

9ENO 04 Coursework Folder Commentaries

Folder 1

Original writing – 30/30

The work in this folder is an excellent example of original writing that is sophisticated and engaging. The candidate has produced two blogs which target different audiences and have different purposes. Piece 1 is aimed at 'inspiring, encouraging and persuading people' who are suffering from anorexia and therefore, although specific to sufferers of the disorder, the audience would comprise a wide range of ages and genders. The second piece is aimed at a niche audience – philosophy students - and its purpose is to educate and inform them about the various issues and attitudes concerning the language of theology. The folder illustrates how important it is for a candidate to choose a topic and focus that interests them. It is clear from the quality of the writing and the depth of research completed that the candidate enjoyed producing their folder of work.

Piece 1 initially gives the impression that it is a piece of narrative writing, with the metaphorical language being used to convey the desperation and difficulty in coping with an eating disorder: 'the desolate forest'. This manipulation of language and style to convey the torture of experiencing anorexia is extremely powerful and emotive and fully deserves a mark of 30. The effective and repetitive use of pronouns, particularly 'you', together with the varied sentence lengths and erratic nature of the narrative, enables the writer to involve their reader on a very personal level. The clarification of the first two paragraphs in the short sentence 'The forest is your life', helps establish the more self-help stage of the blog. The language moves away from the metaphorical and dark focus of the earlier paragraphs and the candidate begins to use a more positive lexis to create a more encouraging tone. In paragraph 4, the candidate cleverly uses personification and short sentence structures to present anorexia as an evil entity 'it will not win. It will not succeed' again to counter the negative aspects in the language used earlier in the paragraph: 'darkness. Inescapable nightmares'. The length of the piece also highlights how clever manipulation of language, form and structure can enable full marks to be achieved within the word limit.

Piece 2 similarly illustrates the accuracy and sophistication of level 5 writing. The candidate shows a secure depth of knowledge when constructing the central argument: 'Religious language is meaningless?' In many ways the writing goes beyond that of an A Level piece of writing. The choice of specialist language and the prestigious tone utilised mirrors that of an educational piece of writing. There is a clear balance of argument and counter-argument presented throughout, with reference made to a number of philosophers. Overall both pieces are extremely well constructed, within the word count and show a sophisticated manipulation of language and structure.

Commentary 20/20

A sophisticated and assured commentary which presents a critical analysis of the process taken by the candidate in the creation of their original writing and the way various style models and research have impacted on the construction of meaning. The candidate makes excellent links between all texts and uses close exemplification from their own writing to develop ideas. Language is sophisticated and pertinent to the points made and there is a complex awareness of the audience and particularly in piece 1, an empathy for the sufferers of anorexia. An excellent example of a level 5 piece of writing.

Folder 2

Original writing – 23/30

The candidate shows a controlled understanding of genre requirements and has produced two convincing pieces of travel writing. Piece 1 makes an effective attempt to shape the language to suit a younger audience, perhaps a 'gap year student'. The use of the informal and chatty tone: 'as my friends and I', creates a believable voice. The article does use synthetic personalisation through the integration of pronouns and punctuation, and there is a clear attempt to select vocabulary that would engage a younger audience and effectively balances factual information on Barcelona with the more informal and chatty conversation: 'built in 1957 to host the Olympics', 'taking selfies'. It is clear that the candidate has researched the language features and structures used within travel writing.

There is a controlled attempt to differentiate the second travel piece by choosing to write it from the perspective of an older married man, celebrating his ruby wedding anniversary by visiting Barcelona. There is effective understanding of genre requirements and the semantic field relating to the topic chosen: 'Gaudi', 'Gothic Quarter' gives the impression that the speaker has visited the particular places mentioned.

Commentary – 14/20

The commentary is controlled, applying a range of concepts and issues to analyse the language and structural devices employed in the crafting of both travel pieces. The candidate opens by explaining the process they took as part of their research: 'competition entries from Just Back' and in particular 'Rebecca Russell's entry' concerning a trip to Venice. It is obvious from the commentary that the candidate had a detailed awareness of the construction of travel writing and how to adapt language to the relevant audience. For both pieces of original writing, links between style models and own writing are clear and supported by appropriate examples: 'I found this particularly useful'. To move to a higher level 4, a more controlled and interwoven analysis of the examples taken from the candidate's own work would be required as a number of paragraphs ended with exemplification but with limited analysis. Despite this, the terminology is clear: 'alliteration', 'historical information', 'Standard English', although alternative interpretations and wider inferences for the use of these features would develop the commentary further. The candidate is aware of contextual factors influencing the language of travel writing and mention is made to issues surrounding the choice of language and the importance of converging with an audience.

Folder 3

Original writing – 14/30

Both pieces of original writing demonstrate a reasonable understanding of how to craft magazine articles and despite the occasional lapse in language, they generally meet the demands of the audience.

Piece 1, aimed at adult women, is not entirely convincing as the style models: 'Pick me up' and 'Take a break', generally deal with lighter issues or human-interest stories in a more positive manner.

Piece 2 also has some errors and technical lapses, which restrict the mark from moving to a higher level 3.

Paragraph 3 is syntactically awkward and there are some basic punctuation errors, which should have been picked up in drafting by the candidate. Despite these features, the candidate has attempted to use language in keeping with both subjects, piece 1 illustrates research into the language of the ambulance service, whilst piece 2, includes technical terminology and jargon associated with football. Due to the inconsistencies within both pieces the mark of 14 was awarded.

Commentary 12/20

The commentary is focused and meets all the requirements of a level 3 as it is clear, well-structured and able to explain how audience and function affect construction. The response is balanced but there is a lack of close language analysis to enable the mark to move into a level 4 range. The candidate does show an awareness of the audience, particularly for piece 2 and clear mention is made to the 'Four Four Two' style model to aid construction of the piece. The format of the commentary is fairly systematic in its approach. Examples from own writing are integrated within the piece and analysis is clear. The candidate makes references to the thinking behind the original writing's construction and references the drafting process: 'I learnt what style to write my article', to illustrate that consideration had been made to the creation of both pieces. Overall the commentary is a good example of a top level 3 piece of writing.

Folder 4

Original writing – 15/30

The candidate has produced two narrative pieces with the function of entertaining the chosen audiences. Piece 1 is aimed at a teenage audience, whilst piece 2 is more targeted towards adults. Although piece 1 does follow a typical teenage storyline, it was difficult to distinguish between the two as both narratives could appeal to a number of age groups or genders.

Both pieces are presented in the third person narrative form and focus on a central character. There are a number of spelling and grammatical errors within the folder, particularly in piece 1, where the candidate switches tenses on a number of occasions. These irregularities impact on the quality of the writing and the believability of the storyline. Despite the errors, there are some areas that do meet the requirements of a level 3 mark – the language of piece 1 creates a contrast between the chaos of the party and the calmness of the protagonist opening her presents.

Similarly, the selection of language for piece 2 conveys the candidate's empathy for the character of Margaret and her presentation as an elderly woman. Taking the minor errors and irregularities into account, the candidate has a clear understanding of the genre requirements for narrative writing and has attempted an individual voice for both pieces. A mark in the middle of level 3 is appropriate.

Commentary – 10/20

The commentary is beginning to show a clear understanding of the concepts and issues required in producing two pieces of narrative writing. The candidate uses an appropriate register and style throughout with some clarity. The first part of analysis securely meets the requirements of a level 3, with clear expression; a logically structured discussion and it systematically explores the process taken to create 'Margaret'. In contrast, the second part of the commentary lacks the use of terminology and close reference to linguistic features to warrant a top level 3 mark. There is also a tendency to re-tell the storyline rather than closely analyse the language of the candidate's own writing and style models. As a result of the imbalance within the commentary, the mark awarded meets the demands of a lower level 3 mark.