

EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL OF ESWATINI

JC

EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

YEAR

2020

JC EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR 2020

Table of Contents

<u>Subject Code</u>	<u>Subject Name</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Page</u>
101	<i>English Language</i>	<i>P1</i>	<i>3-6</i>
101	<i>English Language</i>	<i>P2</i>	<i>7-11</i>
101	<i>English Language</i>	<i>P3</i>	<i>12-15</i>
15	<i>English Language</i>	<i>P4</i>	<i>16-19</i>

JC ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 101/01

GENERAL COMMENTS

This component is a reading and writing examination that comprises five exercises. This paper was able to make a clear distinction between weak, average and above average candidates. In 2020 there were few candidates who were above average. A majority of the candidates ranged between twenty and thirty some above thirty and some scored below twenty and below ten. Most candidates lacked the skill and art of reading and responding to questions in the desired manner.

EXERCISE 1

This exercise aimed at finding out if candidates have mastered the skill of skimming and scanning. A number of them scored averagely.

- (a) Required candidates to state what makes Mauritius an attractive holiday destination. The expected response was “hundreds of miles of white sand lapped by clearest sea”. More than fifty percent were able to get this one correct, even though some have a tendency of giving incomplete answers.
- (b) Candidates had to mention **three** activities one can enjoy on the beaches. The desired response was “trips in glass bottomed boats, snorkelling, wind surfing, undersea walks, diving, deep sea fishing, speed boat rides, water skiing and kite – surfing (any three)”. This question seemed to be a bit challenging since a majority of them could not get it correct. However, some managed to give the desired answer.
- (c) Required candidates to state what excitement awaits visitors in June. The expected answer was “Rugby World Club Tournament/ World Club Tournament”. This seemed to be fair to most of the learners. However, some have poor writing skills, they did not note that this was a Proper Noun, hence they used in small instead of capital letters.
- (d) Candidates had to state **two** teams that would bring their legends. The desired response was “All Blacks and The Italian All Stars”. This was another fairly answered question. A majority of the candidates were able to give the correct responses. However, some could not, they failed to lift up the correct response from the passage.
- (e) Required candidates to write where the Amateur finals would take place. A majority of the candidates were able to get this one correct “Anjalay Stadium”. This seemed to be easy since a majority of them were able to get this one correct. However, some could not because of carelessness with writing the response as a common noun instead of a proper noun.
- (f) Required candidates to state the tournament that would take place alongside rugby. The desired answer was “Grand Tennis Baile”. A majority of the candidates were able to get this one correct. However, some could not.
- (g) Candidates were expected to mention the tournament that was featured by the Mauritius Ocean Classic. About fifty percent of the candidates were able to identify the correct answer from the passage “The World Surf-Ski Series”. Some could not write the answer in full, they omitted series, thus could not be awarded marks.
- (h) Required candidates to state how one can place a booking. A majority of the candidates could not score on this question. Writing an email address was a challenge as most candidates space up the address. The expected response was “email: www.mauritius365.mu”. Some simply wrote “email”.

EXERCISE 2

This exercise aims at testing the candidates' ability to read for details and infer information from a given text. Most candidates did not do well in this exercise.

- (a) Candidates were expected to state what information can be learnt simply by looking at a person's plate of food. A majority of the candidates were able to correctly state that "aspects of one's identity". However, some candidates omitted 'of one's identity' but simply wrote 'aspects'. A few could not identify the correct answer from the passage.
- (b) Required candidates to give one way in which we can explain the expression "you are what you eat". A few, were able to give the expected response: "Humans are made up of chemicals just like food they eat / simply collection of well-organized chemicals / health is achieved by eating the right chemicals to support body systems". A majority of them wrote incomplete responses like, "human beings are made up of chemicals" omitting the major aspect of the response, "just like the food they eat", thus they could not score marks.
- (c) Candidates were expected to explain in what way food has always had certain meaning. A minority of the candidates were able to explain that "(food eaten now can be viewed) as adopting a certain moral or political stance". A majority of the candidates could not get this one correct because of writing incomplete answers like "adopting a certain moral" and omitted "a political stance".
- (d) Required candidates to explain how "coffee orders and personality types are linked". A majority of them were able to explain that "they communicate our identities (who we are), characters/attitudes". A number of them could not explain and they failed to identify the correct answer from the text.
- (e) Candidates had to explain what perception people might have about vegetarians. A majority of the candidates were able to score on this one "love for animals / extremely health conscious".
- (f) Expected candidates to mention one way in which our food choices get influenced by certain people. About fifty percent of the candidates were able to mention that "people may choose certain foods to portray a specific image of themselves / avoid other foods for fear of being judged. Some candidates could not identify the correct response from the passage.
- (g) Candidates were expected to explain in their own words what the phrase "we have paired food with their own messages," mean. A majority of the candidates were able to explain that "food is associated with certain meanings / identity, attitude and character".
- (h) Required candidates to describe how human beings use food in different circumstances since they could not describe that food is 1. "Used as a communication tool" 2. Used to make judgements about persons personality, identity, attitude, character" and 3. "Used to manage people's perception about them".

EXERCISE 3

This exercise aims at testing the candidates' ability to follow given instructions and transfer relevant information from a given text into a form. Very few candidates scored above average, some failed due to omitting some information e.g. full name, date and place of birth. Some ignored instructions especially in Section B. Some did understand what 'current spouse' meant.

In Section C, a majority of the candidates used second person narration instead of first person singular "I". Some were not consistent. They began the first sentence with "I" but used the second person in the second sentence. Most candidates ended up scoring one mark for each sentence because they omitted a full stop at the end of the sentence. Some ignored the instruction on the number of words. They either wrote less than 12 words or more than 20 words.

EXERCISE 4

This exercise aims at testing the ability to present given information in note form under relevant sub-headings. Very few candidates scored above average. Others could not score at all due to:

- Use of capital letters
- Use of full stops
- Presenting irrelevant information under different headings
- Writing full sentences instead of notes
- omitting the key words

NOTABLE CHANGES IN THE POST-INTERNET ERA

- Instant chats or email / instant chats or email family, friends or pen pals (across the globe)
- Online dates made possible
- International friendship made easy
- People creating own personalised websites

HOW WIFI CONTRIBUTE TO A BETTER SOCIETY

- (Police use) mobile devices to track mug shots and criminal records
- Social media used to fight crime
- To reduce crime
- Improvement of emergency services

APPLICATIONS USING WIFI IN HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

- Infusing pumps
- Oxygen monitoring devices
- Smart beds

WIFI BENEFITS TO SMART CITIES

- Data stored used to improve various industries and services\
- Citizens gain access to online world wherever they go / no matter where they go
- To generate huge amounts of data

EXERCISE 5

This exercise tests the candidates' ability to identify relevant points to the question and present them in continuous prose. A majority of candidates were able to score above average in this exercise. They could identify the points according to the question which required (advantages) / why one should invest in bitcoin and (disadvantages) why one should not invest in bitcoin. Most of them capitalized on advantages thus they could not score full marks for content. In addition, language was a challenge, very few candidates could score above average and the rest had limited expression. They solely relied on lifting from the original text. They failed to group and sequence ideas in their own words. When attempt was made it resulted in distortion of meaning.

ADVANTAGES

1. Decentralisation / its decentralisation nature
2. Make border payments easy / no middleman
3. Making transactions easy / transactions are nearly instant, done in groups called blocks
4. Low transaction fees / cheap / saves a lot on transaction fees

DISADVANTAGES

1. Cannot handle increased volumes of transactions
2. Stores users' public keys on public domain or on security / easy to hack
3. Alternative coins to replace / a number of alternative coins have emerged.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is therefore imperative that in preparing candidates for the paper they;

- Are exposed to a lot of reading to enhance understanding of written work and to enrich vocabulary
- Be given of lot comprehension work to help in mastering the question analysis skill and for responding to questions
- Be taught basic grammar and sentence construction
- Be exposed to exercises designed to train them to follow instructions
- Be taught the skill of note taking

JC ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 101/02

GENERAL COMMENTS

The second component of the English Language examination assesses candidate competency in continuous writing. Unlike speaking which can be intuitively acquired in the right context, writing is in most cases deliberately taught and learned. It is in writing that candidates get the opportunity to creatively produce what they acquired through listening and reading. The paper carries significant weight and it is important for candidates to be thoroughly equipped to tackle the paper as it increases their chances of scoring high marks in the exam. It is also a necessary academic and life skill.

The 2020 examination was accessible to most candidates and their performance could be generally described as average, though it leaned towards being poor. The questions were based on familiar, everyday content, such as domestic chores and the wearing of school uniform. At the same time, some questions were able to differentiate between candidates who are aware of their surroundings and those who are oblivious to what is going on around them. Most candidates were able to finish writing within the given time, which means the time allocated for the paper is adequate.

The paper was divided into three exercises. The first two were compulsory, guided and economic writing, while the last one had an option of three questions from which candidates had to choose one. The last one was a longer piece of free-style writing.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Exercise 1: Informal Writing

You and your siblings went on an outing and something devastating happened. You ended up rescuing the situation.

Write a letter to a friend explaining what happened.

In your letter you must:

- Describe where you were and what happened
- Explain what you did to help
- Say what you learnt from this experience

The pictures above may give you some ideas but you are free to use ideas of your own.

Your letter should be between 150 and 200 words long.

You will receive up to 8 marks for the content and up to 7 marks for the style and accuracy of your language.

In this particular exercise, candidates were expected to write a friendly letter, giving an account of a devastating experience they had while on an outing with their siblings. They were given a clear guide of what to include in the letter, indicated by the use of the modal verb, *must*, which refers to obligation. It was expected that they should include a description of the place; say what happened and how they rescued the situation, as well as a lesson learnt from the whole situation. In addition to the written prompts there were two pictures which were meant to stimulate their thinking. It was in their discretion whether they wanted to incorporate those ideas in their writing, or if they wanted to come up with something different altogether.

A majority of the candidates performed well. Poor performance was more a result of faulty grammar and poor articulation rather than a misunderstanding of the question. Good candidates were able to write letters that captured the reader's interest and were creative in terms of the outing ideas presented and possible distressing scenarios. They also ensured that they responded to all bullet points and adequately developed them within the given space.

Some responses were compromised by poor question analysis. For example, key words such as outing, siblings and devastating were evidently misunderstood. Lack of exposure could be seen in responses where outing became a walk to the shops or a visit to relatives. The gap between the exposed and less exposed was very obvious. This is a gap which can be closed by extensive reading which transports readers to places and experiences they have never had. In some cases, instead of siblings these were friends, class/school/church mates. It is not clear whether this error emanated from poor vocabulary or just negligence. It is advisable that candidates should be trained on question analysis.

It appeared a few candidates were distracted by the visuals and they ended with incoherent pieces of writing. A few candidates left out some bullet points and only squeezed in a line at the end of their writing. Such negligence is quite costly and should be totally eliminated from candidates' practices.

Another area which needs refining is that of appropriateness. It seems candidates were not aware of the elements of formal and informal language. As a result, in the friendly letter, there was heavy presence of formal, serious and official tone e.g. "I would like to *inform* you..." There were long and winding sentences; as well as use of the passive voice. On the other extreme, some candidates who consciously used informal language ended up overlapping to slang, which is totally unacceptable. It is therefore important to weed out colloquial words and phrases e.g. "Hey dawg; what the hell; gonna/wanna; lit etcetera".

Exercise 2

There has been an outcry from the School Administration that candidates do not wear the appropriate school uniform. As the head boy/girl of the school, you have been requested to motivate candidates to put on the appropriate uniform.

Below are some comments from some of the students

What's the point! Wearing a school uniform has a lot of disadvantages.

Uniforms are our identity.

We spend a lot of time at school; when are we ever going to wear our own clothes?

It's part of the school rules; we must adhere to them

Write a speech that you will deliver during morning assembly, convincing the learners to wear the appropriate school uniform.

Your speech should be about 150 -200 words long.

The comments above may give you ideas, but you are free to use ideas of your own.

You will be given up to 8 marks for content, and up to 7 marks for the style and accuracy of your language.

Exercise 2 was a formal piece of writing, a speech by the head prefect to the learners after he/she was requested by the administration to 'drum some sense' to his/her peers about the importance of adhering to the school guide regarding the wearing of uniform. According to the question, candidates were supposed to write a motivational speech, not an argumentative article. There were no prompts to follow, but there were comments which candidates could consider as they formulated the speech. It could help to promote the wearing of appropriate uniform while acknowledging and countering some of the reasons for the deviation. Unfortunately, a majority of the candidates did not motivate but argued strongly for the wearing of appropriate school uniform. There were rare cases where candidates argued strongly against the wearing of school uniform yet they were supposed to promote it. Some candidates tried to be on the safe zone by floating between a speech and an argumentative piece. Persuasive writing is not always argumentative, and that is what needs to be explored in the classroom to avoid generalisation and confusion.

Candidates did not struggle with content because the "Uniform" territory was a very familiar one with them. Although the content was familiar, not all of them could do well. Excellent responses were those who were unwavering in their awareness of purpose and audience they were also not distracted by the comments in the speech bubbles. They employed spoken discourse, used speech markers, and showed independence of thought even where they opted to use given ideas, instead of merely copying and pasting them.

Exercise 3: Free-style writing

This exercise consisted of three types of compositions; a narrative, a descriptive and an argumentative. Candidates were expected to **choose one**, and express their creativity within the confines of the question, in about **250 to 350 words**.

Q1. Write a story based on these words: "If only I listened to that piece of advice."

This was a narrative piece; write a story, one story, not multiple stories showing multiple regrets after ignoring different pieces of advice. "...that piece of advice" meant there was a particular piece of advice upon which this story builds, not just general advice received every day from different people. So good candidates were those who clearly narrated a story that depicted regret for not taking particular advice from a parent/ teacher/ friend/ church or even a total stranger. The main focus was on the story, a story which linked to advice that was ignored at some point. It was the most popular choice among learners.

Excellent candidates displayed captivating story lines, with dives and twists at unexpected places. They were fluent with language usage and totally engaged the reader from start to finish. Sadly, they did not consist of the majority of the candidates. A majority produced mediocre work, with flat and predictable story lines. Some stories were not even easy to decipher because they were marred with linguistic errors.

Unfortunately, even a seemingly straightforward question like this one was misunderstood by some candidates and they focused on the regretting part hence. So, instead of a story, they raised a lament and ended up with irrelevant essays. Others explored different pieces of ignored advice and how that affected them negatively.

Q2. Describe a corruption-free country and how it can improve the economy

This was meant to be a descriptive piece of writing, describing a country free from corruption, as well as how it can improve its economy. It can be safely said that this was the least popular choice among candidates, and some of those who chose it suffered badly because they failed to deliver. This question required candidates to describe a country free from corruption, to paint a clear picture of such a country. Then they had to then describe how that country can improve its economy.

Excellent candidates showed acute awareness of rife corrupt practices, and flipped those to describe a state free from such. Examples ranged from practices of statesmen, law officials, migration officers, traffic officers, customs officers, investors, down to the simple man on the street. They were aware of how corruption stifles economic growth; hence they were able to explain how eradication of corruption can enable growth. Weak candidates on the other hand simply described the opposite, which was corrupt states, or simply spoke about general means of boosting the economy without realising that this time there was context. As a result of failing to unpack the double barrel nature of the question, and/or the link between its first and last parts, they scored low marks.

Q3. Boys and girls should do the same chores at home. What are your views?

This question too was popular among learners. They are familiar with domestic chores and how they are segregated between boys and girls, and could not wait to state their views on the matter.

The nature of the required essay here was argumentative. 'What are your views' meant that candidates had to take a firm stand, and give a personal opinion in a solid voice that echoes throughout the essay. A standard paragraph would state a reason for their chosen stance, advance the argument by providing examples whether by giving evidence of desired/undesired effects depending on their position; quoting authoritative people on the matter and many other ways that would lend credibility and authenticity to their argument. It would then be expected that at the end of the paragraph, the learner would echo his stand. In the event they acknowledged their detractors, they would be expected to quickly provide a counter argument which would underscore their position as more rationale. Good candidates were able to do that and their command of the English language enabled them to express themselves almost effortlessly.

A majority however presented arguments that lacked depth and critical thinking. Some kept repeating the same arguments and only varying the examples they gave for support. There were cases where argument scales tilted heavily towards contrasting views instead of candidates investing better in their own sides. In most cases, candidates would simply state a contrasting view and not offer a counter argument save to say that they maintain their side/ will not be moved by such myths/they strongly believe etc...but with no counter argument.

Teachers should be commended at this point for the job they did in training candidates in this type of writing as evidenced in the consistent use of cohesive devices. However, sometimes they give candidates a template in which they should fit their argument, this produces counter results as it stifles even potential candidates because they cannot freely explore possible angles as they present their cases. A certain fraction of the candidates discussed the matter, equally weighing pros and cons, instead of taking a stand. That resulted in a discursive piece of writing.

There were instances where instead of talking about the same chores, the argument was based on more/equal chores. The worst case though was a misreading of chores for choirs, and the argument explored the advantages of having mixed choirs instead of boys/girls only groups. These performed dismally.

Recommendations

Teachers are advised to look into the following:

1. The teaching of grammar. There is huge neglect of grammatical rules in writing, even among candidates with 'clean' English. Their writing suffers from mistakes of punctuation and structure e.g. run-on sentences, sentence fragments, word order, ambiguity and many other errors. Then there are the glaring mistakes of tense, subject-verb agreement, first language interference, as well as the creeping in of social media language in the classroom. It is critical to balance content with style and accuracy in the classroom. There are standard conventions of writing and candidates must be aware of them.
2. Candidates must be exposed to formal and informal pieces of writing, and be trained thoroughly on what makes one and not the other. Such a skill cannot be mastered if they only hear about the difference in passing. Also, there must be a distinction between informal writing and slang.
3. The need to help candidates analyse questions cannot be overemphasised. This can be closely linked to making suitable choices. Teachers must avoid channelling candidates to certain types of essay because these candidates may find an unfriendly topic in the exam room but because the essay is the teacher's recommendation, they may take that option.
4. For exercises 1 and 2, candidates should be trained on carefully planned, economic and concise writing so they can maximise given space.
5. The lack of extensive reading among candidates was evident in the quality of work they produced. There is great need to go back to the basics. It takes a good reader to produce a good piece of writing.

6. Candidates should also pay attention to the number of words they write. They may not have to count them in the exam room if during the course of the year they trained themselves to write adequate content.
7. Practice, practice, and more practice...that is the only way to ensure an improvement in performance in this component of the exam.

Conclusion

It is worth noting that writing remains an important skill in the acquisition of a language, as it is the ultimate expression of competence after the learner has listened and read. It is important that teachers be intentional about helping candidates sharpen their writing skill, patiently taking them through every step.

JC ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 101/03

General Comments

This component tests the skill of listening with understanding and for specific information. Candidates' responses indicated that some of them had not grasped this skill. Generally, the standard of language usage and of language comprehension seems to have dropped. This was demonstrated by the candidates' weakness when it came to spelling simple words such as "gums" and "freeze". Candidates would write "gams" and "friz". At first glance the paper seemed to be accessible with familiar subject matter, but candidates did not perform very well.

The 2020 examination was not done well by a majority of candidates compared to that of last year. There were quite a number of students who attained single digit scores with some scoring zero in different exercises and overall. This was quite alarming as the increase was very noticeable as compared to other years.

Most of the candidates were not able to relate to the situation or context of the subject matter indifferent specific cases. This made them to come up with incorrect responses even for simple questions. Furthermore, some candidates seemed to lack effective listening skills. It was as if they had never encountered such exercise before the examination. Thus, some would leave whole questions unanswered. Others would simply write anything they heard even if it is not related to the question asked. Even those who managed to pick the right answers, spelling became their pitfall. The time allocated for the task proved to have been enough as a majority of candidate attempted all given questions.

Exercise 1

The exercise was fairly done by most candidates.

Question 1: What is Wakhile's problem?

The correct response was: forgotten/ left his assignment at home/ can't find his assignment. Most candidates could not score as they had a challenge with the spelling of 'assignment'. They would write: assignment, assigment, assigninment, assingment, assignement, assaignment, assisgnemt.

Some candidates had a challenge with pronouns as they would use 'she....he' in the same response. They mixed the genders, e.g; 'She left his assignment at home. He can't find her assignment at home'.

A few candidates used the first person pronoun instead of using the third person, e.g, 'I forgot my assignment at home.

Question 2: Why is Vuyo unable to return the library book?

The correct response was: It does not belong to this library. Some of them would omit 'it' and write 'does not belong to this library' hence they could not score. Some of the other responses were:

'His little brother took it'

'The book does not belong to the library book'

'It does not belong there/here/that the...'

Question 3: Who is eligible to take part in the competition?

The correct response was: 'writers between 12-16 years'.

Candidates had a challenge with indicating that only writers that were eligible to take part in the competition NOT children / people/teenagers/ students as they said.

Also the spelling of 'writers' was a challenge. They would write "writters". On top of that , was the issue of the years. They would write '20-25 years, 12-15, 12-18 years'.

Question 4: Which type of cream is recommended for this summer?

The correct response was: 'light and long lasting'. Most candidates were able to score. Those who did not score wrote: lite, ligher, lighten, lighter (mvtel, Lucia) which were not related to the answer.

Others wrote 'moisturise' as their response: lasty, long last, last, long and last which deprived them of getting a mark. Others wrote: 'that has light', 'lust'.

Question 5: Why is the chalk safe to eat?

The correct response was: 'It is made of food ingredients'. Most candidates were unable to score due to the wrong spelling of 'ingredients'. They would write 'ingredents', 'ingridients', 'ingredient', 'ingrediant'.

They also left out: 'It is made of food' and wrote just 'ingredient' hence they could not score. Other candidates would list the ingredients but not all of them. Still spelling proved to be a challenge on the list of the ingredients, e.g, instead of flour they would write flower, food colouring- 'coloring', 'colourants'. Other candidates would say that 'chalk is edible' thus repeating the question asked.

Exercise 2

This is a gap filling exercise. Candidates were expected to listen to a talk on the health benefits of guavas and then fill in the details. This question was accessible to most candidates, although some failed to score even a single mark. This was mainly due to wrong spelling.

Item 1: Preservation

Answer: Freeze

The word was misspelt as: 'freez', 'frizzy', 'freezer', 'friz', 'freezes', 'freezing', 'frezze', 'fryz', 'frozen'. Some candidates gave answers like: 'keep guavas, keep fruit'.

Item 2: Medicinal uses

Answer: Infections

A majority of the candidates scored in the second item but some candidates failed to score as they wrote responses such as: 'infaction', 'infectioning', 'infection', 'inferction', 'enfections'.

Item 3: Dental Hygiene

Answer: Gums, Teeth

A majority of the candidates got this item correct. Those who failed gave responses such as: for gums they wrote 'gams', 'gurm'. For teeth some wrote: 'teaths', 'teets' or 'tooths'.

Item 4: Cosmetic uses

Answer: Hunger, ingredient

A majority of the candidates were able to score hunger those who did not, it was for wrong spelling such as: 'hurnger', 'hanger', 'hungry'. Ingredient proved to be challenging as a majority of the candidates could not write the correct spelling. Their responses were: ingredence, 'ingredients', 'ingridiant', 'ingreden'.

Exercise 3

This is another gap filling exercise. Candidates were expected to listen to an interview on Dolphin Play and fill in the details. This question was fairly done as most candidates gave correct responses while some had spelling challenges.

The correct responses for this exercise were: perfect, condition, regulate, emotions, wild, plastic, mother and peers.'

For perfect: candidates gave: pefect ,perfact, prefect,

For condition: it were: conditioned, condiction, condictioning,

For regulate: regulats, reregulates, regulacts,

For emotions: imotions, emmotions, emrtions, motion,

For wild: wide, wird, wirl,
For plastic: pastic, plastik, plastic,
For mother: most candidates were able to score this one except for those who wrote 'mather',
For peers: pears, peas, pees, spears.

Exercise 4

Candidates were expected to listen to a presentation on anger and then answer questions. This exercise proved to be very challenging. A majority of students couldn't score on the last two questions of this exercise.

Question 1

What is anger?

Answer: Resentment

Most candidates were able to identify the answer but they were challenged by the spelling. Some wrote: rezentment, resetment, reservement, recentment.

Question 2

How can anger be of good use to humans?

Answer: It helps you deal with a problem/ express negative feelings.

Most candidates were able to score but some could not. Those who could not, failed to explain how. They simply wrote: deal with the problem or express negative feelings without saying 'it helps...'. Others came up with their own answers like: 'it makes you powerful'. Some had a problem with the word 'negative': negetive, nagative.

Question 3

Why do other people get angry than others?

Answer: They have anger issues/ easily gets irritated and reacts with anger.

Most candidates scored but some could not. They had answers such as: angry issues, angrier issues. Some with wrong spellings for issues: isues, isuesses.

For the answer 'easily get irritated and reacts with anger': some candidates cut the answer into half. They would either say: 'easily gets irritated' or 'reacts with anger'.

Question 4

How can people manage their anger?

Answer: By seeking help through counselling/ talking to therapists/ learning methods of controlling their actions.

Again, most candidates failed to address the 'how' part of the question by simply saying 'counselling', 'therapist'. Spelling also proved to be a challenge. For counselling: counselling, conselling, counselling. Therapist: therapast, therapist, terapist.

For learning methods of controlling their actions: most candidates left out learning and said 'methods of controlling actions'.

Question 5

Which particular skills can one use to control their anger?

Answer: Ability to recognise the anger and learning to diffuse it.

Most candidates failed to score instead they opted for the examples given but writing one instead of all the examples given. The examples were: counting, taking a few moments of quiet time, take five minutes before talking, have a glass of water before talking.

Exercise 5

Candidates were to listen to a lecture on gratitude and then answer questions. This exercise also proved to be very challenging as most candidates failed to score full marks.

Question 1

How does being appreciative benefit people?

Answer: Improves physical health

A majority candidates managed to score and those who didn't, it was due to spelling.

For physical: phisical, phycal,

For health: helth, heath, healthy.

Question 2

In which way can we share positive feelings?

Answer: Tell a difficult person how much you value them/ go public.

Most candidates fairly attempted this one but some would omit some words which then made their responses wrong, e.g. tell a person how you value them. Some replaced difficult with different thus changing the whole answer.

Question 3

What is the benefit of going public?

Answer: You adopt a brighter outlook/ develop a more thankful attitude

Most candidates performed poorly on this one and some even totally failing to identify the answer.

Instead of adopt, some would write 'adapt'

For outlook: uplook

Question 4

How does the state of your inner voice affect your mood?

Answer: If your inner voice is negative, your inner voice will be low/ if it is appreciative, your mood will be high.

Most candidates generally failed to show how the inner voice affected the mood. They only gave one aspect of the answer, e.g. 'mood will be low' without linking it to the inner voice.

Question 5

Explain how one feels after receiving an appreciative letter?

Answer: It gives one a boost.

Most candidates responded well to this question. Those who didn't score it was because they responded in plural yet the question was in singular form:

'It gives them a boost', 'they feel boosted'.

Spelling also led to some not scoring.

For boost: boast, bost,bust.

JC ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 101/04

This component is school-based. It is assessed by teachers at school and then moderated externally at ECESWA.

General Comments:

This year, there was a slight decline in performance compared to last year, but still most candidates did well. Excellent candidates did exceedingly well, while weak ones struggled a lot. The most popular cards were A, B and C (A –Seeking Advice; B – A Memorable Day; C- Determination).). The least popular cards were D and E (D - An Introvert and E- Self Introspection).

Most examiners did not partake fully in conversations to help candidates elaborate. They did not simplify the topic cards to help ease the conversations, but made candidates to speak on their own. Some examiners gave candidates the chosen cards and then said ‘... that is your card, go on’. In such cases, the candidates seemed to be bewildered and spoke less.

Most candidates had difficulties with structure, vocabulary and the last bullet in the topic cards which focused on society. Teachers are encouraged to simplify this for candidates. In this way, candidates will do well.

It appeared some Centres had not read through the Teachers Notes which help them on how to conduct the exam. This is very important as improper handling of the test, greatly disadvantages the candidates. Examiners are encouraged to read their schools’ individual reports to get feedback so that they correct mistakes where there is a need.

Examiners are reminded to coordinate themselves as the English Language Department before conducting the Oral Test to ensure they all have the same understanding of the Marking Criteria and Students’ Cards. This way they will be able to simplify them for the candidates where necessary for ease of conversations. Examiners are also encouraged to listen to the recordings before submitting them to ECESWA.

Comments on specific aspects of the oral test.

Part A – Welcome and brief explanation of the test format

This part was handled extremely well as a majority of the examiners were able to explain the format of the test properly. Only a few forgot to do this. They were also able to greet candidates and ask them how they were. This helped in preparing candidates for the oral test. Examiners were also able to make candidates aware that the exam does not test knowledge or understanding of the topic.

Part B – Warm up

Most examiners handled this part very well, but some could not use this part to full advantage. In many cases, it was not clear how a card was chosen for a particular candidate. Some warm up sessions were either too short or too long.

Part C – Handing out the card and preparation time.

This part was handled fairly well. It may serve as a reminder that when tape is paused, candidates should be allowed to ask questions so that certain aspects or words are simplified. This enhances conversations.

Part D – Conversation

This is supposed to be carried out within the stipulated time, and should be strictly in English. A number of candidates seemed to be at ease with the whole exercise; they spoke freely and gave their views on given topics. However, it appeared as though many candidates were not really comfortable with the exercise. Some could not say anything after the warm up – they seemed to be afraid of both the exam and the examiner.

Examiners are encouraged to be friendly (in a professional way though) so that candidates can be free. They should try to always remember to ask open questions that allow candidates to elaborate. Some asked closed questions and disadvantaged the candidates who could not develop their conversations.

Many examiners were mainly silent in conversation and expected candidates to look at the card and speak on their own. Such candidates were disadvantaged; they performed poorly as they could not elaborate. Other examiners dominated conversations thus deprived candidates a chance to develop their own ideas.

The card bullets are meant to help the examiners to generate a focused discussion on the given topics. They should not be used as a tool for question and answer. Examiners are urged to read and prepare for the oral test prior to conducting it. This helps them to find better ways of simplifying for clarity.

Grammar was a problem to a number of candidates. Most of them had poor sentence construction and this lowered their marks on structure.

Vocabulary given by candidates was mainly simple. There were exceptional cases where candidates managed to use sophisticated vocabulary. Where sentence construction was poor, most candidates struggled even in vocabulary and sometimes even the intended meaning could not be deciphered.

Topic Cards

The bullets in the topic cards are meant to help both parties develop a conversation. The first two are usually personal, focussing on the candidate's personal experience and views. As one progresses, the conversation moves to more general issues. Towards the end, the conversation is meant to move towards more sophisticated issues where abstract ideas can be discussed.

The cards given to candidates proved to be relatively friendly as some candidates were able to converse freely. It was only cards D and E that seemed to be challenging to candidates. It is in such cards that the examiner has to simplify so that the candidates can have something to say and be at ease.

Card A – Seeking Advice

This was a popular card and it proved to be much simpler and friendlier to the candidates as they could relate to it. Candidates performed well on it as they were able to list issues that force them to seek advice (e.g. teenage pregnancies, substance abuse, career choices etc.)

Weak candidates could not venture to issues outside the school context and they also had a challenge with talking about the role that the society has to play in supporting young people. The grammar and vocabulary challenge hindered most candidates from expressing their views. They either gave short responses or resorted to code switching to vernacular.

Card B – A Memorable Day

This was another popular card. Most candidates were able to talk about their experiences. A number of candidates shared freely about interesting experiences like their birthday celebrations, the day they visited friends etc. Good candidates were able to clearly show what made this day to stand out.

On the other hand, weak candidates only talked about general everyday experiences, not selecting a particular one. They also failed to note that this day should be a happy day that was worth being remembered. Instead, they talked about real life experiences that brought sadness, like a day they lost a family member.

Card C – Determination

This card was fairly done. Candidates were able to bring it to their daily lives. Most notably though, was the fact that they seemed to think that determination only applied to academics. They mostly talked about working hard at school. Candidates who performed exceptionally well were able to use a wide range of vocabulary like the fact that such a person is ; passionate, courageous, a risk-taker etc.

Weak candidates could not elaborate much, and seemed to consider only the positive aspect of determination. They could not say much on the bullet which about one being determined to do wrong. Such candidates were able to give own views on last bullet if their examiners had been able to simplify the aspect of society.

Card D – An Introvert

This was not a popular card among candidates as evidenced by the fact that most of those who got it did not do well. Most examiners did not help explain this concept to candidates. It was noted that seemingly, most examiners chose the card for candidates they considered to be introverts. Such conversations did not yield much as these candidates were not keen to open up about the topic.

Good candidates were able to give the characteristics, advantages and disadvantages of being an introvert. They were able to even venture into extroverts to show the distinguishing factors.

Generally, this card required that examiners clarify to make topic accessible to candidates. Unfortunately, many examiners failed to do this.

Card E – Self Introspection

This was the least popular card. A number of candidates did not do well. Many of them could not even pronounce the word 'introspection'. They kept on saying 'inspection'. Good responses were given by candidates who spoke about themselves, their experiences. They also showed awareness of the fact that everyone can do self-introspection, regardless of age.

Weak candidates were limited by the misconception they had of thinking that self- introspection can only be done by people who had done wrong. They also did not have the suitable vocabulary to express their opinions. This is another card that required the examiner to help by simplifying for candidates.

Assessment Criteria

Most examiners awarded mark satisfactorily. However some were either too severe or too generous and presented inflated marks.

Most notably, was the fact that some examiners did not guide the conversation effectively- they would only make candidates to speak on their own. Such candidates would seem to be uneasy and scared. In such instances, the common trend would be that, such candidates would get very few marks because there isn't much they would have said. Examiners are encouraged to guide candidates so that they are in the lead with the development of conversations and can exhaust all possible ideas. This would form basis for awarding scores between 4 and 5.

Administrative procedures

A majority of centres displayed awareness of the procedures they have to follow. Some seemed to have forgotten about these. Examiners are reminded to read the Teachers' Notes 72 hours before the oral test in order to prepare and simplify where necessary. This enhances performance in conversations with candidates.

Please take note of the following:

- Always present candidates in an orderly way in summary sheet and recording
- Conduct a final check of the total of marks awarded to each candidate as recorded in the summary form. A colleague could be of great help in this regard
- Listen to recordings so to make sure all conversations have been captured
- Include well labelled CDs
- Indicate all present and absent candidates in register
- Include all paperwork when submitting. This includes:
 - -register
 - -summary form
- marks should be presented as raw scores not in percentage form
- Make sure you have used JC grades (out of 15), instead of EGCSE grades (out of 30)
- Always use a pencil on MS1 and remember to sign Make sure shading on lozenges is not faint, and should be done neatly with an HB pencil
- Where there are more than one examiners, an internal moderation should be done prior to the Oral test so that grading is uniform
- Only large centres should use more than one examiner
- Guide candidates in conversations to encourage them to 'open up' and give maximum ideas they can have

- Examiners are urged to check after recording each and every conversation to make sure it has been properly done. They should further listen to the recordings to make sure that all conversations are included and clearly audible before submitting them to ECESWA.

Problems encountered

1. On Recordings;
 - Missing candidates in recordings yet they had been awarded marks.
 - Candidates mixed up in recordings and summary sheet- not following sequence of examination numbers.
 - Inaudible recordings – most of the time it was the examiner who seemed to have been closer to the recording device yet it should have been the candidate who was clearly audible.
 - Background noise in recordings.
 - Use of vernacular in recordings.
2. On the Attendance Register :
 - Failure to submit register
 - Failure to indicate in register the candidates who were present and those who were not, using ticks.
 - Confusion between 'A'- Absent and 'M'- Missing – ('A' is simply for candidate who did not do the exam, while 'M' is for candidate who did exam, but his mark is missing.
 - Failure to write totals of present candidates in each page of register.
3. On the Summary Sheet:
 - Mixed up candidates in summary sheet
 - Wrong calculations
 - Using the EGCSE totals of 30, instead of 15
 - Converting marks to percentage form
 - Awarding marks to candidates who are not in recordings
 - Failure to indicate cards used for different candidates
 - Including the externally moderated mark in centre
4. Some examiners were the ones who dominated in conversation, and even supplied vocabulary, thus not giving the candidates a chance to elaborate on their ideas. In such instances, the candidates were greatly disadvantaged.
5. Some conversations were longer than the stipulated time.
6. Some recordings were empty.
7. Some conversations were too short – especially in instances where the examiner did not help candidate to elaborate.