

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

Content

- Answer the **set** question and focus on the key words.
- Support your main points with appropriate examples.
- Keep anecdotal/personal evidence to a minimum.
- An introduction should immediately address the question and show understanding of it.
- A conclusion should be a reasoned assessment of the arguments made.
- Ensure that all aspects of the question are addressed.
- Re-visit the question after each paragraph.
- It is important to choose the question which best suits what you know.

Use of English

- Leave time to check your English thoroughly to avoid basic errors.
- Concentrate on using appropriate vocabulary so expression is fluent and precise.
- Basic sentence structure/grammar needs to be accurate to ensure clear communication of content.

General comments

More successful responses answered the question as set and included a variety of examples to illustrate the main points of the essay. There were many examples which offered few or no examples at all, resulting in vague and generalised arguments which either lacked conviction or were unconvincing.

When the set question demands it, candidates should focus on aspects of their own country; if this is not the prompt then a broader focus is required. More successful responses demonstrated good topic knowledge and included local, regional and global examples to support points. Those that were less successful wrote on topics with which they were insufficiently familiar and provided little or no evidence to support points made. Candidates need to spend time studying the chosen question to make sure they understand what is being asked and then re-visit after every paragraph to check that key words are being addressed. Although topic knowledge was often thorough and detailed, there was a tendency to present it more as a descriptive list than an evaluative discussion.

Most candidates used the time reasonably efficiently and were able to produce a clearly structured essay of around the recommended length. Some responses could have gained higher marks had their introductions been briefer and more focussed. The introduction is where the candidate should begin to address key words, to reassure themselves that, from the beginning, they understand the question. Effective conclusions arrived at a reasoned, personal assessment, rather than listing points from the essay.

Despite the rarity of rubric infringements and 'short' essays (less than 375 words), the quality of the Use of English was variable. A substantial number of candidates have acquired a wide-ranging English vocabulary (especially technical/specialised) but need to ensure they use these words in an appropriate context. Thorough and systematic checking for errors would help greatly to improve the standard, as well as to clarify content.

Use of English

Basic errors need to be checked and corrected in order to improve English marks. Typical examples are listed below:

- Subject/verb non-agreement
- Frequent incorrect or superfluous use of the definite and/or indefinite article
- Omission of apostrophes
- Confusion between homophones such as their/there/they're, to/too and your/you're
- Incorrect comparative forms
- Missing endings on plurals (which could be corrected through checking)
- Incorrect use of vocabulary
- Incorrect use of prepositions
- Using advanced vocabulary incorrectly or inappropriate ways, e.g. '*myriads*' and '*plethoras*'

In a number of cases, it may be better if sentences were phrased using candidate's own wording, in preference to the use of clichéd phrases which do not always show full understanding, for example:

- 'How good was that?'
- '(In) This day and age'
- 'In a nutshell'
- 'At the end of the day'
- 'Holistic approach'
- 'Mother Nature'
- 'Think outside the box'
- 'Words are inadequate to describe...'
- 'Since time immemorial'
- 'On a conclusive note'

Whilst the above phrases may be appropriate in some instances, in most cases candidates could gain better marks by using their own phraseology, to demonstrate contextual understanding, in preference to using the stock phrases that may not be appropriate or strictly accurate.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

The words 'evaluate the extent' permit candidates to examine the case for prioritising sport and leisure in a given country. The need for, and benefits of, sport and sometimes leisure were mentioned in many responses to this question, but only a few endeavoured to rank them in relation to the other needs of the country, and many responses could have gained higher marks had they given greater consideration the word 'priority'. Some very good responses made it clear that in their countries there were other, more pressing priorities than sport and leisure.

Question 2

Many responses to this question were strikingly honest and bold about the history their own countries as well as others'. In many responses the view was accepted that lessons could be learned from both domestic and foreign experience, though many responses would have benefitted from describing how these lessons might be applied in the future. A few responses detailed the history of the candidates' own country. These could be effective essays, particularly where candidates challenged Eurocentric historical interpretations, though in order to achieve high marks there also had to be some consideration of other countries. The best responses discussed their own country's place in world history and a few pointed out that political borders are relatively recent developments.

Question 3

Most of the responses to this question were focused on the idea of democracy alone and, though often detailed, these responses would have benefitted had they also addressed 'people power'. Examples could have been offered from various parts of the world; Egypt, Greece and Venezuela, to name a few. A few responses pointed out that, even where a democratic vote prevailed, it was actually the leader(s) who directed a successful democracy. A few discussed the dangers of mob rule and the descent into anarchy broadening their discussion to describe the consequences; violence, civil war, innocent victims.

Question 4

Responses to this two-part question often focussed on justifying the initial 'scene-setting' sentence, rather than addressing effectively the key question of responsibility in the second part of the question. A number of answers therefore exemplified the dis/advantages of multi-nationals, but would have benefited from addressing the prime question of the responsibility to make good the 'damage', a word that needed to be analysed. Some responses used balanced illustration, such as mining companies taking diamonds out of a country but providing employment and improving infrastructures that benefited the people generally. The highest marks were achieved when the remarks made were attached to relevant and supporting examples of companies that exploited resources for negative or positive reasons.

Question 5

Questions such as this need to be approached both with caution and a spirit of critical fairness towards the opposing views on the issue. The key issue, here, is prosecuting the 'helper'. There were a number of essays that delved into the twin issues of the desirability of dignified euthanasia *in extremis* and of the problems attendant on the decision, but the best responses also considered the role of law (and of the wider consequences). A few essays included personal experience in both a moving and thoughtful way. Understandably many wrote in general terms about euthanasia, but that was not the question. Those who considered legal, religious, and medical aspects, wrote essays which were relevant.

Question 6

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be made.

Question 7

This can be considered as a two-part question and many candidates approached it as if it was. In the majority of responses the opening paragraphs were used to point out the benefits of the internet before considering how it could be misused and become an addiction. This was a valid approach, but some responses would have benefitted had a stronger counter-argument then been offered, illustrating some of the less desirable aspects of internet use. The approach of many candidates to this question illustrates the need for a clear statement of intent in the introduction as pointed out in the 'Key Messages' section. Several candidates defined 'addiction' successfully and were able to offer quite striking examples of how addiction and the internet interact. In a small number of responses the source of the addiction was questioned, blaming not the internet itself, but our 'inner addiction'. The best responses saw the potential for a wide-ranging debate by keeping the word 'addiction' at the forefront of the response.

Question 8

Some responses to this question compared the silent film era to the films of today, making the point that great films do not necessarily require a sophisticated or beautifully composed musical score. The best responses to this question used a range of examples to illustrate the points made. Some were very successful, citing film versions of musicals such as 'West Side Story' and, of course, 'The Sound of Music'. Others looked at specific genres such as the Western or the horror movie and built a strong case for how integral music is to a film's impact. Some stronger responses were able to refer to specific composers. Many responses would have benefitted from using the appropriate vocabulary. Many responses described music as 'good', 'scary', 'exciting', 'loud' or 'emotional', but would have benefitted from more specific wording. Those who were able to analyse the music they exemplified did well.

Question 9

The key word in this question is 'reading' and not 'internet'. Many responses to this question described the experience of reading from screen on tablet or PC and the attendant advantages for learning, shopping, and communication – in other words, the advantages and disadvantages of reading on-screen and of having ready internet access. Many responses that adopted this approach focussed excessively on description of the technology, but would have benefitted from analysis of the nature of the reading that it encouraged. The best responses to this question went beyond this approach to examine how reading on e-readers compared to traditionally printed material may affect the nature of the way in which we read, and examined the implications on how people process written information. The best responses queried, for example, the ability to read into text printed on small-format electronic screens, where scanning across an entire passage may not be possible, and the possible effect on long-term memory of reading on electronic devices that have search capability.

Question 12

Most responses to this question deployed a wide-range of examples to support their arguments, such as 'The Kardashians' and various iterations of 'Big Brother' or similar programmes. There was a range of perceptive insights, and many responses went beyond common sense and wrote philosophical essays on reality and appearance which were full of common sense. Candidates were able to distinguish between the real and the contrived with careful selection and use of examples their essays made sense contextually. For example a few referred to the real humiliation inflicted upon people in the preliminary rounds of 'Pop Idol' and 'X Factor'.

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

Content

- Answer the **set** question and focus on the key words.
- Support your main points with appropriate examples.
- Keep anecdotal/personal evidence to a minimum.
- An introduction should immediately address the question and show understanding of it.
- A conclusion should be a reasoned assessment of the arguments made.
- Ensure that all aspects of the question are addressed.
- Re-visit the question after each paragraph.
- It is important to choose the question which best suits what you know.

Use of English

- Leave time to check your English thoroughly to avoid basic errors.
- Concentrate on using appropriate vocabulary so expression is fluent and precise.
- Basic sentence structure/grammar needs to be accurate to ensure clear communication of content.

General comments

More successful responses answered the question as set and included a variety of examples to illustrate the main points of the essay. There were many examples which offered few or no examples at all, resulting in vague and generalised arguments which either lacked conviction or were unconvincing.

When the set question demands it, candidates should focus on aspects of their own country; if this is not the prompt then a broader focus is required. More successful responses demonstrated good topic knowledge and included local, regional and global examples to support points. Those that were less successful wrote on topics with which they were insufficiently familiar and provided little or no evidence to support points made. Candidates need to spend time studying the chosen question to make sure they understand what is being asked and then re-visit after every paragraph to check that key words are being addressed. Although topic knowledge was often thorough and detailed, there was a tendency to present it more as a descriptive list than an evaluative discussion.

Most candidates used the time reasonably efficiently and were able to produce a clearly structured essay of around the recommended length. Some responses could have gained higher marks had their introductions been briefer and more focussed. The introduction is where the candidate should begin to address key words, to reassure themselves that, from the beginning, they understand the question. Effective conclusions arrived at a reasoned, personal assessment, rather than listing points from the essay.

Despite the rarity of rubric infringements and 'short' essays (less than 375 words), the quality of the Use of English was variable. A substantial number of candidates have acquired a wide-ranging English vocabulary (especially technical/specialised) but need to ensure they use these words in an appropriate context. Thorough and systematic checking for errors would help greatly to improve the standard, as well as to clarify content.

Use of English

Basic errors need to be checked and corrected in order to improve English marks. Typical examples are listed below:

- Subject/verb non-agreement
- Frequent incorrect or superfluous use of the definite and/or indefinite article
- Omission of apostrophes
- Confusion between homophones such as their/there/they're, to/too and your/you're
- Incorrect comparative forms
- Missing endings on plurals (which could be corrected through checking)
- Incorrect use of vocabulary
- Incorrect use of prepositions

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question was approached by most from a personal perspective with many examples anecdotal. Sometimes the response was too subjective, with a limited range and depth, but 'importance' was always addressed. More successful candidates were more objective and approached it from a sociological perspective, sometimes citing appropriate authorities such as 'Parsons'. There was careful reference to the family being the tool of 'primary socialisation'. Also, reference was made to the range of families found in modern times, often in a cultural context, and an acknowledgement of the family's role in achieving social cohesion.

Question 2

In most responses 'education' was recognised as a 'measure of achievement', important for higher education and 'a respectable career'. Less successful responses did not move beyond this, stressing that the gathering of certificates was essential, not only for the individual but for family pride. More successful candidates were able to argue in broader terms, considering education as a preparation for adult life, and the responsibility that comes with it. There was some recognition of the vocational aspect although this was never fully developed. A few balanced the need for 'qualifications' with the need for 'life skills education', arguing that too much 'qualification pressure' could be destructive as well as constructive.

Question 3

Many responses to this question would have gained higher marks had they focussed more on the 'image' aspect of the question. Often references to it were vague and tangential with constant references to 'soccer'. The popular example was 'The World Cup' with its issues of corruption, financial mismanagement and popular protest. More successful candidates did link their country's international participation in sport to improving their country's image, encouraging people's patriotism and involvement in local sporting activities. Most candidates were able to visualise the health benefits derived from sport, but the best addressed 'to what extent', balancing the positives with the negatives (match-fixing, crowd behaviour, as a priority for government funds).

Question 4

Many responses to this question tended to focus on World War Two and its legacy. Most candidates seemed to be knowledgeable about history but it was whether the candidate addressed the 'more than just learning the facts' aspect of the question that often determined their success in responding to the question. A popular point was 'not repeating mistakes' but the most successful explored the reliability of historical facts, which were often popularised by biased sources with fixed loyalties. The range of examples was then the determining factor, some considering the French Revolution and American Independence. Some candidates focused only on local history.

Question 5

Responses to this question were often ready to acknowledge that the government had a vital role to play in people's health through raising health awareness, providing health facilities and implementing vaccination and/or medication programmes. More successful responses balanced this against 'the responsibility of the individual' and explored dietary concerns, alcohol and smoking-related problems, fitness and even alternative therapies (such as yoga and meditation). References to Ebola were inevitable considering the current media attention.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to produce balanced and focused responses. Very few just wrote all they knew about computers. The degree of reference to 'pocket-sized' was the differentiating factor. However, 'portability' was a feature of most responses, often exploring the technical aspects of such devices. This could be list-like or descriptive but the most successful responses considered cost issues and referred to a range of advantages and disadvantages. Conversely, there was awareness of the disruptive influence of 'pocket-sized' devices on young lives, often to the detriment of their education. The best responses did 'assess' and produced a personal evaluation, often as a reasoned conclusion.

Question 7

Many responses to this question could have gained higher marks had they been more tightly focussed on answering the actual question set. Many candidates tended to offload their knowledge of global warming with most describing natural disasters but with very little on 'lessons learned'. Sometimes there were generalised ideas but these were often implicit and superficial. The most successful addressed 'how true' with reference to the building of infrastructures (e.g. Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station), re-locating populations or improving building structures, often with a final assessment that 'lessons learned' are limited in the face of such powerful, unpredictable natural forces.

Question 8

Most responses to this question featured an example of a storyline from a film, but would have benefitted from tighter focus on the question set, as many responses tended to be descriptive with tenuous reference to special effects. There were references to CGI dominating a film, where the plot was lost in the spectacle of it all, but the most successful of these arguments gave specific examples of this occurrence, and many tended to be too generalised. More successful responses detailed how special effects, without an effective storyline, could be frustrating or even boring. However, some considered that certain genres needed special effects to be convincing (sci-fi/horror). The most successful provided a range of appropriate examples and addressed 'how far', often using 'Avatar' as an example of a film which provided ground-breaking special effects but still maintained complex and effective storytelling.

Question 9

Most responses to this question focused on the ecological impact of 'not cutting down trees' to supply paper and that it would not matter if newspapers disappeared because everyone has a computer anyway. Some highlighted the impact on the poor, marginalised sectors of society by suggesting that they would be disadvantaged, in terms of not having access to news, because they could not afford computers or reliable internet connections. The most successful responses did address 'to what extent' suggesting that wi-fi or mobile internet connections are becoming the norm, but that some people will always enjoy magazine/newspaper reading as something cheap, portable and tangible. However, most responses concluded that 'it didn't matter whether they disappeared' as it was inevitable, in the context of technological progress.

Question 10

Most responses to this question considered censorship in the context of cultural values and propriety, with an emphasis on advertising providing a truthful representation of a product. The most successful responses addressed 'to what extent', arguing that the only 'essential' element of censorship was if the advert was misleading, but that anything else depended on factors such as age, religion, values of different countries or groups.

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/13

Paper 13

Key Messages

Content

- Answer the **set** question and focus on the key words.
- Support your main points with appropriate examples.
- Keep anecdotal/personal evidence to a minimum.
- An introduction should immediately address the question and show understanding of it.
- A conclusion should be a reasoned assessment of the arguments made.
- Ensure that all aspects of the question are addressed.
- Re-visit the question after each paragraph.
- It is important to choose the question which best suits what you know.

Use of English

- Leave time to check your English thoroughly to avoid basic errors.
- Concentrate on using appropriate vocabulary so expression is fluent and precise.
- Basic sentence structure/grammar needs to be accurate to ensure clear communication of content.

General comments

More successful responses answered the question as set and included a variety of examples to illustrate the main points of the essay. There were many examples which offered few or no examples at all, resulting in vague and generalised arguments which either lacked conviction or were unconvincing.

When the set question demands it, candidates should focus on aspects of their own country; if this is not the prompt then a broader focus is required. More successful responses demonstrated good topic knowledge and included local, regional and global examples to support points. Those that were less successful wrote on topics with which they were insufficiently familiar and provided little or no evidence to support points made. Candidates need to spend time studying the chosen question to make sure they understand what is being asked and then re-visit after every paragraph to check that key words are being addressed. Although topic knowledge was often thorough and detailed, there was a tendency to present it more as a descriptive list than an evaluative discussion.

Most candidates used the time reasonably efficiently and were able to produce a clearly structured essay of around the recommended length. Some responses could have gained higher marks had their introductions been briefer and more focussed. The introduction is where the candidate should begin to address key words, to reassure themselves that, from the beginning, they understand the question. Effective conclusions arrived at a reasoned, personal assessment, rather than listing points from the essay.

Despite the rarity of rubric infringements and 'short' essays (less than 375 words), the quality of the Use of English was variable. A substantial number of candidates have acquired a wide-ranging English vocabulary (especially technical/specialised) but need to ensure they use these words in an appropriate context. Thorough and systematic checking for errors would help greatly to improve the standard, as well as to clarify content.

Use of English

Basic errors need to be checked and corrected in order to improve English marks. Typical examples are listed below:

- Subject/verb non-agreement
- Frequent incorrect or superfluous use of the definite and/or indefinite article
- Omission of apostrophes
- Confusion between homophones such as their/there/they're, to/too and your/you're
- Incorrect comparative forms
- Missing endings on plurals (which could be corrected through checking)
- Incorrect use of vocabulary
- Incorrect use of prepositions

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most responses considered treatment in the home and at school, tending to present a one-sided argument focusing on a young person's rights (or lack of them). Authorities were described as repressive, unfair or unsympathetic. More successful responses challenged the quotation and considered that young people needed to be educated, disciplined and learn moral values in order to achieve responsibility in adulthood and become a 'first-class' citizen. Some emphasised that, in some cultures and/or families, young people were attributed with constant 'first-class' status. Some did address 'sometimes' and suggested that discipline was 'a necessary evil'.

Question 2

Most responses to this question suggested that 'respecting popular opinion' characterised a successful democracy and was 'important' as such, referring to various consequences if it was not respected (violent protest, ousted government, clampdown by the authorities). Examples were often taken from known dictatorships. More successful responses introduced balance by suggesting that sometimes unpopular decisions have to be made for the good of law and order, the economy, or improving infrastructure. Better responses also concluded that a way of respecting popular opinion was through government transparency and incorruptibility. The free press was seen as a measure of 'popular opinion' and government accountability.

Question 3

There were a number of successful responses to this question but most would also have benefitted from citing more examples. All responses possessed an argumentative tone and supported the idea that terrorist acts were criminal acts, outside the world of politics. The most successful responses suggested that terrorism could be defined in different ways by various groups and governments and provided some balance but still lacked examples.

Question 4

Most responses focused on the question and tended to cite the Middle East as a region which depends on one industry. Some considered local examples and tended to be descriptive, but supported the need for multi-nationals to operate in a country if economic progress is to be sustained. The most successful responses were balanced with a reasoned conclusion and integrated a range of examples.

Question 5

Most responses to this question referred to Ebola and seemed knowledgeable about the aid available in terms of human resources and medication. Some considered the difficulty of providing aid to corrupt, autocratic countries and questioned how closely this was monitored. The most successful responses argued that education was the most significant 'aid', to teach about healthcare and for the poor to be made aware of preventable diseases. An assessment of 'to what extent' was also a feature of better responses.

Question 6

Good local knowledge was shown in most responses to this question, and many described a range of transport features, with specific examples, and were aware of certain developments and future attempts to improve. Whereas most did address 'efficiency', there was a tendency to focus primarily on urban communities. More successful responses provided a balanced view and assessed the degree of 'efficiency', expanding the argument to include countryside features (the railways/public transport) and explored whether these met the needs of more rural communities. Less successful ones were anecdotal and often focused on one element, such as the need to get to work/school on time.

Question 7

Many responses considered the internet as an unlimited source of health information which enabled society to be more self-sufficient. Various forums were identified as allowing people to share their health issues/worries on a global scale. Any negative points were concerned with the sedentary lifestyle of internet users, repetitive strain injury and eye strain as well as mental health problems (cyberbullying) and the possibility of the internet encouraging hypochondria. The most successful responses addressed 'how far do you agree' with reference to both 'health' and 'well-being' and presented a reasoned conclusion linked to the idea of 'improving'

Question 8

Most responses to this question identified 'big budget' as special effects, car chases, explosions and overpaid actors. Some were descriptive, listing films, while others tended to generalise. The more successful responses suggested that storytelling was the most important feature of a good film and that the budget would be determined by the need to tell the story effectively. Some suggested that some genres inevitably needed a large budget to be convincing (sci-fi/horror) although citing such films as 'The Blair Witch Project' and 'Paranormal Activity' as low budget but effective horror films. The most successful responses addressed 'to what extent'.

Question 9

Many responses to this question slightly misunderstood the question and considered everyone becoming journalists, with the idea that 'amateurish' journalism, via 'blogs' and social networking sites, were distorting the truth, suggesting that professional journalists did not do this. Many responses would have benefitted from more examples being used. More successful responses focused on modern technology, enabling anyone to 'create news' via mobile phones/cameras and suggested that it empowered people to record the truth of events, although acknowledging that such 'news' could be fabricated as well. A range of examples were given to demonstrate the effects of such a development.

Question 10

There were some well-informed responses to this question, with most addressing both the 'singer' and the 'song'. Less successful responses described 'favourite' singers and then summarised the lyrics from various songs but did comment on which they found most important. More successful responses provided a wider range of examples, with a balanced argument. Some considered singer-songwriters, songs which stood the test of time, the emergence of 'manufactured' singers, and addressed 'how far do you agree'.

Question 7

Quite popular. Many responses considered the Internet as an unlimited source of health information which enabled society to be more self-sufficient. Various forums were identified as allowing people to share their health issues/worries on a global scale. Any negative points were concerned with the sedentary lifestyle of Internet users/repetitive strain injury/eye strain as well as mental health problems (cyberbullying) and the possibility of the Internet encouraging hypochondria. The most successful responses addressed 'how far do you agree' with reference to both 'health' and 'well-being' and presented a reasoned conclusion linked to the idea of 'improving'

Question 8

Not too popular with most responses identifying 'big budget' as special effects/car chases/explosions and overpaid actors. Some were descriptive, listing films, while others tended to generalise. The more successful responses suggested that storytelling was the most important feature of a good film and that the budget would be determined by the need to tell the story effectively. Some suggested that some genres inevitably needed a large budget to be convincing (sci-fi/horror) although citing such films as 'Blair Witch Project/Paranormal Activity' as low budget but effective horror films. The most successful responses addressed 'to what extent'.

Question 9

Quite popular. Many responses slightly misunderstood the question and considered everyone becoming journalists, with the idea that 'amateurish' journalism, via 'blogs' and social networking sites, were distorting the truth, suggesting that professional journalists did not do this. More examples would have been useful. More successful responses focused on modern technology enabling anyone to 'create news' via mobile phones/cameras and suggested that it empowered people to record the truth of events although acknowledging that such 'news' could be fabricated as well. A range of examples were given to demonstrate the effects of such a development.

Question 10

Popular. Some well-informed responses here with most addressing both the 'singer' and the 'song'. Less successful responses described 'favourite' singers and then summarised the lyrics from various songs but did comment on which they found most important. More successful responses provided a wider range of examples, with a balanced argument. Some considered singer/song-writers, songs which stood the test of time and the modern manufacture of singers and addressed 'how far do you agree'.

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/21

Paper 21

Key Messages

It is important that candidates read through the paper carefully before making their choice of question. This is particularly significant in the case of **Question 3**, where candidates should appreciate the demands of **section (e)**.

It is important the candidates note where the rubric states *Using your own word*, as this cannot be ignored. In such questions little credit, if any, can be awarded for copying from the text.

Word limits are imposed to test candidates' ability to write in a concise fashion. Examiners are vigilant in judging the point at which the limit is exceeded, and material beyond that point cannot be credited.

General Comments

All responses demonstrated showed clear engagement with the paper and had evidently taken it very seriously. Virtually all candidates attempted all parts of their chosen question. Only a handful of candidates appeared were unable to approach the task in a meaningful way, either in terms of ability to comprehend the questions or to write in intelligible English.

Candidates' use of English was, on the whole, strong – most wrote intelligibly, showing secure (if sometimes uneven) control of vocabulary, syntax and sentence structure. A common weakness that could be avoided was the habit of using commas where a connective would have been more appropriate, and few candidates used more sophisticated punctuation such as colons, semi-colons or hyphens. The commonest errors, other than lapses in punctuation, were the misspelling of common words (receive, achieve and accommodate), non-agreement of verbs, and inconsistency of tenses within sentences.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This was easily the most popular question, attracting over 60% of the candidature.

- (a) Candidates opted for Mola and Ninani in more or less equal numbers, giving reasons which often often showed clear and appropriately-selected reading of the source material.

In the case of Mola, most commonly cited reasons were its dowdy image, familiarity, current trading difficulties, lack of commitment to the shopping mall and weak profit margin. Fewer candidates cited transport problems of the elderly and the reduced bus service.

Candidates who chose Ninani often saw that its glamorous image, expensive prices and niche product range were sharply at odds with a run-down town, an elderly demographic and high unemployment.

- (b) Most candidates selected Primestore and saw national prestige, variety of products, frequent customer footfall, employment opportunities and subsidy for the mall as convincing reasons.

Those who chose Futurgizmo also cited the strongest reasons for this: employment, an effective monopoly of trade in the town, an aggressive pricing policy and free delivery – particularly attractive in a town with poor public transport.

In both cases, stronger answers were those who co-ordinated their responses well. Four reasons with effective, comprehensive and focused development attracted a better mark than a selection of points simply cited, but not developed or reinforced.

- (c) Most candidates chose an appropriate point, but the explanation was not always sufficient to obtain full credit. In selecting the site of the Rado and then justifying the choice by simply saying that 'it isn't important' adds little, if anything, to the choice. In order to obtain more marks some understanding of the fact that the point applies equally to all four stores was needed.
- (d) Candidates found this question very accessible. Almost all cited pleasure at new shops, food and entertainment facilities with some also citing the positive effect of a reverse in the town's decline. Equally, negative effects (such as noise, over-crowding, traffic, and pollution) were quoted by many.
- (e) This question confused some candidates, who made a comparison between Radoma's current out-of-town centre and the proposed development. To the extent that facts about these were available in the source, this had the effect of limiting answers or producing ones that 'fitted where they touched' which had to be mined for applicable content.

Many answers fitted the generality of the question, and issues such as accessibility, free parking, a spacious and pleasant environment and the idea of a social experience featured in many answers.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates cited the correct dead or dying traditions of the village – the pub, the fair and the Maypole dancing. Some chose the flower festival, even though minute 7 states specifically that it is ready to go ahead this year.

The majority of the marks came from candidate's development of their points, and stronger candidates recognised that the Red Lion's function as a meeting place was important as was the support of the village School for country dancing.

Some candidates cited the current state of the village council, vandalism or the village's financial predicament; these could not be credited, as none were traditions, let alone dying ones.

- (b) The best answers concentrated on key issues such as the five-year residency rule, the nature of the council's quorum and how it has been affected by recent resignations and its powerlessness to revise its own constitution, and developed these, often making fruitful reference to the negative attitudes of the village's 'incomers'.

A significant proportion of answers could have been improved significantly had they referred to the material in minute 10, referring instead to material in minutes 5, 8 and 11.

- (c) The commonest choices were the parking problems, vandalism, rising costs for such services as grass cutting, electricity supply and repair to vandalised facilities, financial over-commitment and social tensions amongst the villagers. Relatively few references were made to fire hazards, the closure of the village hall and behaviour of young people, which could have been cited by candidates.
- (d)(i) Most candidates offered answers which incorporated some idea of a delay.
- (ii) Not all candidates were able to respond to this question, other adjectives making some sense such as *difficult*, *insoluble* and *expensive* could be substituted for *perennial*.
- (iii) Most candidates understood that the phrase implied some sense of regret.
- (e) Most candidates answered this question well as they identified the references to the lack of support for the flower festival and the refusal to close the meeting with a prayer. A source of confusion was the reference to Mrs Bane's thatched-roof fire as an act of God which caused some misfires - particularly as it could suggest that the power of God in the village was increasing rather than waning!

Question 3

Candidate who responded to this question typically completed parts (a) to (d) successfully, but most candidates could have improved their performance in part (e).

- (a) Candidates needed to note that the reference to the source.
- (b) The quality of the answers to this question depended as often as not on the candidate's ability to frame a selection of the material listed in the mark scheme in their own words. Perhaps, as the material was spread throughout the source, some candidates found it difficult to collate.
- (c) (i) The expression *Twitterati* was not widely appreciated, and only a minority of candidates offered something that would give the word some context. *Logging off* was well understood.
(ii) Candidates found it easier to explain *collaborative* than to find a synonym for *tool*.
(iii) Many candidates obtained full credit on this question.
- (d) As with (b), a good score for this question went to responses that where the material was identified most readily, from across the various parts of the passage, and re-framing in the candidate's own words. Most candidates cited cheapness, relative speed, its use as an audit trail, the size of its potential audience and its use as an investigative tool, and managed within the word limit.
- (e) As suggested in the key messages, many candidates found this section difficult. It is important that candidates check the context of the word's usage in the passage and ensure that this is matched in the sentence they compose. For example, many candidates got somewhere near the sense of sifting as used in the passage – sorting through, searching, looking for, all underlain by a sense of discriminating useful from useless. In the subsequent sentence, however, they would often write about sifting in the culinary sense (as in sifting flour).

Candidates must be careful to define noun with noun, adjective with adjective, verb with verb and adverb with adverb. Many candidates lost marks by (for example) defining deluge (used as a noun in the passage) with a verb or phrase such as *to flood something with a lot of water*. This was particularly unfortunate as such candidates clearly had a secure concept of what a deluge is, but could not be rewarded for knowing it.

A significant number of candidates offered two answers which was frustrating when, as often as not, the first answer was incorrect and the second one right.

In (e)(ii), candidates are required to illustrate the meaning of a particular word using a single sentence. Candidates should appreciate that a simple comma is inadequate support in a sentence that contains two independent clauses.

In conclusion, it must be said that many candidates showed intelligence, flair and accomplishment in tackling the paper. 'Own words' responses significant numbers of scripts couched in lucid, concise, accurate and well-structured English prose.

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/22

Paper 22

Key Messages

- The standard of written English was very strong this session, with most performances corresponding to the criteria found in the top two bands. There was much evidence of responses that flowed well because of the good use of connectives (not only...but also, furthermore, moreover, in contrast, when comparing and considering), and which contained appropriate idioms used judiciously. A few candidates did not realise that the style and/or register of idioms they incorporated into their responses were inappropriate on occasion (for example, too informal), but this did not impact greatly on the overall mark for English. Very few candidates relied too heavily on the text by resorting to wholesale 'lifting' from the passages, so hardly any candidates received a Use of English mark in the bottom band.
- Many candidates this session showed evidence of attention with regard to tackling questions with word limits (most obviously in **questions 1(a) and 1(b)**), by stating their choice succinctly and immediately, citing reasons, rather than writing a long introduction, thus maximising the number of points communicated within the word count. However, a significant minority wrote well beyond the word limits stated in questions and sometimes wrote erroneous word counts at the end of the response. One of the skills this paper tests is the ability to write concisely, so credit is not given to work beyond a word limit; Examiners are vigilant about checking such rubric infringements, meaning that some candidates would have attained higher marks if their answers had been more succinct.
- The majority of candidates could have improved their marks if they had developed the points they made with evidence or nuanced insights, rather than by making unsupported assertions. Sweeping or generalised statements are rarely creditworthy, but candidates could gain marks by incorporating modal verbs (may, might, can, could); vocabulary such as perhaps, maybe, possibly, seemingly, etc.; comparatives and superlatives; discursive expressions (such as I feel, this implies, this could be interpreted, etc.) – all of which would positively impact upon the Use of English mark.
- A very small minority of candidates clearly changed their mind regarding which question they were going to respond to midway through the examination, crossing out their answers and completing another question instead. It is highly recommended that candidates read through a question in its entirety before committing to it, in order to assess their ability to answer **all** the sub-questions and to allow the maximum amount of time possible for the composition and proofreading of answers, and thus gain the most marks possible. A few candidates answered multiple questions – either two of the questions or all three – leading to a likely depression in the overall mark attained by the candidate because of the lack of time spent on each question.
- Very few instances of illegible handwriting were noted by Examiners, and crossings-out or additions were clearly made in the main, which meant that candidates' work gained all the marks that they deserved.

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates chose this question, and engaged well with the subject matter of choosing a university: very few short answers were seen.

(a) and (b)

Almost all candidates endorsed one university straight away, Endsor in **(a)** and Candoo in **(b)** being the most frequent combination of choices, following the rubric as required. Many candidates handled the questions well, scoring at least 6 marks with a range of factors. The ones cited most often and handled most confidently included the grades required, the tuition and accommodation costs, the travel options and the position in the league tables. A significant number of candidates managed to link these factors to information in points 1 to 15, and make developed points: if she

studies English, then it would enhance her job opportunities as employers look for English graduates rather than History ones; if she goes to Endorsor, then employers would be more likely to employ her as it has a good reputation academically; if she goes to Banrock, then she would have money worries as it is too expensive for her. A few candidates showed insight regarding the ability to choose Banrock in particular: although Banrock is too expensive, she could take advantage of her parents' savings and the money she earns in order to be able to afford the best university. Good answers were characterised by a confident use of comparatives and superlatives (e.g. Frassi is cheaper than two of the other universities; Banrock has the highest position in the league tables of all the universities). With regard to providing synonyms, some good alternatives to key words were seen: live independently, motion or travel sickness, nauseous.

Some candidates could have attained higher marks by noting the key words in the question to consider **both** the advantages **and** the disadvantages, and by ensuring that they included balance within the word count. A few candidates could have improved their performance by clearly stating whether a point raised was an advantage or a disadvantage, rather than simply listing it. Some candidates thought that the class size referred to the actual dimensions of the classroom rather than the number of fellow students, or quoted incorrect data (Candoo is the nearest university). A few also struggled with calculating the costs of going to the four universities: coming up with an incorrect figure, not taking all the costs into account, or making assertions such as Banrock is affordable, whilst Candoo was not. Some candidates cited more disadvantages than advantages in **(a)** and more advantages than disadvantages in **(b)**, or started their response to **(a)** with disadvantages and to **(b)** with advantages – all of which can be confusing, and which impact stylistically on marks awarded to such a response.

- (c)** A significant number of candidates scored marks on this question, choosing point 10 more regularly than point 2, but it was rare to see enough justification to gain full marks. A few candidates chose to cite the point relating to taking the family dogs for long walks, rightly pointing out that she would not have access to the dogs while at university so would not be able to take them out whichever university she chose. Another point cited quite regularly was point 11, though it was more convincing if 'music reviewer' was referred to rather than 'music journalist', as the former was easier to justify.

A few candidates offered more than one piece of information, thus forfeiting marks as this was a rubric infringement. Some would have gained marks if they had noted that the question required an **irrelevant** piece of information, rather than the most **useful** piece of information. A significant minority offered the justification that the point was not relevant or connected, but more detail is required to gain marks.

- (d)** A majority of candidates scored at least half the available marks, whilst a significant number achieved marks between 6 and 8. These responses showed insight into the world of work on a personal level if one possessed a degree; an understanding of the impact on one's country, economically and socially, and on a global level; the benefits culturally (better integration because of mutual understanding) and spiritually (improved confidence and self-esteem, respected more), etc. Good candidates offered fluent, mature and thought-provoking responses that deserved such high marks.

However, a significant number offered answers that would have attracted higher marks if they had not alluded to the quality of university facilities, the nature of the delivery of lectures and/or picked up points made in **(a)** and **(b)**, such as costs, grades and transport, in their responses.

Question 2

This question attracted a smaller number of the candidature; the feedback, therefore, is limited because of the smaller number of scripts seen.

- (a)** The vast majority of candidates coped well with selecting characteristics from the passage, and many showed some insight with regard to how this might affect interactions with the general public, meaning that answers scoring less than at least half marks were rarely seen. The characteristics most often cited for Henry were his inexperience (with a few candidates linking this to him then being naive when debating with the general public) and his lack of 'savvy' about the world of work because he was unemployed (with a few candidates developing this by saying that the public might not trust him, or would regard him as naive). Candidates tended to elicit and develop characteristics for Ida and Jackson more easily: Ida's arrogant attitude distancing the public from

her, and her delicacy health-wise leading to the possibility of being ill when meeting the public, whilst Jackson's lack of patience or his tendency to be blunt could lead to arguments with the public (with some astute candidates linking the latter to occasions when the public might question him about his private life or failing businesses).

- (b) There were only a few rubric infringements, such as selecting promises from two or three of the manifestos. Most candidates chose either Henry or Jackson, managing to put the promises into their own words without too much difficulty, and then astutely developing these promises by putting the relevant parts of the manifestos into their own words too (e.g. to beautify Brownsville, to lend a hand to help others and to boost the employment rate).
- (c) Some excellent responses were given, with candidates enumerating techniques such as the use of rhetorical questions, metaphors, repetition and exclamation marks, and explaining how these techniques would convince or engage readers, all in fluent and sophisticated English. However, quite a few candidates struggled with the concept of 'language techniques' and, instead, summarised elements of the manifestos again.
- (d) Many candidates conveyed either the idea that he would be more accessible or that there would be a change from past administrations, but only a few managed to combine both ideas to gain full marks. Excellent insight was noted on occasion: he wanted to break the political stereotype ... of political manipulation and deception.
- (e) This was handled very well by a significant minority of candidates, but, overall, most candidates did manage to gain three marks, with *antidote*, *drawing a line in the sand* and *frittering* being the most commonly scored. Candidates attracted the higher marks either by confining themselves to just the word or phrases required, rather than lifting too much from the text in their responses (*a noisy menagerie*; *an antidote to corrupt politicians*), or by ensuring that all the necessary words were included (for example, *roughshod* on its own was not creditworthy).
- (f) Candidates attaining the higher marks showed insight, and some examples of excellent lateral thinking were seen. With regard to Henry, candidates pointed out that recruiting volunteers might not be as easy as he thought, as, although he might be dedicated to the cause, most people would not be willing to do something without a certain reward; and that Henry was unemployed, but not everyone would have as much free time as he did to do this type of work. As for Ida, some candidates were live to the issue of how hard it might be to find work placements in a town with a failing economy. Regarding Jackson, a significant minority realised how difficult it might be for him to juggle a difficult personal life with making himself readily available to townspeople, or how corruption would not be so easily tackled, as it had been tried before in other countries and not worked. Candidates who successfully tackled this question cited a promise, rather than a whole manifesto.
- (g) Some candidates used the opportunity to create their own questions to very good effect, composing thought-provoking ones that showed they had taken into account information given in the introduction (by asking questions related to bringing back the steam railway as a tourist attraction, or about attracting the youth back to the town), or had read between the lines regarding the background to the three candidates (Jackson, you have a lot on your plate so how are you going to be available at all times? Henry, you have no leadership background so how will you lead a team of volunteers? Ida, how will you cope if your illness worsens?), or had noted issues in their manifestos (How can you be sure of affording to give the green light to the building of a wind farm with a failing economy?). A significant minority could have gained higher marks by not asking questions that had already been answered in the candidates' manifestos.

Question 3

This question had fewer responses, so the feedback is more limited, as fewer scripts were seen.

- (a) Most gained full marks on this question, as they lifted the key phrases succinctly from the passage, without running on and including a reference to Atkinson carrying out experiments on penguins.
- (b) Most candidates found synonyms for key words and phrases and so handled this question very well, gaining high marks. Instances of good vocabulary used included the following: a blizzard whipped up; conducting experiments; lights out. Instances of sequencing were also noted: drank warm beverages after a freezing day at work before they set off to continue their work when there

were no blizzards. Good answers were characterised by candidates abiding by the word count and noting the reference to 'a typical day' in the question, thus not including material from paragraph five, which referred to the first winter and so was not creditworthy.

- (c) A majority of candidates scored at least one mark by citing the point about men lying about their birthdays, but only a few managed to develop this by pointing out, for example, that the supply was limited. However, insightful answers were seen, such as references to the dangers of imbibing alcohol in such a hostile environment. Good use of English was also noted: so as not to exhaust supplies; to ensure that the limited alcohol would last the full course of the expedition; alcohol provides warmth and pleasure which would tempt some men.
- (d) Candidates gaining higher marks sought synonyms rather than lifting from the text, though *the archetypal bumbling Englishman abroad* and *foibles* proved tricky for most candidates to put into their own words. Instances of good use of English included 'Scott received negative comments after he died'; 'an eventual widespread acceptance of his bravery' and 'people have come to realize Scott's positive traits'.
- (e) Only a very few candidates gained full marks on this question, realising that a description of the celebrations was not what was required, but rather an understanding of the magnitude of the events in the men's lives. However, most did manage to convey one or two ideas: reminding them of home at Christmas; a bonding exercise which would improve team work; it would take their minds off work; a day when colour would come into the hut and they could let go of their worries – most insightful responses.
- (f) 'A memento from home' or 'a gift from someone close' were the points most often cited. Some candidates showed awareness by making statements such as it 'stands out from everything around him; it could serve as a remedy to boredom induced by the barren Antarctica', or that it could be a reminder of previous expeditions. Some candidates had not noted from the passage that it was a bowl with special qualities, hence offered the response that it was to eat from, which was not creditworthy.
- (g) There are five ways in which candidates could have improved their mark on this question: remembering to use the correct grammatical form as in the question (e.g. another adverb to replace the adverb in the question – *extravagantly*); providing only one synonym per question, offering only one sentence as two sentences separated by a comma is a rubric infringement (comma splice – overcome by the use of a semi-colon), checking that the subject matter of the sentence is not the same as in the passage, and, finally, ensuring that the precise meaning of the word is clearly shown in the sentence offered.

Candidates struggled to score the higher marks on this question, but all managed to score at least one mark. Correct synonyms for all the words were noted, but *silhouette* (shape), *disintegrates* (decays) and *fashioned* (designed) were most often seen. 'Luxuriously' and 'lavishly' were often given for *extravagantly*. Candidates who experienced difficulty in finding synonyms frequently responded with 'shadow' and 'decorated'. Some candidates who did not score *silhouette* in (i) because they had given 'shadow' managed to gain the mark when composing the sentence in (ii) though. Some excellent responses seen included the following: 'Iron that is exposed to water disintegrates with the passage of time due to the formation of rust'; 'The airport lounge bristled with passengers due to the cancellation of all the morning flights', and 'The Queen of England lives extravagantly because of her wealth, power and authority'.

Use of English

- A significant number of candidates across the ability range experienced difficulty with the conjugation of the present tense (e.g. 'she is' and 'they are'; 'she has' and 'they have'; 'she does' and 'they do'), yet could manipulate with confidence more complex tenses such as 'she might have been', which is surprising to note.
- Articles and pronouns also proved to be tricky for candidates. Many omitted articles almost entirely from the elements of their responses that had to be couched in their own words, and a significant minority struggled both to incorporate pronouns and to make them agree correctly with their subjects.

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level
8001 General Paper November 2014
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

- The flow and clarity of some candidates' work were hindered by the incorrect use of both commas and semi-colons, and that of connectives and conjunctions. Most candidates over-used the aforementioned punctuation, and did not use 'who' when it was required, but rather 'that', 'which', 'in which' or 'whereby'.
- A couple of spelling errors that were seen on a very frequent basis were 'oppurtunities' and 'accomodation' – the latter despite being given in the passage.

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 8001/23

Paper 23

Key Messages

- The standard of written English was very strong indeed, with the vast majority of performances gaining marks in the top two bands for the Use of English. There was much evidence of fluent and confident responses because of the good use of connectives (e.g. first of all, finally, moreover, given that), and the judicious use of appropriate idioms. There were a few candidates who did not realise that the style and/or register of idioms they incorporated into their answers were occasionally inappropriate (for example, too informal or of American origin), but this did not impact greatly on the overall mark for English. Rare were the candidates who relied too much on the text by resorting to wholesale 'lifting' from the passages so hardly any candidates received a Use of English mark in the bottom band.
- The majority of candidates kept to word limits (most obviously in **Questions 1a** and **1b**), by stating their choice concisely and then citing reasons rather than using up words by giving a long introduction, thus maximising the number of points communicated within the word count. However, there were a few candidates who wrote at length beyond the word limits stated in questions and gave incorrect word counts at the end of the response. One of the skills this paper tests is the ability to write succinctly so credit is not given to work beyond a word limit; Examiners are vigilant about checking such rubric infringements, meaning some candidates would have attained higher marks if their answers had been more concise.
- Many candidates' marks would be improved if they developed the points they made with evidence, examples or nuanced insights rather than by making unsupported assertions. Sweeping or generalised statements are rarely creditworthy. Candidates would gain more marks by using, for example, modal verbs (such as may, might, can, could); vocabulary such as perhaps, maybe, possibly, seemingly, etc.; comparatives and superlatives; discursive expressions (such as I feel, this implies, this could be interpreted, etc.) – all of which would positively impact on the Use of English mark.
- A few candidates answered multiple questions – either two of the questions or all three, which is a rubric infringement - leading to a likely depression in the overall mark attained by the candidate because of the lack of time spent on each question. In addition, a small number of candidates clearly changed their mind regarding which question they were going to answer midway through the examination, crossing out their answers and completing another question instead. It is strongly recommended that candidates read through a question completely before committing to it, in order to assess their ability to answer **all** the sub-questions and to allow the maximum amount of time possible for the composition of answers, and thus gain the most marks possible.
- It is also recommended that candidates allow some time at the end of the examination to proof read their responses. The candidates who attained higher marks showed clear evidence of carrying out this vital process by spotting slips and omissions and rectifying them in a legible manner.
- Another recommendation is to attempt **all** sub-sections of a question rather than leaving any blanks. Candidates achieving the higher marks did so as there is no penalty attracted by attempting every sub-question, only the chance to attain the maximum mark possible.

Question 1

- (a) and b) There was much evidence that candidates had been well trained in responding to data. For example, the vast majority of candidates followed the instruction to only refer to the garden of their choice, and remembered to give balance by offering an advantage or a disadvantage within the word limit. Candidates achieving the higher marks used the necessary comparative and superlative forms to good effect (the second most expensive, the longest to construct and bigger than); sequenced their response well (Furthermore...) and flagged up balance clearly (The limits are ..., The advantages are ..., However, ..), adding to the fluency and clarity of the response - all of which impacted positively on the Use of English mark. Responses attracting the higher marks noted what would affect all the gardens (e.g. the contractor and the maids) and avoided offering them as unsupported assertions. Good answers were characterised by candidates noting details which lent clarity to their response (e.g. the various sizes of the pools, some flower beds located more conveniently than others, and Garden D being the only garden to offer a playground) thus avoiding vague points offered as reasons (there was no place to enjoy themselves) or generalised statements that could apply to more than one garden (there is a pool for the boys to enjoy). Some excellent expression and reasoning were noted: Garden B has the second lowest price tag which would be enough for the family's limited budget, and The rockery could be dangerous for both the grandparents and the children as they could trip and injure themselves. Many candidates achieved higher marks by abiding by the instruction to extract reasons from the passage and develop them in their own words, however, a significant minority of candidates remained too close to the text, lifting phrases too extensively and therefore gaining no credit for those sections.
- (c) Most candidates struggled to gain half the available marks or more on this question. Candidates achieving the higher marks read the key words in the question (*one* and *least*) carefully and responded with the correct perspective – citing points that highlighted which group was not being catered for – rather than referring to what was in the garden for the group they chose; discussing more than one group or explaining which features catered for which family group. Some insight beyond the information provided in the passage was noted: the teenage girls are least likely to be catered for as they will be leaving home soon. A reason often given with regard to the choice of the parents being least likely to be catered for was 'because they had hectic careers so would have little time to spend in the garden' which was valid, but it was difficult to offer any other reasons so limited the marks gained by candidates making this choice.
- (d) Candidates who responded well to this question linked their choice clearly to money in some way – cost, upkeep or affordability – rather than simply listing all the facilities in the garden of their choice. Examples of good linkage to the question were observed: Garden A is the cheapest option and provides a range, though limited, of facilities to satisfy fruit and nature lovers which will last the longest.
- (e) Candidates responded very creatively to this question, with a majority attaining high marks because they showed good use of techniques around marketing and describing things. It was very rare for a candidate to simply offer a list of the facilities or to mention at length cost or other irrelevant material. A very competent knowledge of adjectives was noted: stunning, relaxing, eye-catching, magnificent, extraordinary, etc. In addition, some candidates proved to be good sales people, using persuasive language ('ideal for big, busy families', 'with a magical fountain in the centre bounded by colourful flowers giving life to your house' and 'if you love food, vegetables and fruit will grow in your garden so forget the supermarket') and imperatives ('Looking for a garden? Well, look no more – you have found the best garden right here!') to excellent effect.

Question 2

This question was chosen by a significant number of the candidates, many of whom engaged very well indeed with the subject matter and showed sensitivity and understanding, impacting positively on their overall mark.

- (a) Many candidates showed insight by reading between the lines and exhibited a sophisticated knowledge of the vocabulary of emotions, thereby gaining high marks on this question. Examples of good use of idiomatic vocabulary linked to emotions included the following: struck a nerve, not prone to arrogant behaviour, set her on edge and put her in an unstable emotional state. Candidates attracting the higher marks for both content and expression offered nuanced responses (e.g. he **may** feel stressed that his wife earns more money than him and shocked to hear his daughter yell at him; he **may** feel bored and lonely all day and, when he wants to spend time with

his family, they are all occupied with Schoolwork; he **could have** felt that his work went unnoticed and felt unappreciated). Only a minority of candidates lifted their response directly from the text.

- (b) Insight beyond the information given was evident in this question from candidates receiving the highest marks (e.g. ... she apologised to her mother; the father may have been expecting the same...). Good responses were characterised by candidates reading the question attentively and selecting evidence from the text that the older daughter reacted unusually, rather than either giving reasons as to what caused her to react this way (a response required in **c**) or explaining the sudden and unexpected rage of the father (as required in **a**). A significant minority struggled to find alternatives for *quiet*, *conscientious*, *friendly* and *helpful*, though many offered 'good manners' for *polite*.
- (c) Some lateral thinking was also evident in this question, leading to yet more insightful responses. Examples of a sensitive understanding of the situation included the following: because of hormonal changes; the boyfriend could have changed her as he is a different influence; As she has had to give up hobbies to study, she may not have a way to get rid of this stress; she is very fond of the church and may resent the change.
- d) Once again, many candidates were very adept at putting themselves in the situation the younger daughter found herself in and empathising with her, thereby coming up with some original thinking: she might be pleased to see her sister getting into trouble for once; she suffered from 'second child pressure' – trying to live up to the older sister and feeling resentment; she was popular and it could affect her social life if she were punished for intervening; she understands what her older sister is going through as she has days of loving and hating people. The most common points raised were that she might have her mobile phone taken away from her and that it might draw attention to her poorer school grades.
- (e) The majority of candidates selected the mother as their choice. The rubric was well adhered to in this question, though a few candidates did choose to write their response as if they were the mother or younger daughter (e.g. I am stressed out because...), but this was still creditworthy. Responses gaining the higher marks tended to take the mother's side and were both empathetic and well expressed: she thinks she should be on her husband's side in order to avoid humiliating her husband and further conflict; she has a new and more challenging job and may still be getting used to the added work and dealing with the pressure this entails; she may also have to put up with her husband's frustration due to the fact that he does not feel useful anymore. Insight regarding the younger sister's situation was seen though too (e.g. if she had taken her father's side, the older sister could have been resentful and this could have created awkward situations between the girls) as well as some creative expression (e.g. either way it was a lose-lose situation if she got involved in the argument).

Question 3

This question was hardly chosen by candidates, hence the feedback is very limited indeed because of the extremely low number of scripts seen.

- (a) Candidates struggled to gain full marks on this question, especially as there was often a lot of conflation of the three points that were required. The point candidates scored the most often was the idea of protecting nature and developing tourism, whilst the idea of merging proved the most elusive mark to gain.
- (b) A few candidates managed to gain the mark for **(i)**, but the first part of **(ii)** tended to be better handled, whilst the second point in **(ii)** proved very problematic for candidates. Some creditworthy responses noted were the following: can not see what is in front of his eyes; he knows it's true and it is happening, but just does not want to admit it; to act as if nothing has happened; to purposely ignore; willing to look in the other direction.
- (c) Some good responses were seen, conveying most frequently the ideas contained in the first five bullet points of the mark scheme. Examples of candidates putting the points into their own words included the following: it has become normal tourism as it has lost its objective of conserving nature; it has brought destruction to animals and environments rather than protecting them; the lack of rules in ecotourism businesses has produced many problems, such as corruption. Good sequencing of responses was also noted (e.g. besides this, the first one being..., the last issue...)

- (d) Some candidates achieved the higher marks on this question, citing the points about causing people to protect various species; causing people to save species from extinction and affecting how people view the natural world.
- (e) Few candidates gained the marks available, but some good attempts at own words were noted: the constant, never-ending lack of honesty and greediness of people... and ... fraud has not been acknowledged.
- (f) Candidates found synonyms most easily for *virgin*, *generated* and *ruthlessly* in (i). *Darling*, *inclination* and *vision* all proved to be trickier to find alternatives for, with many synonyms offered being too vague. Most successful answers matched the mark scheme, though 'without caring' was seen for *ruthlessly*.

In (ii) a few good responses were seen, such as 'he dictator ruthlessly eliminated all those who opposed him' and 'The lack of water in the city has generated several health problems.'

However, there are five ways in which candidates could have improved their mark: remembering to use the correct grammatical form as in the question (e.g. another adjective to replace the adjective in the question – *darling*); offering only one synonym per sub-question, composing only one sentence as two sentences separated by a comma is a rubric infringement (comma splice - overcome by the use of a semi-colon), ensuring that the subject matter of the sentence is not the same as the passage, and, finally, checking that the exact meaning of the word is clearly shown in the sentence given.

Use of English

- With regard to data response questions, candidates attracting the higher marks showed good control of comparatives and superlatives. It is highly recommended to emphasise the manipulation of such constructions in order to maximise the marks a candidate can achieve.
- A majority of candidates across the ability range struggled with the conjugation of the present tense (e.g. 'she is' and 'they are'; 'she has' and 'they have'; 'she does' and 'they do') yet could confidently manipulate more complex tenses such as 'she might have felt'.
- Both the flow and the clarity of some candidates' work were hindered by the incorrect use of commas and semi-colons, and that of connectives and conjunctions. A significant number of candidates either over-used the aforementioned punctuation or did not use it at all, and even more did not use 'who' when it was required, but rather 'that', 'which', 'in which' or 'whereby'.
- Certain awkward expressions and incorrect vocabulary were regularly seen: pass time (for spend time), yell the matter, seat (for to sit), and disrespectful or unrespectful (for disrespectful). 'Beneficial' and 'tendency' also proved to be difficult to spell correctly for a few candidates.