

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH (COUNT-IN-ORAL)

---

Paper 0522/01  
Reading Passage (Core)

## Key Messages

Candidates are advised to note carefully that:

- **Question 1 g (i)** requires that they only explain the meaning of the italicised word or words as used in the context of the passage.
- **Question 1 g (ii)** requires that they comment on how the language of *the complete phrase quoted in the question* helps to convey a particular effect to the reader and to ensure that they focus their comments closely on how this effect is achieved.
- This paper tests reading and that it is important to read both the passages and the questions closely and carefully.

## General Comments

Overall, candidates managed the paper well, and nearly all found the passages and questions accessible. There were only very few who did not attempt at least most of the questions. There were very few rubric infringements and handwriting and presentation were generally of a satisfactory to good standard.

### **Question 1**

Most candidates were able to answer most of the comprehension questions and their responses indicated a secure understanding of the main details of the passage. The question testing understanding and appreciation of the writer's use of language 1 g (i) and 1 g (ii) was the least well answered overall. This point will be considered more fully later in this report.

### **Question 2**

Candidates responded well to this question. The most successful responses showed good understanding of the requirements of the question and did their best to observe and elaborate on all three bullet points. Less successful responses were often the result of only a partial understanding of the details of the passage, in particular, through confusing the functions and actions of the Captain, Mr Riach and the Narrator. Many responses in this category despite their misunderstandings, nevertheless, achieved high marks for their Written Expression. There were also a small number of candidates whose responses could not be awarded any marks for Reading as they were based on the content of Passage 2 and not Passage 1.

### **Question 3**

All candidates were able to pick up marks for both parts of this question, but a significant number were distracted by the conspiracy theories and the findings of the report as opposed to focusing their notes and summary on the facts of the account, and, as a result, were not able to gain as many marks for either content or writing as they might have.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates showed that they had a good understanding of the simile 'as steady as steel' as applied to the captain although some attempted to explain either 'steady' or 'steel' rather than the

phrase as a whole. The most successful responses referred to the captain's firmness (both mental and physical) as shown by his concentration or focus on his task. Less successful responses thought the phrase signified 'bravery' or 'alertness' or 'being prepared' none of which fully captured the point, although answers using these words were still rewarded if more appropriate comments were included (e.g. 'he was brave and concentrating on keeping the ship on course').

- (b) There are two points in the passage that make the Narrator realise the power of the tide. One is that the tide was throwing the boat about and the other is that it took three men to control the wheel. There was no requirement for candidates to use their own words when answering this question so those who simply lifted the phrase, 'threw the boat about' were rewarded. It was more difficult to make the alternative point by lifting directly from the passage as it was necessary to refer to the wheel in order to show clear understanding - 'it took two extra men to control the wheel' was a correct response but 'it needed more men' was insufficient.
- (c) Most candidates showed understanding of some of the effects the tide had on the boat and scored one or more marks for this question. Less successful responses were not able to express the key points clearly in their own words, with the result that their responses were insufficiently precise to convey accurate understanding. For example, saying that the tide caused the boat to drift off course or simply turn does not suggest the full force of the passage's description of what happened; similarly, it was not enough simply to write that the boat crashed unless it was made clear that it smashed into the reef. Some responses stated that the tide knocked 'the crew over' on its own which, in fact, described the effect of the tide on the people in the boat but not on the boat itself, which was the focus of the question. As stated in the 'Key Messages' above it is important to identify exactly what the question is asking before attempting to answer it.
- (d) Many candidates successfully described the external conditions that caused the narrator to become terrified but sometimes their responses failed to explain precisely the nature of those conditions. For example, stating that the boat had struck the reef does not convey that the boat is breaking up. Similarly, reference to the strong waves or wind without explaining that the former break over the boat, or that the noise of the latter is terrifying, meant that such responses could not be fully rewarded. The mark for explaining the Narrator's state of mind (his sense of doom about the boat sinking and his fear of dying) was rarely awarded, mainly because responses simply reiterated 'terrified' which is in the question, used less intense synonyms such as 'nervous', or failed to address it at all. Responses that stated that the Narrator was confused and scarcely understood the things seen were incorrect because this reaction was the result of being terrified and not the cause.
- (e) Most candidates achieved at least one or two marks for this question and attempted to answer it using their own words. As with **Question 1d**), some responses lacked the precise focus required to gain marks. For example, many stated that the Captain 'groaned out loud' without including the clinching detail which distinguished this point from his talking to himself, that this was in response to sharing the 'pain' felt by his boat. Others did not gain a mark as a result of simply lifting the word 'stunned' from the passage without attempting to express this in their own words. Overall, there were four distinct responses of the Captain that were credited:
- He physically does nothing to help / holds on to the mast
  - He is overwhelmed / paralysed / / shocked / in shock etc.
  - He talks to himself
  - He groans out loud / suffers when the boat hits the rocks
- (f) Most candidates gained the one mark available for this question. It was important, however, that responses made clear the precise phrase that conveyed the importance of his boat to the Captain which was (his) 'boat was like family to him'. Responses that lifted the complete sentence in which this phrase occurs were not rewarded unless the correct phrase had been identified by underlining or some other acceptable means. However, the vast majority knew which sentence contained the correct phrase.
- (g)(i) Candidates generally answered g (i) better than g (ii). As stated in the 'Key Messages', it is important that candidates understand that g (i) focuses primarily on vocabulary whereas g (ii) focuses on the whole phrase. The failure to appreciate this frequently resulted in responses in which the definitions given to g (i) were simply repeated in (g)(ii), which meant that no further marks could be awarded for the latter question.

- (1) In order to gain a mark for explaining '*singing of the wind*' it was necessary to focus on the nature of the sound of the wind such as 'shrieking', 'moaning' 'whistling' and so on. Responses that attempted to paraphrase with answers such as 'the wind sounded like a song' did not gain the mark, as such explanations did not reflect the context of a violent storm.
  - (2) '*Scarcely*' – many candidates were successful in explaining this word, choosing synonyms such as 'barely', 'partially' and 'hardly'. Answers which identified the things being seen as 'not fully understood' also gained the mark. 'Not really' was not credited, however, because it suggested misunderstanding as opposed to 'little' understanding.
  - (3) '*Hampered*' – this word caused difficulty and in a small number of cases was confused with 'hammered' in phrase 4, for the obvious reason of one letter being different. Although this was probably the least chosen option, the majority of candidates were able to understand that it 'made things worse/more difficult for the people on the boat.'
  - (4) '*Hampered*' – virtually all responses clearly identified the word as 'hitting' but many failed to qualify the nature of the hit and the power/force conveyed by the word. As previously mentioned, candidates should think carefully about the word's meaning in the context of the passage.
- (ii) The most obvious preparation which can be undertaken by candidates when preparing for this question, is to keep in mind that their explanation of the words and language within each phrase should be related to the wording of the question: in this instance, how the language used helps to convey the experiences of the people on the boat. It is important that, as far as possible, candidates should attempt to express this understanding in their own words rather than by copying the words of the phrases that are to be explained. A comment focusing on being 'terrified' is, however, perfectly acceptable when the language is being analysed rather than simply stated.
- (Phrase 1)** A large number of responses simply repeated the point about the wind singing, often conveying this in terms of loudness arising from 'the great noise' in the phrase. Only a small number attempted to relate this to the experience of the people on the boat who were terrified and overwhelmed by the strength of this sound. The most successful responses contained comments such as, 'taunting them with ghostly shrieking so they knew they were about to die', and suggestions that the wind sounded like the music for a horror movie.
- (Phrase 2)** Responses to this phrase were generally more successful, with many candidates linking the fear and confusion implicit to the experience of the people on the boat. There were some convincing references to being 'blinded' by fear or being rendered helpless to discern what was happening around them.
- (3) Few candidates realised the degree of difficulty and desperation of the crew's efforts to control the boat against the strong wind and heavy waves.
  - (4) Candidates generally understood the significance of the boat being hammered on the rocks and were usually able to explain the brutality of the action and its effect on the crew.

One final point to be made about responses to this question is that it is important that candidates write in the correct number of the phrase they have chosen to explain. For example, writing in '3' to identify the phrase and then proceeding to explain phrase 2 in the space immediately beneath this number will not be rewarded.

## Question 2

### READING

As stated earlier in this report there were many good responses to this question which were both linguistically well written and also effective and convincing creative pieces based on the material in the passage. Middle range responses tended to omit or only just about manage to refer to the third bullet point relating to survival. Of those responses which skirted 'survival' it was often the case that the Narrator passed out only to be washed up on a desert island without having drowned. Driftwood from the boat was often a credible method of survival. Conversely, other responses wrote only about surviving and did not mention the context of the boat's dilemma and the crew's response. Less successful responses adopted the wrong

narrative viewpoint and wrote the account from the perspective of the Captain of the ship or revealed some confusion about the fact that Mr Riach, the Captain, and the Narrator were three different people.

Even though there were some less than convincing anachronistic accounts (rescues by helicopters or nuclear submarines for example), most candidates made genuine attempts to write using their own ideas and interpretations of the passage, rather than being over-reliant on lifting material from it.

## **B WRITING**

In general, the standard of writing was of an, at least, satisfactory standard. Incorrect sentence separation was the main cause of blurring of meaning, but overall the structure of accounts, together with the use of an appropriate register and thoughtfully chosen vocabulary, contributed to a large number of accounts that were enjoyable to read.

### **Question 3**

#### **(a) Notes**

Most candidates identified at least 6 correct points but very few identified all 10. Marks were frequently lost through imprecision, with answers such as '635 crew' not referring to death or loss. Many responses included points which were either irrelevant – 'There was an 11-day delay' or simply wrong – the ship was sunk by a submarine'. A minority of responses offered more than 10 answers and it should be noted that in such cases, only the first 10 points made will be marked - even if those that follow contain what would otherwise have been creditable points.

#### **(b) Summary**

The rubric for this question states that responses should use all the points made by candidates in their responses to 3a). Less successful responses, however, tended to go back to the original passage and summarise that rather than expand their own points in their own words. More successful responses remained focused on relevant material from the passage and expressed appropriate points listed in 3a) in a concise and focused way, either using their own words or re-casting the words of the original in such a way as to show clear understanding of the passage and the demands of the question. The most successful responses introduced the battle, its date and where it took place; gave details of the ships and what took place; and ended with the consequences of the battle such as both ships sinking with the loss of so many lives. The least successful included much inappropriate personal comment and also became confused through including references to the theories as to what may have happened, with references to the deaths of the crew being machine-gunned in the water and their bodies subsequently hidden by the government.

Overall the paper elicited generally worthwhile responses from the majority of candidates. Nearly all candidates appear to have tried to do the best of which they were capable and most were well prepared for the paper. The main point for future candidates to keep in mind is to ensure that each question is read carefully and that answers are focused on the key phrases in the rubric.

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH (COUNT-IN-ORAL)

---

Paper 0522/02

Reading Passages (Extended)

## Key Messages

Candidates did well when they:

- read the passages carefully, not forgetting any information at the top of each passage
- read all questions carefully, paying attention to the specific guidance offered
- adapted their writing style to suit each task, taking account of voice, audience and purpose
- planned the structure and sequence of each answer, making each point once only in a response
- allowed time to address fully each section of each question
- avoided copying whole sentences or sections from either passage
- used their own words in **Questions 1** and **3b** and when explaining choices in **Question 2**
- ensured that ideas were developed and fully explained in **Question 1** and **Question 2**
- checked their responses carefully to correct errors of spelling and grammar affecting meaning
- used a range of appropriate vocabulary.

## General Comments

Candidates' responses to this paper indicated familiarity with the demands of each task and the format of the paper, along with an awareness of the need to use material from the passages to answer the questions. There were some responses that depended too heavily on the wording of the passage in **Question 1** and **Question 3b**). Candidates are expected to adapt and modify the material in the passage for higher band marks, and copying from the passages is to be avoided.

Candidates appeared to find both passages equally accessible and were able to finish the paper within the time allowed. There did not seem to be many significant misunderstandings of the content of either passage, though careful, purposeful reading is essential to ensure that finer details are interpreted and used effectively to show understanding at higher levels. For example, close reading of Passage A would have revealed that a novice skydiver did not have to pull a cord to open their parachute – a fact which could then have been included in the jumpmaster's talk to reassure their audience.

Copying was sometimes evident in **Question 1**, especially in response to the first two bullet points. The description of crawling out of the open door of the aircraft and hanging from the wing strut, or the calculations carried out by the jumpmaster, were often copied. There is a significant difference between using textual detail in support of points and reproducing whole sections of the text or key phrases. There were also responses that included lengthy quotations about the narrator's fear of death or injury which could not be credited as a helpful supportive detail since the perspective of a jumpmaster demanded a different voice. Where candidates assumed that the jumpmaster was the narrator of the passage years later, they tended to repeat the narrative rather closely, instead of adapting and modifying the material appropriately for the purpose of the task. Candidates must change the language of the passages in response to **Question 1** and **Question 3b**) in order to achieve higher Reading and Writing marks.

For **Question 2**, candidates need to offer appropriate choices of words and phrases from each of the two paragraphs and make specific, detailed comments about these choices. To gain marks in the higher bands candidates need to write detailed explanations of the effects of their choices in both parts of the question, demonstrating sound understanding of the writer's purpose. Weaker responses tried to explain the selected language in the same words as the language choice – “spread-eagled like a frog, means that the woman was spread out like a frog”, for example. Candidates should avoid using a grid or table format to respond to this question, as it often results in repetition and can limit candidates' ability to explore and explain the choices they have selected.



In **Question 3a)** many candidates managed to earn a mark in double figures by finding a reasonable number of points. Candidates do not need to use their own words in **Question 3a)** but should use short notes, rather than whole sentences taken from the passage. Copying chunks of the passage will not be rewarded. Each point offered needs to be precisely identified and clearly communicated. The majority of candidates used their own words in **Question 3b)**, and attempted to summarise the ideas, however, candidates must be aware that the meaning must not change so that the summary is factually inaccurate. An example is changing 'computer generated special effects' to technology, which misses the precise point. Candidates are not expected to change key words and terms in **3b)**, but should not lift whole phrases and sentences from the passage. Inclusion of material outside the passages is also not rewarded and is distracting. There were some examples of excessively long responses, and this is an area that sometimes leads to a lower Writing mark. Most lengthy responses were due to inclusion of unnecessary material, indiscriminate copying of the passages, or repetition.

Though Paper 2 is primarily a test of Reading, candidates need to keep in mind that 20% of the available marks are for Writing, split evenly between **Questions 1 and 3**. It is important that candidates do not lift from the passage and consider the quality of their writing – planning and editing their responses to avoid inconsistencies of style, imprecise meaning and awkward expression. Most responses were written in an appropriate register, but some Writing marks were affected by awkward expression or limited style, over-reliance on the language of the passages, or structural weakness and incoherence. The word counts for questions are there for guidance, suggesting the length of response it is expected a candidate might need to address the requirements of the task within the time scale of the examination. Over-long and/or very brief responses are likely to be self-penalising.

A clear focus on the specific instruction and wording of a question during the planning of an answer will allow candidates to work to identify relevant detail in the text, cover all aspects of the task and target marks at the higher levels.

### **Comments on Specific Questions**

#### **Section A**

##### **Question 1**

Stronger responses to this question selected and interpreted the events in the passage, modifying ideas to offer instruction, advice and reassurance to novice skydivers and creating a convincing voice for an experienced jumpmaster. They were able to sustain the use of supporting detail throughout the response, firmly tying any development to details in the passage. The first bullet allowed them to retrieve relevant material from the passage to describe the process of the jump, offering development opportunities by explaining why they would need to follow each step in the process. The second bullet allowed candidates to develop ideas from the passage in terms of how fear may manifest itself in the skydivers and advice on how they could overcome and deal with their fear. The best responses firmly linked their ideas for the third bullet to details in the passage: the exhilaration and euphoria felt immediately after landing, the sense of achievement, the desire to develop skills, the rewards of a shared experience, and the addictive nature of the sport, are some examples of ideas used as suggestions as to why they were likely to repeat their experience.

A feature of better responses was equally careful attention paid to each of the three bullet points of the task, with clear modification of the ideas from the passage, but the responses always remaining firmly tied to the passage. Middle-range responses made reasonable use of the passage, with some attempt at own words, but tended to stick closely to the events and ideas in the passage, and to present them in the same order as in the passage, often using some of the same words. A noticeable feature of such responses was repeating the experience of the narrator in the passage as the jumpmaster's own experience of jumping for the first time, rather than adapting that experience into advice for novice jumpers and using it as examples of what they may experience themselves. This often led to a rather limited response to the second bullet, as, instead of breaking down the experience of fear by carefully using the clues throughout the passage, they simply focused on fear of death. The first bullet posed fewer problems, although again some candidates relied too heavily on the words of the passage, or missed some of the details, such as the parachute being strapped to the back, or the static line opening the parachute for the jumpers. In the third bullet most candidates linked their suggestions to clues in the passage, but some listed them quite briefly rather than using opportunities for development. The vast majority of candidates addressed all three bullets, although some struggled to find a range of ideas for the second bullet point.

Most candidates seemed familiar and comfortable with the style of a prepared talk, but others simply took the form of giving an unselective narrative, retelling the narrator's experience of skydiving without developing a voice commensurate with an experienced jumpmaster. Such responses lacked a sense of purpose. Some careless reading was evident in the confusion about the jumpmaster's identity, the opening of the parachute, the speed of the wind versus the aircraft and the woman's freefall, where she was at times described as gliding through the air like an eagle. A small number of candidates introduced ideas that were not linked to the passage at all, perhaps using their own knowledge of skydiving techniques. As this is a reading examination it is crucial that all ideas used are based on what has been read.

The least successful answers were often thin, simple or short. They offered a very general view of the situation but few ideas and details in response to the bullet points. Some did not move beyond the first bullet point or assumed that there was a mixture of inexperienced and experienced skydivers in the group.

The Writing mark reflected the clarity, fluency and coherence of the response and how well it used language to capture the authoritative yet reassuring voice of the jumpmaster. The better written responses adopted a friendly but stern tone, focusing on delivering clear instructions, while also encouraging a courageous approach to the jump promising many rewards. More mixed responses included casual remarks and jokes about accidents and death, or brushed over the instructions for the jump, instead focusing too heavily on the excitement and adventure ahead. Less successful responses were rather narrative, or disorganised and failed to adopt an appropriate voice.

#### Advice to candidates on Question 1:

- ensure that you adopt the correct voice by reading the question carefully
- think carefully about audience and purpose
- answer all parts of the question, covering each of the three bullet points in reasonable detail
- answer in your own words
- adapt material from the passage to make it an appropriate response written in the required style
- plan your answer to ensure that the material is sequenced logically and to avoid repetition
- select the most appropriate ideas from the passage
- develop and modify some of the ideas you include
- use relevant details from the passage to demonstrate close reading.

#### Question 2

It was expected that the response would take the form of continuous prose to allow candidates to explore their choices fully. Marks are given for the relevance of the words and phrases chosen to answer the question, and for the quality of the analysis. Credit is given in **Question 2** for the ability to select a range of interesting or unusual examples of words and phrases relevant to the focus of the question in each section. Responses that go on to explore and explain meanings of the words are awarded further marks. Responses that also explore the effects that the use of particular words and phrases have on the reader can score up to the highest mark of ten.

The majority of candidates found this question the most demanding of the three, as it requires a wide vocabulary, close reading, and an ability to relate to subtleties of language beyond explicit meaning. It was noticeable in this session that few candidates approached **Question 2** using a grid or table format. This benefited candidates greatly, as when using a grid often the same material is duplicated in two of the three columns. This approach also often forces responses to be expressed very briefly or in note form and does not allow for varying development of comments according to the complexity of the language choice being discussed. It is also rare for responses offered in a grid format to consider meanings appropriately.

The most successful responses to **Question 2** showed precise focus at word level and were engaged and assured in their handling of their appropriate choices. They selected carefully, including images, put the choices in context, and answered both parts of the question equally well. They were able, for example, to explain the inelegance and inanimate qualities indicated in 'sack of cement' and the suggestion of insignificance implied in 'tiny speck'. Many candidates were very secure on meanings, could explain words such as 'blooming', 'splendidly' and 'ecstatic', and were able to gain marks in Band 3 for these if offered throughout the response. There was some misreading – 'hurdle' for 'hurtle', for example, or some misinterpretation of words such as 'spread-eagled' which many interpreted as gliding like an eagle in flight, or 'punctuated' which was often confused with 'punctured'.

Less successful responses sometimes adopted a ‘technique spotting’ approach by identifying literary techniques, such as alliteration in ‘boldly breaking’ or use of simile in ‘like flowers blooming’. This approach often led to rather generic comments about the effects of the techniques, rather than the words themselves, which limited the response. Other candidates repeated the same explanation after each choice, for example, that the fall was fast and uncontrolled in **(a)**. Some candidates simply repeated the words of the original choice in the explanation – “‘flowers blooming’ means that the parachute looked like flowers in bloom”, for example. These less successful responses often took the form of a commentary on the entire paragraph for each half of the question, containing some relevant choices and some brief explanation of them. Some candidates offered single word choices only, not always selecting the most appropriate words, for example, offering ‘exaggerated’ instead of ‘exaggerated belly flop’. Occasionally candidates offered an extremely sparse number of choices or simply lifted the whole paragraph and offered a general comment. These responses were usually awarded marks in Band 5.

### Advice to candidates on Question 2:

- focus on the question carefully to ensure that all your choices are relevant
- re-read the whole paragraph before making selections; choose the best and not those which happen to come first
- choose a range of words and phrases that seem powerful. Do not write out whole sentences, but also do not offer only one word if it is part of a descriptive phrase
- do not write out the beginning and end of a long quotation with the key words missing from the middle
- remember to put quotation marks around your choices. This makes it easier for the Examiner to identify them and makes it easier for you to focus on the exact wording
- treat each of your choices separately and do not present them as a list or give a general comment which applies to all of them
- avoid general comments such as ‘this creates a strong visual image’, or ‘this draws the reader in and makes them want to read on’. Such comments will not earn any marks at all
- if you are not sure about effects, try to at least give a meaning, in context, for each of your choices
- remember you do not get any marks for identifying techniques unless you focus on the meaning and effects of the words you have chosen
- to explain effects, think of how the reader’s understanding is enhanced by the use of language when reading the word or phrase, because of its connotations and associations.
- include images from each paragraph, and try to explain them.

### Question 3

Almost all candidates had understood the need to identify just 15 points in **3a)** and that points added after the 15 would not be credited unless replacing a crossed-out answer earlier on. Selecting and identifying points meant that candidates had to read and plan their answers carefully, both to avoid repetition and to organise their ideas sensibly. There was more than one way in which points could be logically grouped and these options were reflected in the mark scheme. There were a total of 20 potential points available from this one passage, allowing generous leeway for candidates looking for 15. Most were able to identify at least seven points from the passage. Better, more focused, answers typically scored two thirds or more of the available content marks.

**Question 3b)** responses that did well had used their points from **3a)** carefully – organising them purposefully into a concise, fluent prose response rather than relying on repeating points in the order or language of the passage. There was some suggestion that answers at the top end had revisited points in **3a)** during the planning stages of **3b)** in order to edit and refine points in this part of the question – leading to clearer, more distinct points in **3a)** and an efficient and well-focused response in **3a)**.

To answer this question successfully, candidates needed to first identify 15 points that were relevant to the question, listing them clearly – one per numbered line, in note form. Candidates are reminded that they are only credited with a maximum of one mark per line. Candidates are not required to use their own words in this part of the question, but copying out chunks of the passage, including long sections copied over a number of answer lines, is not recommended and can lose marks. Answers, though in note form, needed to be sufficiently clear and focused to make their point effectively. The question had two strands: the job of a stuntman in the past **and** how it has changed in the present, and the best responses organised their points to acknowledge the different strands by indicating whether the point was applied to the past or the present, for example by using the appropriate tense with each point to help focus their notes – such as, ‘used to make own decisions’ or ‘CGI has replaced many stunts’. Failure to indicate past or present sometimes lead to blurring of points. Similarly, simply lifting a phrase without focus on the question did not always lead to a



clear point. An example of this is 'Vic retired at the age of 43' a specific detail related to Vic whereas the implied point about stunt men in general was rather that they retired young or early.

There are no marks to be scored for Writing in **3a**); however, checking responses for accuracy in spelling and grammar is clearly essential if candidates are to avoid the potential danger of negating points through careless slips. Remembering that answers in **Question 3a** still have an audience – the Examiner – might help some candidates to communicate each of their ideas more successfully. Rather than approaching their response in **3a**) as simply a shorthand list for their own purposes in planning **3b**), remembering that each listed point also needs to be sufficiently clear and discrete as an idea to be understood by someone else, could help some candidates to sharpen the focus of their answers.

The majority of candidates demonstrated an awareness of the appropriate style for a summary in **Question 3b**), with very few examples of wholesale copying, though occasionally some added in further speculation and detail, resulting in less concise answers. The most successful responses used the notes from **3a**), re-ordering and regrouping the relevant information with a clear focus on the question. The best answers had considered carefully both the content and organisation of their answer, writing in fluent sentences, within the prescribed length and using their own words as far as possible. They avoided writing introductory statements and making comments, and concentrated on giving a factual, objective summary. In a number of answers, the inclusion of irrelevant and/or repeated material diminished the focus and depressed the Writing mark.

### Advice to candidates on Question 3:

- read the question carefully and underline the key words
- re-read the passage after reading the question, in order to identify precisely the content points required
- list relevant points clearly in as few words as possible
- read through your list of points in **3a**) checking each is distinct and accurate and that there are no repetitions or very similar points
- plan the structure of your response in **3b**) – for example organising and sequencing content logically
- write informatively and never comment on the content of the passage.
- be careful to give only information from the passage that answers the question
- you can choose to use your own words in **3a**) and must use your own written expression in **3b**) although you do not need to change key words
- do not add further numbered points in **3a**) in addition to the 15 required as they will not be marked
- if using a word-processor, number your points for **Question 3a**)
- pay attention to the guidance for length in **3b**).

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH (COUNT-IN ORAL)

---

Paper 0522/03  
Directed Writing and  
Composition

## Key Messages

This paper was mainly assessed for writing, although there were ten marks available for reading in **Question 1**.

In order to achieve high marks, candidates were required to:

- use an appropriate form and style in both questions, adapted for the intended audience and genre
- structure ideas and organise their writing effectively, keeping the reader in mind
- produce detailed and evocative descriptions and engaging, credible narratives
- construct sentences accurately and vary sentence types to create specific effects
- select appropriate and wide-ranging vocabulary and use language with precision

## General Comments

Most candidates showed a sound understanding of what was expected in both questions, Directed Writing and Composition. Most responses, regardless of achievement, were developed and there were relatively few very brief scripts.

Most responses showed a committed engagement with the topic in **Question 1**, often with a sound grasp of the issues addressed in the passage and usually some attention paid to the style and format of a letter. The great majority of candidates approached the topic in their own words rather than lifting or copying the words in the passage. Better answers here also tended to structure their responses independently, selecting and commenting on the details in the passage to support a cohesive argument of their own. Weaker candidates tended to reiterate the ideas in the passage, often in the same sequence rather than selecting and regrouping points. Some made good use of the bullet points in the question to help structure the response. Occasionally, insufficient use was made of the reading material or there was only a tenuous grasp of the task itself, leading some to argue in favour of urban exploring. In weaker responses there was often some general commentary on the danger or illegality of urban exploring but opportunities to discuss, weigh up and evaluate the ideas in the passage were missed.

Better responses paid attention to the audience and style required for a letter of application. These were persuasive in purpose, using the passage to create and structuring arguments with some rhetoric opposing urban exploring. Some in the middle range of marks showed an insecure register, sometimes lapsing into a more colloquial style or producing a factual account with little argument or sense of audience. Valedictions were frequently forgotten in weaker responses, a feature symptomatic of an insecure grasp of audience and purpose, and at this level the points in the passage in favour of and opposed to urban exploring were not always grouped coherently.

In the compositions, the descriptive and narrative genres were attempted in fairly equal numbers although descriptive questions were generally more popular at all levels of achievement. Better responses in the composition section as a whole were characterised by a clear understanding of the genre selected and the particular ways in which the reader's interest could be engaged.

Descriptive writing at the highest level was evocative and subtle and although there was some narrative content in the middle range, most responses gave a range of descriptive detail. A large number of responses to the first descriptive question, about arriving in a big city for the first time, were based on impressions of New York. As is usually the case, these were better when there was specific detail and a vivid sense of the

cityscape and its atmosphere. Fairly frequently, however, responses relied on rather clichéd and stereotypical details or were mechanically structured around the different senses.

The best narrative writing engaged the reader with well-drawn and interesting characters and scenarios which were credible. Weaker narrative writing was often characterised by inconclusive or unsatisfying endings, sometimes with simple storylines which were largely a series of events with limited awareness of the reader. 'Confessions' in Question 4, for example, were occasionally contrived at the end of the narrative. Composition responses would have benefited from a clearer grasp of the features of good writing in specific genres. The conscious shaping of narratives to interest and intrigue the reader and the creation of characters to stimulate the reader's sympathy were features understood by effective writers in this series. Many descriptions would have been improved by the inclusion of well-chosen, original detail and the narrator's reactions in order to recreate the scene in the reader's imagination.

## **Comments on Specific Questions**

### ***Section 1***

#### **Question 1**

High marks were awarded where there was some challenge and probing of the claims made by urban explorers, as well as some discussion and development of the less subtle ideas in the passage, such as the dangers to the explorers themselves and the risk of arrest. Where the letter was also both accurate and appropriate in style, often with a consistent sense of audience and a polished style, Examiners could award very high marks. Better responses here tended to challenge the urban explorers' portrayal of themselves as 'superheroes' with the public's interests at heart and to contrast this image with the thrill-seeking selfishness of risking their lives and nascent careers on an essentially immature pursuit. While the more straightforward aspects, such as the risk to life and limb and the illegality of the sport, were readily identified in most responses, Examiners awarded the highest marks where the contradictions of the urban explorers' image of themselves were highlighted and explored.

Responses given marks in the middle range tended to be more straightforward selections of the points in the passage which referred to the drawbacks of participating in urban exploring. In some cases, there was some understanding shown of the attractions of the sport and some comment suggesting that the 'cons outweigh the pros' when considering participation. These responses, while accurately identifying such points as the risk of falling or being trapped, as well as of arrest and a criminal conviction, typically showed a less subtle grasp of the inferential points in the passage.

Weaker responses showed some understanding of the more obvious dangers of urban exploring but wrote in more general terms and covered fewer points in the passage. At this level, the range of ideas was narrower and candidates often relied more on the wording of the passage. The section about being trapped over a weekend without food and water was often paraphrased or lifted at this level of response. Some misreading of the passage or the task was also evident. For example, some argued in favour of the sport or had an insecure understanding of what urban exploring entailed.

#### ***Marks for reading***

The best responses adopted a consistently evaluative stance and read effectively between the lines of the passage to show a more sophisticated understanding of the passage. At this level, the demographic of urbex participants was examined closely, as was the clandestine nature of the activity. Some expressed incredulity that professional people with their careers in front of them would risk criminal convictions which would jeopardise their futures. There was also some discussion of the comparison with Superman, often highlighting that superheroes risked their lives on behalf of others, unlike the Urban explorers. The secrecy surrounding their activities was interpreted thoughtfully as evidence of their cowardice or their awareness of wrong-doing or, as in one notable response, of their immaturity – 'silly little boys running about on roofs to impress other silly little boys.' The claim that urban explorers risked harming no one but themselves was also carefully challenged by many who were awarded 8, 9 and 10 for Reading. The danger to others such as security guards obliged to chase these intruders, the risk of anguish to their families and the financial harm to businesses and economic prosperity were most commonly cited as evidence that the claim was untrue and naïve. The idea of limited freedoms or real challenges in the modern world, given in the passage as a reason for the growth of Urbex, was also effectively explored in many good responses. Other sports and activities of many different types were suggested as having equal thrill and a sense of personal risk without harming others. One excellent response included the observation that 'where there is a long tradition of skill and

expertise being passed down to younger participants as in mountaineering, people can manage risk without diminishing thrill.' Where Examiners saw this consistently probing use of the passage, challenging the claims made by urban explorers and highlighting the contradictions in the passage, a mark in Band 1 was awarded.

Marks in Band 2 were given where the ideas were evaluated to some degree. A mark of 7 was awarded for many responses where some thoughtful inferences were made from the passage. At this level, responses tended to include some discussion of others who may be harmed by these activities as well as the explorers, suggesting some evaluation of the claims made in the passage. In other responses, some more evaluative ideas were given about how health and safety measures are for the benefit of citizens and should not be flouted or that everyone suffers if insurance premiums rise. These inferred ideas, even where other, more surface points were reproduced, were often enough for Examiners to award a mark of 7, but a more sustained understanding of the attitudes which underpinned the passage was needed for a higher mark.

Examiners awarded marks in Band 3 where there was adequate breadth of coverage of the passage but without the more implicit meanings mentioned above. Responses at this level showed a sensible understanding of the specific points made in the passage about the drawbacks to participating in urban exploring. Responses tended to list specific risks and dangers, often expressing some personal reactions to the topic. Examiners noted that candidates often discussed both the attractions and the pitfalls with some conclusion drawn about how the activity was too risky for its thrills. Where there was enough range and discussion, Examiners could award a mark of 6. Responses with more limited selection, usually points about illegality or the risk of injury, could be given 5 marks if there was sufficient understanding of what Urbex is and its main features.

Weaker responses showed some misunderstanding, drifted away from the passage or task, or addressed the material thinly. Some at this level did not really understand what Urbex is, sometimes implying that there was one specific building to be climbed or the task was not carefully adhered to and the response argued in favour of the sport, often missing the point that it was against the law. Another approach which sometimes limited the mark for Reading was where the focus of the response was on the style in which the article was written rather than the topic of urban exploring itself. In these cases, some of the language used to describe both the thrills and the drawbacks of the activity were selected as evidence to show that the article was biased towards a positive presentation of urbex, but there was limited coverage and a lack of evaluation of the views in it. Where a mark of 4 was awarded, some firmer links with the passage and a wider range of points were needed, whereas 3 was generally given for very thin or brief responses. Marks below 3 were rarely given and usually applied when the task was not understood, the passage largely copied or only a few lines were written.

## **Marks for writing**

### *Style and audience*

A formal tone was required for a letter to the editor and most responses were written in an appropriate register, even where the writing was technically weak. The best responses were often quite subtle in the tone of the writing. Some were scornful and mocking of urban explorers and a strong individual voice emerged which was sustained throughout the letter while others were less arch and rhetorical in style but equally well-argued.

In the middle to lower mark range, the style was often appropriate, although there were sometimes lapses in candidates' awareness of the intended audience, and although most started in an appropriate way valedictions were frequently forgotten. A clear sense of purpose and audience was needed for marks in Band 3, even though some of these responses relied on listing the pros and cons of urban exploring. Some given marks lower than Band 3 tended to confuse the audience, addressing the editor as if he/she was an urban explorer seeking to recruit people to the sport. The style of these less effective responses was sometimes too colloquial or informal as a result of this confusion of audience.

### *Structure*

Some accomplished responses, awarded high marks for writing, handled the material confidently and presented their arguments cogently. The issues addressed were combined into a persuasive application which was clearly derived from the ideas in the passage but was not dependent on its structure and sequence. At the highest level, an overview of the issues involved was given rather than a list of the claims made in favour of urbex and those made against it.

Responses given 7, 8 or 9 for writing tended to reflect the sequence of points made in the article in a response which was sensibly structured and paragraphed. Responses opened with a considered introduction and ended with a concluding paragraph which showed a clear sense of the purpose of the letter. Many at this level were straightforwardly but clearly organised with a section or paragraph for the supposed benefits of urban exploring, followed by a section or paragraph on its drawbacks with a closing paragraph which sometimes gave a personal opinion. At the lower end of Band 3, candidates sometimes structured their responses too closely to the sequence of the passage, resulting in some lack of cohesion and purpose overall. Some seemed more convincing when addressing the more thrilling aspects of the sport and there were quite a number where a ban on urbex was called for when it had already been noted that it was illegal.

Some weaker responses given marks below Band 3 were less coherent in structure and more dependent on the sequence of ideas in the passage. This often led to some basic reiteration of the passage with less careful organisation into pros and cons or with only a little attention paid to the second bullet in the question.

### Accuracy

Accomplished writing which was accurate and controlled was given a writing mark in Band 1. These responses were not only authoritative in style and convincing in their arguments but fluent and virtually free of error. Precision in the control of a subtle and ambitious vocabulary resulted in some high marks in this component.

Responses given 7, 8 or 9 were usually purposeful and clear, though not as ambitious and wide ranging in vocabulary and style as those given higher marks. Although the style was usually appropriate and the level of formal language was sustained, a range of quite basic spelling and punctuation errors was evident. The failure to use a capital letter for the personal pronoun 'I' was a very frequent error, as was the use of capital letters where they were not needed, even where there was otherwise general accuracy in the writing. Apostrophes were very often not used appropriately and sentence demarcation by commas rather than full stops began to creep in at the lower end of Band 3. Mis-selected homophones were also a common feature, with some responses affected quite badly by the frequency of these errors. Commonly used words were also wrongly spelled in many responses. These included words used frequently in the passage or words essential for letter-writing such as 'sincerely', 'faithfully', 'skyscrapers', 'insurance' or 'buildings'.

While some of these more minor errors could be compensated for by secure sense of audience or a varied vocabulary, faulty sentence structures often kept writing marks for **Question 1** in Band 4. These responses often showed reasonable clarity in conveying meaning but contained a wide range of quite basic punctuation errors, which meant that Examiners could not award in Band 3, where mostly correctly structured sentences are required. Similarly, a simplicity of style and language, limited in range and complexity, sometimes resulted in a rather immature style which could not be given marks in Band 3.

### Ways in which this type of answer could be improved:

- Consider the writer's ideas rather than the language used to convey them.
- Make sure you understand the task.
- Think about the underlying attitudes in the passage as well as the specific points being made.
- Look for, and use in your response, inferences made indirectly by the writer
- Aim for breadth of coverage of the ideas in the passage as well some depth in evaluating them.
- Be aware of the audience for your writing and adapt your style accordingly. Think carefully about the kind of style the recipient of your letter (or reader of your article) would expect.
- Check your writing for basic punctuation errors, such as missing full stops, missing or wrongly or wrongly used capital letters or key words mis-spelt.

### Section 2: Composition

#### *Content and Structure*

Both descriptive writing questions were popular choices for candidates across the mark range. The best responses to **Question 2** showed a range of sensory experiences and were able to convey a range of different emotions effectively; a sense of excitement and sometimes bewilderment were created and sustained in most good responses although there were a few excellent scripts in which the narrator was filled with horror and dread on their arrival at the city. In **Question 3**, Examiners allowed for a wide range of different kinds of parade, carnival and procession. There were some unusual and often moving depictions of Remembrance Day parades or more solemn gatherings. One engaging piece was written from the point of



view of a veteran soldier in an Armistice Day parade whose feelings of pride tinged with sadness were very convincingly portrayed.

For the first question, the best responses often included the feelings of the narrator as a cohesive device for the piece as a whole, starting with expressions of excitement or anxiety as the train drew into the station or the airport came into view. Some effective personification of the buildings in the city as threatening, looming presences was sometimes used and sustained in quite sophisticated images throughout the piece. Although responses at all levels were very often focused on New York, the best were specific in the details selected and in the way the narrator reacted to them. Some were structured cohesively around a particular journey to Ground Zero or the Statue of Liberty and included vivid images to convey the mass of people, the movement of crowds and also picture portraits of individuals selected carefully to reflect different aspects of the city and the narrator's reaction to it.

Responses given marks in the middle range were more straightforward in their approach to the task, often moving from place to place in the city from arrival to a hotel and including various sense impressions on the way. The quality and effectiveness of the writing varied but the structure of many average pieces relied on this approach. There was sometimes a tendency to use the senses in a rather formulaic way to help structure the response, with comments on what was seen and heard, touched and smelt being somewhat mechanically covered. A high number of scripts in this mark range included sense impressions which were not very evocative of a particular city or cities in general; hot dog stands were very common in New York, for example, as was the smell of fresh coffee.

Examiners gave marks below Band 3 where the writing was more typically narrative than descriptive in focus or more general than specific. Some journeys were described with long preambles about the reason for travel and many relied on stereotypical features, such as yellow taxis in New York or people in business suits talking loudly into mobile phones, without real description of them. The reactions of the narrator were also often rather unvaried and clichéd. There was at this level some insecurity about what constitutes effective descriptive writing and a tendency to lapse into narrative fairly quickly.

The second question also elicited responses across the mark range including some highly original and effective descriptions. Examiners were open to different interpretations of the title, from Mardi Gras processions to local funfairs, and the best responses often brought to life the energy, colour and vibrancy of a carnival. Again, skilful writers used personification and extended metaphor to good effect at the top of the mark range. Processions were compared with various animals and the colourful costumes of participants elicited some surprising and original images. The more solemn occasions referred to above were also sometimes very fruitful sources of images and descriptive ideas in which the piece as a whole became charged with strong emotions reflected in the details selected. Those who described parades or processions rather than funfairs often had the advantage of movement to describe, and better responses tended to convey this idea of an excited, loud and lively crowd of people moving through streets or beaches. Some used a static vantage point to describe the procession as it passed while others described the feeling of being swept along by the crowd following the procession. Most higher and middle Band responses effectively described the narrator's thoughts and feelings, as well as the feelings of others. Most were successful at using sensory details to describe the atmosphere, focusing on colours, smells and movement as well as including details of more closely observed individuals.

In the middle range, there were rather more depictions of funfairs and responses and these tended towards more narratively framed structures with some description. Many followed the narrator's journey through various stalls and there was often some attention to sense impressions involving candy floss and hot dogs. In some cases, the use of the senses became a little formulaic and the details selected were sometimes a little predictable and clichéd. Marks below Band 3 were given where responses were more narrative than descriptive in intent, such as accounts of days out at carnivals or funfairs, the rides enjoyed and the food eaten. Perhaps candidates' marks could have been improved at this level by a better understanding of the differences between narrative and descriptive writing, as well as the need to paint a convincing picture without recourse to clichéd images.

Marks for Style and Accuracy were sometimes lower than those for Content and Structure, even in some original and interesting responses. In the best responses, precise and varied vocabulary and controlled complex sentences with secure punctuation within and between sentences were used. Images, words and phrases, as well as varied sentence lengths, were employed to create specific effects. In weaker responses, as is often the case in descriptive writing, tenses switched between past and present, sometimes within sentences, and incomplete or verbless sentences were common, even in scripts where responses to **Question 1** showed a secure grasp of sentence structure.

### **Ways in which the writing of descriptions can be improved**

- **Try to avoid clichéd scenarios and consider a more individual and original selection of content.**
- **Remember the key features of descriptive writing and keep the timespan of your writing short.**
- **Write sentences with proper verbs. There are no special sentence structures for a description.**
- **Choose your vocabulary and sentence structures carefully to create specific effects.**

### **Narrative Writing**

Both narrative questions proved popular and a wide range of interpretations of the titles was evident. In the first question, better responses were carefully structured to make the 'confession' a vital and integrated element of the story as a whole. The best were those which were based on moments or events which would convincingly have changed lives and were often based on family revelations and confessions which had a ring of authenticity about them. Examiners credited revelations and discoveries of various kinds as 'confessions' as well as the more obvious interpretations of the idea such as confessions of crimes or of love. There were some ambitious narratives about war and scenarios which spanned decades before the 'confession' was revealed and where these were well-managed and controlled Examiners could award high marks for Content and Structure. Other successful responses worked well because the content was more manageable and familiar, such as narratives about cheating in examinations or betraying friends in love. Characteristic of higher Band responses was the creation of credible and well-drawn characters, often through the narrator's own mounting sense of guilt or conscience which resulted, with some sense of inevitability, in the confession at the end.

Middle range stories offered many different versions of the 'confession' but the stories were a little more straightforward accounts of crimes committed or misdemeanours revealed. One feature noticed by Examiners was the lack of satisfactory endings after reasonably effective beginnings and narratives in which the 'confession' seemed rather forced or too predictable. This weakness often kept marks in Band 3 where there were some features of Band 2 at the start, such as the creation of credible characters and settings. Some narratives were also too reliant on speech in places. Dialogue was used to tell the story more than to highlight aspects of characters and relationships, weakening the overall impact and often also revealing weaknesses in speech punctuation.

Weaker responses tended to be series of events rather than shaped narratives which showed due regard for the needs of the reader. Even where the plot itself was credible and had some shape and sense of purpose, a mark of 6 was often given where there was insufficient preparation and characterisation was weak. More awareness of the reader was needed at this level to lift straightforward recounts into more shaped and engaging narratives.

For the second narrative question, a very wide range of underground scenarios was employed. Examiners awarded high marks where the underground setting was essential for the development of the characters and the plot and there were some excellent responses based on underground hiding places, escape routes or underground tube stations and tunnels. Where characters were created with some skill, these settings often added atmosphere as well as plot development; for example, a family hiding in a cellar while hostile soldiers rampaged through the house above them.

In the middle range, stories tended to be cohesive overall but were more straightforward in their interpretation and use of the underground setting. There were many accidents in woods and forests at this level, involving characters falling into underground caves or holes which contained various hidden treasures or objects from the past. Where there was some credibility in the characterisation and setting and the story had some engaging features, Examiners were able to award 7 or 8 for Content and Structure.

Weaker narrative responses to this title tended to be less well developed and cohesive. Some simply told the story as a series of events with only limited awareness of the reader while others included some preparation but ended weakly, often with boys simply going home after discovering some underground treasure. Characters were often not really described except cursorily and in some the underground setting was irrelevant to the action of the story

High marks for Style and Accuracy were given for responses where the writing was lively and varied in vocabulary and where different sentence structures were controlled and used to create particular effects. Errors in sentence control and separation, as well as lapses in tenses, if persistent, limited even competently told stories to Band 4, as did frequent errors in basic punctuation. In many scripts, the punctuation of direct speech was insecure, even when the story itself was quite well-structured. Again, basic punctuation errors with misused or omitted capital letters, the spelling of simple words and wrongly selected homophones appeared in otherwise competent writing and were sometimes so frequent as to affect the mark for Style and

Accuracy. A controlled, competent style secured a mark in Band 3 and even where candidates wrote in a fairly pedestrian style but punctuated sentences accurately, Examiners could award a mark of 7 or 8. Weaknesses in constructing sentences, comma-splicing or frequent basic spelling and punctuation errors resulted in marks below Band 3. A few responses were very brief and faulty in style, making it difficult to follow the meaning. These were given marks lower than Band 4.

**Ways in which the writing of narratives can be improved:**

- **Plan how to resolve your story in an interesting way before you start writing.**
- **Make sure that the characters and setting are credible and developed.**
- **Characters' thoughts and feelings help to engage your reader.**
- **Check your writing for errors such as basic spelling and punctuation mistakes.**

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH (ORAL ENDORSEMENT)

---

Paper 0522/04  
Coursework Portfolio

## Key messages

Successful candidates:

- reflect in their writing their personal ideas, feelings and interpretations of the world about them;
- write on assignments that challenge them to write at the highest standard of which they are capable;
- write independently of undue guidance from published materials or from teachers;
- demonstrate variety of style, use of language and genre in the three assignments;
- write in fluent and varied sentences separated by full stops and clarified by the appropriate use of commas and other punctuation;
- revise, edit and correct first drafts in their own handwriting;
- check their work carefully.

## General comments

Varied, lively and individual work did well. In cases where Centres had set the same assignments for whole sets, even for all their candidates, work lacked some of the liveliness of writing that the Moderators were looking for. There were also instances where too much guidance had been given to candidates concerning the content of an assignment. This resulted in uninspiring writing and an unsatisfactory similarity from script to script.

In the first assignment more attention appeared to have been given to the level of challenge of subject matter than in previous sessions.

There was an increase in the submissions of descriptions for Assignment 2 and a decrease in original and engaging fiction. While some of the descriptions were excellent, others were presented as a series of unstructured images, and it seemed that the techniques of presenting a description had not always been studied sufficiently. Autobiographical episodes were generally successful because of their originality and the personal involvement of the writers.

There was a trend away from responding to the text in Assignment 3 and instead, addressing the topic. Centres are reminded that the ten marks reward the ability of candidates to read for an overview of the text (including the writer's attitude) and to evaluate selected ideas and opinions from the text in relevant detail. The writing of a generalised commentary that included single words from the text was not sufficient for high reward.

Annotation of accuracy in final versions of assignments was generally not well done. In some cases a significant number of errors were disregarded. The use of full stops and commas was frequently poor and semi colons, colons and dashes were used too often and sometimes inappropriately. Exclamation marks and question marks were also sometimes used injudiciously. Faults in punctuation were usually associated with the lack of ability to construct and control complex sentences. Candidates sometimes did not take the opportunities offered by the second assignment to use a wide range of appropriate vocabulary. Some of the writing was spoiled by the use of over-ambitious vocabulary that prevented effective communication. Where a Centre's marks were reduced the quality of style (including register) and accuracy was generally the chief reason.

### Good Practice:

The Moderators recognised Centres that ensured that their candidates should

- write three assignments that clearly differed in the type of content, style, register and range of language and where the quality of all three pieces was consistent;
- express their own views and experiences free from undue teacher influence or repetition of ideas and content from the Internet;
- work on the first draft of their work, editing, revising and correcting so that it was clear to the Moderator how progress had been made;
- read final versions carefully, making their own corrections of simple errors.

### Bad Practice:

Candidates did less well because they

- did not structure their first and third assignments satisfactorily;
- were not able to sustain an assignment to the very end;
- did not control the register of their writing or, in the second assignment, the tense they had chosen;
- did not construct fluent sentences or punctuate them correctly.

## Assessment of coursework

### Writing

Coursework offers excellent opportunities for candidates to draft and to check their work for errors. They have time to check their work and are allowed to use electronic devices to help them with spelling and to identify stylistic shortcomings. Therefore, the expectation is that there should be fewer errors in Coursework than in work done in the Examination room.

The assessment of content and structure was generally correct, although one or two exceptions are noted in the comments on individual assignments below.

The commonest shortcomings in style were the use of repetitive sentence types, particularly short, simple sentences, and a limited range of language. A common fault was the repetition of key words in adjacent sentences. Some candidates had difficulty in handling complex sentences that proved to be exceedingly long and convoluted, so that the meaning became less clear as the sentence went on.

The commonest errors were

- putting commas at ends of sentences, or no punctuation at all. Pronouns were commonly mistaken for conjunctions;
- using semi-colons where commas or full stops were correct. Some candidates split up sentences by putting a semi-colon where no punctuation was called for;
- using question marks and exclamation marks for statements because it was thought that they would illustrate a certain tone of voice. However, these were frequently inappropriate, for example in sentences beginning with 'surely';
- spelling homonyms wrongly, such as 'there/their/they're', 'off/of', 'were/where'. Many spelling mistakes were the result of the careless use of a spell check, for example 'manor' for 'manner';
- making basic grammatical errors such as 'off of', 'she should of' and 'him and me'. There were frequent errors of singular and plural and of parts of verbs;
- simple errors such as missing words out of a sentence or a letter off a word.

### Assessment of reading

This was a test of reading. Centres were often careful to select a text or texts that presented a high enough level of difficulty to ensure that candidates could score marks of 7 and above. Such texts had to contain ideas and opinions that were complex enough to require candidates to understand not only the wording but also the implications. Many Centres were careful enough to ensure that candidates understood the main drift of the article and could appreciate the writer's attitude to the topic. They then ensured that a selection of ideas and opinions was made and that there was some evidence of evaluation. Evaluation consisted of understanding the difference between a fact and an opinion, dealing with inconsistencies in an argument and



detecting bias. Where there was an overview of the article and a consistent approach to a number of ideas and opinions the high marks of 8-10 were correctly awarded.

However, some marks were too high, significantly so where candidates addressed the topic and not the text. They used the text at least partly as a stimulus for their own ideas and drifted away from what had been read. This meant that there was insufficient evidence of reading other than a very general understanding of what the article was about.

### **Assignment 1**

The best of this work was where the topic was sufficiently challenging to produce work justifying a mark in Band 3 and above and where the argument was clear, presented in a logical sequence, and sustained until the end. While there were examples of interesting and well-presented factual content, the best and most secure work was argumentative and persuasive. Factual topics such as an introduction to the rules of a sport might result in competent work but are unlikely to generate work worthy of marks in Band 2 and above.

Film reviews sometimes produced weak pieces with little structure or argument. Where the films were the individual choices of the candidates, work could be competent enough, but where a whole Centre wrote about the same film, the scripts were too similar and did not appear to be the unaided, original work of the candidates. There was also a weakness in structure because, although each paragraph was secure, the connectivity between them was often weak.

It was appropriate to write the words of a speech and some of them were very good. However, the over-use of rhetorical devices, such as exclamations and questions, was sometimes disturbing to the flow, and candidates who considered their style and register were more successful than those whose work bordered on the colloquial.

This was particularly true of the 'rant pieces', many of which still went under the general title of 'Don't get me started...' The problem here was that they were often weak in content and structure. Candidates might not have much to say, so after two paragraphs, there was a good deal of repetition. Another problem was that of register. Some attempted to use an appropriate register at first but were unable or unwilling to maintain it and slipped into colloquial and sometimes inappropriate language. Candidates who ranted about year 10 boys, school skirts, teachers or Transport for London, for example, produced work that was immature and not typical of what a Year 11 candidate should be capable of.

Where the topic was a serious one, such as racism, and where the candidate controlled diction, the result was usually much better.

The following list of topics shows the wide range offered by Centres. All these topics produced good writing.

*The Syrian crisis*  
*Equal pay in sport*  
*Beauty pageants*  
*Cheerleading (personal)*  
*Being in a percussion band (personal)*  
*A secret guide to Hong Kong*  
*Forced marriage*  
*Votes for 16-year-olds*  
*Online learning*  
*One gender schools*

### **Assignment 2**

There was noticeably little good fiction. The best examples provided engaging stories with changes of focus, turning points and some clever endings. These were original choices and were the product of some careful teaching. Both descriptions and fiction need some careful handling and a good deal of preparation before a piece for the folder can be attempted. Unfortunately, a number of assignments looked very similar. There were too many haunted houses, and the content of some of these stories was predictable and immature. There were also a number of zombie stories which nearly always descended into a catalogue of blood and gore. Many of the stories were opportunities for candidates to write about violence with sometimes graphic descriptions of death and injury. On several occasions the amount of violence interrupted the flow of the narrative and became an end in itself. Matters such as these could have been addressed at the draft stage.

The best descriptions had structure. It was not enough just to give a series of images. In such cases it appeared that candidates were struggling to find new content as the piece continued. Where a single event or a short passage of time was built into the writing, the description had cohesion and often came alive.

There was plenty of writing from experience and this was typically very sound and engaging work. Candidates wrote about places they had visited, sometimes with perception, and about important moments in their lives ranging from auditions and performances on stage through football matches to sad deaths in the family or personal misfortune and illness. They were careful to choose content that was significant enough to engage readers, and the writing worked because of the vivid detail that memory conjured up and the genuine emotions that were expressed, often with commendable restraint and control.

There were many monologues, mostly through the mouths of literary figures. These too, needed shape and where the outpouring was confined to one event or situation it was difficult to structure without repetition. The emotion was sometimes well expressed, although this was more difficult than where personal writing was chosen. Some candidates found it difficult to climb convincingly into other people's shoes and walk about in them.

It is important to consider the language of this assignment. The aim is to communicate events, descriptions and emotions with conviction, and this is largely done through the arrangement of the content and the subtlety with which the unbelievable is made believable. Language plays an important part. The choice of words with their associations carries the reader along with the events that they describe. These words need to be suitably varied, attractive in themselves, and above all capable of creating pictures in the mind. Simple, repetitive vocabulary does not do this, but equally, over writing, using too complex vocabulary is just as bad because it cloy the mind. Some candidates tried to use too complex a vocabulary and at its worst this only led to a lack of meaning where the words were inappropriate. The Moderators looked for a wide range of appropriate vocabulary that suited the content of the writing.

Many assignments had no title, or the title did not prompt opportunities for original and developed writing. Examples of assignments are as follows:

#### Stories

*The humming*  
*The final breath*  
*The chimney sweep*  
*Paradise Lost*

#### Descriptions

*Meeting a legend*  
*Aurora Borealis*  
*The football stadium*  
*On the sea*

#### Experience

*Dismaland (a visit to a theme park invented by the graffiti artist, Banksy)*  
*Tornado*  
*A day that changed my life*  
*The day the earth shook (account of the New Zealand earthquake)*

### Assignment 3

The best approach was to give candidates a text no longer than two sides, with some very clear ideas and opinions. The text was not reportage or factual, and it was well written structurally. Many online texts were repetitive and were written in confusingly short paragraphs. Texts that worked were complex enough to provide a test of reading for Band 1 candidates, but controversial enough for candidates to be aware of arguments that were inconsistent or heavily biased.

The best responses showed by means of an overview that they understood the stance the writer was taking and the gist of the whole text. Having discussed this in what was often an opening section of up to two thirds

of a side, they then chose four or five important ideas and opinions from the text, explained what they meant and implied and commented on them as contributions to the theme of the text. Each of these evaluations would be in the form of one substantial paragraph which was entirely relevant to the chosen quotation.

It was not appropriate to feed in ideas that did not relate to the text as these did not constitute a response to the text itself. Still less was it appropriate to use the text as a stimulus for the candidate's own ideas. Candidates who provided a critique of literary and rhetorical devices did not respond to ideas and opinions. This is tested adequately in Papers 1 and 2 and is inappropriate here. It was not sufficient to feed in single words from the text as part of a generalised commentary except as part of an opening overview of the text.

Some texts were repeatedly used from Centre to Centre. The Flamehorse argument against the death penalty, although a good article, did not work well. Candidates tended to quote the headings as a very easy selection of ideas and opinions, but then did not deal adequately with the complex arguments that the headings gave rise to. 'I saw a killer die' was reportage and was a questionable choice for 16-year-olds. Little good analysis arose from this unpleasant article.

Some articles elicited good analysis and evaluation. They included

*Katie Hopkins on immigrants*

*Katie Hopkins on choosing friends for her children*

*Why I hate Facebook (although there were better alternatives to this well-worn article)*

*School sport*

*Tattoos*

*Bring back the cane*

*Stereotyping teenagers*

*Several different texts on video games and perceived links with violent behaviour and other problems*

The article on legalising cannabis proved difficult and many important arguments were ignored. Malala's speech was too long, although part of it could have been used. 'Casualties of class warfare' was confusing to candidates who did not really understand which side to take and found little in the passage to analyse. There was little content in the article on footballers' pay, which was not a good challenge for candidates seeking marks in Bands 1 and 2. The Educating Essex /Yorkshire articles confused because they were reviews of television programmes, but also had very little of any weight to select and to comment on. These articles are now very outdated.

### **Administration by Centres**

There were instances where internally moderated marks were not correctly transcribed on to the mark sheet. There were also some errors of addition. It was also important that the candidates' final marks should be written on the folders themselves.

Centres are reminded of the importance of the Candidate Assessment Summary Form (also known as the WMS). This is a record of the marks awarded for each candidate for reading and for writing, and any alterations to those marks that have been made at internal moderation. The Moderator expected to see the evidence of internal moderation on this form and expected the marks of a number of candidates to have been changed. However, the only evidence of internal moderation was often in the folders and in some cases there was no evidence that internal moderation had been carried out.

The internal Moderator used the CASF to check that the final marks had been correctly transcribed, to check which candidates belonged to which set, and to create a distribution of the reading marks. The CASF had to be completed for all candidates in all columns and sent to the Moderator.

Centres are asked to make sure that the work of each folder is securely fastened together to avoid the risk of lost work.

Most Centres submitted a copy of the text used for Assignment 3. Where this was not sent, the Moderator was put at a disadvantage in assessing the reading marks.

Otherwise, the administration was very good and Centres are thanked for the time they spent on these important tasks.

### Summary of the contents of the folder

- 1: The folders required from each Centre by CIE
- 2: In addition, the top and bottom folder in the Centre's mark range
- 3: The CASFs (WMS) for all the candidates in the Centre
- 4: The Moderator's copy of the MS1 or electronically submitted mark list.
- 5: An early draft (see below) of one of the assignments
- 6: A copy of the article used for Assignment 3, preferably with the candidate's annotations.

### Annotation

Centres are reminded that final versions of each assignment should be annotated. Moderators were interested in the general comments on strengths and weakness at the end of each assignment. However, it was also important to annotate errors in the body of the text, since the number and types of these contributed significantly to the final mark.

### Drafts

Some Centres submitted drafts where individual errors were corrected by the teacher. This is strictly not allowed and can lead to a malpractice enquiry. Centres are asked to give general advice at the end of each draft, alerting the candidates to work that must still be carried out before the final version is submitted. No comments should be made in the body of the text or in the margin.

There was some excellent practice where candidates had obviously made considerable revisions to their first drafts. Best practice was when changes made in what was obviously the candidate's own handwriting were made to the draft.

Some drafts had no final suggestions for general improvement at all.

### Authenticity

There were again some cases of plagiarism. These should have been noticed before folders were submitted.

Moderators found it easy to discover websites where the wording of much of an assignment had been copied.

### Choice of assignments

Some Centres chose assignments that were immediately recognised by the Moderators. An example of an 'off-the-shelf' folder would be 'Don't get me started', a fictional episode related to 'Saving Private Ryan' and an analysis of the Flamehorse article on the death penalty. It was not clear where these assignments came from, although they were not CIE recommendations. The best assignments were those that were carefully guided by teachers to suit the individual interests and concerns of candidates. This frequently led to more lively and committed writing.

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH

---

Paper 0522/05  
Speaking/Listening

## Key messages

- Candidates can make their Part 1 presentations more lively by incorporating more creative presentational styles such as taking up a 'voice' or presenting a dramatic monologue.
- Candidates do best when the task matches their ability level.
- Candidates do best in both tasks when they have had opportunities to practise in timed situations.
- Centres are required to send all recordings.
- Candidates did best when the timing requirements of both tasks were adhered to.

## General comments

Candidates had the opportunity to perform to their best ability when they had had the chance to practise both types of task in timed conditions. They could then learn from this how best to plan their work. Tasks which were set with an eye on the assessment criteria, and designed to bring out the qualities to be rewarded by the mark scheme, allowed candidates to show what they could do. Candidates did best when tasks were kept to time: long rambling presentations were less successful.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Part 1 – the Individual Task**

In Part 1, candidates who met the criteria for Band 1 fully, for 9 or 10 marks, showed creativity, the ability to develop a topic and sustain the listener's interest. Simple, factually-based tasks in reportage style usually produced work which merited a maximum of Band 2.

Candidates who presented very short Part 1 pieces, or relied heavily on notes did not usually achieve higher than Band 4, where "delivery is not secure, resulting in some loss of audience interest". Very long Part 1 pieces (that is, more than 5 minutes) also tended not to satisfy top band requirements, as they lacked the required control and structure.

Content in itself could not score any marks- – it is the use of (i.e. the *development* of) the content which is being assessed. For example, "What has inspired me..." could achieve a Band 1, or indeed a Band 5, depending on how the content has been planned, is introduced, is organised, and then presented and developed.

The more successful individual tasks were from candidates who spoke from brief notes and about a topic which they had researched thoroughly. Successful tasks often included some kind of visual presentation to the examiner, such as sharing a PowerPoint slide or some photographs. The most successful presentations were given by candidates who also utilised a variety of speaking devices to maintain the listeners' interest. In all the best examples there was a real sense of engagement with the topic. Where candidates chose well, prepared thoroughly and were fully committed to the task the results were usually good.

Talks which showed greater awareness of a wider audience did well, and these sometimes involved humour and irony. These presentations were often highly engaging and memorable. Candidates who created their



own literary pieces (e.g. in character, or empathic pieces) often performed well. Presenting empathic work using literary texts often leads to quality work. Teachers may like to explore these approaches in lessons.

#### *Use of third party sources*

Candidates did best when they chose a topic of personal interest. However, some relied too much on collating from third party sources and simply repeated them. Those who referred to third party sources for inspiration and then created their own talks based on the material achieved higher reward. In the better cases, being stimulated by third party sources and quoting directly from them in a minimal and selective manner led to highly competent work.

*Some examples of productive Part 1 tasks from this session:*

- ISIS – is it really a global issue, or an issue only for the Western world?
- Despite our advances in other areas, racism is growing globally
- Escaping from a war zone
- My philosophy of life
- The human brain
- The importance of travel
- Work/life balance for students
- Gifted hands
- My tribe and how it makes me what I am
- Volunteering
- Are we sure that pride always comes before a fall?
- Are teenagers growing up too quickly in Latin America?

From this list, it can be seen that the crafting of the task is important. Some very simple topics did not give candidates the best opportunities – e.g. my family, my pets, my football team, my favourite video game – unless these were woven into a controlled piece with a specific objective and/or rationale, e.g. instead of just ‘football’, the consideration that professional footballers should not be paid more than doctors.

#### **Part 2 – the Discussion**

Candidates did well when they had clearly practised a structured discussion, run to time, and focusing on a topic that could spark interest and promote a full, 6 to 7-minute dialogue, allowing for the incorporation of anecdotes, examples, views and opinions. Good pieces also made use of tangential discussion – i.e. contributions from both parties which change direction but which still relate to the main theme.

Some very long discussions (more than 7 minutes) did less well because the discussions tended to stray off task and begin to lack cogency.

In many cases, examiners were very much part of the discussions, entering into the spirit of the occasion, and in these cases the conversations were generally productive extensions of the individual tasks. Such candidates had clearly planned for further discussion and had predicted probable questions, or areas of interest that might be appropriate for further discussion. More effective examining ‘raised the bar’, encouraging stronger candidates to explore more sophisticated issues by asking challenging questions to demonstrate higher order thinking skills.

#### *Taking notes to prepare for discussion*

Effective discussions clearly arose when examiners took notes as the candidates completed their talks, and then based the discussions very closely on what the candidates had actually spoken about. This usually led to focused conversations, and changes in direction which arose naturally from the content covered in the individual task.

#### *Staying on task*

In general, candidates and examiners stayed on task. However, there were some instances of examiners using the allotted time to involve candidates in discussions about other matters – for example, their future plans or other interests – when this was not part of the candidate’s talk. Such transgressions are likely to

result in lower marks as the assessment criteria assume that content in Part 2 relates directly to content in Part 1. The examiner should ensure that the discussion stays on-task for the duration of Part 2.

#### *Open and closed questions, and effective questioning*

Good prompts drew on previous discussion and enabled the candidate to respond with an argument, a defence, a point of view, an anecdote, or an example. Candidates did well when they had clearly practised effective questioning. There was a lot of refreshing and lively work, where it was clear that the students had enjoyed taking control of their own learning and had responded well to being allowed to be active in the skills of research, oral presentation and subsequent discussion.

#### **Administration**

##### *Conduct of the examination and a suitable location*

This is a formal examination and as such an appropriate examination room is required. Candidates should not be examined in the presence of other candidates. A quiet, secure room is crucial for the success of the examination. The test should be conducted by a single examiner. While a second person may be present, the test itself must be conducted entirely by one examiner – it is not permissible for two people to be asking questions or discussing matters with the candidate.

##### *Materials required by the Moderator*

Cambridge requires three different items in the package sent to the Moderator: 1) all of the candidates' recordings on as few CDs/DVDs as possible (or preferably, on a single USB drive) and using separate re-named audio tracks for each candidate, 2) the summary forms for the entire entry, and 3) a copy of the Mark Sheet that has already been sent to Cambridge confirming the final marks. In addition, any letters relating to the work undertaken by the students or regarding issues experienced by the centre should also be placed in the package for the attention of the external Moderator.

- 1 There should be a single folder on the CD or USB with all recordings in that folder. The use of sub-folders should be avoided. Without the full set of recordings, Cambridge is unable to moderate the work from a centre.
- 2 The summary form is the form that records the separate marks awarded to the two parts of the test, in addition to the total mark. The teacher/examiner who conducts the examination is responsible for filling out the summary form. S/he should sign the form and date it – this is the form which is the working record of the examining undertaken, and is therefore of most use to the external Moderator. It is useful if the candidate numbers are recorded on the summary forms as they appear on the mark sheets.
- 3 The Moderator needs a copy of the mark sheet in order to verify the accuracy of the transcription of the marks from the summary forms.

Some centres entering candidates for the IGCSE First Language English syllabus might consider whether their candidates might be more suited to the IGCSE Second Language syllabus. The assessment criteria assume a fluent discussion and this can be impeded where significant language slippage is present. While the 0500 05 test can cater for some language limitation, it is not equipped to deal with the assessment of second language usage.

# FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH (ORAL ENDORSEMENT)

---

Paper 0522/06

Speaking and Listening (Coursework)

## Key messages

- Component 6 consists of three distinct tasks: Task 1 is an individual presentation; Task 2 is a paired activity; Task 3 is a group activity.
- The three separate tasks can be assessed at any time during the course. This flexibility allows a broader range of topics and skills to be assessed but requires Centres to fully embrace the concept that the Speaking and Listening tasks are an integral part of the overall course.
- Centres are required to record Tasks 1 and 2 and send all recordings.
- Candidates do best when their tasks are carefully planned and well prepared.
- Candidates achieve best results when they are given adequate time to demonstrate both speaking and listening skills.

## General comments

Successful Centres implemented the component efficiently and imaginatively. Candidates performed best when they selected tasks which matched both their ability and interests. Well planned and prepared responses to tasks were generally more successful. In each of the activities candidates needed to be given sufficient time to demonstrate a range of speaking and listening skills.

## Comments on specific tasks

In response to Tasks 1 and 2, candidates whose performance was lively and well developed met the high band criteria. Those candidates who relied heavily on written material were less successful as Tasks 1 and 2 do not benefit from over-scripted and seemingly 'artificial' performances where spontaneity is missing. Candidates who met the higher band criteria were able to react positively to changes in the direction of the discussion in Task 2.

It is very difficult to achieve the higher bands if the performances are heavily scripted and/or very short. A response which is too short does not allow the candidate to meet all the criteria and should not normally be considered as more than 'adequate' in Band 3.

## **Task 1 – Individual Activity**

Responses generally took the form of an individual presentation. This component allows differentiation by task setting so the ability of the individual candidate needs to be taken into consideration when topics are chosen.

*Some examples of productive Task 1 activities include:*

- A personal experience that is relevant, thought-provoking and developed beyond narrative
- Social issues teenagers feel strongly about
- A review where the candidate is thoroughly engaged and able to develop the presentation beyond a literal re-telling of the events
- An engaged reflection on a hobby or sport (though responses to football can be problematic).

### **Task 2 – Pair-based Activity**

There should be only two participants in Task 2. Where there is an extra candidate, a teacher or a candidate who has been assessed may make up the pair. Task 2 activity comprising of more than two candidates becomes a Task 3 Group Activity. As three distinct tasks are expected in response to Component 6, this becomes non-compliance.

For paired activities it is essential that the Moderator is able to distinguish between the candidates in the activity so that successful moderation can take place. The simplest way of achieving this is for the candidates to introduce themselves and their roles in the activity at the beginning of the recording.

Unlike Component 5, there is no specified time duration for Component 6 tasks but, given that both speaking and listening are assessed, it is important that the activities last long enough for candidates to clearly demonstrate their strengths in both mediums. Planned, rehearsed and developed performances will normally justify higher marks in the same way written examination practise encourages more successful outcomes.

Scripted responses have become more common but Component 6 is not an assessment of a candidate's reading skills. Heavily scripted responses normally do not meet the criteria of the higher bands when judged against the Speaking and Listening skills being demonstrated.

The Pair-Based Activity is more successful when two candidates of similar ability work as a pair. With regard to role-plays, it should be borne in mind that this is an assessment of language skills rather than drama skills so the language requirements should always drive the assessment criteria.

Responses to Task 2 that are teacher-led, either with a teacher interviewing a candidate or with two candidates being led by a teacher, are less successful than a developed discussion between two candidates. It is recommended that this approach is only considered where it is deemed the candidates are too weak to initiate the discussion without external assistance. This would also be reflected in the marks awarded by the Centre.

A popular Task 2 vehicle is the 'interview' where one candidate acts as the interviewer and the other is the interviewee. This can work well but there is an inherent weakness in the activity if the interviewer does little more than ask a set of pre-prepared questions. This restricts the level of performance, particularly for the Listening element. One way to counteract this problem is for candidates to swap roles halfway through so each has the opportunity to demonstrate a wider range of relevant skills.

*Some examples of productive Task 2 activities include:*

- Topical social issues such as sexism in sport
- Which video game is the best? (One championed by each candidate)
- Analysis of set texts such as poems and novels focusing on specific events/characters
- The influence of social media in teenagers' lives
- Desert island survival techniques
- Are politics irrelevant to teenagers?

### **Task 3 – Group Activity**

Task 3 may take various forms but it is most important that each candidate in the group is allowed sufficient scope within the activity to demonstrate their strengths without being dominated by others. A group made up of candidates of similar ability levels is often more successful. In more diverse groupings the weaker

candidates are disadvantaged and do not have the opportunity to contribute to the best of their ability. The role of a group leader should be considered as a more successful outcome usually results from having one of the candidates directing the focus of the discussion.

*Some examples of productive Task 3 activities include:*

- Characters from a literary text participating in a televised debate
- Performing an extra scene from a play that has been written by the candidates
- Any discussion of a topical issue with each candidate having their own viewpoint
- What to include in a time capsule/School newspaper, etc.
- Championing a character from a film or book where each candidate chooses their favourite
- Balloon debates

### **Administration**

There are many Centres where internal moderation has been successful.. Samples are well-prepared and aid the moderation process considerably.

### *Recordings*

- Centres are required to record and send all the Task 1 and 2 responses for the entire entered cohort.
- We strongly encourage the use of digital recording equipment to generate audio files which can then be transferred to a CD, DVD or USB drive in a recognised common audio file format that can be played by standard computer software.
- Please check the quality of the recordings before despatching to Cambridge and ensure that the CD, DVD or USB is securely packaged to avoid damage in transit
- Each track should be labelled with the candidate's name and number. For Task 2 both candidates' names and numbers should be included in the title of the track.
- Each track should be introduced formally using the rubric prescribed in the current syllabus. This is particularly important for Task 2 recordings where Moderators must be able to distinguish between the candidates. The ideal way to achieve this is for candidates to introduce themselves by their names and numbers at the beginning of their responses.
- Wherever possible, recordings should be made in a quiet, undisturbed environment.

### *Materials required by the Moderator*

- Please be aware that four different items must be included in the sample package sent to the Moderator: all of the Centre's recordings; all the Summary Forms; all the individual candidate Record Cards and a copy of the mark sheets showing the total marks awarded for each candidate entered.
- Moderators require Summary Forms detailing a breakdown of the marks awarded for the whole cohort entered.
- The accuracy of the Summary Forms should be checked thoroughly before submitting to Cambridge.

### *Recommended support material*

Centres are encouraged to use the current syllabus, Speaking and Listening Handbook and online training course to ensure the requirements for the administration of the component are fully met.