

FIRST LANGUAGE KOREAN

Paper 0521/01

Reading

Key Messages

- To score full marks in **Question 1**, candidates should give clear, precise and well-constructed answers.
- Pay attention to the marks available to be sure whether answers required are simple ones or complex/detailed ones with multiple points to cover.
- Respond precisely to the wording of questions.
- **Question 2** answers require comparison and contrast between text 1 and text 2. Thoughts and ideas should be organised and written in a cohesive fashion using relevant connectives.
- To score full marks for language/style/organisation, candidates should present their answers in syntactically more complex sentences, not in bullet points or a list of notes.

General comments

Candidates performed well on this paper and there were many positive features in their responses. Most candidates demonstrated their comprehension of the texts and tasks. Some candidates produced work of an exceptionally high standard, showing their ability to analyse and evaluate relevant information from the text for each question with a clear and appropriate style of language in their answers.

However, some candidates did not fully address the questions and/or answered them only partially. Candidates should pay attention to the marks available for each question in order to know how much information is required to answer fully. Some questions required a simple answer indicated by one mark available, but some required more complex answers with many points to be made.

In addition, some candidates did not present their answers in full sentences where necessary. Candidates should be made aware that answers presented in basic forms such as bullet points, a list of notes or syntactically too simple sentences, will have a negative impact on marks available for language.

Candidates should also be reminded that they should use a relevant and consistent style of language for their answers, rather than mixing different styles of language.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Generally, all of the sub-questions were answered well. Questions **1(a)**, **1(b)** and **1(d)** required simple and straightforward answers, and, as such, were answered correctly by the majority of candidates. Candidates also answered **Question 1(f)** well, finding and writing the appropriate lines/phrases which show that the South Korean army is pushed back, which are ‘맥빠진 몰골’, ‘수 없이 밀려오는 탱크’, ‘탱크에 이쪽 대포알이 명중하여도 움쩍도 않는다.’ ‘불안의 낯덩이’, etc.

However, some answers to more stretching questions, such as **1(c)** and **1(j)**, lacked precise answers and/or discussion. **Question 1(c)** asked candidates to write at least three reactions from South Korea to the plea letter (호소문) from North Korea as written in the diary for the day of 25th June. Many candidates answered correctly that the South Korean government kept the details of the plea letter in secret, made the messengers who brought the letter turn to South Korea, tortured the messengers and announced that the messengers betrayed North Korea. However, some candidates mistakenly wrote that the South Korean government sent the messengers back to North Korea and revealed the absurdity/irrationality of the plea honourably, which is precisely what the South Korean government should have done in the author’s opinion, but didn’t.

Some candidates answered **Question 1(e)** inadequately. Candidates were asked to write what Mr Kang's attitude was to the newspaper report in lines 37–39. His attitude was cynical/sarcastic, negative/pessimistic or critical. Some candidate answered wrongly that Mr Kang was too young to understand, uninterested, or naïve, etc.

Many candidates answered **Question 1(h)** correctly, but some candidates gave answers that were too simple and/or incorrect. The question asks candidates to write what the special characteristics/features of text 1 are. The text is a diary written by a historian; it recorded historical events chronologically rather than personal events and the author viewed the events factually and objectively. Some candidates answered simply that the writing shows the date or that the author was very critical, which is not an adequate answer for this question.

Question 2

The majority of candidates successfully linked and explored the common themes of the two texts, compared the texts and answered the question as instructed. Many candidates answered the question correctly with good use of their own words and complex syntax. However, some candidates did not fully understand the question and did not give specific answers to each question. As mentioned in the General Comments above, candidates should pay attention to the marks available for each question in order to know how much information is required to answer fully. **Question 2(a)** requires more complex and detailed comparison in an organised fashion, which is indicated by twelve marks available. Some candidates gave more detailed answers for **Question 2(b)**, which is worth three marks, than **Question 2(a)**, which is worth twelve marks.

Question 2(a) asked candidates to write about the difference between what the government said through the media and the actual situation after the war broke out. Many candidates identified and linked the differences well and presented answers in well-structured sentences in a cohesive manner. Some of the answers included that the government announced only positive news through the media, e.g. the South Korean army being superior/predominant, fighting well and chasing the retreating North Korean, that the army would occupy Pyongyang within three to five days and that the government assured the nation that the UN was going to help so the nation could relax. However, the reality was that the North Korean army passed through Uijeongbu (의정부) in a day and was advancing towards Seoul, South Korean soldiers were retreating exhausted and the gunfire was audible in Seoul. President Lee escaped from Seoul on the 27th June secretly and broadcast on the radio with pre-recorded messages. The South Korean army blew up the bridge on the Han River, and caused massive casualties. The North Korean army took Seoul completely within three days of the war breaking out, and within two months all South Korean territory except North Kyungsang Province was taken by North Korean army. Some candidates did not write about the differences and did not compare propaganda with reality but only wrote about the one or the other.

Question 2(b) asked candidates to summarise what the common view of the authors of text 1 and text 2 was towards their government. Candidates should compare the two texts and organise their thoughts and ideas in a cohesive fashion using relevant connectives. Many candidates successfully identified the common views and linked the thoughts cohesively, but some candidates simply wrote that they both authors criticised their government, which is not adequate to be awarded three marks. Some candidates gave answers in the style of a list of notes which had a negative impact on the marks available for languages.

FIRST LANGUAGE KOREAN

Paper 0521/02

Writing

Key messages

To do well on this paper, essays should be accurate, use a wide range of vocabulary and structures, be well organised and coherent, with well-developed ideas. Essays should focus entirely on the given question.

General comments

Candidates are given a choice of four titles for the discussion / argumentative essay (Section 1) and four for the narrative / descriptive essay (Section 2) and they need to choose one title to answer on from each Section. The essays are each marked out of 25: a maximum mark of 12 for style and accuracy and a maximum of 13 for task achievement. The best essays were fluent and well-structured, with candidates addressing the title throughout.

This year the questions in Discussion and Argument section in particular seemed to be popular to with candidates and it has yielded essays that developed their argument easily and effectively. Top marks were scored by essays with a good structure and cohesive and detailed arguments. The quality of writing seems to have improved compared to last year for this section.

In the Narration and Description section narration was – as always – more popular than description; however, the best essays tended to be the descriptive rather than the narrative ones. Describing atmosphere, movements or images seemed to stimulate better writing than story telling did. This is due to the fact that in many cases narrative essays did little more than list a series of events or present a straightforward story with little character building or creations of a setting.

As far as language is concerned, many candidates gave evidence of a good command of grammar and accuracy in their language, chosen the right style for their writing and impressed with wide-ranging vocabulary. There are still some areas for improvement in punctuation and spacing between words (띄어쓰기). For example: –지 않다 and 안 하다 (some candidates still write **않** 하다), **얇은** 채로 (which should be **얇은** 채로), **틀어진** 날 이다 (should be **틀어진** 날이다), etc.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 - Discussion and Argument

- (a) 동물원은 왜 필요합니까 그렇게 생각한다면 왜 그런지 반대한다면 왜 그런지 논하십시오.

This was the second popular topic. Most candidates made clear and relatively well-supported arguments about the advantages and disadvantages of zoos.

- (b) 공연이나 운동 경기 등을 직접 공연장이나 경기장에 가서 보는 것이 TV로 보는 것보다 훨씬 재미있다' 이 주장에 대해 동의합니까? 동의하지 않습니까? 이유를 들어 논하십시오.

Candidates who chose this title have had no trouble making relevant points about the merits of live events vs. TV and supported their opinions with evidence.

- (c) 10대 청소년들이 학생일 때에 일하는 것을 허용해야 합니까? 이에 대해 어떻게 생각하는지 논하십시오.

This was most popular question and about 40% of candidates chose it. The essays written on this topic were generally good, with relevant points and clear arguments in support of or opposition to teenage students being allowed to work. However, some answers tended to be repetitive and/or had overly long examples.

- (d) 원자력 발전은 꼭 필요한 에너지원이므로 유지되어야 한다.' 이 주장에 대해 찬성하는지 반대하는지 논하십시오.

This was the least popular topic but those candidates who choose it mostly wrote essays of excellent quality. There were detailed arguments pro and contra using nuclear energy, with well-structured paragraphs forming cohesive and well-sequenced essays. The use of specialist terminology was also impressive in a number of essays.

Section 2 - Description and Narration

- (a) 족기 전에 보고 싶은 발명품을 하나 골라 묘사해 보십시오.

This was the least popular question in this section, but similarly to Section 1 the candidates who chose this question produced quality essays. There were some excellent descriptions of the inventions candidates chose with well-developed ideas, vivid images and a range of details.

- (b) 다른 나라에는 없는 한국적인 관습을 골라 묘사해 보십시오.

The essays written about Korean customs were generally satisfactory, with good-quality writing, containing some detail and relevant points but there was some repetition and occasionally some lack of structure.

- (c) 모든 것이 틀어진 날이라는 주제로 이야기를 만들어 보십시오.

This was the second popular question in this section. Many interesting stories were offered, but a number of essays lacked character development and had no setting.

- (d) Write story beginning with – 그는 그날 그 일에 대해 전혀 기억을 못 한다. 도대체 왜 그 일을 그의 기억에서 깨끗이 지워졌을까? 를 시작으로 소설의 한 부분을 쓰십시오.

This was the most popular topic in Section 2. The writing was generally a straightforward with satisfactory creation of atmosphere and setting but many times with a lack of plot and structure.