

Candidate's Name: _____

Candidate's Home Tutorial Class: _____

**CATHOLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2008**

**GENERAL PAPER
PAPER 2**

8806/2

MONDAY 25 AUGUST 2008

1 hour 30 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

This paper contains the passages for Paper 2 and the Answer Booklet.

Write your Name and Home Tutorial Class in the spaces at the top of this page.

Answer all questions.

Attach this cover sheet to the completed Answer Booklet.

If you remove the passages for easy reference, please reattach them to the back of the answer booklet before handing it up.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question.

EXAMINER'S USE ONLY

Content	/35
Language	/15
Total	/50

This paper consists of **10** printed pages including this page

PAPER 2 (50 marks)

Read the passages and then answer all the questions which follow below. Note that up to fifteen marks will be given for the quality and accuracy of your use of English throughout this paper.

Note: When a question asks for an answer IN YOUR OWN WORDS AS FAR AS POSSIBLE and you select the appropriate material from the passage(s) for your answer, you must still use your own words to express it. Little credit can be given to answers which only copy words or phrases from the passage(s).

Questions on Passage A:

1. In line 6, in what way is the pancake phenomenon created? **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [2 m]

2. In paragraph 3, what is the similarity in human achievements between the original Renaissance and the modern renaissance, in each of the following pairs of examples?

- i) painting vs. holography
- ii) circumnavigating the globe vs. orbiting in space
- iii) printing press vs. the Internet

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [3 m]

3. "Web sites live not by their own *strength* but the *strength* of their links" (lines 23-24). Explain the difference in the two uses of the word *strength* in this sentence.

.....

.....

.....

..... [1 m]

4. In paragraph 5, what are the social benefits of the renaissance in the modern age?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [2 m]

Questions on Passage B:

5. What is the writer's intention in citing the examples of the scuba diver and the guy on a jet ski in lines 8 and 9?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [2 m]

6. Why does the writer use 'almost' in lines 12-13?

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [2 m]

7. "We are not only *what* we read, we are *how* we read." (lines 16-17) Why does the writer italicize 'what' and 'how'?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... [2 m]

Questions on Passages A and B:

9. Give the meaning of the following words as they are used in the passage. You may write your answer in one word or a short phrase. [5 m]

From Passage A:

(a) take (line 12)

(b) arsenal (line 13)

(c) equivalent (line 20)

From Passage B:

(d) duly (line 4)

(e) disengaged (line 22)

10. In Passage A, Rushkoff emphasizes that the pancake phenomenon has positive effects on society, whereas in Passage B, Carr views the pancake phenomenon in a negative light.

Do you regard the pancake phenomenon to be broadly beneficial or harmful to you and your generation?

Justify your views with reference to the points made by the writers and your experience.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

[illegible]

..... [8 m]

END OF PAPER

Passage A: DOUGLAS RUSHKOFF writes...

- 1 Having access to data through our network-enabled communities gives us an entirely more living flow of information that is appropriate to the ever changing circumstances surrounding us. Instead of growing high, we grow wide. We become pancake people. I don't think it's the computer itself enabling the pancake people, but the way networked computers give us access to other people. It's not the data — for downloaded data is just an extension of the wealthy gentleman in his library, enriching himself as a "self." What creates the pancake phenomenon is our access to other people, and the corresponding dissolution of our perception of knowledge as an individual's acquisition. 5
- 2 I have been studying the "renaissance" shift for the past few years. The original Renaissance invented the individual. The Renaissance age flourished in Europe during the 14th to 16th Century and saw the revival of arts, literature and learning. With the development of perspective in painting came the notion of perspective in everything. The printing press fuelled this even further, giving individuals the ability to develop their own understanding of texts. Each man now had his own take on the world, and a person's storehouse of knowledge and arsenal of techniques were the measure of the man. 10
- 3 The more I study the original Renaissance, the more I see our own era as having at least as much renaissance character and potential. Where the Renaissance brought us perspective painting, the current one brings virtual reality and holography. The Renaissance saw humanity circumnavigating the globe; in our own era we've learned to orbit it from space. Calculus emerged in the 15th Century, while systems theory and chaos math emerged in the 20th. Our printing press is now the Internet, our equivalent of the sonnet is the hypertext. 15
20
- 4 While our renaissance brings with it a shift in our relationship to dimension, the character of this shift is different. In a holograph, fractal, or even an Internet web site, perspective is no longer about the individual observer's position, it is about that individual's connection to the whole. Web sites live not by their own strength but the strength of their links. As Internet enthusiasts like to say, the power of a network is not the nodes, it's the connections. 25
- 5 That's why new models for both collaboration and progress have emerged during our renaissance — ones that obviate the need for competition between individuals, and instead value the power of collectivism. Anyone and everyone is invited to make improvements and additions, and the resulting projects — like the Firefox browser — are more nimble, stable, and user-friendly. While the Renaissance invented the individual and spawned many institutions enabling personal choices and freedoms, our renaissance is instead reinventing the collective in a new context. 30
- 6 Networks give us a new understanding of our potential relationships to one another. Membership in one group does not preclude membership in a myriad of others. We are all parts of a multitude of overlapping groups with often paradoxically contradictory priorities. Because we can contend with having more than one perspective at a time, we needn't force them to compete for authority in our hearts and minds — we can hold them all, provisionally. Our capacity to contend with multiple dimensions is increased. Things don't have to be just one way or directed by some central authority, alive, dead or channelled. We do have the capacity to contend with spontaneous, emergent reality. 35
39

Source: Adapted from "Media Virus"

Passage B: NICHOLAS CARR writes...

- 1 For me, as for others, the Net is becoming a universal medium, the conduit for most of the information that flows through my eyes and ears and into my mind. The advantages of having immediate access to such an incredibly rich store of information are many, and they've been widely described and duly applauded. "The perfect recall of silicon memory," *Wired's* Clive Thompson has written, "can be an enormous boon to thinking." But that boon comes at a price. What the Net seems to be doing is chipping away my capacity for concentration and contemplation. My mind now expects to take in information the way the Net distributes it: in a swiftly moving stream of particles. Once I was a scuba diver in the sea of words. Now I zip along the surface like a guy on a Jet Ski. 5
- 2 Users are not reading online in the traditional sense; Indeed there are signs that new forms of "reading" are emerging as users "power browse" horizontally through titles, contents pages and abstracts going for quick wins. It almost seems that they go online to avoid reading in the traditional sense. Thanks to the ubiquity of text on the Internet, not to mention the popularity of text-messaging on cell phones, we may well be reading more today than we did in the 1970s or 1980s, when television was our medium of choice. But it's a different kind of reading, and behind it lies a different kind of thinking — perhaps even a new sense of the self. We are not only *what* we read, we are *how* we read. The style of reading promoted by the Net, a style that puts "efficiency" and "immediacy" above all else, may be weakening our capacity for the kind of deep reading that emerged when an earlier technology, the printing press, made long and complex works of prose commonplace. When we read online, we tend to become "mere decoders of information." Our ability to interpret text, to make the rich mental connections that form when we read deeply and without distraction, remains largely disengaged. 10 15 20
- 3 When the Net absorbs a medium, that medium is re-created in the Net's image. It injects the medium's content with hyperlinks, blinking ads, and other digital gewgaws, and it surrounds the content with the content of all the other media it has absorbed. A new e-mail message, for instance, may announce its arrival as we're glancing over the latest headlines at a newspaper's site. The Internet scatters our attention and diffuses our concentration. It's becoming our map and our clock, our printing press and our typewriter, our calculator and our telephone, and our radio and TV. Indeed, the Internet is subsuming most of our other intellectual technologies. 25
- 4 The Net isn't the alphabet, and it can never replace the printing press. The kind of deep reading that a sequence of printed pages promotes is valuable not just for the knowledge we acquire from the author's words but for the intellectual vibrations those words set off within our own minds. In the quiet spaces opened up by the sustained, undistracted reading of a book, or by any other act of contemplation, for that matter, we make our own associations, draw our own inferences and analogies, and foster our own ideas. Deep reading, as has been often argued, is indistinguishable from deep thinking. If we lose those quiet spaces, or fill them up with "content," we will sacrifice something important not only in our selves but in our culture. As we are drained of our inner repertory of dense cultural inheritance, we risk turning into 'pancake people' — spread wide and thin as we connect with that vast network of information accessed by the mere touch of a button. 30 35 39

Source: Adapted from "Is Google Making Us Stupid?"