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GP June Intensive Revision

**Comprehension Learning Skills 5 – Summary Question**

The objective of the summary question is to present the main ideas of a particular section of the passage. It is also the task of the students to answer the summary question in their own words. The question examines the students’ ability to comprehend the passage, extract the information and present them in systematic manner according to the requirement of the question without any grammatical error. To do so, students need to perform the following steps:

(for a level – it must be an independent paragraph that answers the requirements of the summary question)

1. Understanding of the questions
2. Extraction of information
3. Rephrasing of the points
4. Systematic Writing
5. **Understanding of the questions**

Students should ensure that they have a good understanding of the question in the following areas:

* 1. The nature of the summary question – it is important to take note of the nature of summary on whether it is a discussion on the causes of the issue, the effects of the issue, the comparison on the issue and the solutions on the issue as this will affect the words to be used to link the discussion and on how you can make it more coherent

(causes – contributing factors, reasons) / comparison – while, on the other hand)

* 1. The perspective of the question – the view the points to be presented – for example, the views made by the writer on the other views made by others but presented by the writer for discussion.
  2. The focus of the requirement – attend to the areas of requirement in the question – there is a possibility that the areas of requirement may be more than one.
  3. The understanding of the requirement – students must have a good understanding of subjects and implications laid out – this will determine the gist of ideas that need to be summarized.
  4. The source of your points – pay attention to the section of the passage you should extract your points from. From which paragraph?
  5. The word limit – must ensure that your number of words written does not exceed the stated limit.

1. **Extraction of information**

In the extraction of the information from the passage, the students need to follow these steps:

* 1. Mark out the relevant part of the passage
  2. Underline only the part of the sentence or only the words that are relevant to the question. In situation where the words only provide an implication, students may need to write down the implications.
  3. Exclude irrelevant information like – details, examples, elaborations, repetitions, quotations.
  4. Number the points you may have and match the marks given.

1. **Rephrasing of the points**
   1. Rephrasing can be done through **word substitution** – parts of word like adjectives, adverbs and verbs can be replaced by using antonyms or synonyms but it may be difficult to replace certain terms (nouns) which are the subjects of discussion, e.g. education.
   2. **Rephrasing c**an be done by **re-writing the meaning of the sentence – restructure the idea in the sentence** according to the context of the passage when the writer expresses in a figurative manner. (the write demonstrates the point through an analogy or illustration)
   3. Rephrase the abstract and inference meaning of certain terms in the passage based on your understanding of its implications in the passage but if you are not sure, do not rephrase it according to your understanding.
   4. Link the ideas in an orderly manner so that you can see that the various ideas are presented in an orderly manner.
2. **Systematic Writing**

It is important to ensure that the summary is written in a systematic and coherent manner that clearly present the essential points required by the question. To do so, the following steps are needed:

* 1. Ensure that connectors are used to link the various sentences. These connectors can either connect, further explain, show contradictions or compare differences. They are supposed to link all the points to create a cohesive and systematic paragraph.

Ways to connects: subsequently, nonetheless, nevertheless – link sentences

* 1. Order of the ideas – ensure that the order of ideas presented in the passage is logical and has an orderly development. (follow the flow of the passage
  2. Check for grammatical order – an error-free essay is important – be more careful in the areas of grammar, sentence structure, spelling and punctuation.
  3. Ensure that you have the exact number of words. You can increase or decrease the number of words by deleting or adding the adverbs or adjectives used. If the number of words you have written exceeds or short fall of the word limit, please review again the points you have underlined as it implies that you have not extracted the points correctly.
  4. Do use a variety of ways to construct you sentences and make sure that they can reflect the order of presentation.

## 5) Do’s and Don’t’s

* Do not hand in a passage with grid lines but it is advisable for you to draw them in pencils and rub them off if you do not have time to write another new piece.
* Do proper time management based on the allocation of marks, which should be around 25 minutes (8/35 X 90 minutes + 5 minutes).
* Write in complete sentences and use connectors to connect them.
* Write your summary in one paragraph.
* Check the number of words you have written (Use the grids). Write it down.
* Ensure that you have no spelling errors.
* Do not hand in your first draft unless you have no time to correct. Under such situation, rub off the grid lines.

**Practice Question 1**

Besides prejudice and discrimination because of ethnicity or race, there is also discrimination because of religious beliefs. Much traditional discrimination against women and perhaps most discrimination against homosexual is not necessarily based on beliefs about people’s abilities or characteristics but on religious beliefs about the proper roles of the sexes and about the proper forms of sexual behaviour. People may be becoming increasingly offended by the notion of separate roles in life for the sexes, and it has become quite common for gay rights advocates to bluntly call people who disapprove homosexuality “bigots”. However, the principle in these issues is different from those concerning ethnic stereotypes. This issue is often not one of matters of fact but of traditional moral beliefs about sex, usually based on religious moral commandments.

Homosexuality is clearly and strongly prohibited by Leviticus 18:22, which says “Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is an abomination”. The seriousness of the offence is later driven home at Leviticus 20:13, where it is ordered that the offending parties are to be put to death. Islam has also always strongly endorsed public separation for the sexes. While all these strictures may be regarded as remnants of archaic societies, there are plenty of Jews, Muslims, and Christians who take them at face value as direct and unavoidable commands from God, for which they will be called to account hereafter. For all we know, they might be right, and certainly no one accuses Jews or Muslims of being bigots because they think they are commanded by God not to eat pork.

Religious rules about diet or sexual behaviour are often interpreted purely as signs of obedience to God, or as fulfilling a purpose. For us that God has set beyond our comprehension. It is not unreasonable to abstain from homosexual or other sexual practices or to have separate spheres in life for men and women. Many aspects of such religious commands, of course, like forcing women, or anyone into certain ways of life, or like putting homosexuals to death, violate moral laws.

We therefore cannot have a general respect for all traditional or religious moral principles. Our question about these principles must be instead where we draw the line between what we must forbid as a matter of justice in public life and what we must respect as a matter of private choice. The answer is simple enough: believers can adopt their religious rules, or any rules, for themselves they wish as matters of individual liberty and voluntary association, but if they try to impose their rules by force on us or others, we have every right to stop them. However, if it is just that we don’t like the way they live life because of these rules, we simply do not have to associate with them.

The problem for us arises now where believing employers, or landlords, might not wish to employ, or rent to, those who evidently transgress their religious laws from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, women have been included in anti-discrimination legislation, and homosexuals are now commonly included as well. Many believe that the purpose of such laws is actually to assault religion, both by forcing believers to associate against the principles of their traditional sexual roles and by forcing them to accept homosexuals and associate with them as morally no different from anyone else. The idea that people have a right not to be discriminated against by private individuals in private and voluntary transactions involves a fundamental and extremely dangerous confusion about the very nature of civil rights. When it comes to employment, we may feel certain that discrimination against women or homosexuals on religious grounds is deeply irrational, even offensive to our sense of the good, but it is, after all, the employers who pay the cost of that discrimination and they may be quite willing to pay it for the sake of obedience to God. If we do not believe that somebody should be forced to work for a certain employer against their will, the same freedom of association allows that no employer should be forced to employ a certain person against their will.

Prosecuting people for practicing discrimination in friendships, dating, and marriage could not be far behind, as in politically correct Madison, Wisconsin, where a woman has already been found guilty of practicing “homophobic” discrimination by refusing to accept a lesbian woman who answered her advertisement for a roommate. Advertising for a roommate, it seems, means that, as part of business and commerce, one no longer has freedom of association in choosing the roommate.

Adapted from [www.freesian.com](http://www.freesian.com), 2005

**Using material from paragraphs 2 to 5, summarise the reasons for people abiding by religious rules and why, according to the writer, we should respect their decision to abide by the rules.**

**Use no more than 120 words not counting the opening words which are printed below. Use your own words as far as possible. [8]**

*Some people abide by religious rules because…*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Material from Passage** | **Answer** |
| Homosexuality is clearly and strongly prohibited by Leviticus 18:22…The seriousness of the offense is later driven home at Leviticus 20:13…  (l.12-14) |  |
| there are plenty of Jews, Muslims and Christians who take them at face value as direct and unavoidable commands from God,  for which they will be called to account hereafter.  (l.17-19) |  |
| Religious rules…are often interpreted…as fulfilling a purpose for us  that God has set beyond our comprehension.(1.22-24) |  |
| For all we know, they might be right,  (l.19) |  |
| …if it is just that we don’t like the way they live life because of these rules, we simply do not have to associate with them. (l.36-37) | . |
| it is not unreasonable that abstention form homosexual or other sexual practices or separate spheres in life for men and women.  (l.24-26)  …and what we must respect as a matter of private choice.  (l.30-31)  believers can adopt their religious rules, or any rules, for themselves if they wish, as matters of individual liberty and voluntary association…  (l.31-33) |  |
| Many believe that the purpose of such laws is actually to assault religion, both by forcing believers to associate against the principles of their traditional sexual roles and by forcing them to accept homosexuals and associate them as morally no different from any one else.  (l.40-43) |  |

**Practice 2**

In all of these films we see the world in transition as we are living it. All have managed to break the cycle of remakes in which Hollywood has been stuck by telling new stories -- something American filmmakers, who have prided themselves on their imagination and originality, once excelled at. Meanwhile, with ever fewer exceptions, American filmmakers too often grind out formulaic, shock and awe blockbusters with the inevitable gratuitous violence, sex and special effects that may be winning the battle of Monday morning grosses, but are losing the war for hearts and minds. For all their brawn, American filmmakers, like the generals in Iraq, are in danger of losing the battle of ideas.

In this sense, Hollywood's "Mission Impossible III" has a lot more in common with George Bush's "mission accomplished" than we might have suspected. Despite America's continuing, but diminishing, dominance, its ability to win hearts and minds is draining away. In cinema, as in politics during the information age, it is all about whose story wins. Just as America's image has fallen in world opinion because of the Iraq war, audience trends for American blockbusters are beginning to show a decline as well, both at home and abroad. For years, the big blockbusters have grossed more abroad than at home, where infatuation with contrived spectacle has waned. But something out there is stirring. Even long-time American cultural colonies like Japan and Germany are beginning to turn to the home screen. For the first time in decades more than half of cinema admissions went to local films in Japan during 2006 while German admissions for domestic films hit a post-war high of nearly 25 per cent. This suggests they are headed to where TV viewers have long been.

The heat is on in Hollywood due to this change in climate, adding further woe to the digital -distribution- "You Tube" -nightmares of the studios. What's happening is that globalization accompanied by technological change is hitting Tinsel Town just like every other industry. Just as the post-World War II American order that defeated communism paved the way for new economic and political competitors from Asia to Europe to Brazil, so too American-led post- Cold War globalization -- and its backlash -- has led to cultural competition. This suggests that we may be seeing the beginning of the end of the century-long honeymoon of Hollywood, at least in its American incarnation, with the world.

Now that globalization has moved us all into the same neighbourhood, more and more people out there on the former periphery want to see their own stories on the screen, to see what is in their imagination and culture, at least as much as they might enjoy the latest offerings from LucasFilm or Pixar. Filmmaker Gonzalez Inarritu best captures what's happening. "The world is changing," he says. "The film community is now a global film community. It’s not anymore about cultural barriers or language barriers. It’s about emotion and humanity. We are using the power of cinema to cross borders. We understand that now there's a connection that needs to happen." In our global age movies must expose "the point of view of others, of those on the other side," he says. And it must be done with dignity, not portraying Third World faces as mere victims nor Japanese as cartoon caricatures.

**Using material from paragraphs 2 to 5, summarise the authors’ argument that Hollywood blockbusters have declined. Using your own words as far as possible, write your answer in no more than 120 words, not counting the opening words which are printed below. [7]**

**One reason for the decline of the Hollywood blockbusters is…**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Material from Passage** | **Answer** |
| …**the cycle of remakes** **in which Hollywood has been stuck** (line 8) |  |
| American filmmakers, who have **prided themselves on their imagination and originality, once excelled at** [telling new stories] (line 9) |  |
| American filmmakers too often **grind out formulaic, shock and awe blockbusters**...(line 10-11) |  |
| ...with the **inevitable gratuitous violence, sex and special effects** (line 11) |  |
| [The blockbusters] may be **winning the battle of Monday morning grosses, but are losing the war for hearts and mindlines.** For all their brawn, American filmmakers, like the generals in Iraq, are **in danger of losing the battle of ideas.** (line 12-4) |  |
| At home, [...] **infatuation with contrived spectacle has waned.** (line 21-22) |  |
| **Even long-time American cultural colonies** like Japan and Germany **are beginning to turn to the home screen.** (line 22-23) |  |
| the **digital -distribution**- "You Tube" -**nightmares** of the studios (line 27-28) |  |
| [The **backlash** against] American-led post- Cold War globalization [...] has led to **cultural competition**. (line 30) |  |
| People…want to see their **own stories** on the screen, to see what is in **their imagination and culture** (line 36-37) |  |
| It’s about humanity…And it must be done with dignity, not **portraying** Third World faces as mere victims nor Japanese as cartoon **caricatures** (line 39, 43-44) |  |

**Suggested Answers**

**One reason for the decline of the Hollywood blockbusters is…**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Material from Passage** | **Answer** |
| …**the cycle of remakes** **in which Hollywood has been stuck** (line 8) | They are trapped in the pattern of making new versions of old movies. |
| American filmmakers, who have **prided themselves on their imagination and originality, once excelled at** [telling new stories] (line 9) | American filmmakers have lost their ingenuity/ability to come up with fresh ideas and stories/losing creativity |
| American filmmakers too often **grind out formulaic, shock and awe blockbusters**...(line 10-11) | They produce in large numbers/churn out (1/2) movies that conform to a template (1/2) |
| ...with the **inevitable gratuitous violence, sex and special effects** (line 11) | ... of mindless/pointless/superfluous/  unnecessary (1/2) brutality, titillation and technical displays. (any 2 for ½) |
| [The blockbusters] may be **winning the battle of Monday morning grosses, but are losing the war for hearts and mindlines.** For all their brawn, American filmmakers, like the generals in Iraq, are **in danger of losing the battle of ideas.** (line 12-4) | These movies have high box office takings but are unable to engage the audience emotionally, intellectually and artistically/showing creativity |
| At home, [...] **infatuation with contrived spectacle has waned.** (line 21-22) | the popularity/craze for such stilted extravagance has diminished. |
| **Even long-time American cultural colonies** like Japan and Germany **are beginning to turn to the home screen.** (line 22-23) | Countries that used to have great demand for/embraced American media (1/2) have abandoned them for their own products. |
| the **digital -distribution**- "You Tube" -**nightmares** of the studios (line 27-28) | Internet piracy has significantly reduced the blockbuster’s profits |
| [The **backlash** against] American-led post- Cold War globalization [...] has led to **cultural competition**. (line 30) | Rejection of American ideological hegemony has led to audiences favouring movies from other countries. |
| People…want to see their **own stories** on the screen, to see what is in **their imagination and culture** (line 36-37) | Due to the global aspect of the movies, people now want to see their way of life/local issues/local concerns rather than those presented by Hollywood |
| It’s about humanity…And it must be done with dignity, not **portraying** Third World faces as mere victims nor Japanese as cartoon **caricatures** (line 39, 43-44) | Hollywood depiction of other cultures was inaccurate/stereotypical/inaccurate (1/2) and not disrespectful (1/2) |