

The second question was usually not well answered, in fact not a few candidates omitted it; but on the other hand several answers were equal to Senior standard and a few were remarkably well done. The chief flaw was the paucity of examples to illustrate the general statements.

The third question was fairly well done.

The explanation of technical terms asked for in Question 4 was generally weak. There was often a lack of arrangement in the replies, and examples were generally hackneyed. Why, for instance, did about a third of the candidates give lily-of-the-valley as an example of a raceme? Each year there is this same difficulty of presenting sufficient and suitable examples, and the examiner suggests that students should keep a note-book specially for this portion of the work. On the right-hand page the technical term and its definition should be entered, together with notes referring to use or function, while the left-hand page should be reserved for examples actually noted and for drawings made from actual specimens. The examiner believes that such a plan would be well worth the small amount of trouble involved, that it would be possible to work up a good deal of enthusiasm and competition, and that many points not clear to the students would come up for explanation which would otherwise be overlooked.

Some good replies were received to Question 5, but again there was not sufficient reference to local examples. In this connection it may be noted that during the past year a most interesting series of illustrated articles on South Australian orchids, written by Dr. R. S. Rogers, appeared in the *Children's Hour*. It will probably be difficult to secure back numbers, but if the Education Department republish the articles in booklet form teachers are strongly advised to introduce the work to their pupils.

In Question 6 there was too much written about unimportant points, so that essential differences were often buried in a mass of irrelevancies. Some of the answers were excellent had the question asked for a complete description of both poppy and buttercup.

### Senior Examination.

#### *Senior English.*

While several good essays were written, a very large number of candidates showed a complete lack of continuity of thought

in dealing with the subject set, and simply wrote a paragraph about each character. Many candidates do not seem to realize that good English, with attention to such points as spelling and punctuation, is expected *throughout* an English paper.

#### *Senior Modern History.*

The bulk of the work done by Senior candidates was satisfactory. In some cases marks were lost for illegible writing, and there was an unusual amount of poor spelling, e.g.: "Amerika", "Prodestant", "Louise" (for Louis), Lord "Falf-land" (for Falkland), and "pryspers" (presumably for presbyters); these examples were not accidental errors, they were mis-spelt throughout the papers.

The examiner also wishes to point out to candidates that it is both useless and impertinent to write notes in their books asking for special consideration. One candidate wrote after the first answer: "Please go on with my paper, the rest is really good", and after Answer 4: "I don't know much about Charles II, as you have probably found out, but the answers to Questions 2, 3, and 5 should make up for a few little errors in this one and number one, don't you think?" It is perhaps needless to say that this paper was intrinsically weak and far below pass standard.

The first question was generally well answered: most students were able to give a correct summary of Sir Walter Raleigh's life asked for in Question 2; only a few seemed to realize the importance of his pioneer work; while a large number of candidates wrote more about Raleigh's last voyage up the Orinoco than about all his previous career. The importance of the introduction of tobacco was too thoroughly appreciated; one candidate with a slight confusion of ideas wrote: "the taste for smoking innate in British character owes its origin to Raleigh". Another candidate evidently remembered the phrase "singeing the King of Spain's beard", and gave a circumstantial account of how Raleigh set fire to a town from which the King of Spain had so narrow an escape that one side of his whiskers was singed.

The third question offered scope for arrangement of answer, detail, and generalization, but, except in a few cases, a summary of facts was all that was given, and in many cases the chronology was very confused. The examiner was struck with the fact