**English Language Paper Two**

**Constructing an answer – What does a good point look like?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question Two**:  In Source A, Aberfan is described as being an unremarkable place which should not really be known about. It is described as, ‘tucked away’ and having ‘anonymous terraced houses’. This suggests that it is a town that is almost hidden from the outside world and that it contains nothing which should have alerted people to its existence.  In Source B, London is described in a much more impressive way. For example as a, ‘colossal city’ with ‘well built houses’, showing that it is a significant place in terms of its size and scale but also it has been constructed with a greater sense of planning. The description implies that it is huge and filled with activity. This contrasts with the description of Aberfan which is presented as being a lot smaller and having little importance before the tragic events.  NB – Do not analyse language in this question. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question Three:**  The writer uses personification to describe the coal tips, ‘killer with a rotten heart’. This is used to emphasise the threat posed by coal tip number 7. The word, ‘rotten’ suggests that it is completely evil and lacks any kind of compassion, implying that it is bad to the very core. The idea of it being a ‘killer’ builds a greater sense of danger and deadliness to its presence. By using these human characteristics the writer is able to make the events seem more sinister in nature, suggesting that it was not just a natural disaster but a human made one.  Be really clear about the effects of the language choices. Use some of the following phrases to make sure you are:  *suggests that… builds a sense of…*  *implies that… emphasises a…* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question Four:**  The writer of Source seems fairly unsentimental at the start of the extract. He describes Aberfan as ‘tucked away’. The verb ‘tucked’ is more usually associated with being tucked up in bed and tends to suggest more positive ideas of safety and warmth. But here, the writer uses it differently, perhaps to imply complacency. He reinforces this view when he creates a sense of a malevolent ‘killer’ stalking its victims. He sees this disaster as ‘cruel’ and a ‘shame’.  In contrast, the writer of Source B mocks the idea of the earthquake. One method he uses is exaggeration where he describes the incident out of all proportion, with the Midlands for example, where it merely, ‘broke crockery’. The reference to broken crockery is hardly momentous yet through it the writer cleverly understates the threat at this point. The idea that just a few cups and plates were broken shows that he doesn’t feel that the event was particular significant. This is very different to the perspective of the writer of Source A which is focused on how tragic the landslide was and the needless waste of life that it resulted in. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5:** The following is the start of a response to this question -  *‘Young people in wealthy countries take what they have for granted: they should care more about young people suffering in poor parts of the world, and do more to help them.’*  *Write an article for a magazine of your choice in which you argue your response to this statement.*  In our world today there are many contrasts in countries development. You’ve got 1st world, 2nd world and 3rd world countries, but why do we limit, with names? Why don’t we thrive as a united world and develop together? My answer is ignorance. Ignorance is the way we live today, it’s the way we get by. But I do not speak for the whole world, just part of it.  People, most people today are ignorant and do not understand the depth of the problems and poverty the world has. We’ve got phone, computers, tv’s, ipods, ipads etc and all we care about is the next ones coming out, when some people worry whether they’re going to be able to feed their brothers and sisters or even parents for the night. I do believe young people are slowly losing the humanity they have left in them. |