READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

An answer booklet is provided inside this question paper. You should follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper, ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

Answer two questions: Question 1 and either Question 2 or Question 3.
You should spend about 15 minutes reading the passages and questions before you start writing your answers.
You are reminded of the need for good English and clear presentation in your answers.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.
Answer Question 1 and either Question 2 or Question 3.

1 The following text is the opening of an investigative report by the Chicago Tribune newspaper on the regulation of sales of dangerous children's toys.

(a) Comment on the language and style of the extract. [15]

(b) Write the opening (between 120 and 150 words) of a similar report on an issue that you feel needs investigation. Base your answer closely on the style and language of the original. [10]

Not until a boy died

By: Patricia Callahan
Tribune staff reporter
May 6, 2007, Part 1

Part 1 of 2: A captive of industry, the Consumer Product Safety Commission lacks the authority and manpower to get dangerous child products off store shelves.

Sharon Grigsby pleaded with the operator at the federal safety hot line. A popular new toy, Magnetix, nearly killed one of her preschoolers.

Please do something, Grigsby remembers urging. When the plastic building sets broke, she told the operator, they shed powerful magnets inside her northern Indiana preschool. Grigsby didn’t see the loose magnets, not much bigger than baby aspirin.

But one of her 5-year-old students did. He found some and swallowed them. The extraordinarily strong magnets connected in the boy's digestive tract, squeezed the folds of his intestines and tore holes through his bowels. Only emergency surgery saved his life.

If this product isn’t recalled, Grigsby remembers warning, children will die.


"Because of limited resources and the volume of incidents reported to us, only a few complaints may be selected for follow-up investigation at this time," stated the letter, which arrived a week after Grigsby's May 2005 call to the hot line.

If Grigsby's complaint were important enough, the agency informed her, an investigator would call within 30 days.

Thirty days went by, then another 30. No recall, no word from government investigators. The magnets that doctors removed from the preschooler's intestines – corroded globs in a hospital specimen jar – sat in a drawer in Grigsby's office waiting for an investigator to examine them.

"I felt like I was pushed aside," Grigsby said. "I thought I was helping the next family."

Precisely what she feared would happen did, six months later and more than 2,000 miles away.
Kenny Sweet Jr., a suburban Seattle toddler with wispy blond hair, died from Magnetix injuries on Thanksgiving Day 2005. Kenny’s parents thought he had a stomach bug. By the time they realized something was seriously wrong, it was too late. His heart stopped within minutes of his arrival at the emergency room.

But this is not a story about just one defective product and one family’s grief. A Tribune investigation found that Kenny Sweet’s death is emblematic of how a weakened federal agency, in its myopic\(^1\) and docile approach to regulation, fails to protect children. The result: injury and death.

For instance, the safety agency waited years to respond to consumer and attorney complaints that soapmaking kits were landing children in hospital burn units. In the meantime, more kids suffered disfiguring injuries.

The safety commission also recalled several types of playpens after they collapsed and suffocated babies. But the agency did not act on reports that yet another style of playpen posed the same hazard. It recalled those only after another baby suffocated.

As the agency slowly moved to address dangers of Magnetix toys, injuries mounted. To date, at least 27 children have suffered serious intestinal injuries after swallowing loose Magnetix magnets.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission, or CPSC, declined to explain why it didn’t act sooner on warnings about any of these unsafe children’s products. In refusing to answer questions about Magnetix, the agency cited a provision of federal law that protects manufacturers’ reputations.

That law gives manufacturers great sway in how government officials regulate children’s products. Combined with skimpy budgets and reduced staffing, the provision undermines the agency’s power.

The Reagan administration gutted the CPSC in the early 1980s, less than a decade after its inception. Bipartisan neglect\(^2\) since then has left the agency with fewer than half the number of employees it had in 1980 – deeper cuts than in any other federal health and safety regulator.

Yet the number of products the CPSC oversees, everything from chain saws to baby cribs, has exploded. As consumers clamor for the latest high-tech toys and nursery gear at ever-cheaper prices, companies are offering more complex products that introduce new hazards.

Childhood play always has come with risks. Parents expect skinned knees, even the occasional broken bone, from a fall off a bike or jungle gym. They don’t expect pieces from a broken toy to rip holes through a child’s gut like a gunshot, which is what happened with Magnetix.

Notes:
\(^1\) myopic: short-sighted.
\(^2\) bipartisan neglect: neglect by both main American political parties.
The following text describes part of American writer Paul Theroux's train journey across the Khyber Pass, from Afghanistan to Pakistan, in the 1970s.

(a) Comment on the ways in which the language and style present the writer's experiences. [15]

(b) Continue the account (between 120 and 150 words), basing your answer closely on the style and language of the original. You do not have to bring the account to a close. [10]

I found a seat in the last car and watched a tribesman, who was almost certainly insane, quarrelling on the platform with some beggars.

Content removed due to copyright restrictions.
Well, I have a problem, and I am an old man, so I need some advice.
The following passage is a review of a hotel in Buenos Aires from the online website TripAdvisor. The review was written by guests, not by professional reviewers.

(a) Comment on the language and style of the passage. [15]

(b) Imagine that you stay in a hotel where things go less well.

Write a review of this stay (between 120 and 150 words). Base your answer closely on the style and language of the original piece. [10]

“Excellent small hotel, fine and helpful staff, clean and pleasant”

Star rating: *****

Reviewed 1 week ago

This is an excellent small hotel, with a fine staff, one that is helpful in all ways and very friendly. It has a rather good location in the Palermo district within a few blocks walking distance to a number of good restaurants, shops, etc. If you want the city center, this is not it, but if you want some peace and quiet, while at the same time you want good service, this is a place to consider.

It has rooms in three categories, Terraza, Patio or Vitraux. We had a patio room on the entrance floor and found the room to be clean, the en suite bathroom to be of good size, the king bed to be very comfortable and the little patio nice for fresh air. WiFi is included so you can stay connected if you wish. Also included (at least at our room rate) is a rather nice breakfast. The breakfast includes a choice from many items and you can have whatever you want in whatever quantity. So, there are three choices of cereal, there is yogurt, there are egg choices, rolls, bread, juice, fruit, etc. All very attractive to look at and good to eat. The coffee is excellent (at least we thought so) and comes with steamed milk if you like it that way – you add the milk from a little pitcher.

The little front desk is staffed 24 hours a day. Access to the hotel is only available by ringing the doorbell – you can’t just walk in. This enhances security and the bell is responded to typically within a minute. Just a bit of advice – there is no huge sign to identify the hotel. Work by the street address 1746 Julian Alvarez and when you arrive you will find a small sign on the wall of the building just to the left of the door. That is your indication that you are at the right place. Our driver was a bit concerned that we were in the wrong place, but the door opened and we were warmly welcomed.

In fact, we arrived before normal check-in time after a long overnight flight and our room was ready. There are several staff members who rotate in their times of duty, but we found them all to be extremely helpful. We had communication with Alex by e-mail and he was also there to provide breakfast on several of the days we were there. He and the other staff speak English quite well and there was never any difficulty with communication. We also found the staff to be very helpful with recommendations for things. So, for example, we asked if there were reasonable (in terms of quality) restaurants nearby and we were asked what kind of food we might like and there then followed several suggestions. We tried a couple of them and found the descriptions to be accurate and the quality and prices to be as we were told in advance. The staff will make reservations for you, ask if credit cards are accepted, etc. The staff will also make reservations for a return ride to the airport for you (and confer with the driver in advance so that there is no surprise about the
cost). For such a trip the staff will also confirm whether or not the fare can be in US dollars or Pesos. When the official exchange rate was 8.1 Pesos to the dollar, our ride for 300 pesos was paid with 30 US dollars, a 10–1 rate.

Anyway, this is a fine place. If we are in Buenos Aires again and need a place in that general area of the city, I certainly would not search further, but would return to Magnolia for sure. We really liked it there.

**Room Tip:** Entrance floor (patio) rooms may be the quietest.

Stayed August 2014, travelled as a couple.

This review is the subjective opinion of a TripAdvisor member and not of TripAdvisor LLC