



OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS

LEVEL 2 FUNCTIONAL SKILLS ENGLISH

09499/02

PRACTICE PAPER 3 – BR07 READING TASK AND ANSWER BOOKLET

TIME: 55 MINUTES

Your surname or family name [grid]

Your first forename (if any) [grid]

Your second forename (if any) [grid]

Date of birth [grid]

Centre name [grid]

Centre number [grid]

Your OCR candidate number [grid]

FOR EXAMINER USE ONLY	
Question No	Mark
R1	/3
R2	/3
R3	/4
R4	/4
R5	/3
R6	/4
R7	/4
<b>Total</b>	<b>/25</b>

YOU NEED

- This task and answer booklet.
- A pen with black ink **OR** access to a computer and printer to print out your responses which should be firmly attached to this booklet.

You may use a dictionary and spell/grammar check facilities but you must not ask anyone to help you.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CANDIDATES

Do NOT open this booklet until you are told to do so by the supervisor.

Fill in all the boxes above. Make sure your personal details are entered correctly. Use BLOCK LETTERS.

- Write your answer to each question in the space provided in this answer booklet or attach your printouts to this booklet before handing in.
- Additional answer space can be found on pages 17 and 18.
- If you use extra paper, make sure that it has your name, candidate number, centre number and question number(s) on it and is securely attached to this booklet.
- When you have finished, hand this booklet to the supervisor.

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**RESOURCE DOCUMENTS**

Document 1 (page 5), Document 2 (page 7) and Document 3 (page 9) contain information to help you answer the Reading task.

- The resource documents are perforated along the left hand side. You can remove them from the Reading task and answer booklet.
- Please fold page 5, page 7 and page 9 along the perforated strip before removing them from the Reading task and answer booklet.
- You have **55 minutes** to read the resource documents and answer questions 1 to 7. You should spend about **5 – 10** minutes of this time reading the resource documents.

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# The Sanderham Telegraph

## University courses - too long and too expensive?

**By James Mason**

Many universities are now thinking about reducing their three year degree courses, says a report published today. This move is, in part, a response to the proposed substantial increase in tuition fees. The thinking is that the students would receive the same amount of teaching time as they currently do, but that it would be condensed into two years.

The report states, "There are only 24 weeks in the average university year. So universities provide around 72 weeks of teaching in total over three years. This could easily be squeezed into 36 weeks per year over two years - which would still allow for holidays and marking".

A two year course could cost a university as little as £10,000 per student. Students would not suffer, because they would still have the same number of contact hours. In terms of cost, students would indeed benefit substantially. Their debts would be much lower.

University lecturers would have to change their way of working. There would have to be a split between research institutions and universities which concentrate on teaching. The move would allow academics to find more time for tuition, with staff teaching throughout the year rather than taking long summer holidays. "If we have to pay for our education," said a Students' Union representative, "we need value for money. We are not going to subsidise university lecturers who have spent too long in their ivory towers, pretending to do research – it's time they woke up and smelt the coffee".

The University of Sanderham will shortly hold a Governors' meeting to decide whether they should investigate further the option of offering two year courses.

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# The Sanderham Telegraph

## Letters to the Editor

---

---

Dear Sir

### **Disaster looms for Universities**

I must take issue with the recent article by James Mason.

University tuition fees are about to treble. This will have disastrous consequences for students. Many will decide not to go to university and will spend the rest of their lives in jobs that are well beneath their ability. Others will decide to go to university in spite of the danger of spiralling debt, and will be paying off that debt for decades to come. Neither alternative is acceptable.

The rise in tuition fees will also have disastrous effects on university lecturers. Instead of letting students explore and research their subjects, lecturers will be pressurised into producing exam results. Lecturers will be expected to spoonfeed students instead of giving them space to develop. Lecturers will not be able to develop their own research interests and write papers – which not only will make the research world a poorer place, but will also make Britain even poorer.

However, the third alternative, suggested by a recent report and advocated by James Mason in his recent article in this paper, offers no solution at all. Condensing courses and cramming learning into a shorter timescale will be disastrous for students. Can anyone doubt it? There are many reasons why it will be a disaster:

- Students need time to develop. Surely everyone can see that? A degree is far more complicated and demands much more maturity, reflection and study than A levels. In their second year, students are not ready to take final exams – a two year course will mean poorer quality degrees and graduates who are not ready for the world of work.
- Students need to be inspired. Students deserve value for money – and at the moment they are getting it. Today's lecturers are researching a subject they love, and writing papers – this is why they inspire students. Professor Brian Cox, famous for his TV programmes, is at the cutting edge of research into astrophysics. His enthusiasm interests students far more than the teachings of some dull old curmudgeon who has never been at the leading edge of research.
- Universities will turn into conveyor belts, churning out degrees without caring about study or reflection.

At the moment, we are between the frying pan and the fire. Some people are offering to save us by throwing us into the burning bonfire!

Yours faithfully

Alison Taylor

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



## Document 3

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Back Forward Stop Refresh Home Search Favorites History

Address [www.uosstudentvoice/coz/forum](http://www.uosstudentvoice/coz/forum)

## University of Sanderham – Student Voice

Your chance to discuss issues that affect you today!

---

**Kim Baness, student**

We are the lucky ones – we don't have to pay the exorbitant fees that future students will have to pay. Up to £9,000 a year. If I'd been paying that sort of money, I'd have thought long and hard before coming to university. I'm looking forward to starting a good, well paid job. If I hadn't gone to university, I'd be working now in a boring, low paid job with no hope for the future.

---

**Jamed Magden, lecturer**

British Universities are the best in the world! Their success is unparalleled. They produce the best graduates and the best research. So, what about the future? Either we are going to charge ridiculous fees and students will stop coming, or we are going to charge reasonable fees and go bankrupt. Either way, I see no hope for the future of Britain. **None at all!**

---

**Samson Jaguar, student**

One thing's for certain, if I have to pay higher fees for my tuition, I'm going to demand better tuition. Aren't you? Some lecturers are getting away with poorly delivered tutorials, cancelling lectures and not marking work. If we students have to pay a lot more, we won't put up with that sort of treatment, I can tell you. I thought I wasn't in favour of higher fees, but if we get better courses – perhaps it will be worth it?

---

**Majid Alistair, students' union rep**

University fees are spiralling, as is the number of students coming to university. Don't assume this new increase in fees will be the last! Student debt is out of control. Many students will have to declare themselves bankrupt. In any case, there are no jobs left. Young people today have no future. Fact. No hope left. **The end!**

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**TASK AND ANSWER PAGES**

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**READING TASK (25 marks)**

**INFORMATION**

You have **55 minutes** to read the resource documents and answer questions 1 to 7. You should spend about **5 – 10** minutes of this time reading the resource documents.

Answer **all** the questions using information from the documents.

You do **not** need to write in sentences.

**Scenario**

A friend is thinking about going to Sanderham University and has shown you an article in the local newspaper (Document 1), a letter to the editor of the Sanderham Telegraph (Document 2) and a web forum from Sanderham University (Document 3).

**1** What is the purpose of **each** document?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(3 marks)

**2** Explain what is meant by the word “spiralling” as used in the documents. Identify **two** examples of what is described in the documents as “spiralling”.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(3 marks)



**5** In your opinion, how might students react when the increase in tuition fees is introduced?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(3 marks)

**6** Describe the techniques used by the writers to persuade the reader in:

**a)** Document 2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(2 marks)

and

**b)** Document 3

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(2 marks)









**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office: 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466

OCR is an exempt Charity

/



**OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS**

**OCR FUNCTIONAL SKILLS  
QUALIFICATION IN ENGLISH AT LEVEL 2**

**This assessment may be taken within these dates:  
PRACTICE PAPER 3**

**Mark Scheme**

The maximum mark for the Reading paper is [25]

## Functional Skills English L2 Mark Scheme – Reading (25 marks)

### Reading (25 marks)

Q	M/S Ref	Description	Type of Response	Mark allocation	Total marks
1	2R1	<p>Candidate has identified purposes eg</p> <p>Doc 1:</p> <p>a) to inform people about a possible solution to the rise in student fees</p> <p>b) to suggest that university courses might become two years instead of three</p> <p>Doc 2:</p> <p>c) to criticise the author of Document 1</p> <p>d) to oppose the introduction of two year courses</p> <p>Doc 3:</p> <p>e) to share the views of different people about the increase in student fees</p> <p>f) to give people the chance to say what they think about student fees.</p> <p>Accept any other valid points</p>	Closed	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 1)</b></p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 1)</b></p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 1)</b></p>	<b>3</b>
2	2R1	<p>Spiralling in this context means increasing out of control.</p> <p>Examples: a) debt b) fees c) number of students going to university</p>	Open	<p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 1)</b></p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 2)</b></p>	<b>3</b>
3	2R2	<p>Candidate has compared the views of the student union representative and Alison Taylor on the suggestion that university courses might be condensed into two years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some identification of the student union representative's views or Alison's views but no comparison</li> <li>• some identification of the student union representative's views and Alison's views but little comparison</li> <li>• reasonable comparison of the two views though at times implicit (eg by juxtaposing related points. For example, the union rep says that lecturers pretend to do research. Alison's suggests that lecturers are at the leading edge of research.)</li> <li>• good and explicit comparison of the two views including specific examples from each (eg both believe that students should be getting value for money, but Alison's believes that they are getting it where the student union representative does not believe that they are.)</li> </ul>	Open	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<b>4</b>

Q	M/S Ref	Description	Type of Response	Mark allocation	Total marks
4	2R2	<p>Candidate has compared the opinions expressed in the letter (Document 2) with those of contributors to the Students' Forum on the effect a rise in university fees will have on university lecturers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some identification of the claims made by Alison or some identification of Students' Forum contributors' views</li> <li>• some identification of the claims made by Alison and some identification of Students' Forum contributors' views</li> <li>• reasonable explanation of a range of views expressed, though at times the explanation is implicit (eg by juxtaposing related views from both documents)</li> <li>• good and explicit comparison of all views including specific examples from each document</li> </ul>	Open	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	4
5	2R3	<p>Candidate has given their opinion on how students might react when the increase in student fees is introduced with valid explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opinion(s) given with little or no explanation</li> <li>• opinion(s) given with brief explanation, which may include personal opinion</li> <li>• opinion(s) given, with good explanations from the documents and/or personal opinion</li> </ul>	Open	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	3
6a	2R3	<p>Doc 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repetition of the word "disastrous"</li> <li>• Use of bullet points to list reasons</li> <li>• Use of strong language – "disastrous", "spiralling debt", "churning out degrees", "frying pan and the fire", "burning bonfire".</li> <li>• Use of reasoned tone to lend credibility and authority</li> <li>• Use of rhetorical questions to draw in reader.</li> </ul>	Open	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 2)</b></p>	4
6b		<p>Doc 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclamation marks to emphasise points</li> <li>• Use of personal (you and we) to involve reader</li> <li>• Short sentences and strong language (No hope left. Fact. None at all.)</li> <li>• Use of bold to emphasise certain words (The end)</li> </ul>		<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p><b>(Max 2)</b></p>	
7	2R3	<p>Candidates may focus on one document, or on more than one</p> <p>Doc 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appears mostly factual and unbiased</li> <li>• provides quotations from both sides of the argument</li> <li>• gives both sides to appear independent</li> </ul>	Open	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	

Q	M/S Ref	Description	Type of Response	Mark allocation	Total marks
		Doc 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is a letter of complaint - therefore automatically one sided.</li> <li>only gives views against any change in universities (no positives)</li> </ul> Doc 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>gives range of views but each is biased and personal</li> <li>says 'selection' but no evidence that these have been selected impartially</li> <li>forceful language eg 'None at all! No hope left!'</li> </ul> Explanation of why bias is important (eg to persuade the reader to adopt a particular point of view, only deals with one side/aspect etc)		1 1 1 1 1 <b>(Max 3)</b> 1	4
		<b>Total available for Reading</b>			<b>25</b>

**Note to markers:**

- where a candidate does not meet the minimum required for the award of 1 mark, 0 marks should be awarded. This applies to all mark scheme references.
- accept other valid points not identified in the mark scheme but which occur within the source documents.