



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education (9–1)

CANDIDATE
NAME

CENTRE
NUMBER

--	--	--	--	--

CANDIDATE
NUMBER

--	--

FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH

0627/01

Paper 1 Reading Passages

For Examination from 2017

SPECIMEN PAPER

2 hours 10 minutes

Candidates answer on the Question Paper.

No Additional Materials are required.

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name in the spaces at the top of this page.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Answer **all** questions in the space provided. If additional space is required, you should use the lined pages at the end of this booklet. The question number(s) must be clearly shown.

Dictionaries are **not** permitted.

The Insert contains the reading passages for use with **all** the questions on the Question Paper. This Insert is **not** assessed by the Examiner.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

This syllabus is regulated in England as a Cambridge International Level 1/Level 2 (9–1) Certificate.

This document consists of **13** printed pages, **1** blank page and **1** Insert.

Read carefully **Passage A, *David Copperfield***, in the Insert and then answer **Questions 1(a)–(f)**.

Answer all questions using your own words as far as possible.

Question 1

(a) Re-read paragraph one, 'School began ... his captives.'

(i) Using your own words, describe what happened in the schoolroom when Mr. Creakle entered (lines 1–4).

The cacophony of voices was silenced instantaneously by his presence. [1]

(ii) Using your own words, describe what Mr. Creakle does when he enters the schoolroom (lines 1–4).

He paused in the doorway both to examine and intimidate the children. [1]

(b) What impression of Mr. Creakle do you get from what he says in paragraph two, 'Now, boys, this is a new ... get to work, every boy!' (lines 6–10)?

He seems brutal, clearly in his threats of coercion, but simultaneously straightforward in warning the boys, yet more evidently unpleasant as a consequence, and such that, in designing his actions to fear him. [2]

(c) Using your own words, explain the meaning of the following phrases as they are used in the passage.

(i) 'profound impression' (line 1)

'Profound impression' refers to the sudden manner in which David's perception of Mr. Creakle is formed, and, by extension, that of his school, in response to his appearance and cadence, 'profound' because it is an ultimate description of his predicament, the consequence, of course, being fear. [2]

- (ii) 'speechless and motionless' (line 6)

This clearly refers to the reduction of the children to emptiness by Mr. Creakle's entrance, unable to act for fear of punishment, becoming his servants, halted and frozen. [2]

- (d) Re-read line 15, 'At every question he gave me a *fleshy cut* with it that made me writhe.' Using your own words, explain how both of the phrases in *italics* are used by the writer to suggest how David Copperfield is feeling at this point.

The 'fleshy cut' is both invasive, ~~to~~ and personal, in that by penetrating his 'flesh', the suggestion is that his ~~the~~ mind is similarly isolated by this sound, making him 'writhe', having no reasonable mode of retaliation, and thus feeling trapped in himself. [3]

- (e) What impression does the writer give of how the boys feel when Mr. Creakle is described as 'a giant in a story-book surveying his captives' (lines 3-4)?

Firstly, the depiction of him as a character from a 'story-book' indicates the children's regression to child-like interests, thus being deprived of something (perhaps their individuality), and ~~also~~ feeling emptied of higher-tier consciousness. The image of a 'giant' further both the notions of primal fear and of inferiority, servitude, inequality to defend oneself. - [4]

In a word, oppression - at the hands of Mr. Creakle. Furthermore, being 'his captives', not just 'captives', they are reduced to possessions, property, which Mr. Creakle can use in any manner he desires, thus finalizing the sense of powerlessness and inhumanity.

(f) Re-read paragraph five, 'I should think there never can ... infinitely less mischief.'

Explain how the writer uses language to show:

- What Mr. Creakle is like.
- How he treats the schoolboys.
- What David Copperfield thinks about Mr. Creakle.

In your answer you should:

- Select powerful words and phrases.
- Explain how the writer has created effects by using this language.

You should write about 200 to 300 words.

The fact that Mr. Creakle 'enjoyed his profession' is demonstrative of his sadistic complex, taking 'delight' in hurting the children - furthermore, this being likened to a 'craving appetite' suggests the intrinsic nature of this behaviour to Mr. Creakle, that it is uncontrollable, fundamental, and thus part of him, indicating some deep contortion of the consciousness. This 'fascination' indicates the forensic manner of his actions, furthering the ~~for~~ complementary impressions of Mr. Creakle as a pure villain, entirely without emotion, and of the children being seen as his property, as test subjects rather than people. This paying on 'clunking' boys, however, indicates some desire to aggrandize himself, if not just a notion for the weak.

The children, already shown to be seen as chattel, were 'scored' - an action ~~can~~ used specifically with reference to meat, there being nothing more than a meal - furthermore,

'Scorning' is preparatory, perhaps suggesting that this is merely to warn the children, ~~to get~~ ~~partake~~ them, prior to the next attack, whatever that may be.

David is understandably frustrated, since he views Mr. Creakle as an 'incapable brute', who has manufactured his empire, with nests on the shaky foundations of fear. Mr. Creakle, he seems to imply, is attempting to enlarge himself by preying on the defenseless, a sort of Napoleon syndrome. - David, noting that Mr. Creakle 'would have done infinitely less mischief' in a different position of command suggests the unique nature of his dominion over children, our conclusion being that, since he is not the 'brute' he thought himself to be, he seeks to manufacture an image. [15]

David, then, sees Mr. Creakle's empire as artificial, but, ~~because~~ he too being powerless, ~~the anger~~ ~~is~~ profoundly
he is angered

Read carefully **Passage B Summerhill** in the Insert and then answer **Question 2**.

Question 2

Imagine that you are a teacher new to Summerhill who does not agree with the way that the Headteacher runs the school.

Write a brief report to the school's governors explaining what you think is wrong with the Headteacher's approach to discipline and rules.

You are advised to write no more than 250 words.

Governors of Summerhill,

I write to you to voice my concerns for the pupils of your school, for the quality and consistency of their education.

Your headteacher's model is premised upon certain faulty assumptions. Children are not omniscient - I know this from experience - and it is a mistake to suppose that they are aware of their own potential, or how to reach it. Some students are innately motivated - others desire leadership, structure, a base from which to develop, something which your model often fails to provide. I believe that it is only with adult guidance that children can grow fully.

Moreover, the notion of an innate moral compass, good or bad, is flawed. Children's behaviour will reflect their environment - structure leads to confidence, calmness, whereas chaos leads to dissonance, and finally delinquency. *

As a teacher, I feel that my capacity to educate is severely hampered by an uncooperative classroom. Having no children show at some of my lessons ~~there~~ renders all of my work ~~less~~ valuable only if the whim of the children dictates it so - I am destabilized and devalued, and the children see me as a tool, an accessory.

All this, I plead, is firm intention to modify your head teacher's system - lack of direction, in both my opinion and experience, invariably leads to lowered capacity for the teachers to teach and the children to learn. The Human Rights Act guarantees an education - I ask you to guarantee your pupils one, too.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Lindam, newly appointed teacher.

~~And~~ I fear a vicious cycle, in which the child who does not immediately benefit is further off-put. We are putting lives into the hands of chance. [25]
 →
 remorseless

Read carefully **Passage B Summerhill** and **Passage C Bring back the cane to restore discipline in schools** in the Insert and then answer **Questions 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c)**.

Passage B Summerhill

Question 3(a)

Re-read paragraph one, 'I had taught in ... an unknown science.'

- (i) The writer thinks that Summerhill School takes a completely different approach to education from that offered in conventional schools.

Identify a phrase that shows this.

'The other way'

[1]

- (ii) Using your own words, explain why the writer thinks that conventional schools are wrong for children.

Conventional schools teach children to be subservient and obedient, and hamper their creative impulses rather than letting them flourish - they see children as an empty vessel for facts, not a human being.

[2]

Passage C Bring back the cane to restore discipline in schools

Question 3(b)

Re-read paragraph two, 'The silence was deafening ... three foot cane.'

- (b) Give one reason to explain why you think this description of the author being beaten with a cane is an effective opening to this article.

It immediately establishes what the writer thinks should be the case, and the form of the description supports his reasoning, thus encapsulating his case for the reader. Its suddenness parallel to its content.

[2]

Question 3(c)

- (c) How do the writers of **Passage B Summerhill** and **Passage C Bring back the cane to restore discipline in schools** convey their views and ideas on how children should be treated in schools, and what effects do they have on the reader?

In your response you should compare and contrast:

- The views and ideas each writer presents to the reader.
- The evidence that the writers use to support their views and ideas.
- The language, structure and techniques used by the writers, and their effects on the reader.

Remember to support your answer with details from the passages.

You should write about 300 to 350 words.

Both writers attempt to argue their cases by presenting clear points and consequent anecdotes to support them. The first writer expresses his view that children are not inherently bad, and that a modern school should reflect this. He describes his 'step of faith', so to speak, as not requiring 'courage', trying to convince the reader that his school is not some unnatural experiment, but merely the logical conclusion of liberal mentality. The reader, most likely a 'stranger to this idea of freedom', is first met with positive evidence*, the writer portraying those cases of prolonged maturity as the consequence of the children's 'hated ~~that~~ their last school gave them'. The language is straightforward, directly answering questions, such as 'What is Summerhill like? Well, ...'. The tone is conversational, not denying, helping convince the reader that this school is not

* as children attending lessons from the beginning of their 'story'

an abstract academic exercise, but instead is grounded firmly in pragmatism. His mode of describing 'the other way' is equally direct, and serves - 'dated from the days' depicting the model as archaic, 'what a child should be' tapping into the reader's sense of autonomy, of self-direction, making him or her feel cornered by the conventional educational system, shrank by it. All in all, he presents the project as an advancement, from the vulgar to the humorous, ~~giving~~ liberating the children to learn that with ^{warmth and} they want too, a presiding challenge to the status quo.

The other writer advocates a vastly different approach, suggesting that standards have fallen from our hand, and that we must 're-establish' what came before. The writer calls for a strengthening of hierarchy, of 'authority', based on his perception of the current system as 'totally broken' and in disarray. He grounds his case in his own experience, being 'whacked 100 times with a steel foot cane', but urges the reader to reevaluate the standard interpretation of this form of punishment as 'benign', arguing that it serves as an effective deterrent.

The tone changes throughout the text, firstly being dramatic and descriptive, as in 'the silence was deafening', secondly being colloquial and 'common-sense', as in 'you bet', 'believe me', and thirdly being resolved and analytical, as in 'net benefit', 'merent series', etc. This serves to get the reader's attention (part one), draw the reader in and make the text seem relatable (part two), and finally, [20] make it seem as though it is pragmatic, intelligent and thought-out. The crux of his case is a comparison between his school and schools today, whose problems he sees as 'solving'. The whole text is hyperbolic (exaggerately eloquent) and attractive to a certain audience, because of its drama.

Additional Page

If you use the following lined page to complete the answer(s) to any question(s), the question number(s) must be clearly shown.

Lined area for writing answers, consisting of multiple horizontal lines.