Candidate Number									

Please stick the barcode label here

HKDSE 2017
ENGLISH LANGUAGE
PAPER 1 PART A
QUESTION-ANSWER BOOK

A
COMPULSORY

Write your Candidate Number and stick a barcode label in the space provided on this page.
Read Text 1 and answer questions 1-21. *(41 marks)*

1. Which of the following recyclables is NOT mentioned in paragraph 1? Put a tick (✓) in the box.

2. According to paragraph 1, what benefits are supposedly gained from recycling?

_____

3. i) What was the writer's view on recycling in 1996? *(1 mark)*

_____

_____

ii) Why did his opponents disagree with him? *(1 mark)*

_____

_____

4. According to paragraphs 2-4, are the following statements True (**T**), False (**F**) or Not Given (**NG**)? *(4 marks)*

	Statements	**T**	**F**	**NG**
i)	The writer is more optimistic about the recycling industry than he was in 1996.	○	○	○
ii)	Supporters of recycling are disappointed that the industry hasn't matured.	○	○	○
iii)	Sending household waste to landfills is typically more costly than recycling it.	○	○	○
iv)	The business of some recycling companies has suffered.	○	○	○

5. According to paragraph 4, what is in less demand overseas?

_____

6. Which definition of 'crisis' is closest to the meaning used in line 22?

A. a time when a difficult or important decision must be made
B. a sudden change in the course of a serious illness, for better or worse
C. an emotionally stressful event or personal tragedy
D. the point, as in a play, at which conflict reaches its highest tension

A	B	C	D
○	○	○	○

7. According to paragraph 6, why are people ill-informed about recycling?

_____

_____

_____

8. Complete the following summary using ideas given in paragraphs 7 and 8. Write ONE word for each blank. Answers must be grammatically correct. *(5 marks)*

Recycling does not always lead to a reduction in **(i)** _____ _____.

Although the E.P.A. encourages people to **(ii)** _____ _____,

it does not necessarily make much of a **(iii)** _____. The matter becomes

worse if people rinse their recyclables using **(iv)** _____ _____, and the electricity

used to produce that heat comes from a **(v)** _____-burning power station.

9. The writer uses the example of flying to show that recycling…

A. has some benefits.
B. is not very effective.
C. is as bad for the environment as flying.
D. can be effective, depending on which class of airfare.

A	B	C	D
○	○	○	○

10. According to paragraph 8, the statistics mentioned in paragraph 7 can be misleading because…

A. some statistics have been overestimated.
B. people are not actually doing what is reported.
C. the statistics haven't taken into account other facts.
D. there is not enough evidence to draw any conclusions.

A	B	C	D
○	○	○	○

Answers written in the margins will not be marked.

11. i) What does the writer think is the reason politicians support a "zero waste" policy (line 44)?

_____

ii) To achieve a "zero waste" policy, the levels of recycling would need to be…

A. reduced to zero.
B. modestly reduced.
C. slightly increased.
D. increased significantly.

A ○ B ○ C ○ D ○

12. According to paragraph 10, who recycles more?

A. the rich
B. the poor
C. people who live in cities
D. people who have more free time

A ○ B ○ C ○ D ○

13. Using the information given in paragraph 11, complete the table with the missing percentages. *(4 marks)*

i) Current rate of recycling in the U.S. _____%	iii) Recycling target set by some state officials _____%
ii) Recycling target set by the E.P.A. _____%	iv) Maximum percentage of trash useful to recycle _____%

14. According to paragraph 12, what materials are practical to recycle? For each type of material, tick (✓) 'All', 'Some' or 'None'. *(3 marks)*

	Material	All	Some	None
i)	metal			
ii)	food waste			
iii)	cardboard			

15. What are the two alternatives to recycling mentioned in paragraph 14? Give one advantage of using each. *(4 marks)*

Alternative 1 (i)_____

Advantage (ii)_____

_____

Alternative 2 (iii)_____

Advantage (iv)_____

_____

Answers written in the margins will not be marked.

16. What is ironic about the outcome described in paragraph 15? Use your own words to explain.

_____

_____

17. According to paragraph 16, why might some people be opposed to an increase in recycling?

_____

18. According to paragraph 17, what is worth recycling?

_____

19. Using information from paragraphs 5-12, match each person with one of the quotes below. Choose from A-F and write the letter in the box next to each person. Two of the quotes will NOT be used. *(4 marks)*

QUOTES		QUOTES	
A	"There is a limit to effective recycling."	**D**	"Recycling can cause more pollution."
B	"Cities need to recycle all waste to safeguard the planet's future."	**E**	"The recycling movement needs more subsidies."
C	"Recycling has a negative impact on the economy."	**F**	"It's more difficult to make money from recycling than people might think."

David Steiner		Chris Goodall		Bill de Blasio		Winston Porter	

20. Do you think recycling is a waste of time? Provide evidence from the text to support your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Choose the best alternative title for this article.

A. In defence of recycling
B. The pros and cons of recycling
C. Recycling is more rubbish than you think
D. Why cities are recycling less of their rubbish

A	B	C	D
○	○	○	○

END OF PART A

Answers written in the margins will not be marked.

PART A

Read Text 1 and answer questions 1-21 in the Question-Answer Book for Part A.

Text 1

The Myth of Recycling

[1] If you live in the United States, you probably do some form of recycling. It's likely that you separate paper from plastic and glass and metal. You rinse bottles and cans, and you might put food scraps in a container destined for a composting facility. As you sort everything into the right bins, you probably assume that recycling is helping your community and protecting the environment. But is it? Are you in fact wasting your time?

[2] In 1996, I wrote an article arguing that the recycling process as we carried it out was wasteful. I presented plenty of evidence that recycling was costly and ineffectual, but its defenders said that it was unfair to rush to judgment. Noting that the modern recycling movement had really just begun a few years earlier, they predicted it would flourish as the industry matured and the public learned how to recycle properly.

[3] So, what's happened since then? While it's true that the recycling message has reached more people than ever, when it comes to the bottom line, both economically and environmentally, not much has changed at all.

[4] Despite decades of initiatives, it's still typically more expensive for local governments to recycle household waste than to send it to a landfill. Most recycled materials are exported, and the prices for these materials have plummeted because of lower oil prices and reduced demand for them overseas. The slump has forced some recycling companies to shut plants and cancel plans for new technologies.

[5] The future for recycling looks even worse. As cities move beyond recycling paper and metals, and into glass, food scraps and assorted plastics, the costs rise sharply while the environmental benefits decline and sometimes vanish. "If you believe recycling is good for the planet and that we need to do more of it, then there's a crisis to confront," says David Steiner, the CEO of Waste Management, the largest recycler of household trash in the United States. "Trying to turn garbage into gold costs a lot more than expected. We need to ask ourselves: What is the goal here?"

[6] Recycling has been relentlessly promoted as a goal in and of itself: a public and private virtue that is indoctrinated in students from kindergarten through university. As a result, otherwise well-informed and educated people have no idea of the relative costs and benefits.

[7] They probably assume, for instance, that recycling plastic must be helping the planet. They've been encouraged by the Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.), which assures the public that this results in fewer carbon emissions being released into the atmosphere. But how much difference does it make? Here's some perspective: To offset the carbon impact of one passenger's round-trip flight between New York and London, you'd have to recycle roughly 40,000 plastic bottles, assuming you fly economy. If you sit in business- or first-class, it could be more like 100,000.

[8] Even those statistics might be misleading. Residents are instructed to rinse bottles before putting them in recycling bins, but the E.P.A.'s life-cycle calculation doesn't take that water into account. That single omission can make a big difference, according to author Chris Goodall. He calculates that if you wash plastic in water that was heated by coal-derived electricity, then the net effect of your recycling could be more carbon in the atmosphere.

[9] To many public officials, recycling is a question of morality, not cost-benefit analysis. The Mayor of New York, Bill de Blasio, declared that by 2030 the city would no longer send any garbage to landfills. "This is the way of the future if we're going to save our earth," he explained while announcing that New York would join other cities in moving toward a "zero waste" policy, which would require an unprecedented level of recycling.

[10] But while politicians set higher goals, the national rate of recycling has stagnated in recent years. Yes, it's popular in affluent neighborhoods, but residents of low income areas don't have the same fervor for sorting garbage in their spare time.

[11] The national rate of recycling rose during the 1990s to 25 percent, the goal set by an E.P.A. official, Winston Porter. He advised state officials that no more than 35 percent of the nation's trash was worth recycling, but some ignored him and set goals of 50 percent and higher. Most of those goals were never met and the national rate has been stuck around 34 percent in recent years.

[12] "It's practical to recycle cardboard and some paper, as well as selected metals and plastics," he says. "But other materials don't make sense, including food waste and other compostables. The zero-waste goal makes no sense at all — it's very expensive with almost no real environmental benefit."

[13] With the economic rationale gone, advocates for recycling have switched to environmental arguments. Researchers calculate that there are indeed such benefits to recycling, but not in the way that many people imagine.

[14] Most of these benefits do not come from reducing the need for landfills and incinerators. Unlike earlier ones, a modern well-lined landfill in a rural area can have relatively little environmental impact. Decomposing garbage releases methane, a potent greenhouse gas, but landfill operators have started capturing it and using it to generate electricity. Modern incinerators, while politically unpopular in the United States, release so few pollutants that they've been widely accepted in the eco-conscious countries of Northern Europe and Japan for generating clean energy.

[15] Moreover, recycling operations have their own environmental costs, like extra trucks on the road and pollution from recycling operations. Composting facilities around the country have inspired complaints about nauseating odors, swarming rats and defecating seagulls.

[16] The environmental benefits of recycling come chiefly from reducing the need to manufacture new products — less mining, drilling and logging. But that's not so appealing to the workers in those industries that have accepted the environmental trade-offs that come with those jobs. Nearly everyone, though, approves of one potential gain from recycling: reduced emissions of greenhouse gases.

[17] However, according to the E.P.A.'s estimates, virtually all the greenhouse benefits — more than 90 percent — come from just a few materials: paper, cardboard and aluminum in soda cans. Once you exclude these materials, the total annual savings in the United States from recycling everything else — plastics, glass, food, yard trimmings, textiles, rubber, leather — is only two-tenths of 1 percent of America's carbon footprint.

END OF READING PASSAGES

Sources of materials used in this paper will be acknowledged in the booklet *HKDSE Question Papers* published by the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority at a later stage.