was to direct candidates towards the issues of distance, accidents and reduced bus services and most found little difficulty in supporting their choices from the given points. A few, however, ignored the last six points in the given list (numbers 23 to 28). When dealing with Option B, a small number of candidates

wrote about purchasing three sports' coaches rather than three buses (careful reading of the points, especially 10, 12 and 16 would have prevented such a misunderstanding).

- (a) and (b)** These two parts are treated together as they are inextricably linked. The major discriminator noted was that very many candidates failed to take into consideration the second sentence of both questions. Few candidates showed how the merits or objections of their choices outweighed any objections or merits that it had. This meant that a limited number of answers to the first two parts of the question achieved full or nearly full marks.
- (c)** Many answers rarely went beyond the fact that it had taken a long time to raise the necessary funds. Some credit was gained by candidates who noted the inadequate facilities that the College had in the Sports and Biology areas.
- (d)** The key to this part of the question was the need to justify the choice of the least relevant factor given in the list. Frequently, candidates gave pivotal choices such as number 2 – “There is no-one employed at the School with any experience of driving coaches”. The three least relevant factors selected were 21 (high jump record), 26 (The Melkuma Rose) and 27 (Younger Teachers).

### Question 3

Most candidates scored at least reasonably well, but a number lacked sufficient linguistic and analytical skills for it.

- (a)** Many candidates relied on “he”, rather than giving “Roy” and “bemused” which were two of the correct answers. Even some of those who achieved the full three marks did so only through a scatter-gun approach.
- (b)** This was generally well done, although a number of candidates tended to lift from the text, ignoring the question's demand for use of ‘your own words’.
- (c)** The key ideas were the size of the fish eaten and that the device measuring “pulse rate” was insufficient to show how active a penguin was. Few answers saw this.
- (d)** The key here was in Dr Halsey's experiments. Answers needed to focus on the precise question, not write generally about cruelty to animals.
- (e)** This was well answered and the vast majority scored both marks here. A few ignored the word limit and so obtained little or no credit for what they did write in the 20 permitted words.
- (f) (i)** “Embark”, “crucially” and “consumed” were the best understood words. Very few candidates attempted “exertion” or “validity”.
- (ii)** The rubric was followed by most: only one sentence was written and the correct part of speech was used. Worth 12 marks, (f)(i) and (ii) shows why selection of the most appropriate question by each candidate is so essential at the start of the examination. If a candidate does not know the meaning of three or four of the given words in (f)(i), they will not be able to construct an appropriate sentence for each in (f)(ii). In turn, that means that they will not be able to gain 6 or 8 of the marks. In such a case, they should look carefully at Question 1 or Question 2 and select one of them.

# GENERAL PAPER

---

Paper 8001/23

Paper 23

## General comments

All three questions attracted a high number of responses. This is very pleasing because, the comprehension question used to attract the majority of answers. With the other two questions just as popular now, candidates are giving more thought to their choice of question and responding to the one that suits them best. This is very welcome because consideration of all possibilities is in the interest of each candidate.

Very few candidates attempted more than one question. There seemed few if any instances of candidates running out of time. There was a welcome improvement in English usage. Many candidates wrote fluently and with a width of vocabulary. The majority had at least a fairly clear understanding of the text. Most also composed their own sentences – the reduction in cases of candidates “lifting” material from the question paper was especially pleasing.

Teachers can help their candidates to save precious examination time by making clear that writing the question or providing an introduction of several sentences is a waste of time. No credit is given for either. The need for economy is of paramount importance in this paper. The other basic message to get across concerns the importance of the word limit often set in questions. Too many candidates failed to follow the instructions on this. If a candidate writes a two hundred word answer when only one hundred words are required, half of their work will not receive any credit.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

Many understood that the focus of the question was the appeal or otherwise of the four speakers, although a few thought that it dealt with the issue of honesty.

- (a) and (b)** These two parts are dealt with together as they stand as reverse sides of each other. Whilst D had the most popular appeal to candidates and B the least appeal, these two parts of the question were generally understood and responded to in the terms of the material given. It is pleasing to note that, apart from a number of candidates who exceeded the word count, these two parts of the question were generally well answered. Very few referred to the other three speakers.
- (c)** It was pleasing to see a general conclusion of hypocrisy for Speaker A. A few seemed not to be able to work out what Speaker C was saying. A number of candidates dealt only with one speaker or, because of length, covered only one speaker in the prescribed c.100 words.
- (d)** Generally, the best answers used A's comments on the young man's dirty shoes or B's attempt to interest the interviewer in the 'Bargain of the Month'. The question directed candidates to use relevant remarks made during the course of the interviews, but a number of candidates used the notes instead and some ignored 'least relevance'.

#### **Question 2**

Candidates who observed the word limits usually scored well, especially on the first two parts. The thrust of the points was to direct candidates towards the issues of distance, accidents and reduced bus services and most found little difficulty in supporting their choices from the given points. A few, however, ignored the last six points in the given list (numbers 23 to 28). When dealing with Option B, a small number of candidates wrote about purchasing three sports' coaches rather than three buses (careful reading of the points, especially 10, 12 and 16 would have prevented such a misunderstanding).

- (a) and (b) These two parts are treated together as they are inextricably linked. The major discriminator noted was that very many candidates failed to take into consideration the second sentence of both questions. Few candidates showed how the merits or objections of their choices outweighed any objections or merits that it had. This meant that a limited number of answers to the first two parts of the question achieved full or nearly full marks.
- (c) Many answers rarely went beyond the fact that it had taken a long time to raise the necessary funds. Some credit was gained by candidates who noted the inadequate facilities that the College had in the Sports and Biology areas.
- (d) The key to this part of the question was the need to justify the choice of the least relevant factor given in the list. Frequently, candidates gave pivotal choices such as number 2 – “There is no-one employed at the School with any experience of driving coaches”. The three least relevant factors selected were 21 (high jump record), 26 (The Melkuma Rose) and 27 (Younger Teachers).

### Question 3

Most candidates scored at least reasonably well, but a number lacked sufficient linguistic and analytical skills for it.

- (a) Many candidates relied on “he”, rather than giving “Roy” and “bemused” which were two of the correct answers. Even some of those who achieved the full three marks did so only through a scatter-gun approach.
- (b) This was generally well done, although a number of candidates tended to lift from the text, ignoring the question’s demand for use of ‘your own words’.
- (c) The key ideas were the size of the fish eaten and that the device measuring “pulse rate” was insufficient to show how active a penguin was. Few answers saw this.
- (d) The key here was in Dr Halsey’s experiments. Answers needed to focus on the precise question, not write generally about cruelty to animals.
- (e) This was well answered and the vast majority scored both marks here. A few ignored the word limit and so obtained little or no credit for what they did write in the 20 permitted words.
- (f) (i) “Embark”, “crucially” and “consumed” were the best understood words. Very few candidates attempted “exertion” or “validity”.
- (ii) The rubric was followed by most: only one sentence was written and the correct part of speech was used. Worth 12 marks, (f)(i) and (ii) shows why selection of the most appropriate question by each candidate is so essential at the start of the examination. If a candidate does not know the meaning of three or four of the given words in (f)(i), they will not be able to construct an appropriate sentence for each in (f)(ii). In turn, that means that they will not be able to gain 6 or 8 of the marks. In such a case, they should look carefully at **Question 1** or **Question 2** and select one of them.