

Specimen Paper Answers

Paper 2

Cambridge International AS Level English General Paper 8021

For examination from 2019



In order to help us develop the highest quality resources, we are undertaking a continuous programme of review; not only to measure the success of our resources but also to highlight areas for improvement and to identify new development needs.

We invite you to complete our survey by visiting the website below. Your comments on the quality and relevance of our resources are very important to us.

www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/GL6ZNJB

Would you like to become a Cambridge International consultant and help us develop support materials?

Please follow the link below to register your interest.

www.cambridgeinternational.org/cambridge-for/teachers/teacherconsultants/

Copyright © UCLES 2018

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which itself is a department of the University of Cambridge.

UCLES retains the copyright on all its publications. Registered Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, we cannot give permission to Centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party, even for internal use within a Centre.

Contents

Introduction	4
Assessment overview	5
Paper 2 – Specimen answer	6

Introduction

The main aim of this booklet is to exemplify standards for those teaching Cambridge International AS Level English General Paper 8021, and to show examples of very good answers. There are 2 sections in Paper 2 and candidates must answer all questions. These questions consist of a range of sub-questions. These include questions which require short answers and more extended answers which require responses of up to 120 words.

In this booklet, we have provided an answer for each of the questions along with examiner comments. Comments are given to indicate where and why marks were awarded, and how additional marks could have been obtained. In this way, it is possible to understand what candidates have done to gain their marks and how they could improve.

The mark schemes for the Specimen Papers are available to download from the School Support Hub at www.cambridgeinternational.org/support.

2019 Specimen Mark Scheme for Specimen Paper 2

Past exam resources and other teacher support materials are also available on the School Support Hub.

Assessment overview

Paper 2 Comprehension

Written paper, 1 hour 45 minutes, 50 marks

Candidates must answer all questions in each of the two sections on the paper.

Externally assessed

50% of the AS Level

The assessment objectives (AOs) are:

AO1 Selection and application of information

- Demonstrate understanding of information from a variety of material.
- Identify, select and interpret relevant data, information and examples.
- Apply information that exemplifies ideas and opinions.

AO2 Analysis and evaluation

- Demonstrate the ability to analyse the meaning of language as used in its context.
- Develop explanations with examples, analysis and evaluation.
- Develop, analyse and evaluate arguments and make supported judgements.

AO3 Communication using written English

- Write structured responses, using a range of appropriate language for a variety of purposes.
- Communicate information, ideas and opinions clearly and accurately.
- Construct cohesive and organised responses, linking ideas and arguments.

Paper 2 – Specimen answer

Section A

Read the material for Section A, which is about wind farms, in the Insert before answering the questions in Section A.

Question 1(a)

Which one of the two extracts (from *Encyclopaedia Cantabrigensis* or from the proposal by *Blowin' in the Wind Developments*) is more reliable as a source of information about the proposal? Explain your reasoning.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p><i>I think the Encyclopaedia Cantabrigensis extract is more reliable because an encyclopaedia is a reference book filled only with facts and information. It is not supposed to be biased. Blowin' in The Wind is the company which wants to build the wind farm so it won't mention the negatives.</i></p>	<p>1 The use of 'only' clinches the first mark as the candidate is showing an understanding of the nature of a reference book. (1)</p> <p>2 By citing the advantage that an encyclopaedia is unbiased, a comparison with the other extract is implicit, thus gaining the second mark available. (1)</p> <p>3 MAX 2 marks for this question so, although this is correct, no more credit is available.</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 2 out of 2</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate could not have improved upon their performance as more than enough reasoning has been provided.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

Candidates who do not gain some or any credit on such questions tend to just offer quotes from both extracts, often without any analysis or comparison, showing that they do not understand key trigger words in the question (e.g. 'reliable') and/or key vocabulary in the insert ('Encyclopaedia'). Mistakes made in the English used (e.g. in the case of this candidate by omitting articles, using an incorrect article, using conjunctions such as 'in which' incorrectly, misspelling words and using an incorrect preposition or verb) will only affect credit given if the meaning is unclear.

Question 1(b)

Why do you think the blades are 'grey in colour with a non-reflective surface'? [line 20]

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p><i>I think blades is 'grey in colour' because it is dark and people won't see them so easily.</i></p>	<p>1 The candidate gains credit here because, although the response does not quite match the mark scheme, it is a valid point worthy of credit. (1)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 1 out of 2</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

This candidate could have potentially gained more credit if he/she had addressed the second limb of the quote ('with a non-reflective surface') rather than just concentrating on explaining the colour choice.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

A common mistake in responses to questions requiring two explanations worth one mark each is to offer two explanations about one element in the hope of still gaining both marks. However, this is not the case. It is recommended that candidates attempt to respond to all elements of a question as candidates are not penalised for such attempts and might gain more credit by doing so. Another common mistake made by candidates is that they can manipulate complex tenses very well, but make errors in agreements when conjugating verbs in the present tense (e.g. 'blades is grey').

Question 1(c)

If a 2 MW turbine can produce enough electrical energy to power 300 households, how many turbines would be required to meet Segono's needs?

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
$6000 \div 300 = 20$ 1	<p>1 This candidate has noted down their calculations. (1)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 1 out of 1</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate gained full marks for this question.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

A common mistake made by candidates is to do all the necessary calculations in their head and then only write down their answer. This means that it is easy to make a slip (e.g. offering either 2 or 200 as answers). It is recommended that, when candidates are required to do any kind of calculation, they write down their workings-out in full in order to avoid such slips.

Question 1(d)

Identify **five** points made by Louis Logica at the public meeting and show how they could be challenged by material found elsewhere in Section A. You may use continuous prose or bullet points.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p>point 1: She said It's all nonsense – absolutely no need for it whatsoever. 1</p> <p>challenge: but Peter said Border disputes with Ursus mean that we are vunerabel and it's important we follow a policy of self-sufficiency. 2</p> <p>point 2: She said we can get energy here from our own natural resources. 3</p> <p>challenge: but Peter said Border disputes with Ursus mean that we are vunerabel. 4</p> <p>point 3: She said Just imagine the noise from these monsters, whizzing so fast – they'll make you dizzy – no one in the town would ever sleep ! 5</p>	<p>1 This response is too vague to gain any credit as there is no reference to getting oil from Ursus. Using the wrong personal pronoun here ('she' instead of 'he') would not have prevented credit being awarded if a correct point had been offered. In addition, the candidate would not be penalised for not using speech marks in this case. (0)</p> <p>2 The candidate has noted the link across the text to Peter's reference to problems with Ursus and so the need for renewable energy. (1)</p> <p>3</p> <p>6</p>

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p>challenge: <i>wind is a clean source of renewable energy.</i></p> <p>point 4: <i>She said And the sight of them – as tall as 100 houses, they'll be seen from everywhere.</i> 7</p> <p>challenge: <i>the maximum height of the turbines will be 110m to blade tip.)</i> 8</p> <p>point 5: <i>She said They'll be going round forever!</i> 9</p> <p>challenge: <i>over its twenty-year life span</i> 10</p>	<p>There is no reference anywhere else to natural resources so this particular point cannot be challenged. (0)</p> <p>4 This point has already gained credit. (0)</p> <p>5 The relevant point is offered first and given credit. The rest of the quote is not required, but does not invalidate the mark as it is continuing on the same theme. (1)</p> <p>6 The response is not creditworthy as it is irrelevant. (0)</p> <p>7 Again, the run-on does not invalidate the mark given as it is just a continuation of the point. (1)</p> <p>8 The candidate has made the link between Louis' comment and the extract from the company's proposal. (1)</p> <p>9 A creditworthy point (1)</p> <p>10 The candidate noted correctly the link to the extract from the encyclopaedia. (1)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 6 out of 10</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

This candidate could have improved their answer in several ways as he/she made some errors commonly found in scripts. Generalised comments, such as the one offered in point 1, rarely gain credit if there are many factors with specific and relevant details in the text that can be given instead. It appears that this candidate was not very sure about the demands of the question (finding points made by Louis that could be challenged) so he/she tended to work through the text relating to Louis, giving lengthy quotes from it from the beginning (e.g. 'It's all nonsense ...').

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

When quoting from texts, it is essential that only the relevant parts of the text are offered to show understanding and to prevent irrelevant or contradictory material becoming part of the answer, thus affecting the credit awarded to such responses. It is also important to keep answers to questions relevant and succinct as, for example, only the first idea offered can gain credit with questions when candidates are asked to give one idea. Furthermore, credit can only be gained once for making a point or finding a challenge to it, hence the reason why the challenge to point 2 was not awarded a mark in the response above – repetition invalidated it. Finally, it is recommended also that candidates proof-read their answers very closely to avoid misspellings when transcribing from the text (e.g. writing 'vunerabel' instead of 'vulnerable' in the response above). In this case, the error did not affect the awarding of credit, but it could do if a misspelling led to a lack of clarity.

Question 1(e)

Explain why Peter Profundus would be a good choice to lead the opposition to the construction of the wind farm. Answer in about 100 words using continuous prose.

Specimen Paper Response

Peter Profundus would be a good choice to lead opposition to the construction of the wind farm. ¹

In the first instance, ² I think he seem like a knowledgeable guy ³ because he know government is committed to reducing carbon emissions to meet national and international targets so he understand difficulties for them. ⁴

Secondly, he talk about border disputes with Ursus mean that we are vunerabel and it's impotent we follow a policy of self-sufficiency, but then he say he is committed to renewable energy like next person, but it has to make sense, this is wrong place for wind farm. ⁵ He talk about both parts of argument. ⁶

Thirdly, he knows reasonable negatives. ⁷

Examiner comments

¹ No credit awarded yet as this is a repetition of the question.

² Regarding the word limit, sequencing using lengthy phrases uses up valuable words.

³ A point (referred to as a consideration in the mark scheme for this question) has been made here that is creditworthy, as the candidate has intuited this trait about Peter's character by reading between the lines of the text. It is also nuanced – 'seems like'.

⁴ The point about being knowledgeable has been fully explained so the candidate has gained credit for a development here.

⁵ A point has been made here . However, if the candidate had not included 'but then' and offered an explanation afterwards, it might have appeared that the candidate was just copying out the text – in which case, the response would not have gained much or any credit as the candidate must show comprehension of the text.

⁶ A development , though it is noted that it is not as fully developed as the first point's explanation was. The use of 'parts' instead of 'sides' is tolerated here (in terms of reader comprehension not being too compromised because context is given) and so the explanation can gain credit.

⁷ The word count means that the candidate's work that appears after 'negatives' is not considered as it is beyond the word limit. However, enough information has been conveyed to justify giving credit here for a point made – the inclusion of 'reasonable' clinched the credit.

The response conveys a moderate, though slightly narrow, range of relevant arguments and analysis covering some of the main issues in

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
	<p>the question in an organised manner and is mostly coherent and clearly expressed.</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 6 out of 10</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate could have improved their answer by noting that there is a word count attached to this question, indicating a requirement to summarise relevant reasons succinctly, and thus be able to communicate a sufficient number of points within the word limit stipulated. This is a common mistake and it is therefore recommended that, when answering a question with word limits, candidates do not offer an introduction, write out the question again or sequence their answer using lengthy phrases (e.g. by incorporating phrases such as ‘in the first instance’, ‘yet another reason is ...’ or ‘in addition to this,’) as all these techniques use up valuable words. This candidate has also used lengthy quotes from the text. It is recommended that candidates select what is to be quoted more carefully so that quotes are shorter but still contain all the necessary details, meaning that candidates can then offer more points to be considered and, at the same time, explain them fully (thus also having more opportunities to show their analytical skills) within the word count allowed. This candidate managed to convey two developed points (though one was not as fully developed as the other) and a third point (just achieved within the word limit), but he/she could have gained more credit by communicating more points within the word count if he/she had adhered to the aforementioned recommendations. All of this would have lifted the answer to a Level 4 response as at least four fully developed points (considerations) clearly expressed were required for a Level 4 answer. Otherwise, the other criteria (a coherent appraisal, exploring at least one aspect of character) were fulfilled.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

Other than those mentioned above, another common mistake is to offer responses containing language that is too assertive when the requirement is to show insight. It is recommended that candidates nuance their responses. This can be achieved, for example, by using modal verbs (e.g. ‘might’, ‘might have’, ‘may’, ‘can’, ‘could’, ‘could have’), other verbal constructions (e.g. ‘seems to be/ as if’) and words such as ‘probably’, ‘perhaps’, ‘potentially’ and ‘likely’.

Section B

Read the material for Section B, which is about Steve Jobs, in the Insert before answering the questions in Section B.

Question 2(a)(i-iii)

From the material identify the phrase that means the following:

- (i) to tone down the persuasive language [paragraph 6]
- (ii) empathetic [paragraph 7]
- (iii) form a judgement about others [paragraph 7]

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
(i) <i>to ratchet the rhetoric down a notch</i> 1	<p>1 The candidate has selected correctly the exact phrase required from the text to gain the mark. (1)</p> <p>2 The candidate has selected correctly the exact phrase required from the text to gain the mark. (1)</p> <p>3 The phrase selected is not akin to forming a judgement about others, so cannot score the mark. (0)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 2 out of 3</p>
(ii) <i>emotionally attuned to others</i> 2	
(iii) <i>understand their inner thoughts</i> 3	

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

In this case the candidate, in (iii), used the correct strategy when confronted with an unfamiliar idiom (e.g. 'size people up') – by making a reasoned attempt in the correct grammatical form, which is always to be encouraged, rather than not attempting the sub-question at all.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

Common mistakes when responding to this type of question include either offering too much material from the text (e.g. '*it is probably best to ratchet the rhetoric down a bit*') or too little (e.g. '*to ratchet the rhetoric*'). In addition, some candidates do not note the grammatical structure of the phrase in question and offer a phrase from the text that would not work grammatically as an equivalent (e.g. '*he could understand their inner thoughts*' in response to (ii)). These errors all show a lack of understanding of the precise meaning of the phrase in the question. Finally, a few candidates do not select a phrase from the paragraph they have been directed to (e.g. '*a humanities person*' for '*emotionally attuned to others*' – selected from Paragraph 6 instead of 7, and showing confusion about the meaning of '*humanities*').

Question 2(b)(i-iii)

Explain the meaning of the **two** following phrases as they are used in the material. You may write the answer in one word or a short phrase.

(i) wrestled with [line 5]

(ii) not conventionally [line 18]

(iii) Use these phrases in **two** separate sentences to illustrate their meanings as used in the material. Your sentences should use subject matter that is different from the material.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p>(i) <i>struggled with</i> ¹</p> <p>(ii) <i>not in the usual way</i> ²</p> <p>(iii) <i>As he read the English book, he wrestled with the new words and tries alot to understand it, but found it hard.</i> ³</p> <p><i>She is not conventionally clever, she is good seeing other ways to solve problems.</i> ⁴</p>	<p>¹ The mark is awarded as the synonym is appropriate and in the same tense as 'wrestled with'. (1)</p> <p>² This answer gains the mark as, although it does not appear in the mark scheme, it is a valid response. (1)</p> <p>³ The meaning of the phrase has been clearly demonstrated by the inclusion of 'but found it hard' so gains the mark. The third verb is in an incorrect tense, however the meaning remains clear because of the other three verbs being correct, including the crucial 'wrestled with', so, in this instance, the credit is gained. (1)</p> <p>⁴ This answer cannot gain any credit because, firstly, it deals with the same subject matter as the passage (intelligence) and, secondly, it consists of two sentences (comma splice). Both are rubric infringements. (0)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 3 out of 4</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate could have gained more credit by ensuring that the subject matter was different compared to that of the material and that he/she only offered one sentence (the use of a semi colon, colon, connective or conjunction avoids the comma splice issue).

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

There are some other common mistakes made by candidates on this type of question. It is crucial that candidates use the same grammatical form as in the question (e.g. 'struggles with' is not the correct form to replace 'wrestled with'); provide only one synonym per question, especially as only the first answer is marked; check that the exact meaning of the word is clearly defined in the sentence given; offer two separate sentences rather than writing a narrative which randomly includes the two words or phrases required, and, lastly, use the two words or phrases given in the question in the sentences rather than the candidate's own synonyms.

Question 2(c)

Give **three** reasons which accounted for Steve Jobs' success as stated in lines 20–23. Answer **in your own words as far as possible**.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p><i>He is Buddhist so he trust more on experience rather than science. ¹ He did not look at research or figures. ² He could sense what lay ahead. ³</i></p>	<p>1 Credit is gained here, despite the use of the present tense as it does not compromise the meaning in this instance. (1)</p> <p>2 Credit is again gained here. (1)</p> <p>3 Credit denied here as the sentence consists of material copied from the text. (0)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 2 out of 3</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate could have gained more credit by not copying out material from the text – a rubric infringement as the candidate's own words are required. It is recommended that, even when a candidate is unsure of the meaning of a sentence, he/she attempts to recast it using his/ her own synonyms as far as possible as this might some gain credit, whereas copying from the text does not.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

Common mistakes made by candidates when responding to such questions also include the following: providing more than the required number of reasons, meaning that sometimes correct material does not gain credit because it cannot be considered (e.g. four reasons are given - with reasons number 1, 2 and 4 being correct, however only two marks can be awarded in this case); including irrelevant and/ or contradictory material; providing only one or two reasons, or not following the line instructions in the question and offering another section in their own words.

Question 2(d)(i-iii)

Explain **in your own words as far as possible**:

- (i) the differences between Steve Jobs' approach to problem-solving and that of Bill Gates, and the impact this had on their businesses, as stated in paragraphs 2 and 6.
- (ii) the similarities between Einstein and Steve Jobs, as stated in paragraph 5.
- (iii) the similarities between Edwin Land and Steve Jobs, as suggested in paragraph 6.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p>(i) Someone asked about a problem about a monkey taking bananas through a desert and how long a monkey would need. Jobs guessed ¹ couple of times, but wasn't interested in working out answer. ¹ Bill Gates would have solved problem quickly. ¹ Gates liked to read about science on holiday. ²</p> <p>(ii) Jobs was imaginative and could use it. Einstein thought 'Imagination is more important than knowledge'. ³ Einstein is a genius. He show the characteristics of genius, he had intuition and was imaginative so he didn't think the same way as others like Jobs said in publicity – people should think in a different way. ⁴</p> <p>(iii) Jobs always thought of himself as a humanities person in childhood, but he loved electronics. ⁵ Land was hero for Jobs and talked about how people was important who did both humanities and sciences. Jobs decided that's what he wanted to do also. ⁶</p>	<p>1 The candidate has successfully put three of the points from the mark scheme in his/her own words. (3)</p> <p>2 This point is irrelevant to the question. (0)</p> <p>3 This material is copied from the text so cannot gain credit. (0)</p> <p>4 The candidate probably thought that he/she had made three points here, but lines 2 – 4 are all on the same similarity so only two points were offered in this response. (1)</p> <p>5 Too much material from the text has been copied so credit cannot be given here. (0)</p> <p>6 This sentence has been copied from the text. Plus, it is simply a continuation of the previous point which did gain the credit. (1)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 5 out of 9</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate has made a common error in (ii) by copying out a quote on a question that requires candidates to respond using their own words. It is recommended that, if a question stipulates the use of own words, then even quotes should be rewritten in a candidate's own words. This candidate could have thus gained more credit.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

Other common mistakes include giving responses that are too vague or generalised as the candidate has not included all the necessary details when responding in his/ her own words or not noticing trigger words in the question (e.g. in this case, by not focussing solely on similarities and differences) so giving responses containing irrelevant and/ or contradictory material.

Question 2(e)(i-ii)

What do you think is meant by:

(i) the reference to Steve Jobs embodying ‘the Silicon Valley dream writ large’? [line 8]

Answer **in about 30 words**.

(ii) T S Eliot’s observation that ‘Between conception and creation ... there falls the shadow’? [line 57]

Answer **in about 30 words**.

Specimen Paper Response	Examiner comments
<p>(i) <i>I think Jobs was very successful in Silicon Valley as he started his business in his parents’ garage then ended up with the world’s most valuable company. He lived American dream.</i> 1</p> <p>(ii) <i>I think Eliot mean that from when someone has an idea of something to when he make it for real it can get dark.</i> 2</p>	<p>1 The candidate adhered to the word limit and made three valid points so gained maximum credit. (3)</p> <p>2 Within the word limit the candidate made two valid points, but did not understand the meaning behind the reference to shadow, offering a literal interpretation instead. (2)</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 5 out of 6</p>

How the candidate could have improved the answer?

The candidate could have improved their performance by reading between the lines more with regard to the reference to ‘*there falls the shadow*’ in (ii). They have taken something at face value rather than considered a deeper meaning. However, this candidate did attempt to respond to all the elements of Eliot’s observation – a strategy that is always recommended.

Common mistakes candidates make in this question

It is a common mistake for candidates to take something at face value, rather than to intuit a deeper meaning.

Cambridge Assessment International Education
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
t: +44 1223 553554
e: info@cambridgeinternational.org www.cambridgeinternational.org

Copyright © UCLES May 2018