EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL OF ESWATINI

JC

EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

YEAR

2023

Paper 101/01

General comments

This component is a reading and writing paper that comprises five exercises. The paper was able to make a clear distinction between weak, average and above average candidates. Very few scored above forty and there was quite a number who scored below twenty. This year, candidates performed better in Exercise 2 compared to the previous year's candidates, who performed better in Exercise 1. This year, candidates tended to pick answers indiscriminately, which sometimes led them to give excess information which proved that they lacked skills at skimming and scanning. In Exercise 2 they performed much better, showing signs of having mastered the skill of inference or implicature. In the other exercises there was not much change in performance as in the previous year.

Comments on specific questions

Exercise 1

This is an exercise aimed at finding out if their candidates had mastered the skill of skimming and scanning. A number of candidates score below average in this exercise.

(a) **Mention the importance of the Maputo city in Southern Africa.**

Expected response:

gateway to tourist attractions to Sothern Africa

Comment

Very few candidates were able to give correct response as many wrote 'a city that is experiencing rapid expansion and modernisation'.

(b) **What is outstanding about the Maputo-Katembe Bridge?**

Expected response:

longest suspension bridge in Africa

Comment

The majority of candidates were able to give the correct answer, though there were those few candidates who left out 'in Africa'.

(c) **What did travellers do on arrival at Katembe?**

Expected response:

catch a cold drink

Comment

Most candidates got this question correct.

(d) **Mention two features that describe Ponte.**

Expected response:

- chaotic and colourful strip of street shops a petrol station

- a pharmacy

- beautifully lined palm trees (any two)

Comment

In this question, almost all the candidates were able to give the correct responses as there were many options available.

(e) **Describe how the women of Katembe dressed**.

Expected response:

wrapped in colourful and eye-catching cloths

Comment

The majority of candidates gave the correct response, although there were those few who wrote incorrect responses by leaving '<u>wrapped</u>' which was key.

(f) **Which word describes 'Bagamoyo' as an old ferry boat?**

Expected response:

rusty

Comment

Many candidates got this one right, though there were those who wrote more than one word.

(g) **How many vehicles did the ferry boat convey?**

Expected response:

about eighteen vehicles

Comment

Majority candidates did not get the correct response just because of leaving out '<u>about</u>' which was key in the answer.

(h) **How long did the ferries take to reach Katembe?**

Expected response was:

more than an hour

Comment

Most candidates got this question correct, though there were those who misunderstood the question, they wrote 1.5km.

(i) **Mention one thing that made Katembe such an energetic town?**

Expected response:

vibrant sounds of trading

Comment

A majority of candidates answered this question very well.

Exercise 2

This is an exercise aimed at testing the candidates' ability to read for details and infer information from the given text.

(a) **Which expression suggests that electric vehicles came before petrol or diesel cars?**

Expected response:

been around for a considerably longer period than petrol and diesel fuelled cars

Comment

Candidates were able to identify the correct response.

(b) **Give two developments that make it possible for electric vehicle to replace petrol and diesel cars?**

Expected responses:

- improvements in battery construction

- rapid charging

Comment

Most candidates were able to give correct responses.

(c) **Mention one significant target in paragraph 2 which makes an electric vehicle future most possible.**

Expected response:

Many European countries like France and the UK aim to ban the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2040.

Comment

Most candidates were able to give correct response, except for a few who left out 'by 2040'.

(d) **Why do you think electric vehicle are still costly to the environment even though they are said to be environmentally friendly?**

Expected response:

Electricity used to power them is produced from fossil fuels which are major pollutants.

Comment

Most candidates were able to give correct response except for a few who gave incomplete answer leaving out 'which are major pollutants' which was key.

(e) **Which groups of people are mostly affected by fossil fuelled cars? Give two details**.

Expected responses:

- Children

- the elderly

- low-income communities (any two)

Comment

Most candidates got this one correct, except a very few who failed to use the two spaces that were provided.

(f) **Mention one major disadvantage of the electric vehicle.**

Expected response:

- expensive to buy

- battery charging locations a concern for many drivers (any one)

Comment

Majority of candidates got this part correct.

(g) **How would it be most beneficial to by an electric vehicle today? Give three details.**

Expected responses:

- Cost saving/costs less to fuel than petrol or diesel car

- Much simpler engines than petrol or diesel cars/service cost considerably lower

- Do not pay road tax (in the UK)

- Do not pay emission charges (in London) (any three)

Comment

In this question, candidates were able to identify all the points, though there were those who gave their responses in a paragraph form instead of writing one point in each line, making them lose some marks.

Exercise 3

This exercise aimed at testing the candidate's ability to comprehend given information and transfer specific information into a form.

Section A

Full Name: TEMASHAYINA GADLELA

Place of Birth: MPOLONJENI

Number of Siblings: FOUR

Current club and position played: RED ACES LADIES FOOTBALL CLUB, STRIKER

Comment

This section was done well by almost all candidates except for a few who did not use block letters.

Section B

What drove you to soccer?

persuasion from my Siteki High School teachers

What made your debut game so memorable?

- **announced my arrival on the big stage without fear**

- **scored a brace/exquisite passing/intelligent off the ball runs** (any one)

Comment

Candidates did this part very well.

Section C

In 12 to 20 words write a sentence to explain what makes you different from other players in the club

Expected response:

Ideas should include:

blessed with sheer pace and stamina and influential member of the team

Comment

Most candidates did not do well in this section as they failed to either identify the main idea of the sentence or failed to construct correct sentences. They would start their sentences with 'To …' or 'By …'

In 12 to 20 words, write a sentence describing what the country can do to become the best in the game.

Expected response:

Ideas should include:

strategy identifying talented young men and women and expose them to the rigours of world football

Comment

Most candidates did not do well in this section as they failed to either identify the main idea of the sentence or failed to construct proper sentences.

Exercise 4

This is an exercise aimed at testing the candidate's ability to present given information in note form under relevant subheadings. This was another discriminating exercise.

Benefits of tourism

1   generates revenue in form of taxes

2   creates jobs

Causes of over tourism

3   cheap flights

4   increase in income

5   increased desire to travel further and more often

Consequences of overcrowding in Thailand

6   environmental impact to local flora, fauna and marine life

7   closure of island beach to tourists

Ways to prevent over tourism

8   adopting principles of responsible tourism/change in fees or limitations in ticket

9   visit destinations at quiet times in the year

10 demonstrate responsible behaviour when travelling

Comment

Few candidates score above the average, but others could not due to:

- Writing full sentences instead of notes
- Use of capital letters and full stops (meant to punctuate sentences)
- Presenting incomplete responses

Exercise 5

This is an exercise aimed at testing the ability to identify relevant points to a question and summarise them in continuous prose.

Read the following article about the skin colour of ancient Egyptians. Write a summary of the argument about the skin colour of ancient Egyptians and evidence that suggests they were dark-skinned.

Expected responses:

Debate

1   ancient Egypt was predominantly black civilization, populated by Sub-Saharan Africans

2   scholars argue that all black people are descendants from ancient Egypt

3   called the land of Egypt and the entire African continent land of the black

Evidence

4   overwhelming evidence showing how ancient Egypt was ruled and governed by various prominent black leaders

5   Maiherpri appears darker skinned than widely circulated images of Egyptians in illustrated artifacts

6   Queen Nefertari is also often identified as black/colour of the fertile earth

7   DNA sequences show close relation to the people of the Eastern Mediterranean and Near East

8   brown skin colour/reddish brown tone depicted by many surviving Egyptian artworks

Comment

An overwhelming majority of candidate was able to score above average in the exercise. They could easily identify the points. However, for the language part only a few could score above average. The rest had limited expression. They relied on lifting from the original text and failed to group and sequence ideas in their own words. Some wrote in two paragraphs instead of one.

Recommendations

Due to the foregoing discussions, it is therefore imperative that when preparing candidates for the paper, they must be exposed to a lot of reading to enhance their understanding of various types of written work and to enrich their vocabulary. Candidates should be:

- Be given a lot of comprehension work to help them to master the question analysis skill and for responding to the questions asked.

- Be taught basic grammar and sentences construction.

- Be taught the skill of note-making.

PAPER 101/02

General Comments

In 2023, there were about 19 000 candidates who sat the English Language Paper 2, a decline from the approximately 20 000 candidates who wrote the paper the previous year, 2022.

Generally, the question paper was learner friendly as most of the questions proved to be accessible to most learners. Notably, this year we had a number of candidates scoring above 40, the highest being a raw score of 49/50. This paper consisted of three exercises for candidates to tackle; Exercises 1 and 2 were compulsory guided exercises, while Exercise 3 was a freestyle type of writing, consisting of three topics where candidates were expected to choose one. In this paper, candidates have the liberty to showcase their creativity and competence in the English language.

Exercise 1

> Your friend who has been offered a part-time job to be a continuity presenter with the local television station needs advice on how to improve English Language and to be the best presenter.
>
> **Write a letter advising your friend how to improve their English Language.**
>
> Your letter must include:
>
> - the importance of English Language
> - things they can do to improve their spoken English
> - how they can become outstanding presenters.

Expectations

In this exercise, candidates had to write a letter to a friend giving advice on how to improve their proficiency in English. First, candidates were expected to explain why it is important to have a good command of English. Most candidates were able to explain the importance of English Language, stating the benefits and advantages, such as being able to pass even the other subjects, making presentations with ease and being able to find part-time jobs e.g. being an interpreter and other similar jobs with media houses. It would seem that the learners did not associate the importance of having a good command of English in the context of the continuity presenter job, they were mainly repeating what they are usually told in the school context and did not challenge themselves to think beyond those parameters.

For the second bullet, candidates had to suggest ways of improving their spoken English language. For most of them, it was easy to suggest things like reading novels and daily newspapers, using the internet to get some ideas and watching television, especially cartoons. Some even spoke about YouTube tutorials, which was impressive. For the last bullet point, they had to give further suggestions on how to become an outstanding continuity presenter. This bullet point proved to be a challenge for most candidates as a number of them could not understand what being a continuity presenter means. Some mistook it for public speaking presentations. Such candidates could not bring relevant advice on what to do to be the best television presenter. Only a few were able to come up with good suggestions, like building one's confidence, good pronunciation, portraying a friendly face and maintaining good eye contact with the audience. Other suggestions were even more relevant such as connecting with all age groups, lightening up the space with a bit of jokes, as well as talking to legends in the field. They would even remind their friends about favourite presenters they have always admired. These candidates also handled appropriate vocabulary with ease. For example, they used words like viewers, viewership ratings, tuning-in, trends and the like while others struggled.

Some learners were conscious that they needed to adhere to a certain style of writing i.e. an introduction, a body and a conclusion. However, their introduction did not build up to the body; they used memorised lines such as thanking their friends for gifts they bought them/acknowledging letters they received. They did not contextualise the introduction by connecting their introductory remarks with the purpose of the letter. This is very unnatural, and teachers should help learners write cohesively and coherently. They could have at least a congratulatory remark on their friend finding the part-time job before moving on to talk about the importance of English language.

Candidates who failed to score average marks were those who were unable to unpack some parts of the question which was mainly caused by a lack of understanding of the meaning of the keywords. As a result, they dismally failed to come up with any relevant suggestion on presenting, instead they repeated responses they had already given in the first two prompts. Another challenge was misinterpreting the use of the pronoun 'they' to mean a lot of presenters, yet the pronoun 'they' can also be used as a substitute for he/she.

Worth noting this year was that several candidates wrote addresses in their letters, yet it was clearly stated in the rubric that they must not use addresses. This worked to their disadvantage as they did not have enough space to develop their ideas fully. Teachers are therefore urged to intentionally instil this 'no address' approach and explain that it is for the purposes of maximising the available space. They must tirelessly remind the learners and not just assume that they know.

Teachers are also advised to teach and expose learners to the different types of informal writing i.e. different types of friendly letters, for example: letters of advice, sympathy, apology, a congratulatory letter etc. Teachers are urged to spend time teaching learners about question analysis because their performance is mostly determined by how well they understand the requirements of the question. It is not unusual for candidates to fail to properly unpack the demands of the questions and end up scoring between 1-2 marks under content, regardless of their excellent English. Their accuracy and fluency only have value if used for the right purpose. Learners must also be taught how to develop the bullets at length because most of them just provide a line in response to a bullet or simply list items without satisfactorily unpacking them. Lastly, learners must be trained on the importance of attempting all three bullet points as some candidates who could have easily fitted in the effective mark band ended up not getting anything beyond the satisfactory descriptor because they left out one of the prompts.

Exercise 2

The government is conducting a study to introduce a population policy whereby married couples will be forced to have not more than two children.

Below are some responses made by people who were interviewed:

"We are Africans; we need many children."

"Great, most parents would afford to provide for their children."

"Children will look after us when we grow up old."

"That's long overdue, most parents are educated now."

Write an article for your local newspaper expressing your views about this issue.

Expectations

For this question, candidates were expected to at least understand what the population policy implied; which is the fact that married couples would no longer be allowed to have more than two children. That basic understanding was enough for the learner to be able to tackle the question. They then had to state whether or not they thought it was acceptable for government to limit the number of children citizens can have. The Speech bubbles were used to express different opinions. Some represented those who were in support of the move, and others represented those who wanted nothing to do with the population policy. It was expected that candidates give a brief introduction of the topic to establish some kind of background before they could prudently pick a firm stand on the topic in the same introductory paragraph. In the subsequent paragraphs, learners were expected to substantiate their side by developing one point at a time. The points could be relevant ones picked from the pool of speech bubbles or their own ideas. What mattered was independently developing the given point, whether taken from the question or given as an original thought. The shared thoughts were meant to stimulate the minds of the candidates, but they were not necessarily forced to use them in the article. Candidates were expected to advance their arguments using reasonable ideas, statistics, illustrations, quotes from authorities in the field being discussed and/or life experiences where possible. Also, candidates could acknowledge opposing speech bubbles but refute them so that they could not end up sounding like they were advocating for both sides of the argument. Ultimately, it was supposed to be clear which side they were persuading the reader to consider.

Most candidates had a challenge with this question as most of them failed to clearly understand the task, i.e. giving their views on the population policy being proposed. Several candidates only discussed the policy but failed to take a stance. They discussed all the bullet points without picking a side. Such candidates were below average as they failed to make a satisfactory attempt at tackling the question. Another failure for some candidates was taking a stand but failing to bring out a strong argument. Instead, they would regurgitate the speech bubbles without developing them. As a result, they could barely score a reasonable mark, yet going just a little further in their discussions would have scored them good points.

It was also noted that there are still those candidates who still do not own the argument, they continue to discuss with their voice missing. Even though they do advocate for a particular side, it would be the perspective of some people. For example, they would make reference to advocates, protagonists, supporters of the idea and other such terminology but they, themselves, would remain detached. Those did not own the idea because at no point did they maybe use, 'As a supporter of this policy I strongly feel that …', or 'I believe that …', or 'It is my strong conviction that …' and many such phrases which would make them own the argument. It was also noted that some took a stand, but their development went the other direction, a clear indication that sometimes candidates rush into responding without carefully reading the question and planning their response.

Teachers are urged to teach all the required skills of persuasive writing and give adequate practice as it was evident that most candidates lacked practice. It was also noted that some learners fail to make a clear distinction between argumentative and discursive writing, as they would fail to take a firm stand where they were required to express their views. A number of candidates sat on the fence and offered an objective discussion of the issue at hand instead of writing persuasively using the appropriate tools. Learners must be taught how to rebut their opponents' views because in some instances, it was evident that the candidate did not intentionally encroach into the other camp's territory. It would seem they thought they were simply acknowledging other known convictions, but because they could not handle that level of writing, they ended up sounding like they were contradicting what they had already advocated for. This level of incompetence neutralised their voice. Also, the correct use of connectives must be taught as learners tend to use them inappropriately and, therefore, it works against them.

Training learners to use templates is still a big practice in schools, as well as equipping them with big phrases that they can use before throwing in their thoughts. In one centre you would find the use of

phrases such as 'I am fortified to remain *unstaggered* in…' throughout the essay. Sometimes, these memorised phrases took up a lot of space and learners would then throw in their thoughts shallowly, without much expansion. Instead of saying why they take a different side they would only say I still stand to the point that'/'I stand with my conviction' (quoted as is). Sometimes, they would be very detailed and unpack their opponents' views and when they were supposed to then say why they do not agree with those views, they would simply throw in a line or a rhetorical question. e.g. 'As much as there is an ounce of truth in that, have they thought about the cost of raising children?' That would be all. After that, they would not go on to explain their concerns about the cost of raising children. Overwhelming learners with big words could also be seen in their confused use of words like protagonists and antagonists. Learners need good practice, and they should be allowed to acquire persuasive writing skills as naturally as possible instead of giving them a supposed 'one-size-fits-all' template.

Another seemingly tricky area is the writing of an introduction or a conclusion. It seems like candidates think all paragraphs must be of significant size so that instead of just commentary on the issue plus a stand, they would get into discussing the actual reasons for or against the matter at hand in the introductory paragraph. The same would happen with the writing of a conclusion. Instead of simply wrapping up what had been discussed in the essay by reaffirming their stand, they would still be introducing new points.

Candidates who scored good marks were those who were aware of the audience and purpose of the article, hence used the appropriate style and register. Such candidates were able to show an understanding of the implication of the population policy, took a firm stand, and provided supporting evidence for their stand. Such candidates were able to bring forth the benefits of having a small, affordable family, or why nobody had a right to control family size, depending on the side they picked. Those who argued well against the policy had strong ideas, citing issues of labour division and social issues. They even spoke of their religious convictions. They questioned how blended family situations were going to be treated. They even wondered if the policy would equally apply to teenagers. Their being conversant with the matter saw them bringing in interesting perspectives. Even those who were fully supportive of the idea spoke convincingly about economic matters both at the family and government levels. They shared experiences of lack of parental love and attention in big families. They basically provided well-thought-out ideas with appropriate examples and illustrations. They handled the issue so well and in cases where they decided to acknowledge dissenting voices, they were quick to rebut and reaffirm their stand. These candidates were also able to neatly tie up their argument with a clear conclusion.

Finally, it was observed that in some centres, the word limit is not observed. Exercises 1 and 2 are economic writing exercises where learners are expected to write concisely, to be direct and not wander off or throw long curves in their writing. This, in itself, is a skill. In 150-200 words candidates should be able to fulfil the given task whether it is a letter, a speech, a diary entry, a persuasive piece, etc. However, candidates were seen to be conveniently ignoring the word limits and, in unnaturally small handwriting, filling up a page or even creating more lines after the last one. Sometimes, they did not even write a title, probably to 'maximise' space. As much as there were candidates who failed to meet the minimum number of words required, there is seemingly a new problem where candidates go way beyond the maximum amount. Learners wrote up to 388 words in Exercise 2, which is even above the Exercise 3 limit. Teachers are urged to be realistic and discourage this rising practice. This ambitious writing should be reined in because it comes with serious penalties.

Exercise 3

1. Write a story based on these words … 'Now I know that failure is not the end'.

This was a narrative composition where candidates were expected to write a story that would end positively even despite initial failure. This question was very popular with the candidates. A number of them were able to come up with captivating stories that had good storylines, displaying a well-planned plot and theme, such stories portrayed characters who were later seen attaining their dreams after experiencing devastating negative experiences.

However, there were many challenges. Several candidates wrote a discussion where they would give some advice about not giving up in life. These candidates illustrated this point through several isolated life experiences which taught them about rising after failure. Others would write a speech which was meant to motivate people about handling life's difficulties – very moving speeches, very motivational and encouraging, but sadly, the candidates missed the part of the instruction that said, 'Write a story'. Such essays were classified below the satisfactory mark band and scored very low marks. These candidates did not understand the assignment and got carried away with the theme coming across as a lesson. So, instead of writing a narrative piece, they came up with an expository essay. It is important to help learners differentiate between the different genres and especially to clearly distinguish narrative writing from the other forms.

Even though this was not necessarily wrong, it was suspected that for some learners, failure only meant failing a class in school, nothing else. So many of them came up with stories involving getting a report that said they had failed and had to repeat but the following year they would then pass. Sometimes it wouldn't be long before it was then discovered that there was an error, otherwise they had passed and could move on to the next class. But whatever the case, these learners could not apply failing to other areas.

Another disturbing trend in the writing of narrative composition is a seeming polishing up of a template, or generic essay, where one can then fit in any given theme in the last paragraph. For example, the candidate would use a page and a half thoroughly unpacking their emotions. They would describe their appearance in a way that portrays their devastation, they would talk about their emotions at that given moment, their weak joints and all, the sounds they were hearing, the voices in their heads, their surroundings and just how just their world was collapsing and spelling out a cul-de-sac moment. This would be a gripping moment, and as a reader you could maybe shed a tear too. Then finally they would drop in a few words to explain the cause of that situation. Depending on the question at hand, the cause could be because they had received bad news, or lost in a competition, or had someone break their heart, or had a friend betray them, etc. That kind of writing appears to be prepared before coming into the exam room and does not meet the requirements of narrative writing; no background, no rising action, no climax, no resolution/falling action, just a safe one-size-fits-all template. Candidates with potentially good English scored very low marks because they did not write a story. Teachers should try and develop learners' writing skills by guiding them and giving them practice throughout their JC course, that way candidates will drop their shortcut approaches and be confident enough to tackle a short story on their own.

There was also the recurring problem in the writing of a narrative essay: that of candidates presenting meandering plots and bringing in all sorts of details which do not add value to the story, and then towards the end of their essay, they would briefly squeeze in what looks like a relevant answer to the question. For example, they would write irrelevant stories and then towards the end, bring in the words 'failure is not the end'. Those candidates would not score high marks, no matter how proficient their writing, because they failed to filter out irrelevant parts in their writing.

Another stumbling block was the tendency among candidates to then discuss the moral of the story in the last paragraph e.g. 'From this story we learn that …' This should be discouraged because it is not in the conventions of writing a narrative. It is in the reader's discretion to derive lessons from a story.

Teachers are advised to equip learners with the correct elements for writing a narrative essay. It was quite evident that most candidates lacked proper basic knowledge of writing a narrative composition: that purposeful selection of characters, an appropriate setting, events and a plot that brings out the required theme. The sequence also should be deliberate and include a build-up to a climactic moment which must take centre stage in the narration. The story should then taper off to a resolution. Exposing learners to these elements of story writing will help them realise that there is more to telling a story than just filling the page with words.

2. Describe an ideal school and show how it can groom good citizens in society.

This was a descriptive composition where candidates were supposed to describe an ideal school and further illustrate how such a school would help groom good citizens. This question was two-fold; first candidates had to describe what good qualities of an ideal school would be. Secondly, they were then to show how such a school can mould good citizens. This question was not a popular choice. Those who chose it had a challenge with the word 'ideal'. It was noted that most of the candidates described their favourite school where the buildings and the uniforms were attractive. They painted a picture of the first world level of development, e.g. remote-controlled gates, free Wi-Fi and tablets for learners, air-conditioned classrooms etc. They would really think independently, except they only looked at infrastructure, which did not set the stage for the second part of the question, that is, how that ideal school can groom good citizens. It is not easy to link beautiful infrastructure with the grooming of future citizens. Those candidates were not able to score above the average mark since they failed to satisfactorily fulfil the task.

A few good candidates who displayed a good understanding of the question were able to showcase their writing skills by first describing vividly what they perceived to be an ideal school. Their description was not confined to the buildings and uniforms, but it embraced good governance of the school and the opportunities it affords the learners. They touched on issues of discipline, core and social skills, and a good curriculum including the hidden one, which would in turn mould good responsible citizens. Such candidates displayed independent thinking as they clearly articulated their out-of-the-box ideas.

Teachers are implored to expose learners to the different genres; narrative, descriptive, discursive, argumentative, and expository essays as stated in the syllabus. Again, the importance of question analysis cannot be over-emphasised.

3. Free education will alleviate poverty. Discuss.

This was the most popular choice for candidates, yet most of them failed to tackle it well. It was noted that most candidates dismally failed to read the question with understanding. A majority simply wrote about free education, which was a clear indication that they did not analyse the question. Most of them failed to align free education with poverty which made them score low marks. Instead of exploring the connection between free education and the alleviation of poverty, learners veered off into talking about whether free education is the way to go. They would state that education would be more accessible to all despite economic classes, and that more people would be employed. This points back to question analysis skills. Learners seemingly rush into responding without first taking time to understand what a question requires.

It was quite evident that most candidates are still not well versed as to how to handle a discussion as opposed to an argument. Notably, there were a number of argumentative essays where a learner would be arguing about the importance of making education free in the country. Sometimes the question would be partly understood, i.e., it would look at the relationship between free education and poverty alleviation, but the approach would be argumentative, and not discursive. These candidates failed to offer an open discussion without advocating for a particular side, and to maintain that objectivity throughout the essay.

One disheartening error observed was a misunderstanding of the word 'alleviate'. Some candidates thought alleviate was the same as 'elevate' or 'aggravate', so they would give say an example of how

free education ensures that even disadvantaged children can get an education and get high-paying jobs. Then they would say that is a clear demonstration that free education DOES NOT alleviate poverty. Some would say both parents and learners become casual towards schoolwork because they are not losing anything. As a result, they would allege, learners fail, and the cycle of poverty is repeated in their families. This, they said, was a clear indication that free education alleviates poverty. This error was disheartening because it wasn't just committed by weak candidates, but even learners with a good command of the English language. They wrote gripping discussions with good illustrations but were then trapped by failure to understand this key word.

Those who were able to score high marks were able to follow all the conventions of discursive writing. Such candidates were able to introduce the discussion by providing a background without announcing a personal stand. Their introduction would allude to the fact that different people see this matter differently, and then explore these different sides using illustrations and appropriate examples to develop the discussion. They would also show independence of thought by bringing forth some suggestions and solutions.

Teachers are once again urged to assist learners in making a clear distinction between argumentative and discursive writing. As already stated, candidates must be provided with all the proper tools needed to write the different genres in the syllabus.

In extreme cases, candidates decided to write compositions based on all three topics instead of choosing one. Such candidates would write a paragraph on each topic, and the next paragraph would then be based on another question in the exercise. These were found to have been of little relevance and learners scored very low marks. In some cases, candidates simply did not attempt the questions, or just wrote a few lines and then abandoned the exercise. In other cases, those were students who had done reasonably well in the other exercises. It was quite disturbing, and it led to candidates forfeiting marks they would have otherwise scored.

Use of planning space

The space below the question may be used by candidates to plan their writing. It would help if teachers assisted them on how they can go about planning their essays. Failing to plan led to candidates getting carried away with some parts of the questions and only squeezing in other parts without satisfactorily developing them, if not totally leaving them out. With narrative writing, they failed to establish the scope of the story and spent a lot of time on something they should have skipped or mentioned in passing. Planning can also help them decide if picking a side in an argument is influenced by valid points they can develop or if it is just an emotional or even impulsive decision. Teachers are therefore urged to help learners cultivate this planning culture.

Common errors

- Direct translation remains a big problem. Phrases such as 'money to buy our needs and wants', 'eat from the pocket of the parent' were prevalent.

- Sentence construction and paragraph development remain a challenge for candidates. Only exposure to different pieces of writing can bring a change to this issue.

- Tenses: learners fail to rightly apply the appropriate tense, including the simple past tense.

- Slang: it was not uncommon to find phrases/words such as 'am sure', 'split of a sec', pic, cool, hey bro, I got your back, talk soon, gonna, wanna etc.

- Spelling mistakes: candidates wrote words such as congradulations/congragulations, or even wrongly spelling words transferred from the question.

- Proper nouns were written in small letters, such as english, africans

- Learners do not capitalise class names e.g. Form 1, Grade 8.

- Prepositions are either picked randomly or they were wrongly memorised e.g. 'to add on that', 'resulting to'.

- Candidates also had a tendency of beginning a paragraph with a pronoun, which is not acceptable because a pronoun should refer to something that has already been cited in that same paragraph.

- Small numbers were written in the form of figures instead of words.

It is recommended that:

- Learners be cautioned on the importance of question analysis and topic selection before they attempt any question.

- Learners be empowered on grammatical rules and the mechanics of continuous writing.

- A clear distinction between persuasive writing and discursive writing be made and taught to learners, and generally, a clear understanding of all the genres.

- Teachers discourage learners from using slang and 'cell phone' language.

- Learners be guided in making proper choices for Exercise 3, and the exercise must be given due attention as well. It was not uncommon to find one learner doing reasonably well in the first two exercises and very poorly in Exercise 3. This skewed performance suggests that some work needs to be done in Exercise 3.

- Learners be advised not to write less than the required number of words.

- Teachers apply the standard marking guide to mark work even at school.

- Teachers assist those learners who have illegible handwriting styles– some are very small, very faint or just slanted to the extent they are not easy to read. Teaching writing skills must be done simultaneously with attending to the clarity of the handwriting.

PAPER 101/03

Listening Comprehension

General comments

This component is aimed at testing the skills of listening for general and specific information with understanding. It was noted from the candidate's responses that some still need to improve this skill. Worth noting was the fact that a majority of learners still have a lot of spelling errors and fail to follow the basic principles of the language, like the use of proper nouns. It was also noted that some candidates lacked proper practice of the skill as they would leave out a lot of blank spaces without responding to the questions.

Exercise 1

This exercise was fairly done by most candidates, with some getting a total.

Question 1: Why doesn't Nandi like action movies?

Expected response:

There is too much violence.

A majority of candidates could not score as they had a challenge with the spelling of 'violence'. They would write words like *violance*, *violanse*, *violense*, *violent*. Some candidates had a challenge with 'too' as they would write *to, two* which made their response to be incorrect.

A few wrote *March*, *mach*, *mash*, *mesh*, instead of much.

Question 2: What was wrong with Lusanda two weeks ago?

Expected response:

She had a terrible/severe headache.

A number of candidates could not score because of the omission of the adverb 'terrible'/'severe' which was key as it made the answer accurate and specific.

Another challenge with this question was the spelling. Candidates would spell "terrible" as *tereble*, *terreble*, *terable*. Also, some would misspell 'headache' and come up with words like *headach*, *herdache*, *hedache* and also head ache as two separate words. A few candidates idebntified the answer 'severe headache' but had a challenge with the spelling of 'severe'. They would write words like *serve*, *seivere*, *several*, which made them lose the mark.

Some candidates would state that Lusanda had flu, had a cold or was sick, which rendered their response incorrect.

Question 3: When is it going to start raining according to the weather report?

Expected response:

later tonight/that night

A majority of learners did well in this question. However, a few could not score as they came up with response like at night, late July, late at night, latter to night, some would omit the adverb 'later' and wrote tonight only thus could not score.

Question 4: What will the father be doing while the boy is cleaning the house?

Expected response:

raking leaves and pulling weeds

Some candidates could not contextualise and came up with incorrect responses like *recking leaves*, *pulling weaves*, *raking leaves and pulling wings*, *raking leaves and proning leaves*. The spelling of 'raking' proved to be a challenge as candidates came up with words like *wrecking*, *raiking*, *racking*, *recking*. Some candidates wrote incomplete responses like raking leaves and omitted the last part of the answer thus could not score. For some candidates the word 'weeds' proved to be a challenge as they would write words like *wings*, *weaves*, *wills* which was way out of context.

Question 5:   Why won't Sam buy formal clothes for his trip?

Expected response:

He's not sure if he'll need them.

Some candidates came up with responses like *it is summer*, *it is hot*, *he won't need them*, *he'll rent them*, *he'll find someone to marry him*, *he's getting married* and they could not score. Some candidates opted for the 1st person point of view in the response i.e. '*I am not sure…*' , hence they did not score.

Exercise 2

This was a gap filling exercise. A number of candidates did not perform well but there are those who managed to score a total.

Item 1: Habits for nourishment

Expected responses:

active and **exercising**

A majority of candidates had a challenge with spelling, and they would leave blank spaces. They would write words like *ective*, *acctive*, *acttive*, *activ*, *achtiv*. For exercising they would write *exercise*, *excercise.* Some candidates would even write *eating active*, *action exercise*.

Item 2: Dehydration definition

Expected responses:

fatigue and **dizziness**

Again, spelling was a challenge in this part of the exercise. Candidates would write fatigue as *fatic*, *faticve*. Also, dizziness would be written as *dissiness*, *disyness*, *dizzyness* and some would write *diseases* and they could not score.

Item 3: How to boost water intake

Expected response:

variety and **immune system.**

For variety candidates would come up with responses like *variaty*, *variety*, *variet*, *viriaty*, *viriety*. For immune system the candidates came up with responses like *immuno system*, *imune system*, *immune systerm*, which rendered their responses incorrect thus they could not score. Some candidates would just write body's *immune* omitting the 'system' which rendered their responses incorrect.

Item 4: Medical advice

Expected responses:

fibre and **constipation**

Most candidates were able to provide the correct spelling for fibre, some giving the predominantly American version 'fiber'. Teachers are urged to train candidates to use the UK/British English in their writing. A few candidates could not score because they gave incorrect spellings like *fyber*, *fibrer*, *fibrre*, *phyber*, *fabre*. For constipation, they would come up with words like *constepation*, *constipietion*, *constipassion*, constipasion thus they could not score.

Exercise 3

This exercise was fairly done by the candidates with majority of them scoring 3 marks and above. What was noted was that the candidates were familiar with most of the words, maybe because agricultural content is familiar to them from Agriculture lessons.

Item 1: Factors to consider

Expected responses:

location , sunshine and **drainage**

For location: Candidates used synonyms like *place*, *site*. Others used words like *garden*, *area*, *land*. Others repeated the word good which was in the question.

For sunshine: Candidates would write *sunlight*, *sunshin*, hence they did not score.

For drainage: Candidates misspelt the word 'drainage' and came up with words like *dranage*, drainage, *dranaige*, *drainag*, *drainadge*, *draynage*.

Item 2: Preparation for a garden

Expected responses:

shed and **bare**

For shed: Common errors were *sheard*, *shared*, *shedd*, *shede*, *sherd*.

For bare: Candidates came up with words like *bared*, *bear*, *bere*, *beer.*

These spelling mistakes made them not to score.

Item 3: Garden schedule

Expected responses:

fertilisers and **crowded**

For fertilisers: Most candidates misspelt the word and came up with words like *ferteliser*, *firtiliser*, *feteliser*, *fetilisers*. Other candidates wrote *fertilise* which was a verb instead of the noun fertiliser. Some candidates would add unnecessary verbs like *put*, *use*, *add* and *apply* before the actual noun fertilizer which disrupted the sentence thus, they could not score.

For crowded: Most candidates misspelt the word and came up with words like *crouded*, *crowd*,

croweded, crawded, *overcrowded*, *crowdded*, *croweds*.

Others failed to identify the answer and wrote responses like *5cm* and *young* which did not answer the question.

Exercise 4

This exercise proved to be the most challenging with most candidates scoring less than two marks.

Question 1: Why do we need to sleep?

Expected response:

- **It helps your body and brain function properly**

- **it also improves your mood** (any one)

Most candidates did not score in this question as they did not include both nouns 'body and brain' but mentioned one. Also, there were spelling errors in words like function. They came up with words including *fanction*, *funtion*, *fantion*, *fashion*.

For properly: candidates came up with words like *proparly*, *propary*, *propely*, *proper* hence they could not score.

Question 2: How is good sleep an advantage for students?

Expected responses:

- **It improves learning, memory, decision making and creativity**

- **It makes them think more clearly** (any one)

A majority of candidates left out the key word 'improve'. Others wrote responses for question one in this question and did not score. The key phrase in this question was, 'for students'

For learning: Candidates came up with wrong spellings and wrote words like *leaning*, *lerning*, *learn*, *laning*.

For improve: they came up with words like *impruv, impruve*.

Few candidates were unable to identify the correct answer and would write 'doing better in schoolwork' which did not score.

Question 3: What happens if we do not get a good sleep?

Expected response:

It raises the risk of many diseases and disorders.

Some candidates would leave out the key words like 'raises', 'risk', 'diseases' or 'disorders'.

Others included/listed the examples of the diseases such as heart attack, thus they did not score.

For raises: candidates came up with words like *rises*, *raisin*, *raisis*.

For diseases: candidates came up with words like *desease*, *disiseas*

For disorder: candidates came up with words like *disoder*, *disordar* of all which did not score.

Question 4: What advice is given if you have some difficulty in falling asleep? Give two details.

Expected responses:

- **stick to a sleep schedule**

- **include a physical activity in your daily routine**

- **manage worries**

- **limit daytime naps**

- **create a restful environment** (any two)

Candidates misspelt the word 'schedule' and came up with words such as *shidele*, *shadule*, *shedule* all of which did not score.

For stick: candidates came up with words such as *steak*, *stik*, *steek* which did not score.

Other errors included words like *sleep*, *sheet*, *sleep*, *shildow*, *sleep shadow*, *sleep shirt/sheltof* which were all out of question.

For 'include physical activity in your daily routine' some candidates omitted keywords like 'daily routine', 'physical' hence they did not score.

For routine: they came up with words such as *routin*, *rutin*, *root* hence they did not score.

For create a restful environment: most candidates wrote restful as two different words i.e. rest ful(l) and they did not score. Some candidates wrote incorrect spelling of restful. They came up with words such as *resteful*, *restfully*, *restiful*.

For environment candidates came up with words such as *enveroment*, *inveronment*, *enviroment*, *inviroment* hence they did not score.

Question 5: Mention one example of a tea that helps one sleep faster.

Expected responses:

- **chamomile**

- **peppermint tea**

The question required candidates to give an example of a tea. Some candidates did not score because they failed to analyse the question in which 'tea' was the key word, as a result they mentioned the other drinks such as cherry juice and warm milk. A majority of them failed because they mispelt 'peppermint'. Common spellings of peppermint were *pepperment*, *peparment*, *peperment*.

Common versions of chamomile were *cheromile*, *calamin*, *carmomile*, *charamel*, *calamani*, *calamiile*.

21

Exercise 5

Question 1: How long have people been playing chess?

Expected response:

over 500 years

Wrong response included:

- the omission of 'over' which was the key word for the answer.

- Some candidates misspelt hundred and wrote *hundredths*, *hundreth*,

- In digits, some candidates wrote *500 000 years* , *5 000 years*, *5 000 000 years*

- Some candidates omitted 'years' after the numbers

- Some candidates mixed words and digits when writing the number of years

- Some candidates wrote *it has been around for a long time* or *over a long time*

Question 2: Where did the original form of chess came from?

Expected response:

India

Wrong responses included: *india*, *Indian*, *Idia*, *Indra*, *Indea*, *Indya*. Some candidates wrote irrelevant answers like *New York*. Candidates that failed to begin with a capital letter 'I' lost the mark.

Question 3: How might chess be good for people? Give two details.

Expected responses:

- **people are able to make the right move from the start**

- **learn how to make sacrifices**

- **make the mind stronger**

- **a work out for the mind**

- **teaches a person important life lessons** (any two)

Wrong responses included:

- Some candidates omitted 'able to', and 'from the start' in 'able to make the right move from the start'.

- Some candidates failed to write the correct spelling for 'sacrifices', they wrote *cercrifices*, *sucrifices*, *sercrificies*, *sacrifiesin*

- In 'makes the mind stronger' some candidates failed to use the degree of comparison in 'stronger' and wrote *strong*. Some candidates misspelt 'stronger' and wrote *stonger*

- In a workout for the mind, some candidates misspelt 'mind' and wrote *maind*

- In 'teaches a person important life lessons' some candidates omitted the verb 'teaches' and some misspelt lessons and wrote *leasons*, *lessens.*

Question 4: How is blitz chess different from regular chess?

Expected response:

Each player gets ten minutes to use for the whole game whereas in ordinary chess the game ends when a player loses his or her King.

Wrong responses included:

- Some candidates misspelt 'whole' and wrote *hole*, *hall*

- In 'blitz is fast paced and not for average player' some candidates wrote 'fast-*pace' fast-paice' 'fast-pased*, '*fast plays*, '*fast players'*

- In 'you lose when you run out of time 'some candidates misspelt 'lose' and wrote *loose*, *loss*, *lost*

- Some candidates omitted the key words 'each player'.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that beginning a proper noun with a capital letter must be emphasised while teaching.

- Candidates must be guided in identifying key words which should not be omitted from an answer in order to score a mark.

- The WH words should be clearly taught to learners to enable them to respond correctly where they are used.

- Candidates should be encouraged to read extensively to boost their vocabulary and improve their spelling.

Paper 101/04

This is a school-based component assessed by teachers and moderated at ECESWA.

General comments

There was a noticeable rise in performance this year as opposed to last year. There was a lesser number of candidates who got the minimum mark of 3, and some got it because examiners were unable to understand and apply the marking criteria correctly. The oral cards were not abstract for candidates, and they could relate to them well. The candidates were able to sustain a conversation even though they lacked precise vocabulary.

Comments on specific aspects of the oral test

PART A – Welcome and Brief Explanation

Most examiners skipped this part and came back to it later. They would first do warm-up then come back to the welcome and brief explanation which somehow compromised the opportunity for candidates to fully understand what the oral test wqs all about. Other examiners said the exam has 2 parts instead of 3 parts. Teachers are urged to please start with welcoming candidates then give a brief explanation of the whole exam procedure. Examiners are asked to state the candidate number and candidate name before welcoming and explaining the exam procedure.

PART B – Warm-up

This part was fairly done by examiners. Some examiners did very well and took the required 2 minutes. A few warm-ups were too long while others were too brief. Please desist from using the warm-up to fish for the card to give to candidates. Rather ask any other question far from what is in the cards. Also, do not ask candidates to pick their own card from the lot in front of you. You as an examiner are to choose a card for the candidates.

PART C – Handing of Card

This part was fairly done as well. Some examiners forgot to mention the card given to candidate before pausing the recording. Examiners are asked to mention the card before pausing the recorder. Even before beginning the conversation, examiners are to state the card chosen for the candidate.

PART D – Conversation

This is the part that is examined and graded. It is the longest part of the whole exercise. It is noted, however, that most conversations were presentations or interviews instead of conversations. Please remember this is a conversation and should be treated as such. Other examiners sounded too harsh on candidates and intimidated candidates by telling them, 'This is not what I asked…' harshly. Examiners are asked to always maintain a friendly tone and attitude towards candidates.

In some cases, examiners seemed to stick to the prompts instead of taking the cue from the candidates on what to ask next or how to phrase the next question. In other cases, examiners dominated the conversation instead of understanding that the test is learner-centred not teacher-centred. Examiners are asked not to be carried away even when a conversation is interesting but give the time to candidates. Also, do not interject while candidates are talking as this will make candidates to clam up and not talk at all.

Oral Assessment Cards

Card A – My Ideal Company

This was one of the cards that were popular among candidates. The topic was relatable as most candidates have friends/loved ones they spend most of their time with so they could tap from their personal experiences. The card also did not discriminate candidates according to backgrounds. For higher-order questions, the examiners simplified the bullets for candidates, which is commendable. Most candidates talked about their relatives being their ideal company, their parents, especially mothers, as they shared their problems with them, they were their confidantes.

For bullet 3, some candidates were able to give reasons why they avoid some kind of people, like judgemental people, their mothers being too strict, gossip mongers and drug addicts and dealers.

Poor responses were those that lacked an understanding of the word 'ideal' such that they failed to even create or imagine that friend they would love to have or maybe one they admire from a distance.

CARD B – Towns

This was the most popular card for nearly all centres and candidates. Candidates used personal experiences of towns. Good candidates talked of eateries, infrastructure, rates, malls, high crime rates, overcrowding, people paying rates and bills, easy access to government services etc. Others talked about envying town life when coming from rural areas. Bullet 3 accommodated both rural and urban candidates. They were able to compare the two: rural and urban life. They talked about the low cost of living in rural areas compared to urban areas; working harder in rural areas while in towns people just laze around and watch TV all day long; rural areas have muddy roads while urban areas have tarred roads; travelling long distances to school while in urban areas students are dropped off at school: rural candidates having high morals while urban ones have somewhat lost touch with their morals.

Weak responses were a result of lack of exposure, which made candidates unable to talk about town life. Some candidates had been to towns but had never spent some time there. Those who had experienced towns during lay overs (when connecting from one rural area to another), had minimal experiences to share.

Misconceptions

Quite a number of candidates thought a town was an area with shopping complexes/bigger shops like Mhlabubovu yet these are not towns but village shops. Others lacked precise vocabulary for describing towns.

CARD C – My Ideal Weekend

This was another card that was very popular with candidates. A majority of candidates picked from their own personal experiences and things they do on a weekly basis. Candidates had plenty of examples of things they do on weekends. They talked about doing their laundry, gardening, going out with friends, watching movies, sporting activities, weekend lessons, attending funerals and weddings.

Weaknesses were seen when some candidates failed to grasp the meaning of the word 'ideal'. For them, it was a typical weekend instead of a weekend they would be looking forward to or one where they immensely enjoyed themselves. Candidates also thought Saturday was the only day that makes up a weekend. Some candidates misunderstood ideal to mean something ominous, yet ideal meant candidates were supposed to talk about what they would consider to be their perfect weekend or a weekend they experienced that was perfect.

A few candidates decided to talk about visiting their boyfriends on weekends as their best weekend. Examiners are asked not to encourage candidates to talk about such matters during the oral test or while in class. If you do find yourself faced with such candidates, do not reprimand the candidate, but rather venture into neutral ground. Please Read the Teachers' Notes on this.

CARD D – Extreme Weather

This is a card most candidates found challenging. Most had no vocabulary to develop their points. Good candidates talked about their own experiences and touched on flooding rivers and them not being able to get to school. Others even picked on the cold front recently experienced and elaborated that the schools allowed them to wear their own clothes in addition to their school uniform in order to be warm. Others touched on effects of exposure to extreme weather conditions e.g. skin cancer, heat strokes etc. when exposed to too much sunlight or high temperatures. Most candidates who did subjects like Geography were able to talk about effects of extreme weather, therefore had precise vocabulary. They talked about global warming, melting of glaciers, deforestation, acid rain, carbon emissions, etc. These candidates sourced from specific subjects like Geography, Agriculture and Science.

Weak candidates had nothing much to say. They were stuck in their simple vocabulary which bordered on words like hot weather, summer weather etc. Some candidates gave extreme geographical phenomena which were not conditions but natural disasters like volcanoes, earthquakes, while others talked about things like soil erosion.

Misconceptions

Candidates talked about bad habits done by people like peeing in water and overgrazing which are things that only ruin the environment, buy may not cause extreme weather. Others talked about the seasons instead of talking about the type of weather they preferred.

CARD E – Making Sacrifices

This is one of the cards candidates had a challenge in. Some centres even decided not to give their candidates this card yet candidates in a lot of centres had a lot to talk about. Examiners are asked to use all cards and distribute them fairly, not to have a notion that candidates in their centre will have nothing to talk about on a card. This disadvantages candidates who could have had something to say on the card.

Good responses to this card were those where candidates talked about things they were doing already in preparation for oncoming exams. They said they sacrificed their cell phones, time with friends and watching TV. Others, when talking about negative effects of making sacrifices, touched on them losing friends, while others did not achieve what they had hoped to achieve when making the sacrifice. One candidate even said she sacrificed her cell phone, time with friends for her to get a merit while in Grade 7 but ended up not getting it but failed. This candidate showed great understanding of making sacrifices. Others talked about the recent national elections where prospective MPs sacrificed their money and time with the hope of making it to parliament but ended up not being elected at all.

Odd responses in bullet 2 came from candidates who resorted to talking about rituals as sacrifices that people make in order to achieve success. They talked about ritualistic murders.

Good responses came from candidates who talked about sacrificing food in order to lose weight; sleep in order to get good grades etc. Some examiners clearly clarified the bullet points for candidates by making Biblical references which acted as a good basis for candidates to have an idea of what the card was about. For this, examiners are commended. Some candidates were able to evaluate whether making sacrifices guarantees one success by giving clear yes or no responses with supporting evidence or ideas. Good candidates were sailing through as they understood very well what making sacrifices is all about yet weak responses stemmed from candidates not knowing what making sacrifices means.

Problems/Challenges Encountered

Examiners/Centres are requested to take care to avoid the following problems:

1 Attendance Register

- Failure to indicate present or absent candidates

- Failure to follow instruction to tick absent candidates (most crossed instead of ticking)

- Submitting duplicate instead of the original to ECESWA

- Using a pencil instead of pen to mark the register

- Failure to write page totals in the boxes provided

- Detaching register from its original format

- Not marking script submitted column for submitted audios.

2 MS1 Forms

- Stapled

- Use of pen

- Not submitted

- Recording percentages instead of raw marks

- Not signed at the back

- Not following the instructions outlined at the back of the form when filling it in

- Transferring wrong marks from Summary form to MS1

- Confusing Absent and Missing candidates.

➢ Shading wrongly and faintly (follow instructions written on the form)

3 Summary Forms

- Wrong additions

- Candidates not arranged according to Attendance Register

- Failure to check if all candidates are there in Summary Form

- Marks not corresponding with those in MS1

- Not indicating when candidate is absent but leaving a blank space.

- Use of correction fluid

- Submitting a photocopy instead of the original

- Filling in Summary Form using a pencil instead of a pen

- Not stapling all summary forms together

4 CD/Recording

- Submitting blank CD's (please check to confirm if files have been burnt onto the CDs)

- Omitting candidates from the audio, i.e. not burning all candidates' files into CD

- Failure to label audios of candidates according to their given candidate numbers, names and surnames

- Failure to label CDs (Centre number, range of candidates in CD, e.g. 1001 Name of centre, Candidates 001-064)

- Separated tracks for warm up and conversations that are not labelled

5 ECESWA Envelopes

- Not indicating absent candidates' numbers on the spaces provided

- Not labelling envelopes correctly or at all. Some centres failed to write their centre numbers and names and number of scripts(audios) enclosed

- Not using appropriate JC envelope

Recommendations

- Read all instructions given in the Attendance Register.

- Ensure you find, fill and submit the MS1 form together with all necessary documents and recordings to ECESWA (see Teachers' Notes).

- Read instructions at the back of the MS1 carefully before filling it.

- List all candidates in Summary Form according to the order they appear in in the Attendance Register.

- Make use of computer savvy colleagues when burning CD to ensure files are there.

- Listen to all audios burnt onto the CD before submitting.

- Cross check each official document to be submitted to ECESWA.

- Read the Teacher's Notes provided and follow the guidelines outlined there.

- Make the exam learner centred as exam is for learners.

- Keep all unnecessary gadgets out of the exam room. Only the recorder should be in the exam room with the teacher and the candidate.

- Co-ordinate understanding of the cards as a department before conducting the orals so as to be able to use all given oral cards. This is to help avoid preconceived ideas about suitability of cards for candidates.

- Coordinate the marking criteria so all examiners in the centre can consistently apply the marking criteria when grading candidates.