

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8021/11
Essay

Key messages

- Avoid sweeping, assertive statements, at all times, especially in the opening paragraph.
- An even-handed introduction leaves scope for debate.
- It should be clear what the learner's point of view is.
- It should also be clear that the learner is aware of different points of view.
- Maintain an academic register; avoid a chatty, colloquial style.
- Conclusions should do more than summarise the points already made.
- The best conclusions suggest that further debate might be needed.
- Always allow time to complete an essay.
- Remember to use paragraphs to signpost clearly the development of a debate/argument.
- Evaluation and assessment should be a constant presence throughout the main body of a discussion.
- Examples should be relevant; they should provide evidence and illustration.
- Pay particular attention to the wording of the chosen question, the key words.
- Learners will reach their full potential if points are developed.

General comments

This is the first Principal Examiner Report on 8021/11, the Essay Paper. There was a substantial entry and the majority of the learners were well prepared for the examination. The requirement to write one essay of over 600 words was fulfilled in most cases. It is really important that essays on this syllabus are of sufficient length. It is very unlikely that essays significantly below 600 words will do enough to achieve the grade the learner hopes for.

Most of the essays revealed knowledge of the topic chosen and demonstrated that the areas of the syllabus offer opportunities for learners to express themselves meaningfully and purposefully. A few, unfortunately, are still opting for questions where their knowledge is sketchy. There's no point in choosing a question and simply hoping for the best, irrespective of knowledge.

On the essay paper, effective communication using written English, AO3, has a higher weighting than the other assessment objectives. It was very pleasing to see that the majority of the responses communicated clearly overall. Among those that did, there were several instances of sophisticated writing and word choice. These instances are specifically recognised and given credit.

The other assessment objectives, AO2 and AO1, covering analysis, evaluation, information and examples, are distinct but very dependent on one another. It is impossible to engage in a thoughtful, argued discussion, without supportive material in the form of example and illustration.

AO3

The best answers used a range of structures and (topical) lexical items with facility and fluency, leading to well-organised and analytical pieces of work. Conversely, some answers struggled to communicate their ideas with precision, although there were few which failed to communicate anything with clarity.

Common errors included inappropriate use of expressions or vocabulary items; inconsistent use of English or American spellings; lack of agreement between singular and plural verb subjects and conjugations; confusion over tense and time frames; misplaced punctuation and weak sentence demarcation. *Although* and *however* were quite frequently confused.

Paragraphing was usually quite sound but organisation, in some cases, was lacking.

Tone and register were sometimes rhetorical or too informal. Inappropriate register included inter alia: *'To do stuff', 'Off of', 'don't, 'can't, 'it'd, 'would've'* and other contractions, overuse of *'etc, e.g., 'First off, 'To wrap up'*. One unfortunate, relatively recent occurrence is the informal use of direct address; *'Think about it, Close your eyes and imagine...', 'Have you ever....?'* It is not in learners' interests to try to engage with the reader in these ways. Register is now a specific strand of the AO3 descriptors.

Redundant prepositions were fairly common; *debate about, discuss about, issue out, revert back* are wrong.

There were some unconvincing attempts to introduce paragraphs, such as *'To begin', 'To continue (on)', 'To add on', 'In continuation'* and similar.

Learners should be advised to check their work carefully for (basic) errors, such as some of those referred to here, but also including correct spelling of words in the questions, such as *monitored, organisation, necessary, biased, language, interesting*. Common spelling errors included *enviorment, protien* and *recieve*.

AO2

Most introductions made some reference to the terms of the question but tended either simply to state that the prompt/question could be seen from two sides, or to go to the other extreme and list all the points which would later be covered (and therefore repeated). Weaker introductions tended to make vague and general topic-based assertions, with insufficient focus on the question set. A good introduction should aim to demonstrate understanding of the question terms and give an idea where the learner's viewpoint may lie, before discussing the issue in more detail in the following paragraphs. It should do more than simply repeat the question and, where possible/appropriate, offer a specific context in time and/or place.

Learners would be well advised to refer back to the exact wording of the question they have chosen as they start each paragraph, to be sure that their response is focused on the question set, rather than a general piece of writing about the topic. It was not uncommon, for example, to see the essay on music (**Question 8**) become a general description of the life and times of various musicians, or a series of vague assertions relating to the wonders of music. Similarly, in **Question 2**, general descriptions of the poor treatment of animals, or exhortations that they should be given more rights, often took the place of focused discussion on the notion of their having, or not, *the same rights as humans*.

An excellent conclusion to a **Question 2** essay was as follows: *'Whether it be the chicken pecking about in the yard or the magnificent tiger prowling in the jungle, we humans share our world with them. Perhaps we need to eat the chicken and protect the tiger. We have the power and what we do with it is our responsibility.'* This conclusion to an excellent essay raises as many questions as it does answers. If we look back to the report's key messages on the matter of conclusions, this example is near perfect.

AO1

Supporting information and exemplification varied hugely in quality, from non-existent, to vague and lacking clear links to the question or points made, to the very well applied and marshalled in support of the argument advanced. Those that attempted to write all they know about a topic were, by definition, writing unfocused essays. One excellent response to **Question 8** carefully selected a few things related to this AO:

- Music in worship (unifies).
- Rap (can both unify and separate).
- Jazz and the Blues (historical significance, the African-American experience, not universal but...)
- Links to Band Aid and other universal gatherings.

This information and exemplification were more than enough to form the backbone of a very illuminating response.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Evaluate the contribution of any politician or political party to the development of YOUR country.

This was not a very popular question but was well answered by most of those who chose it, with detailed knowledge of the chosen politician or political party and an assessment of their contribution to the country in question. Balance was usually offered by means of discussing the limits of their achievements, lack of lasting legacy and ongoing impediments to progress in relevant areas. Development was usually either taken to be economic or social in focus. One excellent essay focused on Lincoln and slavery, developing a relevant consideration by reference to Martin Luther King and the state of race relations in contemporary America.

Question 2

'Animals should be given the same rights as humans.' Discuss.

This was a very popular question but was often answered rather too generally in terms of animal rights, rather than *same rights*. Quite lengthy description of poor treatment of animals was to be found in weaker answers, the common areas of discussion being pets, animal testing, zoos, circuses and farms. Some answers relied on assertion, for example that humans would have no food source without animals in their diet, or that all animals show us love, or all are dangerous. Better answers were able to consider the potential consequences of the question's proposition, for both humans and animals, and to consider a wider range of animal types and contexts. Although there were many weak and mid-range answers, some of the best, most thoughtful and engaging responses were to this question, as some candidates were able to grapple with the notion of rights at a conceptual and philosophical level. These answers explored the whole area of treating with respect and distinguished between the 'same rights' and respect, or considered issues such as mankind's superiority over animals in terms of cognitive functions, especially the ability to communicate effectively.

Question 3

Evaluate the importance of public sports facilities for a society that is increasingly inactive.

This question was not particularly popular and those who chose it frequently described the importance of sport in more general terms, for example in fighting obesity and promoting health and fitness and where facilities were considered, the emphasis on *public* was sometimes missed. Evaluation of cost was, however, a feature of some responses and these better responses also dealt with mental as well as physical health, teamwork and community bonds. A few strong answers looked at how 'inactive' can be defined, what sports facilities offered to counter this and what the impact of public funding might be. Those learners, unsure of what a public sport facility is, would have been better advised not to attempt the question.

Question 4

Assess the most efficient ways of transporting people and goods in YOUR country.

This question was not especially popular and tended to invite quite descriptive and generalised responses, with *most efficient* not always being sufficiently addressed. Better answers were able to consider different types of goods, distances, required speed and the purposes of people's journeys, with specific examples, destinations and companies cited in support, and to offer a clearly reasoned conclusion in favour of one particular mode of transport, or perhaps several, depending on the context. It was not always appreciated that assessment requires more than the mere listing of ways of transport. By and large, the less confident learners chose this question.

Question 5

Internet activity can be easily monitored. Examine whether or not this gives any person or organisation the right to know what other people are doing online.

This was a popular question and answers usually displayed some knowledge of the possible types and purposes of internet monitoring and who might be involved in such practices. Most answers discussed the issue of privacy *versus* protection, whether by government, law-enforcement bodies or responsible adults. Many saw justifications in parents monitoring their children's phones. Some more perceptive and wider-

ranging answers looked at commercial interests behind the surveillance of our search histories. The recent issues with Facebook, for example, were frequently cited. Some, interestingly, speculated what it really meant when the site user hit the 'I agree' or 'I accept' button. Many learners seem to believe that no one can remain private when using the internet and how it is necessary, for example, that employers look at profiles and postings to check suitability for job roles. The positive aspect for surveillance was often communicated using examples of gun crime and terrorism. Conclusions tended to be measured but some were overly simplistic in their faith that internet monitoring would solve all ills.

Question 6

Assess whether or not sources of renewable energy offer a necessary and viable alternative to fossil fuels.

This was a popular question and usually well done, as most candidates seemed able to apply some knowledge and to address, at least in some part, both *necessary* and *viable*. Environmental issues (with varying degrees of accuracy) and sustainability featured heavily, as did relative efficiencies, costs and practicalities. Most answers did conclude that a switch from fossil fuels to renewables is necessary and increasingly viable as technologies improve. There was some recognition of differing circumstances and contexts which might affect viability, especially in the short term. Better answers were able to consider specific schemes in some detail while critically analysing the 'viable' aspect, by considering the likely cost of switching to a green system of energy globally, especially in developing countries. There were hardly any references to the nuclear option; a good sign as not essential in a relevant answer to the question.

Question 7

To what extent is the media in YOUR country biased.

This was, perhaps, a surprisingly popular question, and rarely answered very well. The terms *bias* and *biased* were rarely used correctly. A common vocabulary error was to use the noun instead of the adjective, *bias/biased*, 'CNN is not bias'. Some answers did not show a clear understanding of the terms in the context of media and/or were narrow in range. While most could cite the left and right leaning sympathies of major broadcasters, subtler examples were hard to find. Some referred to issues of depiction of, for example, ethnic and minority groups, and there was some fruitful discussion of selection of news stories to appeal to target audiences and thus for commercial gain. Social media was regularly included in answers but the nature of bias there was not always well explained or linked to the question, and tended to produce descriptive responses. Better answers talked about bias being inevitable due to human nature and saw social media as a distinct problem area when it comes to the spreading of biased opinions and 'fake news'. The actual ownership of media outlets, and its impact upon 'bias', was rarely addressed. However, a few showed an understanding of bias as the representation or selection of certain facts or opinions above others and recognised the close relationship between freedom of expression, pluralism and dissent and a functioning democracy. Others looked probingly at the relationship between the media, finance and certain political causes or pressure groups.

Question 8

'Music is a universal and unifying language.' To what extent do you agree?

This was a popular question and candidates found it fairly straightforward to come up with something positive to say about music, if in largely generalised terms. However, answers often simply described and asserted, perhaps only implicitly considering the factors which might contribute to music's being *a universal and unifying language*, while the concept of musical notation as a language was rarely, if sometimes quite well, addressed. Most took *language* literally and referred to the rise of K-pop among English speakers, for example, which was not without merit but was only one facet of the issue. Some learners focused too little on the music of the artists concerned, in favour of their fashion brands, role model status and work for charity or campaigns, rather than their music itself. There were a few very good answers to this question, however, in which more specific knowledge was demonstrated, for example of the universality of musical scoring, and recognising music's role in defining cultures and groups but also in bringing people together, in various contexts, with its appeal to a wide range of people, and the importance or ongoing relevance of its messages. There were few references to musicality. References to songs were only ever in terms of the intended message of the lyrics rather than the deftness of the lyrics themselves, or to instrumental dexterity or proficiency. There was also some recognition of counter-arguments that looked at how music can potentially be divisive. Exemplification often came in the form of rap artists who challenge mainstream norms and values or use language that exacerbates generational divides.

Question 9

'Going to a theatre to experience a live event is far more enjoyable and interesting than going to a cinema.' To what extent do you agree?

This was a more popular question than was perhaps expected but it did require knowledge of the theatre as well as the cinema! Artistic considerations were too often relegated in favour of accessibility, cost, and ancillary pleasures such as eating popcorn. Thoughtful answers compared the same storyline in a cinematic and theatrical experience and the differences in production. Shakespeare's plays and Arthur Miller's made an appearance. Several learners referred to 'Hamilton' with one or two adding the interesting 'fact' that it was written by Shakespeare! A few answers concentrated upon the 'magic' of the two experiences, special effects in the cinema and the intimacy of theatre. The theatre scored highly in terms of atmosphere, rapport with the audience, whilst cinema countered with technology and the secure acting performance on film. A few propounded the view that theatre was for a highbrow audience.

Question 10

**'When power leads man towards arrogance, poetry reminds him of his limitations.' (John F Kennedy)
To what extent do you agree?**

Hopes were high that this question would prove popular! It was not to be but there were several sensitive responses. With one or two exceptions this question was only attempted by learners who knew some poems and poets. It was heartening to see references to Robert Frost, Walt Whitman, Shakespeare's 'Macbeth' and 'Hamlet' and even Emily Dickinson. One response referred to Shelley's 'Ozymandias' and, of course, this linked perfectly to both power and arrogance. As always there was someone (not unusual on questions like this) who attempted this question without any reference to poetry at all, only dealing with *arrogance*. However, there were excellent answers to this question which discussed poetry in this context in admirable depth and with a great deal of enthusiasm for and engagement with the topic.

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8021/12
Essay

Key messages

Use the introduction of the essay to focus specifically on the question, not just the topic.
Maintain a formal register through the whole response.
Clear communication is achieved through grammatical accuracy.
Clear organisation and linking of ideas enables the argument to be followed logically and avoids a fragmented structure.
Virtually all responses attempted conclusions, ranging from the repetition of points already made to evaluation and personal assessment.
Examples and information were used to support arguments with some selecting and applying appropriately and others tending to just describe.

General comments

Overall, responses successfully focused on the question set but some did need to indicate this more in the introduction. Many were able to use link words and phrases ('however', 'in addition to', 'consequently') to give the argument shape and coherence, enabling logical progression towards a conclusion. A clearly structured introduction usually resulted in a clearly structured discussion and avoided confusion, digression or just pure description.

Nearly all responses had conclusions suggesting that the time allowed was well managed. Although many tended to summarise the argument in their conclusions a number of candidates did evaluate and introduce a personal judgement or assessment, firmly rooted in the material provided.

Grammatical accuracy (tense, correct use of article, agreement) was the key to clear communication and achieved by a majority of candidates. In addition some did use a vocabulary range, achieving greater precision and sophistication in their communication. However, it is advisable to leave time to check for errors and even re-read completely to correct anything which could impede meaning.

Most responses used examples and information to support arguments. Sometimes these could be overly descriptive and distract from the argument rather than enhance it but, generally, good knowledge was shown throughout, many candidates selecting carefully and integrating information into a specific point.

The focus now is on clear communication and a well-structured, engaging argument and it was felt that many candidates achieved this. Also, nearly all candidates acknowledged the need to write in an appropriate register and to the correct length. Any essay plans tended to be short and there were few crossed out false starts so, again, time was used efficiently.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Many responses successfully identified groups which were disadvantaged in their societies, with problems facing the poor, religious and racial minorities, women and the elderly. These were often well focused and illustrated, demonstrating good knowledge of local situations. Some responses tended to list measures that should be adopted, usually by the government, to tackle the issues, suggesting that this could be done with an unlimited budget. More successful responses evaluated this, discussing the difficulty of changing social attitudes with real problems of financial cost, especially in weaker economies and the practicalities of effecting change in conservative societies.

Question 2

Most responses were able to identify some of the alternatives to custodial sentences such as training and rehabilitation programmes which would help offenders to re-enter society as useful citizens rather than be subjected to the negative influences of prisons. Some tended to assert that 'all crime is the result of environmental and social causes' and, therefore, little could be achieved through rehabilitation or that it depended on the seriousness of the crime. More successful ones referred to some of the enlightened policies operating locally and did focus on how conditions in prison might prevent them from being effective in relation to such policies.

Question 3

Many responses engaged with both aspects of the question arguing that both playing and spectating gave joy. Most examples were from football but more traditional sports were also considered and more successful ones related detailed knowledge of their chosen sport to both sides of the question. Many concluded that, although both playing and watching gave joy, nothing could surpass the excitement and pride of playing in a team in front of loyal fans using their own experiences to illustrate this. Less successful responses outlined a case for their chosen sport rather than addressing 'watching' and 'taking part' and found difficulty in identifying the concept of 'joy'. The best ones presented a balanced discussion, relating arguments to 'joy of sport' as well as 'your country', and addressing 'to what extent'.

Question 4

Most responses showed good knowledge of what was happening in their country referencing various ways the government and local authority were dealing with waste disposal. Many focused on domestic waste and concluded that this was managed inefficiently in their society and that specific initiatives were still not that advanced. Quite detailed accounts of conditions were reported including potential health hazards and the unreliable schedules for the removal of waste. Less successful responses digressed into wider pollution issues of 'global warming' and 'melting ice caps'. More successful ones assessed the work of government, NGOs and individual citizens in addressing the problems of waste control, including industrial waste, and made some informed predictions of the future of society if these waste problems were not addressed.

Question 5

Most responses were very well informed about the history of the science of antibiotics, and about the negative repercussions of their over-prescription. Sometimes this knowledge tended towards description resulting in less focus on 'serious threat to health'. The most successful responses addressed 'to what extent' and provided balanced viewpoints in support: that science can be trusted to find a solution and impose restrictions or that people will continue to be exploited by medical companies and unscrupulous doctors without regulation. Often the conclusion evaluated that it was too late and that the threat would worsen in the future unless drastic steps were taken globally to regulate it all.

Question 6

Many responses listed the benefits and drawbacks of mobile phones, commenting on how convenient they were as a modern means of communication in the modern world. Less successful ones tended to describe too much history by referencing 'smoke signals', 'carrier pigeons' and 'postal communication' before considering the question. Stronger discussions did focus on 'human communication' in the context of such negative effects on language as slang, abbreviation and emojis and the positive aspects of citizen journalism and access to a variety of facilities. Best responses did assess whether there were improvements from a 'human' perspective, balancing such issues as convenience and accessibility with safety, isolation and the effects on relationships.

Question 7

Many responses to this question tended to focus on the question of censorship and control of controversial content in the entertainment media with the majority favouring government intervention. More successful ones considered the independence of radio and television in a healthy democracy and the need to closely scrutinise the behaviour of politicians. Here the discussion considered that government control could be repressive and against various freedoms. In all responses there were few examples of specific programmes, something which could have strengthened the argument.

Question 8

Most candidates who attempted this question did it successfully by showing thorough knowledge of the chosen examples, understanding the concept of monsters in books and examining clearly how they mirror darker aspects of ourselves. The most successful ones integrated specific details into evaluations to produce convincing and logical arguments. An occasional less successful response tended to digress to fantasy films and, therefore, slightly misunderstood the question. Sometimes there was a tendency to be too descriptive but, overall, these responses still displayed good knowledge.

Question 9

Many responses considered issues of identity and tourism using appropriate examples. Less successful ones just asserted that traditional beliefs symbolised one's identity and then described those beliefs. More successful candidates provided a range of points, arguing that not everything associated with traditional cultural practices is worthy of preservation and pertinent references were made, for instance, to the traditional roles of women and the treatment of lower castes. Here some did address 'to what extent' and evaluated which ones should be preserved and which discontinued in the context of examples given.

Question 10

Many responses presented strong views on this question with candidates arguing that medical care should be freely available, referring to the poverty and absence of medical provision in their country. More successful responses considered the financial provisions needed to enable free medical care and referred appropriately to the health services of developed nations. Some suggested that it was a fundamental right and the primary duty of government to look after the health of its people especially as they paid taxes and therefore should expect it. The most successful responses did balance several views and assess 'to what extent'.

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8021/13
Essay

Key messages

The introduction should focus on the wording of the question and not just give a general overview of the topic

Avoid writing in an overly informal style and do not use colloquialisms

It is important to write in a legible manner

Clear communication requires grammatical accuracy

Well-constructed essays, with an appropriate introduction, central sections of several paragraphs and a conclusion, enable a coherent argument to develop

Successful conclusions need to bring together and synthesise the main issues of the essay without simply repeating them all again

Appropriate examples should be used to illustrate points made within a response

Examples should be more than the description of events, people and relevant issues

Comment should be offered about examples given, in relation to the question

General comments

Many candidates were able to write fluently, using a formal register that is expected of an academic essay. There were a number of responses that did not have the correct register and were full of conversational terms such as 'OK', 'yeah, well' and 'making everyone seriously mad'. Other unsuitable phrases included: 'based off of', 'they blew up' (meaning they suddenly increased in popularity), 'I mean, yes, they do know you...', 'Well I am here to tell you ...' and 'Just being flat out hateful...'. These sorts of comments undermined what was in some cases, a good argument.

There was evidence of basic or everyday vocabulary used, with little ambition in vocabulary, sentence structure, or punctuation devices used. Structure could follow a very formulaic format: First; secondly, thirdly, in conclusion.

Better responses were able to link ideas across paragraphs and throughout the essay, ensuring the response followed a logical argument and structure.

Whilst there were some essays which had a number of errors, sometimes of a basic nature, many were easy to follow and did not have basic errors. Sometimes this was because the essay did not have a great deal of ambition.

Many candidates understood the question that was set, but some were unclear on aspects of the question or simply described ideas without relating them to the wording of the question (typical level 2 candidates). There were some evaluative comments in responses – but these were often brief or undeveloped. The most successful answers took the wording of the question and tried to explore and analyse ideas in relation to it. The logical sequence of an argument was often a discriminator – those that were too generic in formula often did not link ideas together, but those that were more cleverly constructed were able to seamlessly link and develop threads of arguments.

Exemplification was sometimes excellent in responses where examples were used to illustrate a developing argument in answer to the question. Some candidates used a list of examples but did not tie these to an argument or the question, which led to some very descriptive responses. If the examples had been used more effectively, the responses would have been much higher in quality.

There were answers devoid of any examples at all, making arguments vague and assertive. It is difficult to write a convincing argument if there are no examples to support the comments being made.

The focus now is on clear communication and a well-structured, engaging argument and it was felt that many candidates achieved this. Also, nearly all candidates acknowledged the need to write in an appropriate register and to the correct length. Any essay plans tended to be short and there were few crossed out false starts so, again, time was used efficiently.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Many responses showed knowledge of the ways farm and factory animals were treated before being slaughtered, but tended to go no further than describing the conditions rather than engaging with the question and saying to what extent they agreed with it. The general consensus among those who chose this subject was that it was wrong to treat animals badly and that it was all down to the need to make as much profit as possible. Answers were often one-sided, showing little consideration as to why the cost/profit factor might also be an important consideration. Showing a consideration for both aspects would have generated greater possibilities for relevant evaluative ideas. There were a number of responses that expressed excessive outrage about the slaughter of cute animals, whilst others moved away from the 'food' focus of the question and wrote about threats to endangered species such as the white rhino.

Question 2

Only two responses were given to this question and both were brief and had little understanding of what the World Health Organisation, the International Monetary Fund or any other international organisation did. The responses did not comment clearly on whether international organisations had become more important in recent years. This resulted in confused and descriptive responses which did not clearly answer the question.

Question 3

The most successful responses successfully considered both sides of the argument, with some pointing out that not all individuals (the disabled, for example) were able to take full responsibility for their own health. Less successful responses focused more on describing poverty in Africa than on the wider issues suggested by the question. Reasons for the gap between the rich and the poor were examined in some successful responses, although there was a tendency to over concentrate on these aspects without then focusing on how these factors might impact on health issues. A more organised answer concentrating on both aspects could have been more successful. There were some simplistic assertions made in weaker responses, rather than the development of a clear argument.

Question 4

Many responses argued that areas of natural beauty should be preserved as they appeal to tourists and boost the economy and also because preserving such areas will help to save endangered species. Some responses were little more than a list of famous beauty spots in the USA, sometimes accompanied by sentimental memories of childhood holidays. Some commented on the beauty and importance of the flora and the fauna, without naming specific locations where they could be found. Arguments were often one-sided, focusing heavily on why preservation might be necessary but with insufficient focus as to why this might not happen. For example – the need to provide more land for housing, industrialisation as population expands and the need to capitalise on economic opportunities etc. More balanced answers would, once again, provide opportunities to demonstrate higher level skills. There were a small number of candidates who misunderstood the question and wrote solely about the role of make-up, botox and cosmetics in preserving natural beauty.

Question 5

Better responses to this question included how funding for space exploration was partly privately sourced and the value of potential and actual discoveries in space; these were balanced against the need to reduce poverty. Only a small number of candidates successfully explained the extent of their agreement or otherwise with the topic. Many stated that the poor needed to be looked after and that it was possible that space exploration might produce solutions to many of our problems, but there were very few clear suggestions as to how the issue might be resolved.

Question 6

This question was answered by over 60% of the candidates who took the examination. There were a large number of knowledgeable and well organised responses dealing with the good and bad influences of social media (very few candidates understood that 'media' is a plural noun) and having balanced the points, came to a conclusion as to its overall impact on society. Less successful responses described the use of different forms of social media and/or gave a history of communication throughout the ages, but ended without evaluating or even considering its overall impact. Only a small number considered the positive sides of social media only, which was not fully addressing the question. There was a lot of confusion of 'affect' and 'effect'. There were many responses which gave an interesting insight into social media influencers with the key figures being Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin and Jeremy Clarkson! Indeed, Donald Trump featured in many essays, either as an example of an effective twitter-user or because of his involvement in the 2016 presidential election (where social media was presumed to play a significant role). 'Cyber-bulling' was a frequent spelling error.

Question 7

There were a lot of assumptions that much of the news was fake, although the main limitation in response to this question was that very few of those who attempted it really tried to get to grips with its philosophical implications, but simply fell back on stating that news about the weather, celebrity gossip and international disasters, such as the Notre Dame fire, were true, but political statements from news media were lies, with very few specific examples of such statements being provided. Arguments were often very one-sided showing a good grasp of negative aspects about how/why the media, particularly in the USA, might not be trusted to report the absolute truth. These aspects were often quite well examined, with President Trump used as an example and how Fox and CNN portray him. Little or no focus was given to the positive attributes of the news media in many responses.

Question 8

Most arguments agreed that art was all around us and discussed/described the art found in nature, graffiti, architecture, statues, street art, tattoos, garden design, fashion, make up and in everyday life. Others responses took a more literal approach and noted that music and drama were forms of art, but were not contained in museums. Some argued that buildings such as the Eiffel Tower (a work of art) were too big to fit into a museum structure. Many arguments were superficial and did not get beyond the surface of the question and might have been more successful if the candidate had made clear what they considered to be art as an introduction to their responses. There was not enough consideration as to why art in museums/galleries might be more recognised than art in 'normal walks of life' leading to a number of very one-sided arguments.

Question 9

Many arguments saw the potential for art in baking and cordon bleu cooking; others said that cookery is not available to everyone as not everyone owns a cooker. There was a lack of balanced ideas to show consideration of both sides of the issue and supporting examples were often scarce. Few responses had much detailed knowledge about cookery. One thoughtful response considered cookery across the world and how it reflected different cultures and values; but did not give much thought about it as an art form.

Question 10

Very few responses were seen to this question. *To Kill A Mockingbird* was written about by some candidates in a relevant, focused and well-organised manner. It was clear that the candidates had studied the book in school, had paid careful attention to what their Literature teacher had told them and had the initiative to realise that this could be easily adapted to answer the question set in this paper. This could have been an approach adopted by other candidates who were less successful answering the question they chose. Some responses spent too much time describing the aspects/contents of a particular book/books and not enough focus was given to why the book/books should form a part of the curriculum in schools/colleges.

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8021/21
Comprehension

Key messages

In **1(a)**, the standard of written English was strong as the majority of responses matched the criteria found in the top two levels. Some candidates copied words and phrases from the passages and placed this material in quotation marks. Unfortunately, when responding to questions requiring the use of the candidate's own words, words and phrases that are copied from the passage cannot be credited even when the candidate acknowledges and attributes them by placing them in quote marks.

A broad range of connectives and conjunctions were incorporated by many candidates into their response to **1(a)** so that their answers were structured, showing good organisational skills, and thus flowed well. Some candidates showed a very good knowledge of idiom, and used interesting vocabulary and appropriate colloquial language (e.g. 'hefty price tag', 'eye-watering' and 'to become more well versed in...'). Many candidates incorporated discursive expressions into their responses and used an appropriate register (e.g. 'it is safe to assume that...'). It was evident that many candidates had been well trained in how to express opinions, adding to the variety of structures and vocabulary employed by a candidate. A few candidates offered either generalised or assertive answers. However, many candidates gave nuanced responses, gaining credit by using modal verbs (e.g. 'might' and 'could'), other verbal constructions (e.g. 'seems to be') and words such as 'probably', 'perhaps' or 'likely'.

Some candidates wrote more than was allowed in questions with word limits. One of the key skills examined on this paper is the ability to compose succinct responses, resulting in material appearing after the word limit not gaining credit. Some candidates included an introduction, which was not required, or repeated the question in their answer.

It is essential to read the question carefully and to respond to that question asked rather than to the perceived one. For example, in **1(a)**, candidates gaining credit discussed the University of Zandi course as directed. However, there were a few candidates who, instead, analysed the Zandi City Council Masterclasses. In **1(f)**, a few candidates discussed the advantages of technology in general, rather than the advantages early adopters might enjoy. In **2(b)(ii)**, some candidates speculated on other possible options and dangers facing the divers, rather than those explained in paragraph 4. In **2(e)** a few candidates thought that the children were telling their father not to continue diving.

A few candidates did not answer all the sub-questions. It is highly recommended that a candidate attempts every part of a question.

Candidates, when copying words from the material in contexts that are permitted, should take care to spell these words correctly, for example, 'hole' rather than 'whole' in **2(d)**.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates followed the instructions to refer to the University of Zandi course. Good responses were characterised by a confident use of superlatives, such as mentioning that this course was the most expensive one. In addition, answers gaining high marks incorporated the use of synonyms for key words and phrases in the material.

Higher level responses exhibited the ability to interpret the evidence offered in the material and read between the lines by understanding the various aspects of Jini's situation and how they linked to her requirements. In addition, they showed an understanding that the most convincing responses are nuanced; for example, by using modal verbs. Candidates gaining high marks gathered information from all the sources available—the Background, the tables containing information about the courses and the Additional information—and put them together to create cogent arguments. Such candidates would offer a consideration that had been developed—whether by explanation (for example, an online course would give her some flexibility with regard to scheduling) or by linking it to another piece of information elsewhere in the material (for example,

citing the length of the course as a disadvantage because Jini would like to improve her skill set quickly)—thus highlighting the ability to present sustained and relevant analysis of Jini’s situation.

Some candidates could have attained higher marks if they had considered **both** the advantages and disadvantages, thus ensuring that they offered a balanced response by including one disadvantage. A few candidates cited more disadvantages than advantages.

Some candidates would have gained higher marks if they had not copied key phrases from the material. ‘*She wants to widen her knowledge*’, ‘*Her long-term goal is to be sponsored*’ and ‘*feels that a deeper understanding*’ were often lifted from the material.

Some candidates selected random facts from the passage, and then cited them in their answers without any development or indication of whether they were advantages or disadvantages so that their response was more of a narrative than an analysis.

Higher marks could also have been achieved if some responses had been more detailed. Generalised considerations, such as the course ‘suits her’ or that it is a ‘good course’, required more precise information to be creditworthy.

A few candidates supported the choice of the University of Zandi course by stating that the other two courses were not as good in certain ways, rather than by explaining the advantages and disadvantages of the University of Zandi course itself as directed. Such responses showed a lack of focus on the chosen course.

In addition, weaker responses were characterised by the repetition of considerations and/or a consideration and its development being separated from each other in the answer, thereby impacting upon the overall clarity and fluency of the response.

A few candidates misunderstood the phrases ‘*in-house training*’ and ‘*Jini is now on a salary*’, or were mistaken about how much the course would cost in total. Some candidates cited two years as an advantage, not taking into account the urgency of Jini’s situation.

- (b) Many candidates engaged well with this sub- question, offering two clear disadvantages. Insightful responses were seen, such as suggesting that as he was her hero, she might be distracted by his presence. Weaker responses were characterised by candidates listing disadvantages without explaining them; offering more than two disadvantages; citing advantages as well as disadvantages, or giving speculative responses that were not based on evidence from the material—such as that Oli Pomerini would not attend as he was too important a man.
- (c) Candidates who followed the instructions to explain two disadvantages scored well, while weaker responses followed the same pattern as similar level responses in (b). The timing issue and the problem with the course content were the disadvantages cited most frequently. However, there were some misunderstandings: some candidates thought that this course took place in Zandi; a few candidates misunderstood who was disabled; others thought that the course took place during the day, and a few thought Carla Patel and Jini worked in the same office.
- (d) Candidates gaining full credit offered an insightful justification, having selected Point 3. Examples of idiomatic English were seen, such as ‘She is already pursuing a career in digital marketing, so that particular ship has already sailed.’ Weaker responses infringed the rubric by offering information from the Background section or from the tables about the three providers, instead of from the Additional information as requested. A few candidates selected the correct point, but did not attempt to justify their choice.
- (e) Many candidates gained credit as they could put the modern phenomenon of social media influencers in context regarding the technological world; exhibited an understanding of the scale or reach of such influencers, and/or could explain an example of the phenomenon—while keeping focus on influencers’ importance to marketing departments. Insightful responses included references to the trust between influencer and loyal follower, the effect of endorsements on followers who ‘worship’ influencers and how influencers promote aspirational brands to their followers, all of which marketing departments could exploit. Some candidates explained the idea of influence and linked it to moral responsibility in general, rather than discussing why marketing departments find social influencers to be so influential.

- (f) Many candidates engaged well with this sub-question, showing themselves to be knowledgeable about the advantages of being an early adopter, such as being able to avail themselves of limited editions and/or special add-ons that could become collectors' items in future and so worth more money, or the fact that early adopters can be sponsored by companies. Common misunderstandings included discussing the general advantages of technology in everyday life, technological advancements in general or explaining why companies use technology. A few candidates offered only one or two reasons, while others offered more than the three asked for in the question—thus infringing the rubric.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates gaining credit located the relevant quote and copied out the comparison correctly. Some candidates would have gained credit if they had not offered a generalised response about Gràcia's career or commented on the beauty of Mallorca without including the comparison.
- (b) (i) In (i), candidates gaining credit offered excellent synonyms: 'back-up' for '*emergency*', 'snapped' for '*broken*', 'crossed each other's path' for '*met...by chance*' and 'vision impeded' for '*making it difficult to see*' were some examples seen. Weaker responses would have gained higher marks if key words and phrases had not been copied from the material. Some candidates did answer using their own words, but did not gain much credit for the content of their responses because all the required information had not been included. Other candidates offered more than the five things that went wrong and/or irrelevant material.
- (ii) In (ii), stronger responses focused on the options and dangers explained in paragraph 4 and employed synonyms, such as 'to get assistance' for '*go for help*', 'lose your way' for '*get lost*', 'designed a different way out...' for '*planned an alternative...route*' and 'carbon-dioxide rich' for '*higher carbon dioxide levels*'. Weaker responses copied key words and phrases from the material, gave answers written in their own words which did not contain all the necessary material, or offered irrelevant material.
- (c) Many candidates engaged well with these sub-questions, scoring highly by correctly locating the relevant material and conveying all the necessary details within the word limit. However, some candidates would have gained higher marks if they had adhered to the word limit as creditworthy material was seen beyond the word limit. Some candidates would have attained more marks if they had not included irrelevant material, such as an introduction, a repetition of the question or answers from elsewhere in the material. Some weaker responses would have gained more credit if they had not omitted key elements of the responses required. In (i), a few candidates misunderstood how many torches were still working; others gave generalised responses about the water and the rock. In (ii), some candidates offered answers that were too generalised regarding what Gràcia thought he could see and hear.
- (d) Many candidates scored well by offering three of the problems outlined in the material, as directed. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of precision regarding, for example, the drilling and/or why Gràcia was left again; the introduction of irrelevant material, such as the raising of the alarm; and speculative comments, such as the rescue team not knowing where to find Gràcia.
- (e) Many candidates offered insightful responses, showing a maturity of thought and sensitivity towards the issue. References were made to showing respect for parents (for example, 'it's not a child's place to tell a parent what to do' and 'they look up to him and appreciate what he does for them...'), being supportive towards parents and/or their dreams, or being proud of him as he is their hero. Some excellent vocabulary was incorporated, such as '...might explain their non-interventionist approach'. Some candidates thought the question was asking why the children tell Gràcia not to dive; others offered generalised answers—for example, focusing on the father and referring to mapping and geology. A few candidates did not respond to this sub-question; it is recommended that candidates attempt every sub-question.

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

<p>Paper 8021/22 Comprehension</p>
--

Key messages

It is most important that the material provided in the Insert is read with great care. Many candidates misread the information for **Section A** and, as a result, were unable to provide a good response to the questions set.

Where questions ask candidates to use their own words little credit can be given to answers which slavishly copy material from the text provided. It is better for a candidate to try and compose their own sentences even if the result is not altogether successful.

A feature of General Paper 2 tests candidates' ability to write economically; where a word limit is stipulated credit cannot be gained for material which goes beyond this limit.

General comments

All candidates showed clear engagement with the paper and virtually all attempted every question. Other than the common misunderstanding of **Question 1**, a mere handful of candidates appeared out of their depth in terms of ability to comprehend the material. Although written English is not formally assessed on this paper, the standard of candidates' expression was commendably high. Writing was usually clear and legible and meaning was usually unambiguous. There was no evidence to suggest that any candidates were short of time.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Questions 1

(a) and (b) The main issue with this pair of questions was that a large number of candidates misinterpreted the questions and believed that they were being asked to consider the various properties as a possible option rather than view them as examples of design style that might influence the proposed building scheme of the Billi family. Candidates were often confused by the difference between the original houses that the architects had designed and were viewable, and the yet to be designed and built house. Such candidates tended to interchange the two and assumed that the family was going to buy one of the existing award-winning houses.

In (a) it was possible to credit answers that highlighted features of No 27 North Shore such as the 'futuristic industrial look' or the use of tinted glass as these could easily be incorporated into the design of the new house. On the other hand, reference to the 'nearby cliff face' and 'sea defences' showed a lack of understanding since there was nothing in the Material to suggest that the site of the proposed new house was adjacent to the sea. Stronger candidates interpreted the question correctly and recognised that the architects' experience in designing a house where the sea could cause problems meant they were well placed to design the new house on a plot of land where the presence of a river could lead to flooding issues.

The questions asked candidates to use their own words as far as possible. Examiners did not expect candidates to find alternatives to technical terms such as 'design and technology' which would be a difficult task, but, in (b), describing Mrs Billi as someone 'who used to be a professional chef' is direct lifting and something such as 'was previously employed as a chef' should not have been too difficult to find. Another common example of lifting was 'Baum and Trulli's designs are so

popular that there is a waiting time of six months for an initial consultation with them.’ It was surprising that so many candidates appeared unable to find alternatives for ‘a waiting time of six months’ and ‘an initial consultation’.

- (c) A significant number of candidates exceeded the word count with the result that Geraldo’s section was often discounted. Almost all candidates recognised that a tree house would attract Eva’s interest. Unfortunately, only a minority recognised that it had potential only as most answers were phrased to indicate that such candidates were writing about Exposita’s existing house. It was rare to encounter a script which understood that the presence of large trees on the site of the new house could provide for a tree house. The majority of candidates made a good link between Fabio’s interest in the environment and Exposita’s green credentials.
- (d) Most candidates correctly identified the point about the family’s interest in tennis as being the least relevant. Many went on to offer good development pointing out that none of the architects had shown experience of constructing sports facilities and, in any event, the family could join a local club.

Section B

Question 2

- (a) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified Yiwu market as the place where he met his wife. Answers which mentioned some aspect of Cropp’s professional life were not credited.
- (b) Most candidates managed to score one or both of the available marks. For ‘must have’ many correctly referred to ‘craze’ or ‘trending’ but answers that indicated ‘mandatory’ or ‘compulsory’ did not capture the spirit of the expression. The second word –‘obsession’ – proved more elusive as many offered something which was not strong enough such as ‘interest’.
- (c) This was an ‘own words’ question and only a minority managed to identify key points and, with sufficient change of wording, go on and get full marks. Phrases such as ‘biggest small goods market in the world’ and ‘clattering of trolleys’ were often left unchanged though many offered ‘traders from all over the world’ which was perfectly acceptable.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates gained this mark though those who offered ‘He can’t afford to miss the new trend or latest colour’ were not stating the options facing Nigel Cropp.
- (e) This pair of questions proved quite hard for many candidates to identify key points and then substitute their own words to gain the marks.

In (i) it was common to encounter unaltered phrases from the text such as ‘avoid electrical’, ‘they won’t pass European Union Regulations’, ‘soft bear with button eyes’ and ‘small parts might choke small children’.

In (ii) a number of candidates were rather imprecise in their use of the word ‘import’ so that it was not clear if they were referring to importing to or from China.

- (f) **Part (i)** proved straightforward, with the majority gaining both marks. In (ii) many candidates correctly identified the change in Yiwu from a shabby backwater with little foreign trade to a place from where freight is sent to many countries over vast distances. The task was, of course, made easier as own words were not required. A number of candidates incorrectly focused on the present day situation in Yiwu market.
- (g) In (i) most candidates correctly raised the uneconomic use of rail given the huge capacity of a ship, the relative costs of rail and sea, as well as the problems caused by changes of railway gauge and engines. Less common were answers that discussed issues of lack of sleep, pressure on workers as well as the need for the train to develop.

Given the very tight word limit in (ii) those candidates who began with laboured introductions such as ‘Wu Xiaodong counteracts criticisms of the railway by saying...’ could obtain only one mark before encountering the constraint of the word limit.

Examiners did encounter some impressive responses that covered the ground in an elegant fashion within the word limits. In **(i)** 'Trains bound for Europe are still being delayed and staff are under extreme pressure causing sleep deprivation. Trains cannot carry as much freight as ships and are more expensive, and are further slowed by changing gauge and engine. And in **(ii)** 'The train is faster than cargo ships and allows for greater expansion into landlocked countries.'

ENGLISH GENERAL PAPER

<p>Paper 8021/23 Comprehension</p>
--

Key messages

This exam required students to complete two tasks based on material provided in an insert. **Section A** was based on a decision-making exercise and **Section B** comprehension of a text.

Many good answers were seen with clearly communicated and detailed responses in **Section A** and responses that made good use of the material in **Section B**.

Candidates who paid close attention to the command words in each question and read questions carefully were able to do well.

Some questions required candidates to write within a given word limit. Centres should note that examiners stopped marking after the stated word limit; anything beyond this could not gain credit.

Other questions required candidates to write in their own words; candidates who lifted material from the passage and did not attempt to put it into their own words, could not score marks.

Candidates who were able to be succinct and write within a stated word limit when required and could answer a question using words other than those in the material (when the question required it) were able to score highly.

When candidates are required to translate a phrase/word they should aim to provide an answer that has the same grammatical form and meaning as the original phrase. They should not use any words that are in the original phrase in their translation.

Some candidates used very colloquial language in some questions such as 'gonna' and 'mom'; among others; these are inappropriate and candidates should be reminded of the need to write in formal English.

General comments

Centres should remind candidates about the meaning of command words listed in the syllabus. In addition, candidates should make sure they take careful note of the rubric in the questions where they are required to write within a word limit or answer in their own words

Consequently, centres should plan to give candidates plenty of opportunity to practise writing to a specific word limit and writing in their own words as they are a common feature of the assessment.

Candidates should be encouraged to read questions carefully before they begin work to ensure they are meeting the all the requirements of the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were expected to read the information about a family choosing a holiday and then use it to explain which holiday they favoured including one argument against their choice.

Good responses were characterised by a statement in favour of a particular holiday followed by evidence for the material to support this statement. For example:

Holiday X provides both meat and vegetarian dishes which is suitable for Mrs Jensen because she is a vegetarian.

Holiday X is in their home country and Mr Jensen would like this because he wants to support national tourism.

Holiday Y has a range of local restaurants which would suit Mr Jensen because he likes to eat out and try local food on holiday.

Holiday Y has the opportunity to visit ancient ruins and Peter may be interested in this because he has just been studying architecture.

Holiday Z has a spa, sauna and several pools which Mrs Jensen may like because she is looking to be pampered on holiday after her difficult year at work.

Holiday X does not offer much in the way of luxury for Mrs Jensen who is looking forward to being pampered.

In weaker answers, there was some confusion between different members of the Jensen family, especially Mr and Mrs Jensen and Renate. Using short, sentences with little development that did not use the full word count usually scored low marks.

Any work in excess of the word limit was not marked. Some candidates wasted words (sometimes up to 15 words) with an introductory sentence which effectively repeated the question; sometimes the knock-on effect from this was that the response was 'cut off' before they dealt with a counter argument against their choice thus restricting their marks. Centres are encouraged to give candidates plenty of opportunity to write succinctly and focus from the beginning on their explanations.

- (b) When candidates wrote their response in their own words, reworking the text in the material to explain which holiday was unsuitable for the family, they were able to score well. Many candidates were also able to give one counter argument in favour of the holiday.

Better answers from Question 1(b) demonstrated the ability to rework the language to give the same meaning with different vocabulary. For example:

Holiday Z is expensive because it is a top hotel and flights are not included.

It takes seven hours to travel to Holiday Y by plane; this could be unbearable for Thomas who gets sick when travelling.

There are lots of activities involving being high up in holiday X; Peter may not want to join in with these as he is frightened of heights.

Unfortunately, many candidates ignored the instruction to answer in their own words and lifted whole phrases and key words from the material in their answers. This resulted in them scoring no marks for large sections of their answer.

Centres are therefore encouraged to give candidates lots of practice in using material to answer questions and then have to write their responses in their own words.

- (c) The least useful piece of information was that Renate had dyslexia; all other pieces of information have some bearing on the decision. Candidates were expected to explain why having dyslexia had no influence on the choice of holiday. Around 30 per cent of candidates gave the correct answer, and relatively few of these gave sufficient development to score the full three marks; most said reading was not necessary for the holiday activities, but relatively few moved on to say that family members could help with menus/notice-boards.

For example, they could explain that none of the activities required reading and if they did, such as visiting the ancient ruins, then Renate's parents and brothers could help her with any difficulty she may have reading information; some other good answers referred to the reading of menus in restaurants and family helping Renate.

- (d) Candidates answered Question 1(d) well. These answers included points about the modest income of Mr and Mrs Jensen and how they have to pay high university fees with it. Points about five people being a large family which can make holidays costly were also relevant. Many candidates recognised that Thomas was about to go to university and so there was a high cost coming in the form of fees and that Peter had just finished university so the family would have also already had to fund this course.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates answered this question well and there were many opportunities to gain marks. Candidates were expected to pay close attention to the question, however, which required information about Stanislav Petrov's day '*...in the Serpukhov-15 base*'. Therefore, there was no credit for information about receiving a phone call and hearing music on the line.

- (b) Many candidates answered Question 2(b) well and were able to find a range of information about Stanislav Petrov and his workers panicking when the alarm went off – to score full marks, candidates had to elicit evidence for both Petrov and the workers.

- (c) (i) Many candidates found this question challenging and did not understand the phrase. Some successful responses were:

melodious sounds
uplifting music

- (ii) Several candidates were successful and able to explain that '*money got tight*' meant that X became poor or had limited income. Those candidates that used the word '*money*' in their answer were unable to gain a mark. Some good examples of responses:

income reduced
his income diminished

- (d) When candidates are asked to explain the meaning of a metaphor or personification, they should aim to break the phrase down into sections and try to explain each section in their own words; they should be also mindful of the 35-word limit and make sure their answer is within the word limit given.

- (i) '*small wonder that, when it was over, he felt wrung out.*'

The most successful candidates produced a concise response for example: 'It was no surprise that, after the crisis passed, Petrov was really tired.' Less successful responses were often limited by wasting words at the beginning such as 'What the author means by these words is...'; the response inevitably went beyond the word count and so losing one or two marks because their key explanations came after 33 words. Some candidates found it challenging to provide an alternative for '*small wonder*'; '*when it was over*' was often repeated without amendment, and 'relieved' was a frequent misconception for '*wrung out*'.

- (ii) *'in such febrile times, one rooster crowing was likely to set off all the others in the village.'*

Whilst some candidates found the phrase *'in such febrile times'* difficult to understand, many candidates were also able to write a clear explanation of this phrase within the required word limit.

Some examples included:

'because of the tension of the Cold War, if Petrov had panicked and said the USSR was under attack, others would have panicked and set off nuclear war'

'it was a tense period of time and if Petrov has announced an attack on the USSR his superiors would have retaliated sending missiles to the USA.'

- (d) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to contrast Petrov's treatment by the USSR and then the West in their own words. Many candidates did not follow the rubric in the questions and therefore low scoring responses contained material lifted from the text.

Examples of good answers were:

His bosses told him off for not following procedures because he had humiliated them;
The equipment had cost a lot of money and he had shown it was faulty.

- (e) Many candidates were able to score at least two out of three marks on this question; the main points made highlighted Petrov's bitterness at his treatment in the USSR, the fact he lived in a grubby flat and that he had little to show for his efforts other than a TV and telephone. Many candidates picked out the fact that he had done little more than his job.