

### **Training Folder 1.**

60 marks. This is a very good example of an exemplary top band folder where there is no reason not to award full marks. The candidate's rationale for the work is clear and there is plenty of evidence of wider reading as well carefully chosen stimulus texts and generic research.

The Commentary is detailed and the AOs are fully integrated so that often you cannot see the joins. This is reflected in the centre's annotations. There is evidence of editing and care in the selection of analytical examples.

The fiction shows a clear sense of narrative voice and the use of different fonts is a good example of the ways in which the narrative voice is sustained.

The non-fiction demonstrates a secure understanding of genre, purpose and audience. It is well edited and the tone is appropriate throughout.

The presentation of this folder can be regarded as exemplary. The centre has used the front sheet to provide useful information for the moderator and the candidate obviously understands the requirements of genre, purpose and audience.

The internal moderation is clearly demonstrated and this work makes the moderator's job very straightforward.

### **Training Folder 2**

41 marks. 14+13+14

This was chosen as an example of a folder where the creative achievement was not matched by the quality of the Commentary. This was acknowledged by the centre and the marks are a fair assessment of this quite common disparity. The Commentary tended be observational and descriptive and even with appropriate terminology, the conclusions were often bland and generalised.

By contrast, the creative pieces showed a high level of engagement and generic awareness, even if the candidate resorted to unhelpful graphics in the non-fiction. This is another example of very high candidate engagement and developed sense of audience and purpose.

The bibliography here is impressive as the candidate has clearly undertaken extensive research and this is reflected in the work.

### **Training Folder 3**

35 marks. 10+11+14

A very good example of a secure mid-range folder. The fiction is a bit on the short side and feels under-developed, although there are plenty of good ideas. The theme of Dystopia was a popular one this year so no surprises here. The non-fiction is better and feels more controlled.

The Commentary tends to skate over the surface so that the candidate can demonstrate plenty of awareness of the relevant issues but there is a lack of development of ideas. The candidate has not used their full word count allocation here and might have benefitted from pushing some of the points further. There are also some sentences which sound very impressive but do not make much sense. The bibliography is minimal.

This folder has a very good front sheet provided by the centre with helpful notes and evidence of internal moderation.

### **Training Folder 4.**

54 marks. 16+16+22

Another example of a very secure folder which fully deserves to be in the top band of marks. The commentary is often very strong and has much to commend although there are one or two generalisations which are not followed through; the candidate has 200 words spare and could have used these to develop some more specific literary or linguistic points. points.

Both the fiction and non-fiction are very strong and the contrast in tone between both pieces is a definite advantage. The candidate is equally at home with over-the-top Gothic and informal journalism with a clear sense of audience throughout.

The work is extensively annotated, with evidence of internal moderation.

The bibliography is impressive and this quality of research is reflected in the work itself as well as in the Commentary.

### **Training Folder 5**

49 marks. 15+14+20

This is a good folder which doesn't quite have enough precise analysis or generic confidence to belong in the top band. However, there is much to admire here, especially in the AO2 and AO4 aspects of the commentary. Not enough specific linguistic analysis to get into Level 5 but very strong elsewhere.

The creative pieces both show a secure understanding of genre and audience and the control of structure and paragraphing is a real strength in the non-fiction. This was a speech with a clearly defined audience, and it really does read like a speech. The fiction also demonstrates awareness of audience and purpose and the level of student engagement with the work is evident throughout; in fact, this was a clear trend in this series overall.

As with Folder 1, this work may be regarded as exemplary in terms of presentations but also in terms of assessment, annotation, and evidence of moderation.

### **Training Folder 6 Takeaway**

46 marks 15+14 +17

This is an ambitious folder which has much to admire. There is a high level of engagement with the topic and the research is often impressive.

The fiction is stronger than the non-fiction and the Commentary does discuss the influence of the stimulus text.

The non-fiction is well-written but there is a sense that this is an all-purpose article rather than a piece tailored for a specific outlet and audience.

This lack of focus is reflected in the Commentary, which does not address the nature of the article or how it has been shaped to reflect the intended audience. It is worth noting that the Commentary does not use the full word limit and there are many opportunities missed for developed analysis. Much of what the candidate has written is very strong; it would not have taken much to move the Commentary towards the top band.