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Question 1

This question tests Reading Objectives R1–R4 (30 marks):

- Understand and collate explicit meanings
- Understand, explain and collate implicit meanings and attitudes
- Select, analyse and evaluate what is relevant to specific purposes
- Understand how writers achieve effects.

(a) From paragraph one (Alexey, our park ranger…), give two reasons why the writer and his companions were in danger from the bear. [2]

- They were confronted by a (disturbed) adult/(very) large bear.
- It was protecting/worried about its cub/mother and cub were separated/they were between the mother and the cub.
- They had intruded on its territory (after it was feeding).

Note: Accept direct lift of ‘…we were in the one spot humans should never be’ as alternative for bullet point 3.

Do not accept: bears are dangerous/they were feeding/they were confronted by a bear with no other explanation.

1 mark per point up to a maximum of 2.

(b) What is surprising about the way that the ‘intruders’ reacted when the mother bear stared straight at them (line 5)? [2]

- They did not run away.
- They did not appear to show any fear for their lives.
- They raised their cameras to photograph/take pictures of the bear.

1 mark per point up to a maximum of 2. Allow a direct lift of part or all of the key sentence.

(c) Why is it difficult to gather information about the size of the bear population in Kamchatka (paragraph three: The Kamchatka Peninsula…)? [1]

- It is a very large/huge (unpopulated) area.

Accept lift of final sentence.
(d) Using your own words, explain the reactions of the birdwatchers when they saw the sea eagles (paragraph five: If you’re after…). [2]

- They became (frantically) excited (or synonym which conveys the frenzy of their reaction – ‘happy’, for example, would not be acceptable)
- They looked (through their binoculars) in all directions/did not know where to look.

1 mark for each point clearly made in own words, up to a maximum of 2.
1 mark for a partial explanation.
Lift of ‘the bird-watchers’ to ‘Sideways?’ = 0

(e) (i) Give one fact about Mount Koryaksky from the final paragraph. [1]

- 28 kilometres from capital/last erupted in 2009/it is a Decade Volcano/constantly monitored/it has been called ‘the land of fire and ice’.

(ii) What is suggested by the word ‘Decade’ in line 39? [1]

- That they (such volcanoes) erupt every 10 years.

(f) By referring to the whole passage, give two ways in which the ranger and the visitors are protected against bears. [2]

- The (ranger’s) flare gun.
- The (ranger’s) rifle/shotgun.
- The (lodge’s) electric fence.

Award 1 mark for general reference to ‘weapon(s)/gun(s)/2 guns.
Award 1 mark per point to a maximum of 2.

(g) Explain, using your own words, what the writer means by the words in italics in the following phrases:

(i) ‘I was probably overdue for a mauling’ (lines 14 – 15) [2]

- I was probably behind schedule for a savaging.

(N.B. ‘Lucky not to have been attacked before’ is acceptable as explanation for ‘behind schedule’. Explanations of ‘mauling’ should convey a sense of serious physical injury, e.g. ‘attack’, ‘eaten’, killed’ would not be acceptable synonyms.)

(ii) ‘the terrain is so impenetrable’ (line 33) [2]

- The ground/country is so impassable.

(N.B. Accept ‘land’/‘area’ as explanation for ‘terrain’; however ‘place’, etc. is too vague. Credit responses that explain ‘impenetrable’ as meaning the ground is too hard to be dug into in order to build roads/houses, etc.)
(iii) ‘looks positively menacing’ (line 39) [2]

- Looks decidedly/very/really threatening/scary/frightening.

(N.B. ‘Dangerous’/‘harmful’, etc. are not acceptable as menace is not addressed in these words.)

NB: the definitions above contain the essence of an answer. However, accept that candidates may respond in different ways, e.g. at greater length.

Be careful not to credit a word actually used in the quoted phrase.

For each of the 3 phrases give 2 marks for a correct explanation in own words; that is 1 mark per definition of each word.

1 mark for a partially correct explanation up to a maximum of 6 marks.
(h) Re-read paragraphs one (Alexey, our park ranger…) to five (...Sideways?).

The writer uses the following phrases to describe the behaviour of the bears.

Choose three of the following phrases and explain how each one of them helps you to gain an impression of the bears’ behaviour:

- ‘gorging themselves on salmon’ (line 4)

‘eating to excess’ = 1 mark; ‘the phrase suggests that they are eating to excess and making the most of it’ = 2 marks. (N.B. ‘eating’ on its own is not acceptable as an explanation of ‘gorging’.)

- ‘strolling along the perimeter’ (lines 23–24)

‘walking past the fence’ = 1 mark; ‘walking casually without a care in the world’ = 2 marks.

(N.B. The overall impression given by the description of the bears’ behaviour in this paragraph is that they are not showing any signs of fear but are indulging in innocent pleasures – an understanding of this point should be a feature of a fully correct response.)

- ‘barged their way through crystal-clear rivers’ (lines 24–25)

‘pushed their way through the cold water’ = 1 mark; ‘crashed through the water with great force and lack of ceremony’ = 2 marks.

(N.B. Responses should focus on the power and strength of the bears and their indifference to any constraints.)

- ‘lumbered out from behind a bush’ (lines 27–28)

‘walked awkwardly slowly/heavily from behind a bush’ = 1 mark; ‘the word “lumbered” suggests that the bear is big and heavy without care of what is in its way’ = 2 marks.

N.B. The examples given of 1 and 2 mark responses are indicative and not definitive. Examiners should use their professional judgement when marking this question.

Some candidates may produce better explanations than those above. If the same explanation is given for more than one phrase, only 1 mark in total can be awarded.

It is fully acceptable to award a holistic mark for this question (e.g. a maximum of 5 out of 6) especially when a partial understanding of the effects of some of the chosen phrases is implied.
(i) Re-read paragraph three (The Kamchatka Peninsula…) to the end of the passage. Write a summary of what you learn about the geographical features of Kamchatka.

Write a paragraph of about 50–70 words. [7]

1. A peninsula/Kamchatka Peninsula/a fish tail attached to the mainland/nearly an island
2. In Far East Russia/Siberia/Eurasia
3. Between two seas/between the Sea of Okhotsk and the Bering Sea
4. Very large
5. Sparsely/unpopulated region/less than one person per sq km/half of residents (200,000) live in the capital/400,000 live in the area as a whole
6. Has a lake/Kurilstoye Lake
7. Has (open) meadows
8. (crystal-clear) rivers
9. No roads/impenetrable terrain
10. (designated) wilderness reserve
11. 300 (snow-dusted) volcanoes/29 active volcanoes/Land of Fire and Ice/Mount Koryaksky is 28 km from the capital

1 mark for each point up to a maximum of 7. Tick each point to be credited.

N.B. Be careful not to reward the same point twice.

Do not credit ‘2 hours from Tokyo’ and ‘Not easy to get to’ as these points refer to travel and not geographical features.

[Total: 30]
Imagine that you are the writer of the passage. On your return you have been invited to give a talk to the senior pupils of your school about your trip to Kamchatka.

*Write the words of your talk.*

In your talk include:

- what you did there
- why you found it to be such a good experience
- what you have learnt about the need to maintain remote wildlife habitats.

You should base your ideas on what you have read in the passage, but do not copy from it. Address each of the three bullet points.

Write between 1 and 1½ sides, allowing for the size of your handwriting.

Up to 10 marks are available for the content of your answer, and up to 10 marks for the quality of your writing.

**General notes on task**

The most successful responses are likely to show a clear appreciation of the wildness and dangers of the area but also show a good understanding of what the writer and his companions found rewarding about their visit. N.B. These two points may well be blended together by some candidates. There will be sensible and convincing suggestions as to how to help preserve such areas and how/why this can be done. Less successful responses are likely to be over reliant on the contents of the original passage and to lift sections of it with little or no attempt to develop the points in any original way.

Look for and credit an attempt to write in an appropriate register.

**N.B.**

1. The question asks for ‘a talk’. For the Writing mark, be prepared to give credit to the use of an appropriate register.
2. It is important not to allow the quality of a candidate’s writing to influence the Reading mark (and vice versa). Reading points must be tethered to the passage, and derive from it.
Marking criteria for Question 2

(a) **READING (Using and understanding the material)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>Uses and develops several ideas, both factual and inferential, from the passage. Consistently refers to what was rewarding about the visit to the area and why such wildernesses should be preserved.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Refers to several details from the passage and shows some understanding of what the writer gained from his visit. There is an attempt to make convincing suggestions as to why the area should be preserved.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Repeats some details from the passage about the area and the bears. Shows incomplete understanding of what the writer found rewarding. Focuses on the question and passage, but uses material simply and partially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>There is some relevance to the question with a tendency to retell the passage rather than focus on the requirements of the question. The response is likely to contain much repeated detail from the passage with little relation to the requirements of the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>May retell the story or give occasional relevant facts. There may be examples of misunderstanding or lack of clarity in attempting to use the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very little/no relevance. General misunderstanding of task and passage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N.B. The ability to fulfil the requirements of the third bullet point is a distinguishing feature of responses in Bands 1 and 2. To achieve Band 1 there should be sustained development of the point, either of one paragraph or more at the end of the response or consistently throughout. Two or three relevant sentences addressing this point may be sufficient for a Reading mark in Band 2.*
(b) WRITING (Core tier)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>Sentences are fluent and there is a fairly wide range of vocabulary. Overall structure is good and sentences generally follow in sequence. Most full stops are correct and errors are infrequent and minor. An appropriate register is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Sentences are correct, though relatively simple. Vocabulary is adequate and correctly used. Structure is generally sound. There are some sentence separation errors and quite frequent other errors, although minor. There are some hints of an appropriate register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Sentence structures and vocabulary are simple, but meaning is never in doubt. The order is reasonable. Error may be frequent, but it does not blur meaning. There may be an inconsistent attempt at an appropriate register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>The response is very simply written and there are occasional examples of blurred meaning. The structure can usually be followed. Some error is serious, affecting meaning. The response may be over-dependent on lifted material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>The response is difficult to understand. The extent of grammatical error seriously impedes meaning. The response may be almost entirely lifted from the original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The answer cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add the marks for Reading and Writing to give a total mark out of 20 for Question 2.*

[Total: 20]