

Mocks Marking Training

Paper 2: Non-Fiction and Transactional Writing

Marks and commentaries

	Question 1	Mark	Comments
Script 1A	<i>Cigarettes</i> <i>Bovril</i>	2	Two correct answers.
Script 1B	<i>Rice</i> <i>Cigaretts</i>	1	Answer 1 is incorrect. Answer 2 is correct - spelling does not need to be accurate.
Script 1C	<i>Oxo cubes</i> <i>Cigarettes</i>	2	Two correct answers offered.
Script 1D	<i>Bread</i> <i>Cigarettes</i>	1	Answer 1 is incorrect. Answer 2 is correct.

Question 2

Script 2A

This response achieves 2 marks. The example identified is relevant in showing how Bert feels about his new wife and the comment identifies how it is used: *he loves her so much he complements her well.*

Script 2B

This response achieves 1 mark - the selected example is relevant to how Bert feels about his wife, but there is no comment on how the writer uses language.

Script 2C

This response comments on language but does not answer the question about how language is used to show Bert's feelings for his new wife. The answer achieves 0 marks.

Question 3

Script 3A

This answer starts with an example of **language**; *Another night has passed*, and gives a comment on what this tells the reader. This is more descriptive than analytical on how language is used. The comment on the description of the parcels is very similar in offering valid reference. There is reference to positive **language** and the reason for its use, linked to the reader of the letter: *because he does not want his wife worrying about him*. The comment on the language used to describe the wife's pastry is simplistic: *shows us he really enjoyed it*. This is continued in the **language** used to encourage *his wife to carry on cooking pastries*.

The response is short and offers a few comments on **language**, although it lacks coverage of the whole text. The selection of references is valid, but not developed. The bullets of Level 2 are met - there is not enough explanation of the **language** use to move higher. This is also an example of rubric infringement: the response does not comment on **structure** and thus cannot progress beyond the top of Level 2.

Level 2 - 4 marks

Script 3B

This answer offers explanation of both **language** and **structure**. The **language** points have explanation and include focus on speech and quotations, personal pronouns. For example, the comments on the use of personal language show explanation: *By doing this the writer is making the letter appear to be more personal*. There is quite detailed explanation bordering on exploration in the points about the use of direct quotation to create a feeling of nostalgia, and in the creation of a *more friendly and playful tone*. The explanation of personal pronoun use borders on exploring them in detail, and has appropriate and relevant quotation. There is a **structural** point on rhetorical questions, although the candidate is really identifying tag questions used. There is explanation of how **structure** is used here. The candidate also comments on the use of brackets, and explains this in a broad way: *made it easy for his wife to adopt his perspective*.

The bullets of Level 3 are all met. A couple of points are slightly explored, for example the use of questions, but not quite consistently or detailed enough to achieve Level 4. There is enough explanation of **language** and **structure** and appropriate and relevant references to achieve the top of the level.

Level 3 - 9 marks

Question 4		Mark	Comments
Script 4A	<i>It used to be 'pointless and laborious' but now he said it is 'quick and delightful'</i>	1	A correct answer is identified.
Script 4B	<i>'Small boy and I are healthier, happier' They are happy now after changing systems.</i>	0	Incorrect answer - this does not refer to how cooking has improved, more how they have been affected.
Script 4C	<i>Cooking for one and a half people has become 'quick and delightful' since it requires minimal preparation and washing up.</i>	1	A correct answer is identified - although just 'quick and delightful' would have been enough.

Question 5

Script 5A

This response achieves 1 mark as there is reference to personification and a relevant example, but there could be more on 'how'. The candidate is given the benefit of the doubt and awarded the mark.

Script 5B

This response achieves 0 marks as it describes the feelings but does not comment on how language is used in order to meet AO2.

Question 6

Script 6A

This **evaluative** response contains some well-informed and some quite developed critical judgement. It does start with straightforward opinion, *The writer successfully shows*, and links this to ideas in the text: her own experience and cooking for friends and her son. The candidate explains (Level 3) the evidence used by the writer to show impact on others and this is developed well (Level 4). For example, the comment on how the writer uses evidence *of her friends opinions of her food...show how she has made them happy*. While this is more focussed on 'how' than 'how well' the addition of *therefore effecting people around* adds an **evaluative** edge. This is also true of the comment on evidence from the writer's online blog, although this has more informed judgement as the candidate identifies: *This particular technique is effective...*The use of informed judgement is consistent as the candidate follows the method of how others are affected, how the writer shows how others are affected, and how successful this is. In the example of how Small Boy is affected the candidate explains how the idea of using her son *gives a personalised feel to the writing*, and then goes on to offer informed judgement with some analysis: *The use of her son is effective because it is relatable to by various different readers and is a personal way of showing a change to someone close to her*. The conclusion pulls together the informed judgement with *This was done successfully...*

There are appropriate references provided from the text (Level 3), and **evaluative** language is used consistently throughout the response (Level 4). Ideas such as the use of opinion, the use of personal anecdote and various examples are explained, but there is not enough analysis to move to the top of the Level.

Level 4 - 10 marks

Question 7a

Script 7A

This response has some clear synthesis of the texts, as the candidate has commented on home cooking, money and simplicity. There is some sound understanding of similarities and some examples given, *home cooked* and *a budget of around £10 per week*, but since the examples given for the final similarity are not explained the response does not achieve the level of detailed understanding or synthesis.

As it is the answer achieves all of the bullets of Level 2.

Level 2 - 4 marks

Question 7b

Script 7B

This response considers a fairly wide range of comparisons between the texts such as the use of time in the texts (quite a sophisticated choice), the contrast in presentation of perspectives and reactions to situations. The first comparison is of Text 2 ordering events *in chronological order whereas in the letter home by Bert time is almost static as such with no real development in time*. This is quite varied and touches on analysis of ideas and perspectives. The second comparison of how *Both texts offer insight into the characters' perspectives by incorporating their reactions to certain situations* is exemplified with detailed evidence from Text 2, but the evidence from Text 1 is briefer. Although the comparisons are quite wide-ranging they are not always connected, for example the presenting of perspectives *in a slightly different way*. There is explanation that touches on exploration, especially at the start of the answer, but references are not always detailed and do not always fully support the points being made.

The answer does meet all of the bullets of Level 3, and just does enough in wide-ranging comparisons and evidence to move into the lower end of Level 4. The first point elevates the response higher than the border mark.

Level 4 - 10 marks

Question 8

Script 8A

The candidate answers Question 8, which asks for a section for a text book on how to manage change. This demonstrates how important it is to consider over the course of teaching and learning the range of potential writing candidates may be required to read and write in their examination. These are identified in the specification on page 8.

This response has some relevant ideas: financial problems, losing someone close and *bad moment*. The response addresses the reader by using the personal pronoun *you*, and this gives the response some basic awareness of audience. There is some establishment of purpose, with the voice demonstrating issues people face (although these do not necessarily link to change), and some superficial sense of how to cope with them or manage them: *think about the good things you have done either should make you feel good, don't worry it is obviously going to change*.

The ideas are expressed and partly ordered (Level 2), although without real direction. They are not developed or connected for Level 3. Paragraphs are used where changes in ideas are shown, but the organisation is lost towards the end as the candidate 'tails off': *after you get over it you will be OK. at life there will be change at some point*.

For AO5 there is some awareness of audience and purpose (Level 1/2), and straightforward use of tone and style (Level 2). Ideas are expressed (Level 2) and mostly ordered (Level 1/2). Paragraphs are used (Level 2) with limited use of structural and grammatical features (Level 1). Overall the response meets the lower end of Level 2 and is too short to have developed ideas.

For AO6 there is a lack of varied vocabulary used, but there are some correctly spelt words (Level 2). There are some more complex words spelt correctly: *financial, recently, struggle*. Syntax is often confusing, for example in the first paragraph structure hinders meaning. The second bullet of AO6 is only met at Level 1, so the best fit is the middle of Level 2.

Level 2 - 7 marks

Level 2 - 5 marks

Question 9

Script 9A

The candidate answers Question 9 which is a letter to a newspaper in response to an article.

The shape of this letter shows that there is no requirement for an address for the editor or anything more in the way of layout than a salutation and close. The opening is clear and immediately shows the idea of a personal response to the article through the use of pronouns: *I am writing to you today...* The viewpoint is clearly identified from the start: Junk food can create a multitude of issues for younger and older customers. This viewpoint is strongly identified through the use of vocabulary such as *relinquishes, crisis, perish* and through alliteration such as *health hazards, hundreds, hands, heart*. This is continued in the next paragraph with *crisps, chocolate, customers, choose, cheaper, caused*.

There is a definite selection of material for effect, for example the sense of concern with junk food is emphasised through the use of hyperbole like *millions of customers, the hysteria that will be caused, The ramifications that Britain will encounter will shatter our reputation and faster than an epidemic*. Sentence types vary to an extent, for example *so why choose the container of olives when I can purchase a delicious, yet disgusting bag of crisps?* and *But what if there was a solution to this issue?* Coordinated structures such as *crisps and chocolate, chaos and corruption* are used for particular effect, as is alliteration in the example *this malicious scheme made by the malignant master minds of money making*. Information and ideas are managed in the main, from the coverage of how junk food affects health, to the cost and ease of manufacture, to the obesity crisis. Towards the end of the response the focus is lost somewhat, for example the analogy of how easy it can be to make a cake and how this can be managed is a little incongruous. The concluding paragraph is a little formal for a letter, *In conclusion I personally believe*, but the voice and style is sustained.

For AO5 the response meets all of the bullets of Level 3. In Level 4 the candidate organises material for particular effect and manages information and ideas. The tone, style and register are appropriate and sometime effective, and there is some deliberate use of structural and grammatical features.

For AO6 the candidates uses a wide, selective vocabulary, for example *multitude, relinquishes, numerous, disturbingly, ramifications, Furthermore, scourge and contagion*. There are few errors in spelling and punctuation is used for clarity, with some sentence structures used for effect. Apostrophes are not consistently used, and syntax is occasionally stilted.

Level 4 - 17 marks

Level 4 - 11 marks

Qu	Comments	Mark
	Script A – whole script	
Q1	Two correct answers are offered for two marks.	2
Q2	There is a valid example of language, <i>My little darling</i> , and an appropriate comment which shows how the language is used: <i>an affectionate pet name for her to show he cares deeply...</i> The 'how' is essential for the second mark.	2
Q3	<p>This answer starts with an identification of who the reader is. This is important for this text as the language and structure used are for one person, as the candidate notes: <i>Bert Bailey clearly intended for this letter to be read by one specific person, his wife...</i> Starting the answer with an identification of the intended audience is useful as it helps to connect technique to audience.</p> <p>There is a specific language technique identified in the opening, direct address, and this is explored in the link to what effect it has, <i>to engage her attention within the letter</i>. This example could be analysed further - but it does focus the answer on language straight away.</p> <p>A structure point is also identified early on as the candidate comments on the use of tag questions, connecting this well with the language point on conversational tone. She uses a clarifying example, <i>didn't you?</i> There are perceptive exploration and analysis of this in the comment that this helps to engage his wife as one would engage someone in conversation. This is developed into the influence on the reader as the candidate writes <i>Bailey is trying to invite his wife to respond to him in future letters with information...</i></p> <p>The candidate also comments on language in the <i>conversational tone</i> and the use of <i>discourse markers</i>. While the technical terminology is not specifically required or credited, it does show a perceptive understanding of language. A candidate just commenting on the example, <i>Now my little darling</i>, could achieve just as high a mark if the analysis of it is of the same quality. In this comment it is the interpretation of alternative effects and influences on the reader, seen in the use of <i>perhaps</i>, that is perceptive and considered.</p> <p>The structure point on the cyclical nature of the letter - that it starts and ends with the <i>banality of the subject of the weather</i> is a point that is explored more than analysed. The comment that this is <i>a dull topic of conversation</i> is appropriate, but the weather as a topic also links back to</p>	14

	<p>the idea of conversational phatic talk and the relationship between reader and writer. The point that <i>it may go some way to reassuring her that her husband is safe</i> could be analysed a bit more in the context, for example the idea of them being newlyweds, the dangerous nature of war, the 'shared familiarity' of weather which also may make Bert feel that he has a connection to home.</p> <p>The comment on reassuring language is detailed and perceptive, showing an understanding and close reading of the text and the introduction to the text - the candidate picks up here that the couple have only been married for a short time, and that this impacts on the use of language. The comment that a simile is used shows clear knowledge of language devices, but again it is the analysis that is more important here. Language to show the closeness of their relationship is commented on broadly as well, with word-level comment on the use of <i>Darling</i> and a link to structure as she says <i>repeatedly calls her</i> this. The link back to the effect on and influence of the reader is analysed, as the candidate says this will be <i>appreciated, particularly in the early stages of marriage</i>.</p> <p>Gentle teasing and humour are other language techniques analysed in detail. The candidate identifies that this affects his reader by quoting to show <i>he is thinking of her frequently</i>. The comment on how the language could help Mrs Bailey to feel more like the traditional <i>good wife</i> is quite sophisticated in terms of the influence on the reader, although the example given is not explored in as much detail as it could be: <i>to hear he enjoyed them...</i> is not explained. The final language point on the use of the reference to <i>never fear for my life in the future</i> is also analysed in terms of the context of the war and the couple as newlyweds.</p> <p>This is a perceptive and sophisticated response which shows that listing of specific techniques with terminology examples is not required to achieve top marks. The candidate has explored and analysed the relationship between the reader and writer with close reading. The response does not reach the top of the Level as there could be more development of some language points. However, the awareness of the bullet in the mark scheme <i>to achieve effects and influence readers</i> is Level 5 quality.</p>	
Q4	<p>The focus of this question is on how <u>cooking</u> has improved. Comments on how the people eating the food have changed are not credited as this is not how cooking has improved. Candidates would benefit from identifying the lines in their Reading Text Insert to ensure the correct lines are being used.</p> <p>This is an AO1 question which requires identification of an example. This candidate has included a valid point from the lines given and has identified before and after: <i>It used to feel 'pointless and laborious' but now feels</i></p>	1

	<i>'quick and delightful'</i> . The mark could be achieved by just writing <i>but now feels 'quick and delightful'</i> , or even just <i>now quick and delightful</i> .	
Q5	<p>For this AO2 question the candidates need to comment on how language is used, not describe what language is used. A comment such as <i>the writer uses personification</i> would not be credited, nor would <i>she gets big angry spots</i>. This is the effect processed food has on her, but not how the language is used.</p> <p>This candidate achieves the mark by identifying the language feature, <i>negative adjectives</i>, with examples (although just the examples would be sufficient), with a comment on how it is used: <i>to show the negative impact processed food has on her</i>.</p>	1
Q6	<p>Q6 achieves all of the bullets in Level 3 and just moves into Level 4 by meeting the first bullet in that Level. Centres should note the key words in the question: <i>evaluate how successfully</i>. Therefore, candidates should look to evaluate (AO4) rather than simply approaching this question as a language analysis (AO2) task - this is appropriate for AO2 not AO4.</p> <p>There is a good focus in the opening paragraph on the question stem of <i>how others are affected by her experience</i>. The response opens with evaluative language, <i>effectively shows</i>, which focuses the answer directly upon evaluation. The answer has identified through close reading the 'others' in the question and structured the response in this way on her son, other parents, the public - although there are other opportunities to comment on others such as her friends. The answer starts with the explanation of an event, <i>becoming unemployed</i>, with references that are appropriate and relevant in terms of the impact on others. There is informed judgement about the use of this event, <i>an effective device</i>, and this is partly developed with the link to empathy with other parents. This point is developed with the comment further reinforced at word-level.</p> <p>The point on the use of contrasts in the situation is explained, but lacks the evaluation needed - it is more on 'how' than 'how well'. The response then moves more into this focus on explaining 'how', rather than 'how well', in the presentation of its effects on the public. A more evaluative comment would be <i>the use of the structural development from the specific individual, Small Boy, to the general public, is an effective device to show how others have been affected as it creates trust in the reader with a specific example, so they believe the effect on the general public</i>. The explanation of the impact of the determiner shows informed judgement that this creates a <i>quite dramatic</i> impact. The point about the <i>sense of irony</i> again needs more evaluative comment and language so that it is more 'how well' than 'how'.</p>	10

	<p>The conclusion to the response moves back to more evaluative language with the phrase <i>successfully shows</i>. The response is best fitted into the bottom of Level 4. The bullets of Level 3 are met overall, and there is some analysis of ideas, events and situation. More evaluative focus - going back to 'how well' when a point is made - would move the response higher.</p> <p>Candidates could quite legitimately comment that the writer is not successful if they feel, for example, that the ideas and events are too personal to focus the reader on others who are affected.</p>	
Q7a	<p>For 7a the question requires synthesis of the texts - so the focus is on what similarities the people have in the case of this question. The indicative content in the mark scheme, for example, shows that a comment that both writers are head of their households, with examples, would be an appropriate similarity to offer.</p> <p>This is a comprehensive and full answer to this question which shows detailed understanding and synthesis. A full range of similarities are covered, with the lead-in to the question, <i>taking care of others</i>, giving an overall thread to connect them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • both have a sense of responsibility • both show the importance of positivity • both show that food is important • both show that home-made is best • both show the importance of a budget • both show compliments and joy in their care for others. <p>While there are six similarities here there is no requirement to produce as many similarities as there are marks - as long as the similarities show understanding and synthesis of the two texts (in other words they are balanced) - this is enough. There could be, for example, three similarities with detailed comment and evidence.</p>	6
Q7b	<p>7b allows for a more broad commentary on similarities and differences between the two texts, specifically with focus on ideas and perspectives in the texts. Some of the similarities from 7a can be used, although the focus of this part of the question is different. Comparisons must be linked to the ideas and perspectives and the theme, language and/or structure.</p> <p>This response deals with comparisons in detail, rather than commenting on a varied and comprehensive range for the top Level. The idea of the situations of both writers having an effect on their emotional states is a clear opening to the response, and the comparisons lead from there. The first contrast is how the writers deal with the changes in their circumstances. Text 2 is commented on with examples that fully support the idea of a <i>negative state of mind</i>. For Text 1 the point about the more</p>	11

	<p>positive presentation of change is explored in relation to the audience, showing analysis of the text.</p> <p>The second comparison is of how the changes affect the finances in the writers' homes. Again, there is exploration in detail of the implications of language in Text 2 and how this shows ideas and perspectives: <i>implies that she previously enjoyed these items but her new situation has made her now perceive these are luxuries</i>. The context of Text 1 is explored in the sense of handing finances over to the writer's wife, showing that this is unusual at this time. The two texts are well-connected through the use of structure: <i>However, as with Monroe, he still maintains some control over the budget by using the imperatives...</i></p> <p>The final comparison explored is how the writers think about food, given the changes in their situations. Examples from the texts are balanced here and fully support the point that <i>home-made food is significantly better regardless of the circumstances</i>.</p> <p>This response explores a range of comparisons between the texts, explores the writers' ideas and perspectives linked to theme and language/structure and uses balanced references from the two texts that fully support the points made. The response achieves the top of Level 4, and more varied and comprehensive comparisons would move it into Level 5.</p>	
Q9	<p>The candidate answers Question 9 and achieves full marks for AO5 and AO6.</p> <p>The shape of this letter shows that there is no requirement for an address for the editor or anything more in the way of layout than a salutation and close.</p> <p>The clear and compelling introduction gives a personal viewpoint, which is key to the question which asks candidates to write a letter <i>giving your views</i>. This candidate has cleverly imagined what the article would have said and responds to these points in the letter, giving shape and direction to the argument made.</p> <p>The candidate starts with <i>I felt compelled to address some of the issues raised by your writer</i>. Pronoun use sets up a one-to-one style with the reader and writer with use of <i>I</i> and <i>your</i>.</p> <p>Organisation is clear in the opening paragraph with the use of <i>Firstly</i>, and the technique used in this first point is expressed in a sophisticated way by showing agreement with one point, then showing criticism: <i>while I agree with your views...you fail to take into account that...</i>The complex sentence effectively creates a sense of an expert writer, along with the use of</p>	<p>AO5 24</p> <p>AO6 16</p>

	<p>extensive lexis such as <i>non-organic counterparts, flavoursome and chemical-ridden</i>. This vocabulary is used strategically to create an image of the contrast between organic and non-organic foods. The use of the conditional sentence <i>If you were to eat...</i> and the image of the family picnic are sophisticated in their shaping of the audience response. Adverbs are used to support the points being made such as <i>significantly, forcibly, instantly, simply</i>. The writer brings the reader cleverly to a view that this will save money - through using far less.</p> <p>The personal viewpoint continues with <i>I was also disappointed by your suggestion that all meat, with the exception of chicken, was somehow so unhealthy...</i> Again, this imagines what the original article may have said and uses an imperative to show the strength of view: <i>This is completely untrue!</i> The technique of using complex sentences to show some agreement but then make a counterpoint is continued with <i>Whilst I concede that...</i> The descriptions used show understanding of complex ideas: <i>nutritious, healthy stews; lean yet inexpensive cuts of meat</i>. The use of repetition for effect is seen in the example <i>will make a far cheaper, (and far tastier for that matter) meal for your family</i>, and later in <i>cutting down on both food waste and financial waste</i>. The use of the reading Text 2 to support the writing is good practice and enables the candidate to demonstrate expert knowledge.</p> <p>The use of complex ideas is seen in the paragraph that uses the idea of Mrs Smith who discovered <i>how much sugar was in her tinned fruit</i>. This is used effectively to illustrate <i>how infrequently people read the labels on food packaging but also demonstrates the urgent need for all people to be properly educated...</i> The reader is shaped with subtlety throughout, with the idea that <i>perhaps an article on label-reading might be a useful next step for your newspaper</i>.</p> <p>There is much to commend in this letter, but it is clear that the candidate shapes the audience response with subtlety and uses a sophisticated tone and register through the creation of a persona. The ideas are complex and manipulated through the use of the structural feature of response to specific ideas from 'the article', vocabulary is extensive, spelling is accurate and punctuation aids precision and effect. Syntax is used accurately and selectively.</p>	
	TOTAL FOR SCRIPT:	87/ 96

Q	Comments	Mark
Script B – whole script		
Q1	Two correct answers are offered for two marks.	2
Q2	<p>This answer offers two examples from the text and two comments on how language is used. Only one is required. There is a valid example of language in the first, <i>my little darling</i>, and an appropriate although vague comment which shows how the language is used: <i>to show he has real feelings for her</i>. The 'how' is essential for the second mark. In the second comment the example of language is not related to his feelings for his wife. The comment <i>showing a love for her</i> would be credited with one mark if there was no other answer offered.</p>	2
Q3	<p>This answer moves directly into commenting on structure with an appropriate comment on rhetorical questions. This is not exemplified with an example, but there is some explanation: <i>to show that the things he is saying to his new wife in the letter cannot be answered</i>. The next references to structure are vague and underdeveloped: paragraphs <i>showing he is beginning a new topic</i> and lists: <i>to show a lot of variety of things/foods</i>.</p> <p>A language point is also identified early on as the candidate comments on the use of words to show how <i>much he cares about her</i>. This is Level 2/3 comment as there is some explanation. The language reference continues with some explanation of the use of <i>speaking language</i> and <i>conversation</i>.</p> <p>The explanation of structure continues to be consistently Level 2/3: <i>short sentences and short pauses - to show the pause between words</i>. The comment on commas repeats the reference to lists made earlier in the response: <i>lists are used for a variety of different things to be thrown into one sentence</i>. The final structure point about ellipsis and how it is used is more comment than explanation initially, <i>makes the letter look interesting</i>, but then does move more into explanation: <i>to show it would have continued and gone further but he just wanted to stop there</i>.</p> <p>This is a fairly sound response which has some imbalance towards structure. The features commented on are appropriate, but the level of analysis of how they are used is more comment/explanation (Level 2/3). The response does meet the bullets of Level 2, and just moves into Level 3 with some explanation of features. More on language would be required to move higher into that Level.</p>	7

Q4	<p>This candidate has included various points that could be credited, the first being: <i>minimal preparation and washing up</i>. There is also <i>can be frozen for home made meals</i> and <i>quick and delightful</i> identified which is not required to achieve the mark - it has already been achieved.</p>	1
Q5	<p>For this AO2 question the candidates need to comment on how language is used, not describe what language is used.</p> <p>This candidate achieves the mark by identifying an example from the quotation, <i>constantly hungry child</i>, and by focussing in on the use of the word <i>constantly</i> to show repetition and <i>how it's happening again</i>.</p>	1
Q6	<p>Centres should note the key words in the question: <i>evaluate how successfully</i>. Therefore, candidates should look to evaluate rather than simply approaching this question as a language analysis task - this is appropriate for AO2 not AO4.</p> <p>This answer is an example of how a lack of evaluation can limit marks. There is much comment on what the writer is doing in the text, but not how well she is doing it. For example, the opening comment that <i>The writer portrays that being a mum is a hard and challenging job to do</i> is a comment on what the writer is doing, but is not linked to how the writer shows how others are affected by her experience, the focus of the question. There is some evaluative language, <i>successfully shown</i>, which shows some opinion at the start. The answer starts with comment on ideas on how the writer's son and the writer herself are affected, with references that are valid. There is some opinion, <i>effectively shows</i>, although this lacks development. It comments on the difference between the types of food eaten but not how this is used.</p> <p>The point on <i>something bad going in</i> is more on 'how' than 'how well'. The response then moves more into this focus on explaining how and why the writer shows how others are affected, rather than how well. There is also a lack of developed ideas about theme, events and setting, as the candidate does not fully consider the whole extract and who the 'others' are. The point about the writer wanting <i>to make a difference</i> again needs more evaluative comment and language so that it is more 'how well' than 'how'.</p> <p>The conclusion to the response is again focussed on the wrong idea - the idea of how the writer feels rather than how others are affected. The response is best fitted into the bottom of Level 2. The bullets of Level 1 are met overall, and there is some comment on ideas, albeit brief, and some straightforward opinion on the text at the start. More coverage of the whole text and its setting, ideas, theme and events and more evaluative focus - going back to 'how well' when a point is made - would</p>	4

	move the response higher in Level 2. The response to this question needs to refer to the whole of the text.	
Q7a	<p>This is a concise response to this question which shows sound understanding of similarities. The first comment that they both want to take care of one another is not clear enough to be credited, but the candidate comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the writers are talking about food • the writers are in a bad situation • there is a struggle to live in different ways. <p>For 7a the question requires synthesis of the texts - so the focus is on what similarities the people have in the case of this question. The candidate here loses focus slightly into 7b, as they move away from similarities the writers have into comments that are not linked to the writers such as <i>They are both set in a time period.</i></p> <p>This response covers some sound similarities, although there is limited synthesis of the two texts. The idea of the writers <i>being in a bad situation</i> is clearer, with valid evidence, but the other points have limited evidence and do not show clear synthesis to move higher into Level 2.</p>	3
Q7b	<p>7b allows for a more broad commentary on similarities and differences between the two texts, specifically with focus on ideas and perspectives in the texts. Some of the similarities from 7a can be used, although the focus of this part of the question is different. Comparisons must be linked to the ideas and perspectives and the theme, language and/or structure.</p> <p>The first comparison offered is an obvious one given the stem of question 7a, that they both show people caring about others. This point is more implicit given the evidence offered, since the language expressing the point, <i>shows that they both care about each other</i>, is confusing. The evidence to support this comparison from both texts is appropriate and relevant.</p> <p>The second comparison, <i>that they are both referring to food</i>, is also an obvious comparison between the texts. This section shows more of a range of comparisons, <i>both connect to wither sending cheap foods or not having enough foods</i>, although this point is not explored and gets lost in the broader comparison about food. The evidence here is valid, but not developed.</p> <p>The candidate continues using the similarities they identified in 7a, which is perfectly acceptable, in the third comparison about the texts being set in tough times. This point is a valid one and could be developed further with evidence, especially the final sentence of the paragraph that <i>This</i></p>	6

	<p><i>shows that the writers of both texts had the same outlook on the story just in a different approach.</i> This shows the candidate starting to consider a range of comparisons. This goes for the final comparison of the answer, the time periods. Although the candidate included this in 7a it is much more relevant to this section of the question 7 answer. If this had not been mentioned in 7b, credit could have been given from 7a. This again borders on showing a range of comparisons, but lacks evidence to develop it.</p> <p>The candidate has met all of the bullets of Level 2, and given there is something of a range of comparisons touched on has done enough to just tip into Level 3.</p>	
Q8	<p>The candidate answers Question 8, which asks for a section for a text book on how to manage change. This demonstrates how important it is to consider over the course of teaching and learning the range of potential writing candidates may be required to read and write in their examination. These are identified in the specification on page 8.</p> <p>This response shows some form that would be appropriate for a text book section - a heading, some bullet points and clear paragraphs. There is some awareness of audience in the opening statement that shows a broad, general readership: <i>People can face many challenges in their lives.</i> The response then moves into addressing the readers directly: <i>But how do you know how to deal with it?</i> In the opening paragraph the tone, style and register are appropriate, with some range of sentence types and pronouns to create an effect.</p> <p>The second section is not as effective as the structure and language used are a little confusing, and meaning is slightly obscured through spelling. The ideas being expressed are fairly clear, that people face many changes, but they are repeated a little and referred to as <i>chances</i>, which is confusing. The tone becomes a little essay-like: <i>Other changes can be a variety of other things such as...</i></p> <p>The ideas are ordered as the response then moves onto how to deal with change, although again the candidate writes quite a lot to express really only the idea that sharing how you feel is the best option. The paragraph is quite long-winded and repetitive, with syntax and spelling impacting on the effect. Whilst there seem to be underlying ideas that could be explored, for example that you do not have to talk to someone close to you, these are not fully explored. The response comes to an abrupt end and the idea of how changes can affect people is not fully explored.</p> <p>This is a fairly brief response which meets the requirements in Level 2. There is an awareness of purpose and audience, and the tone and style are appropriate at the beginning enough to move it into the lower end of</p>	<p>AO5 10</p> <p>AO6 5</p>

	<p>Level 3. The ideas overall are expressed and ordered, but these are not developed and connected enough to be higher in Level 3. Paragraphs and some range of structural features are used. For AO6 the candidate overall meets most requirements for Level 2, although there is some erratic spelling. There is something of a range of sentence structures, and punctuation is also erratic with some use of semicolons but no use of apostrophes or capital letters.</p>	
	<p>TOTAL FOR SCRIPT:</p>	<p>41/ 96</p>