



National  
Qualifications  
SPECIMEN ONLY

---

**SQ14/H/01**

**English  
Reading for Understanding,  
Analysis and Evaluation**

Date — Not applicable

Duration — 1 hour 30 minutes

---

**Total marks — 30**

Attempt ALL questions.

Write your answers clearly in the answer booklet provided. In the answer booklet you must clearly identify the question number you are attempting.

Use **blue** or **black** ink.

Before leaving the examination room you must give your answer booklet to the Invigilator; if you do not, you may lose all the marks for this paper.



\* S Q 1 4 H 0 1 \*

The following two passages focus on the importance of trees.

### Passage 1

*In the first passage Janice Turner, writing in The Times newspaper, considers the value of trees.*

Read the passage below and attempt the questions which follow.

Watching the tree surgeon from the window, I felt I was witnessing a crime. One I'd authorised, like a Mafia hit. The holm oak – a dense, virulent, evergreen ball – loomed over the garden like a storm cloud. It had to be cut back. But as the chainsaw whined and branches tumbled, I wondered if I really had the right.

- 5 I'm a resolute city-dweller, but trees seem ever more precious these days, a rebuke to built-in obsolescence, a steady point in a churning world. My pear and apple trees are remnants from when South London orchards ran all the way down to meet the sea. The walnut reaches out a mammoth limb from my neighbour's garden to mine like God's arm on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in Rome.
- 10 They are our living past, clocking up the years, ring by ring. Trees are calming like cathedrals, reassuring us that they will endure even though we will not. No wonder the ancients believed they were gods; there are worse things to worship than a tree.

And this week, reading how some protesters had been arrested trying to prevent ancient woodland being destroyed to make way for a three-mile link road to Hastings, I thought: yes, I'd go to prison for a tree. Indeed, the protesters who are digging tunnels in the mud and standing before the diggers are not "eco-warriors" or "hippies". Among them are young families, retired folk and ordinary dog-walkers. "Local grandmothers", it was reported, came to swing in giant hammocks strung between the 400-year-old oaks.

But this is their last stand. They can only slow the developers. By March the trees will be felled. Local people have fought for 20 years to save them, but they are on the wrong side of what the government is determined to market as progress, however short-term and dubious the economic benefits. The Chancellor of the Exchequer gave £56.8 million of government money for this very road, which will fill up with extra traffic, as new roads do, and lead in time to a spanking new industrial estate, although Hastings town already has plenty of boarded-up premises from which to trade.

Development versus the trees. The government tells us that those who want to protect open countryside and woodland from being turned into endless Lego-brick estates are not conservationists, they are selfish, privileged people who, sitting comfortably in their own cheaply bought piles, have no care for struggling young couples who can't afford a family home.

30 Anyway, what's a bunch of trees?

But people with no respect for trees show a special kind of arrogance: they think they're bigger than history. I'd argue that cutting down an ancient oak is worse than killing most types of animal. Certainly the more numerous species such as dogs, cows, monkeys or cats. A chainsaw slicing into a 300-year-old trunk is more brutal and grotesque than hunting 100 foxes. Chopping down a fine old tree is more like shooting an elephant or harpooning a whale: the aching poignancy of an enormous creature whose size and strength nonetheless cannot save it. Except even the mightiest mammal can be bred to maturity in a few years. Not so a tree.

Yet it is astonishing, given how much people love them – planting them to mark special moments or honour dead loved ones, measuring their lives by their seasonal changes – that officialdom loathes trees. Insurance companies fretting about subsidence would rather you took them all down just in case. Councils detest them, employing municipal butchers to hack away at whole groves. Embarrassed stumps with a couple of twigs are all that remain.

It's a wonder any tree survives a health and safety audit. One City Council tried to remove a whole row of horsechestnuts because conkers fell on cars and children might slip on leaves. Our  
45 local primary school cut down a fine tree beneath which generations of children had played, because the new head deemed its twigs and leaves too messy. A posh gardener once suggested we cut down most of our trees and start again with fresh, more groovy varieties. This misunderstood the very point: trees are the antithesis of fickle fashion. But some crass homeowners can't bear the fluff-balls from plane trees messing up their hall carpet or the lime  
50 sap puking down on their shiny car bonnets. Neater to reach for the axe. Maybe garden centres should start selling plastic ones: say goodbye to autumnal hell.

Visiting Burma, I learnt that its teak forests were flogged off to China by the generals, who were desperate for quick cash, like a beautiful girl being forced to sell her hair. Iceland is barren because Vikings cut them all down in a year and Peru is logging away its resources.

55 Our country's trees will tumble to make way for the machines of progress. But for how much economic growth is it worth mowing down a wood? Trees are beyond priceless: they are our history inscribed in the natural world. Which rich men, planting beautiful orchards to their own glorious memory, have always known.

*Adapted from an article in The Times newspaper, January 2013.*

## Questions

1. Re-read lines 1–12
- (a) From the first paragraph, identify two feelings the writer had as she watched the tree in her garden being cut back. 2
- (b) Analyse how the writer’s use of language in lines 5–12 emphasises the importance of trees. You should refer in your answer to such features as sentence structure, word choice, imagery, contrast, tone . . . 4
2. Re-read Lines 13–25
- According to the writer in lines 13–18, in what ways are the protestors different from how we might expect them to be? 2
3. **By referring to at least two features of language in lines 19–25** analyse how the writer conveys her feelings of unhappiness about the Hastings development. You should refer in your answer to such features as sentence structure, word choice, contrast, tone . . . 3
4. Re-read lines 26–37
- (a) From lines 26–30 identify two claims the government makes about the protestors. 2
- (b) **By referring to at least two features of language in lines 31–37**, analyse how the writer conveys the strength of her belief in tree conservation. 4
5. Re-read lines 38–54
- (a) Identify any **four** reasons given in these lines for cutting down trees. You should use your own words as far as possible. 4
- (b) By referring to at least one example, analyse how the writer’s use of imagery emphasises her opposition to cutting down trees. 2
6. Evaluate the final paragraph’s effectiveness as a conclusion to the passage as a whole. 2

## Passage 2

*In the second passage below, the science writer Colin Tudge gives his own views on trees.*

Read the passage and attempt the question which follows. While reading, you may wish to make notes on the main ideas and/or highlight key points in the passage.

In New Zealand a few years ago I experienced more powerfully than ever the sheer gravitas of trees: in the presence of the world's largest kauri. Kauris are conifers, the biggest of their family. The great trunk of the kauri rises like a lighthouse out of the gloom: fifteen metres in circumference – it would touch all four walls in an average living room – and straight up,  
5 leafless, for twenty metres or so. And then on its great horizontal boughs rests a virtual park, a floating island with an entire ecosystem of ferns and flowers. Kauris are about 2000 years old. For the first 1400 years of the kauri's life, moas strutted their stuff around its base. Moas included the world's tallest-ever birds, like giant emus, which were preyed upon by commensurately huge but short-winged eagles. The moas and their attendant eagles are now  
10 long gone. The kauri lives on.

The remaining kauri forest has been horribly reduced these past two hundred years, but the way modern New Zealanders look after the trees that are left to them is a model for all the world. Rare trees are no longer felled but existing planks are prized and meticulously re-cycled. Meanwhile, you can follow slatted wooden paths among the vast conifers. That's conservation;  
15 that's intelligent ecotourism.

Similarly, if new farming economies are to come about, then trees must be at the centre of them. Yet, tree-based farming systems have to fight for survival against the massed ranks of the powers-that-be. How ludicrous. The world's most powerful governments have made themselves answerable to the big companies – and they take pride in this. They call it “realism”.

20 So although the things that need doing seem obvious, governments – and the big corporations whose interests they serve – have a quite different agenda. If we want life to be agreeable or indeed to continue at all we just have to ignore the pressures from our ostensible leaders, and do things the way they should be done: building new ways of life, whatever the pressures from on high. Again, trees show the way.

25 Outstanding among the world's many popular initiatives is the Greenbelt Movement, a campaign among Kenyan women to re-plant trees in places they used to grow. Now they have planted 30 million. They have transformed landscapes and changed entire economies and the whole tenor of life. This kind of thing, very simple, and achieved in the teeth of the modern economy (for who makes money out of it?), contributes far more to human wellbeing than, say, cheap white  
30 goods from China, on which the economy of the modern world, egged on by our world leaders, is being built.

The broadest issue of all is the western conceit that we can “conquer” nature, or indeed control it. This idea truly took off in the 19th century, and yet is taken still as a mark of modernity. In 1879 the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins lamented the felling of poplars: “O if we but knew what  
35 we do/When we delve or hew – Hack and rack the growing green!” We still don't know what we are doing but the hacking and racking continue more vigorously than ever. The only halfway sane approach if we want this world to remain habitable, is to approach it humbly. Trees teach humility. We need to take the world far more seriously. It would be a good idea to begin with trees.

*Adapted from an article published on Colin Tudge's website in 2005.*

## Question

7. Both writers express their views about the importance of trees. Identify key areas on which they agree. In your answer, you should refer in detail to both passages. 5

You may answer this question in continuous prose or in a series of developed bullet points.

**[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]**

[BLANK PAGE]

*Acknowledgement of Copyright*

Passage 1 Article is adapted from “Cutting down a tree is worse than fox hunting” by Janice Turner, taken from The Times, 12 January 2013. © The Times, 01 2013.

Passage 2 Article is adapted from “Trees, me, and all of us” by Colin Tudge. Reproduced by kind permission of Colin Tudge.