This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners’ meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.
Question 1

Note: All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidate scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Imagine you are a schools inspector and you have recently visited the school described in Passage A. You are not pleased with what you have observed.

Write your report, in which you:

- outline and explain the reasons for your dissatisfaction;
- make some recommendations to improve matters.

Base your report on what you have read in Passage A.

Support your ideas with evidence from the passage.

Write between 1½ and 2 sides, allowing for the size of your handwriting.

Up to 15 marks will be available for the content of your answer, and up to 5 marks for the quality of your writing.

This question tests Reading Objectives R1–R3 (15 marks):

- understand and collate explicit meanings
- understand, explain and collate implicit meanings and attitudes
- select, analyse and evaluate what is relevant to specific purposes

AND Writing Objectives W1–W5 (5 marks):

- articulate experience and express what is thought, felt and imagined
- order and present facts, ideas and opinions
- understand and use a range of appropriate vocabulary
- use language and register appropriate to audience and context
- make accurate and effective use of paragraphs, grammatical structures, sentences, punctuation and spelling.

General notes on possible content

Candidates should select ideas from the passage (see below) and develop their own recommendations, supporting what they write with details from the passage. There is a lot of material here, so do not expect too much development. The recommendations may be quite brief.

Mark B, P, S, and C for ideas identified from the passage (see below) and Dev for development (in margin). Mark d with a small tick in the text for supporting details. Mark R for recommendations.

Look for a clear report, not in any particular format, but well structured and in the candidate’s own words. It needs to make narrative into report writing, so reward well expressed concerns.

The content must be clearly related to and derived from the passage.
Candidates may use the following as concerns:

**B School buildings** and their surroundings
- **Classrooms:** Use Mr Raj as an example of others; health and safety issues – broken furniture and the mess on the wall

**C Principal's philosophy of ‘freedom’**
- **Curriculum** – which sacrifices Language and Mathematics and leaves gaps in knowledge; sport leads to ‘loafing about’

**S Staff:**
- Do not arrive early to school
- Do not take work home at night
- Appear to have given up
- Are not purposeful, but ‘drift’
- Have to shout to be heard

**P Pupils:** fight, shout, scream, don’t care, slouch, ‘wait to be taught’, sad, morose, ‘we never do anything’

**Recommendations** may be briefly applied to any of the above, for example, to improve the look of the flowerbeds, to re-introduce a properly structured teaching day, staff training, rewards and sanctions, classrooms to be tidied at night, improving the looks of classrooms and treating children fairly and firmly. Accept all sensible suggestions whether tacked on to the end or (better) assimilated into the report. Details from Ms Jhabwala’s practice may be used as recommendations.

**Important check:**

Candidates may lift expressions from the original, particularly the medieval fortress and details from Mr Raj’s classroom. Much of this indicates that candidates do not understand what they are writing.

Candidates may also list details, but reward the use of own words, the way the details are selected and the grouping within the text. Random listing is not good.

**Layout**

Do not expect headings, but expect some ordering of ideas in paragraphs. Expect a formal style, but do not penalise the use of ‘I’.
A: CONTENT (EXTENDED TIER)
Use the following table to give a mark out of 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13–15</td>
<td>The answer reveals a thorough reading of the passage. A good range of ideas is applied to both parts of the question. There is an appropriate amount of supporting detail, which is well integrated into the report, contributing to a strong sense of purpose and approach. The response creates a consistent outsider’s attitude towards the school and the possibilities for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>There is evidence of a competent reading of the passage. The candidate does well to explain some of the reasons for concern. Some of these are developed, but the ability to sustain content may not be consistent. Expect some appropriate recommendations, although these may be less convincing. There is some supporting detail throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>The passage has been read reasonably well, but the answer may not reflect the range and detail of the original. There may be evidence of a mechanical use of the passage. There is focus on the task and satisfactory reference, but opportunities for development are not always taken. Recommendations are simply formulated. Some supporting detail is used, but not consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>Some reference to the passage is made without much inference or more than brief, factual development. Answers may be thin, lack original thought, or in places lack focus on the text, but there is some evidence of general understanding of the main points of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Answers are either very general with little specific reference to the passage or a reproduction of sections of the original. Content is insubstantial and there is little realisation of the need to modify material from the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is little or no relevance to the question or to the passage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: QUALITY OF WRITING: STRUCTURE AND ORDER, STYLE OF LANGUAGE (EXTENDED TIER)
Use the following table to give a mark out of 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language of the report has character and sounds convincing and consistently formal. There is a clear and effective introduction. Concerns are firmly expressed in a wide range of effective and/or interesting language. Structural presentation is sound throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Language is mostly fluent and there is clarity of expression. The introduction is formal and correct. There is a sufficient range of vocabulary to express concerns and give recommendations with some subtlety. The candidate attempts to write formally. The report is mainly well structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Language is clear and appropriate, but comparatively plain, expressing little opinion. Introductions are plain and simple. Individual points are rarely extended, but explanations are adequate. There may be flaws in structural presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There may be some awkwardness of expression and some inconsistency of formal style. Introductions are weak. Language is too limited to express shades of meaning. Look for structural weakness in the presentation of material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are problems of expression and structure. Language is weak and undeveloped. There may be no introduction. There is little attempt to explain ideas. There may be frequent copying from the original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sentence structures and language are unclear and the work is difficult to follow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2

Re-read the descriptions of:

(a) the school and its surroundings in paragraph 1;

(b)  Mr Raj’s classroom in paragraph 3.

Select words and phrases from these descriptions, and explain how the writer has created effects by using this language.

This question tests Reading Objective R4 (10 marks):

- understand how writers achieve effects.

General notes on likely content:

This question is marked for the candidate's ability to select effective or unusual words and for an understanding of ways in which the language is effective. Expect candidates to select words that carry specific meaning, including implications, additional to general and to ordinary vocabulary. Alternative acceptable choices and explanations should be credited. Mark for the overall quality of the answer, not for the number of words chosen.

The following notes are a guide to what good candidates might say about the words they have chosen. They are free to make any sensible comment, but only credit comments that are relevant to the correct meanings of the words and that have some viability.

Candidates could score full marks for excellent comments on three words from each part of the question. Mark and credit what is positive. Do not take marks off for inaccurate statements – simply regard them as not worth credit.

(a) The school and its surroundings in paragraph 1

Credit candidates who explore the idea that the school is a prison, and especially those who can extend their comments by explaining ‘medieval’ and ‘torture’. Reward those who suggest that the images are exaggerated. Make sure that candidates in Band 1 make valid comments about the images, starting with the image and applying it to the meaning in the passage.

Fortress, a visual idea, usually impregnable, and certainly dark, but here it is said to be forbidding, suggesting that no one is welcome or allowed to enter. In addition, it is cruel, which is a more complex idea and which is related to torture. Good candidates will see that physical torture would be an inappropriate exaggeration, but they could say that it suggested mental torture. After all who would put a child into such a building? Arguing along this direction makes it easy to explain prison, which is ironic considering the Principal’s comments on freedom. Medieval is an easier word since it relates to the idea of fortress, but it might suggest something inappropriate to the twenty first century.

Creaking, is the province of horror movies and a sound effect, and echoing, is about high vaults and emptiness. Miserable is an effective transferred epithet, which is what the person feels, not the object. The sandy deserts suggests death and sterility, which is what most of this school is about.
(b) Mr Raj’s classroom in paragraph 3

The general picture is one of extreme chaos, and it is exaggerated and unlikely to be real. Raj would have to be a ‘madman’, so reward anyone who goes into this use of language. It reminds one of a riot. A number of the words have related meanings, so reward candidates who group them together.

Start with the **wild beast** image and imagine how a beast might move on the rampage and the damage it would do if let loose in a classroom. The picture is more effective than imagining, say a sheep! When the writer says it **blundered**, you get the impression of clumsy and violent movement. The rest of the description then falls into place. Candidates should draw attention to **ripped** and **littered** (and later, **pitted** and **spattered**) as words that have similar meanings and are half rhymed so that the reader gets the emphasis of wilful damage and untidiness. **Pitted** could suggest something as outrageous as gunfire, or at least some bored child making holes in the wall. Candidates must have a go at **heaped into a mountain** which together with **symmetry** gives a shape, but suggests that there was a good deal of the broken furniture. However, start from **mountain** and you see that it is all another exaggeration since in reality it was no more than a pile! Lastly, **spattered with sticky substances** gives a slightly disgusting effect, strengthened by the alliteration. **Spattered** suggests indiscriminate defacing of the wall and the reader is left to imagine the nature of the **sticky substances**, which only adds to the effectiveness of the expression.
Marking Criteria for Question 2: READING

Use the following table to give a mark out of 10.

| Band 1: 9–10 | Wide ranging discussion of language with some high quality comments that add meaning and associations to words in both parts of the question, and demonstrate the writer's reasons for using them. May group examples to demonstrate overview of meaning/inference/attitude. Tackles images with some precision and imagination. There is evidence that the candidate understands how language works. |
| Band 2: 7–8 | Reference is made to a number of words and phrases, and some explanations are given and effects identified in both parts of the question. Images are recognised as such and the candidate goes some way to justify them. There is some evidence that the candidate understands how language works. |
| Band 3: 5–6 | A satisfactory attempt is made to identify appropriate words and phrases. Candidates mostly give meanings of words and any attempt to suggest and explain effects is weak. One half of the question may be better answered than the other. Candidates may identify linguistic devices but not explain why they are used. Explanations are basic or in very general terms (or may be virtually ignored). |
| Band 4: 3–4 | Candidates select a mixture of appropriate words as well as words that communicate less well. Explanations are only partially effective and occasionally repeat the language of the original, or comments are very general and do not refer to specific words. |
| Band 5: 1–2 | The choice of words is partly relevant, sparse or sometimes unrelated to the text. While the question has been understood, the candidate does little more than offer a few words and make very slight, generalised comments. The answer is very thin. |
| Band 6: 0 | Answers do not fit the question. Inappropriate words and phrases are chosen. |
Question 3

Summarise:

(a) the evidence that Mr Chappelle was not a very good teacher, from passage B;

(b) the evidence that Ms Jhabvala was an excellent teacher, from passage A.

Use your own words as far as possible.

You should write about 1 side in total, allowing for the size of your handwriting.

Up to 15 marks will be available for the content of your answer, and up to 5 marks for the quality of your writing.

This question tests Reading Objectives R1–R3 (15 marks):

- understand and collate explicit meanings
- understand, explain and collate implicit meanings and attitudes
- select, analyse and evaluate what is relevant to specific purposes

AND Writing Objectives W1–W5 (5 marks):

- articulate experience and express what is thought, felt and imagined
- order and present facts, ideas and opinions
- understand and use a range of appropriate vocabulary
- use language and register appropriate to audience and context
- make accurate and effective use of paragraphs, grammatical structures, sentences, punctuation and spelling.

A: Content: Give one mark per point up to a maximum of 15.

Mr Chappelle (Passage B)

1. Did not appreciate that Dicey was bright/bored/lazy/didn’t stretch her
2. Couldn’t write straight on the board/unusual writing
3. Played with chalk/distraction/annoying habit
4. Stayed still to teach/undramatic/not dynamic
5. Asked unclear questions/over-complicated, abstruse, silly questions/indecisive speech
6. Accepted weak/stupid answers
7. Wrote down everything on board mechanically/indiscriminately
8. Didn’t think fast/maybe less intelligent than some students/didn’t understand Wilhemina/didn’t understand what he was doing
9. Allowed students to get bored/lack of variety – three weeks learning grammar/class not engaged/challenged
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Ms Jabhvala (Passage A)

10 Planned lessons in advance/had programs on computers
11 Went to school early/to get her classroom ready
12 Kept a neat, bright classroom/children’s work on walls
13 Achieved plenty of varied work with students/in a lesson
14 Well-disciplined, quiet, well-mannered pupils/line up/checks uniform/teacher and class greet each other
15 Took a register
16 Special work to extend some students
17 Rewarded children
18 Children wanted to be in her class/gave her presents
19 Kept her temper/smiled
20 Atmosphere tranquil/peaceful
21 Used computers
22 Maintained standards/did not bow to pressure/persevered/never gave up

Examiners should decide whether candidates have understood a point and have expressed it sufficiently for it to be rewarded. Be aware that there will be a great variety of expression, and be prepared to give the benefit of the doubt in borderline cases.

B: QUALITY OF WRITING (CONCISION, FOCUS AND WRITING IN OWN WORDS)

Use the following table to give a mark out of 5.

| Band 1: 5 | All points are made clearly, concisely, and fluently, in the candidate's own words (where appropriate). The answer is strongly focused on the passages and on the question. |
| Band 2: 4 | Both parts of the answer are concise and well focused even if there is an inappropriate introduction or ending. Own words are used consistently (where appropriate). |
| Band 3: 3 | There are some areas of concision. There may be occasional loss of focus. Own words (where appropriate) are used for most of the answer. The candidate may use some quotations in lieu of explanation. Answers may be list-like, not well sequenced. |
| Band 4: 2 | The answer is mostly focused, but there may be examples of comment, repetition or unnecessarily long explanation, or the answer may obviously exceed the permitted length. There may be occasional lifting of phrases and sentences. |
| Band 5: 1 | The answer frequently loses focus and is wordy, or is grossly long. It may be answered in the wrong form (e.g. a narrative or a commentary). There may be frequent lifting of phrases and sentences. |
| Band 6: 0 | Over-reliance on lifting; insufficient focus for Band 5. Grossly long. |
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Note: A few candidates will copy the text word for word or virtually so. They will probably write at considerable length in doing so. If this is so:

- Mark the points as usual, add them up and take a third of the total away. This will be your mark for content.

- Give 0 for writing.

A candidate who by copying gets all fifteen points for content will score $10 + 0$, which will still allow half marks for the exercise.

Do not follow this procedure for candidates who copy small sections of the text but who write mostly in their own words, even where the answer is a close paraphrase.