

CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL

**REPORT ON CANDIDATES' WORK IN THE
CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®**

MAY/JUNE 2012

COMMUNICATION STUDIES

**Copyright © 2012 Caribbean Examinations Council ®
St Michael, Barbados
All rights reserved.**

GENERAL COMMENTS

Overall, candidates' performance in the 2012 Communications Studies examination continued to improve, with noticeably higher percentages earning Grades I and II; indeed, the percentage earning Grade I almost doubled that of 2011. The percentage of candidates achieving Grades I–V was approximately 95 per cent, following the pattern of the previous two years. Candidates improved their performance on Modules 2 and 3, with marked increases in the number of candidates achieving Grade I. They faltered on Module 1 however, where there was continuing decline in the percentage achieving Grade I.

There was appreciably better performance on Papers 01A and 02, with the respective means being noticeably greater than in 2011. Performance on Paper 031 held constant, while on Papers 01B and 032, it dropped – slightly, in the case of the former, and appreciably, in the case of the latter. (The drop in performance on Paper 01B partially explains the lower performance on Module 1 since that Paper covers only Module 1.)

DETAILED COMMENTS

Paper 01A – Short Answers

Section A – Module 1

Module 1 consisted of Questions 1 and 2, which were concerned with the research process. It tested candidates' knowledge of data collection methods, including the disadvantages of particular methods, and their ability to ensure validity of their data. The vast majority of candidates attempted both questions.

Question 1

The question came in three parts and was based on a scenario in which a Mr David Henry, the person in charge of discipline at Kingsman High School, was looking to research the reasons for students not doing homework. Part (a) asked candidates to identify two methods of data collection that Mr Henry could use for his research; Part (b) asked them to state one advantage and one disadvantage of the methods they had selected in Part (a); and Part (c) asked them to identify one activity Mr Henry could engage in to ensure validity of the data.

There were 14 270 responses and the mean score was 4.72 (out of 8).

For Part (a), stronger candidates were able to select two appropriate methods. Weaker candidates tended to just select any two methods without any thought as to whether these would have been suitable based on the scenario given. For example, many of them selected 'observation', but the scenario given ruled out that method completely. Also, weaker candidates had difficulty distinguishing between methods of collecting data (for example, questionnaires, interviews, observation, etc.) and research design (for example, case study).

In Part (b), stronger candidates provided appropriate advantages and disadvantages while weaker candidates tended to just select advantages and disadvantages from lists that had been memorized, without giving any consideration to the scenario; this resulted in inappropriate answers.

Part (c) presented the greatest challenge to candidates. It was obvious that many of them were not aware of the factors that may affect validity, and they confused validity with reliability. Teachers must make it clear to students that the scenario given is of utmost importance in the expected response. Candidates at

this level are expected to be able to apply knowledge and not simply regurgitate information. Also, at this level, candidates are expected to thoroughly familiarize themselves with the specialized vocabulary of the subject area.

Question 2

This question had three parts and was based on a scenario in which two students were discussing the sources for data and information in respect of research on teenage pregnancy which they were conducting for a Social Studies project. Part (a) asked candidates to identify a source of primary data and a source of both primary data and secondary information; Part (b) asked candidates to state how the sources identified in Part (a) (ii) might be useful to the research; and Part (c) asked candidates to identify two other sources from which the students might collect data for the research.

There were 14 262 responses and the mean score was 5.55 (out of 8).

For the most part, this question was well done but weaker candidates experienced great difficulty with Part (b), which required application of their knowledge.

Part (a) was well done, with the majority of the candidates scoring the maximum marks allocated. Those who scored under the maximum failed to distinguish between a source of only primary data and a source of both primary and secondary data.

Part (b) posed the greatest challenge for candidates, with weaker candidates supplying incomplete and/or general responses. For example, a weaker candidate would give a general answer such as ‘Actual interviews with teenage mothers would supply information from the teenagers themselves’ while a stronger candidate would be more specific and state something like *Interviews with teenage mothers would enable identification of support structures for the pregnant teenagers.*

Part (c) was the best done, with the majority of candidates scoring maximum marks. Candidates scoring under the maximum ignored the word *other* in the question and so identified teenage mothers as a possible source.

Section B – Module 2

This module consisted of Questions 3–6. Questions 3–4 tested candidates’ knowledge of issues related to the use of Creole and Standard Caribbean English; Question 5 tested their knowledge of forms of communication technology; and Question 6 tested their knowledge of register usage as well as their ability to evaluate speakers’ attitudes.

Generally, candidates demonstrated familiarity with the content targeted and performed reasonably well on the module. However, schools need to pay more attention to the exploration of the following areas: *linguistic features, register, and dialectal variety.*

Question 3

This question came in two parts and was based on an extract featuring the use of Creole and Caribbean Standard English. Part (a) asked candidates to give three examples of Creole structure that contrast with comparable Caribbean Standard English structures while Part (b) asked them to suggest two reasons why the writer might have used Creole in the extract.

There were 14 247 responses and the mean score was 5.61 (out of 7).

In Part (a), the majority of candidates responded well. However, too many candidates presented the general levels of language organization (for example, syntax, phonology, lexicon) without structures from the extract to illustrate them.

Teachers need to spend more time with their students on how to analyse what questions require, focusing on key task words. They should also ensure that they themselves are knowledgeable in the target areas.

For Part (b), there were numerous candidates that offered the barest of responses, resulting in low scores. Those candidates who scored full marks were able to (i) use the information which gave the source of the extract to determine the origin of the text; (ii) link the source of the extract with the writer's background; (iii) make a connection between the writer's choice of language and his intended audience and purpose; and (iv) recognize that writers use language both as a tool and as a subject.

Teachers are encouraged to provide students with ample opportunities to critically discuss the purposes of writing. This activity must be linked with the relationship between language choice and audience, context, and subject.

Question 4

This question came in two parts, with Part (a) asking candidates to identify challenges that native speakers of Creole might experience when learning Caribbean Standard English and Part (b) asking them to present an argument for and against the use of Creole in teaching.

There were 14 262 responses and the mean score was 5.76 (out of 8).

Part (a) saw a large variety of responses, many of which were vague and repetitive and, therefore, did not earn full marks. The candidates who were able to score full marks were those who did the following:

- Listed the features of language and provided a contrastive analysis in respect of each feature;
- Gave discrete and logical examples of these features;
- Associated the social factors that sometimes affect Creole speakers in their attempt to use/learn a standard language.

Teachers should teach this aspect of the syllabus by having their students examine the different ways that speakers of Creole can be affected. These include their ability to read, speak, and write the standard forms.

In Part (b), many candidates ignored the instruction to focus on the use of Creole *in teaching* and instead gave generic responses on the use of Creole in society, linking Creole with culture, history, and ancestral ties, but not mentioning how it could enhance learning. For the most part, candidates scored full marks for arguments against Creole use, especially in discussion of the pejorative terms and stereotypical attitudes associated with Creole languages.

Question 5

This question came in three parts and was based on a dialogue between a father and his son Barry on the latter's taste in song. Part (a) asked candidates to suggest a reason why Barry understood a song while his father did not; Part (b) asked for two forms of communication technology Barry could use in a speech to parents to persuade them to listen to dancehall music; and Part (c) asked for an explanation of the suitability of the forms of communication in Part (b).

There were 14 266 responses and the mean score was 6.06 (out of 8).

Most candidates performed well on this question, as the mean shows.

Question 6

This question had three parts and was based on a scenario in which a caller to a fashion boutique was displeased at the speech and attitude of the clerk who answered. Part (a) asked candidates to give a reason for the caller's displeasure; Part (b) asked them to suggest alternative responses from the clerk that would elicit a favourable reaction from the caller; and Part (c) asked them to assume the role of the clerk's supervisor and give a suggestion for improving communication between employees and customers.

There were 14 271 responses and the mean score was 6.21 (out of 7).

This was the best done of the questions in the module.

Section C – Module 3

This module consisted of Questions 7–10. Questions 7–8 tested candidates' ability to plan a presentation for effective communication, using elements and types of both verbal and non-verbal communication; Question 9 tested their knowledge of the order of the stages of communication as well as their ability to explain and interpret the meanings of speakers in a communication context; and Question 10 tested their knowledge of information and communication technologies as well as the purposes for which they are used.

Question 7

This question came in three parts and was based on a scenario in which candidates were asked to assume the role of an advertising executive who was about to plan a presentation to a group of CAPE Communication Studies students on the advantages and limitations of advertising. Part (a) asked candidates to list two elements of the communication process, other than the medium, which they should consider in planning the presentation; Part (b) asked them to state a reason why the medium was an important element to consider in planning the presentation; and Part (c) asked them to anticipate that their message might not be clear enough to some members of the audience and, accordingly, to state two ways in which they would deal with the barrier.

There were 14 225 responses and the mean score was 4.94 (out of 8).

In Part (a), many candidates were unable to distinguish between elements of the communication process and the steps of that process, and did not read the instructions carefully hence they identified *medium* although instructed to exclude it.

Part (b) was done quite well by most candidates, with the very weak offering a definition rather than a reason. Part (c) was the most challenging for candidates, with too many of them treating *barrier* as mostly physical.

Question 8

This question came in three parts and was based on the same scenario as Question 7. Part (a) asked candidates to identify three types of non-verbal communication, other than graphics, that they would take into account in preparing their presentation; Part (b) asked them to describe a form of graphics they would use in their presentation; and Part (c) asked them to give a reason why they would use that form of graphics.

There were 14 169 responses and the mean score was 4.35 (out of 7).

For Part (a), many candidates interpreted the question fairly well while others gave examples rather than types of non-verbal communication.

In Part (b), many candidates did not understand the term *graphics* and so did not describe the form of graphics that they would use in their presentation or give a reason for using it; instead, they named the form of graphic.

For Part (c), those candidates who did not do well erred in their focus, choosing to provide a reason for the presentation rather than for their use of a form of graphics.

Question 9

This question had three parts and was based on a scenario in which a class misunderstood a question asked by a teacher. Part (a) asked candidates to identify the stages between which the students' interpretations occur; Part (b) asked them to suggest two reasons why the teacher thought they had not listened to her; and Part (c) asked them to give the purpose for one of the teacher's comments.

There were 14 180 responses and the mean score for this question was 4.64 (out of 8).

In Part (a), most candidates were able to identify at least one of the two stages required, usually the teacher's feedback. Interestingly, a small number of candidates wrote either numbers to represent the stages, or both numbers and their ostensible stages.

For Part (b), the majority of candidates performed quite well while others provided vague or general statements and not the (specific) reasons asked for. Weaker candidates either had only one full response of the two required or gave two full responses worded differently, but conveying the same point.

In Part (c), stronger candidates were rewarded for responses that indicated either the notion of students' misinterpretation or their lack of attention as the purpose for the teacher's comment. Weaker candidates based their answers on the emotional state of the teacher, stating that, for example, 'she shouted', or 'she was frustrated', or 'she was angry'.

Question 10

This question came in two parts and was based on a scenario in which a Communication Studies teacher intended to shift to more up-to-date information and communication technologies. Part (a) asked candidates to suggest three examples of more up-to-date information and communication technology while Part (b) asked them to give a purpose for which the teacher might use each of the examples suggested in Part (a).

There were 14 021 responses and the mean score was 4.33 (out of 7).

In Part (a), candidates generally did well, scoring at least two of the three marks. Weaker candidates clearly ignored the scenario as they gave responses such as ‘projector’ and ‘slide shows’, which the scenario indicated would be replaced by more up-to-date technologies. In some instances, general responses such as ‘social networks’ and ‘internet facilities’ were given.

For Part (b), many candidates were challenged to provide purposes for which the teacher might use the technologies focusing instead on student use of technologies or benefits to be derived from using them, and providing incomplete answers.

Paper 01B – Aural Comprehension

This paper was based only on Module 1 objectives and consisted of four questions related to a passage for listening comprehension. Generally, it was poorly done.

Question 1

This question asked candidates to state the writer’s main purpose in no more than 25 words. There were 14 273 responses and the mean score was 0.75 (out of 3).

The examiners expected good answers to recognize the end/beginning of a phase in a young man’s life reflected in the stillness of converging circumstances. Many students were able to score at least a mark on the question, but far too many provided unusual responses like ‘...a baby spending the first year of his life on a jetty’, ‘...a funeral occurring’, or ‘...a tsunami approaching to destroy a city’. Many candidates also ill-advisedly expressed their answer as a purposive statement: ‘The writer’s main purpose is to show/tell/describe/explain...’; they are advised to use phrases like the following in the stem of their answers: *is about*, *deals with* or *is that*. Very weak candidates saw the passage as a purely descriptive one about a beach scene, without any reference to the end/beginning of a phase in someone’s life.

Question 2

This question required candidates to identify four pieces of evidence that they used to identify the main purpose.

There were 14 248 responses and the mean score was 3.08 (out of 4).

As usual, it was the best done of the questions. Many candidates were able to score full marks on this question, but a troubling number offered general statements or detailed explanatory statements or rhetorical devices. A few candidates also ignored the explicit connection between Question 1 and this question, so their responses were totally divorced from their response in that question.

Teachers should emphasize the need to extract specific details from the passage in relation to the previous question, and students should make every effort to differentiate their details and avoid repetition, either in quoted or paraphrased form, across the answers provided.

Question 3

This question came in two parts, with Part (a) requiring candidates to identify two literary devices used in the passage and Part (b) requiring them to give an example of each of the devices identified in Part (a). There were 14 273 responses and the mean score was 3.00 (out of 4).

Many candidates were able to satisfy the requirements of the first part of the question but were unable to provide examples to support their responses. Far too many candidates continue to identify ‘description’ and other discourse types as literary devices. Candidates are also listing ‘imagery’ as a device, which is not acceptable; qualifying the type of imagery (for example, *visual*, *auditory*, *olfactory*) is, however. Additionally, some candidates produced their own examples (for example, ‘Bob Marley is the Michael Jordan of reggae music’). Some candidates confused simile and metaphor, and paradox and oxymoron.

Teachers should research and compile an extensive list of devices complete with examples so as to reduce the incidence of candidates giving ‘adjectives’ and ‘description’ as possible devices.

Question 4

The question asked candidates to comment on the effectiveness of the device used in each of the examples given for Question 3 (b).

There were 14 211 responses and the mean score was 0.50 (out of 4).

Most candidates were severely challenged by this question. Instead of discussing the device as used in the passage, they merely defined it or explained it in terms of what it was basically used to do, as, for example, in ‘The simile was effective because it compared the jetty’s posts to black sentinels’. Many of them also had problems making the link between the use of the devices and the main idea, as well as expressing effectiveness in terms of the purpose of the writer and the desired appeal.

This question, more than any other, brought out candidates’ weaknesses in vocabulary and listening skills. Words that seemed unfamiliar to them included *jetty*, *sentinels*, and *hung*.

Recommendations

- There should be more intensive practice in listening comprehension exercises in preparation for the examination. Teachers should discuss with students the requirements of the various questions during these preparatory sessions.
- For Question 2, even though paraphrasing is allowed, teachers should emphasize the need to quote specific details from the passage, which would assist students in identifying examples of the devices and discussing the effectiveness of their use in the quoted examples.
- Far more careful focus needs to be placed on the study of the effective use of literary devices.

Paper 02 – Essays

Paper 02 consisted of three questions – one per module.

Section A – Module 1

Question 1

The question came in two parts, with Part (a) requiring candidates to, in no more than 30 words, state the main point of a passage adapted from the website <http://www.physorg.com/news10031.html>, and Part (b) requiring them to write an essay of no more than 500 words, stating the writer’s purpose, discussing three organizational strategies and three language techniques used to achieve the purpose, and evaluating the validity of the information presented.

There were 14 251 responses and the mean score was 11.48 (out of 25) as compared to 10.66 in 2011.

Candidates' overall performance continues to be fair, with the better candidates demonstrating competence in all the components of the question. Weaker candidates struggled with (i) identification of the problem and purpose, (ii) differentiation of language techniques and organizational strategies, (iii) expression generally, and (iv) evaluation of the information provided. Vague answers abounded, and numerous candidates did not know how to organize their ideas and information in a coherent manner or how to discuss how particular language techniques and organizational strategies were used to achieve the writer's purpose.

As has been recommended in previous years, candidates need to (i) more deeply study how different authors organize text to present messages and achieve particular purposes, and (ii) regularly practise producing written commentary that is structured as a matter of course along the lines of introduction, thematic development, coherence, cohesion and conclusion. It goes without saying that they need to keep increasing their stock of vocabulary and improving their control of the grammar and mechanics of academic English.

Section B – Module 2

Question 2

The question required candidates to write an essay of no more than 500 words on a passage adapted from Samuel Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*, discussing the use of language, with a focus on (i) the varieties of language used by Harris and Five and what they reveal about each character, and (ii) what they noticed in the relationship between Harris' verbal and non-verbal communication and his character.

There were 14 211 responses and the mean score was 11.37 (out of 25), which was similar to the 2011 mean (11.63).

For Part (i), stronger candidates were able to identify the language variety used by Harris (Standard British English) and Five (Trinidadian Creole) in the passage, and make the relevant associations between the characters' personas and the language they used; they were also able to correctly identify and comment on the characters' use of language. Weaker candidates used terms like 'acrolect', 'basilect', and 'dialect' without due regard for context, suggesting they had merely memorized the terms.

Part (ii) was less successfully handled by candidates. Stronger candidates were able to provide reasonably intelligent discussion on the relationship between Harris' character and his verbal and non-verbal communication, but weaker ones merely repeated incidents from the passage without any attempt at meaningful analysis.

Several candidates did not attempt the question while others either summarized the passage or regurgitated bits and pieces of its content in short, inadequate responses. Some candidates had apparently been prepared for a question that required a video representation and discussion of dialectal variation, and they responded to such a question, reflecting a disengagement with the actual task.

With respect to organization, many candidates were challenged to produce an essay with an introduction, well-developed body paragraphs, and a conclusion. Too many of the responses were structurally deficient, and there was sparse and inconsistent use of transitional devices to achieve coherence and cohesion. In some cases where introductions and/or conclusions were attempted, they were ineffectively developed. Some candidates merely produced one extended paragraph.

With regard to expression, many candidates showed that it was a struggle to (i) agree subjects with verbs, (ii) select the right tense, (iii) use tenses consistently, (iv) control complex syntax, (v) choose the right word, (vi) spell words correctly, (vii) punctuate correctly, and (viii) use the appropriate register/level of formality.

It was clear that composing an essay continues to be difficult for numerous students. Accordingly, it is recommended that teachers seek to hone their essay-teaching skills and place emphasis on the structure of expository essays and on fundamental topics like (i) effectively introducing expository essays, (ii) expressing controlling ideas, (iii) stating the theme and constituent topics, (iv) illustrating a point, (v) making a paragraph cohesive, (vi) making transitions from paragraph to paragraph, (vii) effectively concluding expository essays, and (viii) applying theoretical content in the module to authentic language/communication situations.

Section C – Module 3

Question 3

This question asked candidates to write an essay of no more than 500 words based on a scenario in which their community had decided to host a Family Day and the candidate was selected to serve as Public Relations Officer with substantial funds to promote the event, targeting adolescents. The essay had to include the plan of action the candidate proposed to undertake to promote the event, and the plan itself had to include (i) three strategies for reaching adolescents in the community and one way of achieving each strategy, (ii) language registers and varieties that would be considered appropriate; and (iii) how the candidate's knowledge of the process of communication would help him or her to conduct a successful promotion.

There were 14 159 responses and the mean score was 13.24 (out of 25). It was the best-done of the three questions.

Stronger candidates excelled in content, organization and expression. Weaker candidates fell into three general groups: those weak in content but strong in organization and expression; those strong in content but weak in organisation and expression; and those weak in all three areas. Some of the weaker candidates also misinterpreted the question, providing speeches, drawings of flyers and banners, and examples of messages in lieu of, or in addition to, the essay. In respect of Part (i), some could not distinguish between *strategy* and *way* and provided, in some cases, literary devices and persuasive techniques as strategies. For Part (ii), some confused *register* and *variety* and used terms like 'basilect', 'mesolect', and 'Creole' without any clear sense of their meanings. Part (iii) was the easiest for the candidates, but many of them simply listed the steps in the communication process rather than discussing how knowledge of such steps would help them in the promotion.

It is recommended that candidates spend more time on the following: (i) the organization, grammar, and mechanics of their essay writing; (ii) the use of technology in communication; (iii) different ways of advertising and promoting events; and (iv) the use of appropriate language varieties and strategies in such advertisements and promotions.

Paper 031 – School-Based Assessment

The Portfolio

The School-Based Assessment requires candidates to compile a portfolio on a theme organized under the sections: General Introduction, Exposition, Reflection, and Analysis. The General Introduction should identify the theme and the purpose for selecting it and show its relation to the student's personal, academic, and work interests. The Exposition, which is not assessed by CXC examiners, is orally presented and examined and should treat a topic of current interest. The Reflection should consist of a sample of original work created by the student in relation to the theme and covering one literary genre, and should include a Preface specifying the purpose, intended audience, and context. Under Analysis, the student is required to analyse the sample provided under Reflection, addressing any two of the following: registers, dialectal variation, attitudes to language, and communicative behaviours. A sample of assignments from each participating school is re-assessed by CXC examiners who may adjust the marks awarded by teachers in the samples.

In many instances, the CXC examiners' marks differed significantly from those of the teachers.

General Introduction

Weaker candidates failed to show (i) how the theme was treated in the Reflection sample; (ii) what aspects of it were discussed in the Exposition task; and (iii) how it related to their academic, work-related, and personal interests.

Reflection

Overall, highly creditable creative pieces were produced by students, who interpreted the selected theme quite effectively and, in some cases, with refreshing uniqueness. Weaker students failed to (i) provide the required particulars of the Preface; (ii) highlight the theme selected in their creative pieces; (iii) choose themes that either lent themselves to creative development or reflected the genre selected; and (iv) understand the meaning of *context*, seeing it as circumstances or an environment in which the piece was written instead of a situation or forum (for example, magazine, play) in which it could be shared; and (vi) write clearly and concisely.

Analysis

Students should have included in their reflective pieces two of the features they intended to analyse since, without them, they could hardly provide meaningful discussion. While there were students who were able to provide good discussions, defining and linking the features to the communication of the theme, too many students continued to display a general weakness in their presentation even though the features to be discussed have been reduced from four to two. Some students were still only able to define the features and reproduce their class notes, but not to apply them by stating why the features chosen were included in the creative piece or how they contributed to the development of the theme. Some students also provided analyses that were more literary than linguistic.

General Observations

- As previously mentioned, teacher marking did not strictly enough follow the marking guidelines — to the students' disadvantage.
- Although students are required to provide a brief overview of the theme, too much information was included, limiting their ability to adequately discuss the other areas.

- A bibliography should be provided by the students — in part, to indicate that students used sources to support their statements.
- Students included a lot of profane language in their reflective pieces. They should be helped to see that this is not only distasteful but also unnecessary.

Paper 032 – Alternative to School-Based Assessment

Paper 032 consisted of three questions – one per module. Performance on it continues to be weak.

Section A – Module 1

Question 1

This question required candidates to imagine themselves as researchers who were doing research on major developments in science and technology and who had come across the article ‘Connections’ in the textbook *Mastering CXC English* by Clive Borely and Hollis Knight, and to (i) summarize the article in no more than 60 words, and (ii) to write, in no more than 150 words, an evaluation of the article that explored the validity of the information.

There were 119 responses and the mean was 6.32 (out of 20).

The question was poorly done, with few candidates able to respond appropriately — for reasons detailed in previous reports. Most candidates’ response showed a lack of awareness of the demands of the syllabus, the format of the question and, in particular, what it means to evaluate information to determine its validity.

This difficulty was compounded by severe weaknesses in expression and organization.

Section B – Module 2

Question 2

This question required candidates to write an essay of no more than 300 words analysing (i) dialectal variation, (ii) communicative behaviours, and (iii) use of register in an excerpt from Samuel Selvon’s ‘Working the Transport’ adapted from *Ways of Sunlight*.

There were 118 responses and the mean was 6.81 (out of 20).

The question was also poorly done. Most students struggled to explain and provide evidence for the different categories, and they made no distinction between *dialect* and *creole*. Their inability to compose was very evident.

Section C – Module Three

Question 3

This question required candidates to, on an extract from ‘Brooklyn Crush’ by Kelly Magnus in *Caribbean Beat* (September/October, 2005), write an essay of no more than 250 words discussing (i) the writer’s intended audience, (ii) the writer’s purpose, (iii) how the writer engages the audience, and (iv) two contexts other than the printed word that would be suitable for the extract.

There were 117 responses and the mean was 8.04 (out of 20).

This was candidates' best question, but they were generally ill-prepared to respond to it, demonstrating incompetence in providing content for each of the categories, as well as in organizing and expressing whatever ideas they had. As previously mentioned, students were not familiar with either the demands of the syllabus or the format of the question.

Conclusion

Recommendations have been provided in the different sections of this report to help teachers improve their practice, and these should be associated with those given in the new syllabus. In particular, teachers are urged to expand their knowledge of the foci of the three modules by reading more intensively and extensively, devoting time for reflection on the new knowledge gained from such reading, and trying out new research-based methods of delivering their content.