



Coursework commentaries

Course title

Pearson Edexcel A Level English Language and Literature: Coursework Marking Training

Course code

9EL0-24O1

Student Folder A – Total marks 60

This folder was selected as an example of how to achieve full marks by adhering to the AOs and integrating them seamlessly. The commentary fully integrates the AOs and the critical terminology is used appropriately and always with an eye on the effect on the reader. The centre has adopted several good practices which should be regarded as exemplary. There is an appropriate level for the stimulus texts and the genre, purpose and audience are clearly stated at the start of each piece of creative writing. The commentary is always analytical and there is an extensive bibliography which includes multi-modal texts. The two original pieces are creative and deeply felt and there is plenty of evidence of personal engagement and careful crafting.

The work is well-annotated and the centre has clearly undertaken rigorous internal moderation. The word counts show that the candidate has adhered to the wording of the specification and has edited their work appropriately.

Student Folder B – 13 + 15 + 19; Total marks 47

This is a good example of a strong folder which has much to admire but is not quite good enough for the top level. The creative work is engaging and the stimulus texts are well-chosen. However, the commentary is not always fully analytical or incisive, sometimes relying on long quotations rather than detailed analysis. However, there is an excellent level of engagement across the creative pieces. There were some issues with editing, and some lack of control, perhaps from lack of final proof-reading. The work is well-annotated and presented and there is a good sense of genre, purpose and audience.

Student Folder C – 10 + 9 + 14; Total marks 33

This is a good example of a folder which belongs securely in the mid-range of marks. There is a high level of engagement with both tasks and the fiction work is very creative. The non-fiction is slightly less successful in terms of genre and purpose. The commentary is well-written but does tend to skate over the surface in terms of analysis, relying on assertion and declaration rather than probing analysis.

The work is well-presented and thoroughly annotated and the centre has clearly used a rigorous internal moderation process.



Student Folder D – 14 + 14 + 16; Total marks 44

This is another good example of a folder which is exemplary in terms of presentation and moderation. The centre has clearly read previous Moderator Reports and there is much to admire. This folder is also interesting in exemplifying a trend this year whereby there was a clear difference in achievement between the creative pieces and the commentary. The fiction and non-fiction work were both strong submissions which showed good awareness of genre, purpose and audience. However, the commentary was less secure in terms of meeting the Assessment Objectives. Although there is good discussion of context and genre, the candidate struggles to move beyond the observational when discussing the stylistic influences of the stimulus texts. The candidate's discussion of the structure of the fiction stimulus text is very good but there is less detailed engagement with the specifics of language. There is plenty of evidence of attempted analysis and discussion but the overall level is not as detailed as the higher marked folders in this pack.

Student Folder E – 7 + 6 + 8; Total marks 21

Although the candidate has chosen ambitious texts and topics, there is a clear mismatch between the ambition and the achievement. AO1 insecurity is evident throughout and several rounds of careful proofreading would have improved matters considerably. The non-fiction has little sense of genre or audience. The commentary rarely moves beyond a description of content and observation of details in the work

Student Folder F Takeaway – 16 + 17 + 19; Total marks 52

This was chosen as a secure example of a level 4 submission. Like many folders in this series, there was a mismatch between the achievement in the creative work and the commentary. Both the fiction and non-fiction pieces were strong; the commentary had much to admire but lacked the level of analytical detail necessary for level 5.

The work is well-annotated and there is plenty of evidence of internal moderation.

The front sheets make clear that the fiction stimulus, although a 9EL02 text, was not studied for the exam. Centres which are unsure about choosing appropriate texts for the coursework can choose those in the specification with confidence, if they are not chosen as exam texts.