



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

In English Language (1EN0)

Paper 2: Non- Fiction and Transactional
Writing

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

November 2023

Publications Code 1EN0_02_ER_2311

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

This report will provide exemplification of candidates' work, together with tips and comments, for Questions 1-9 of Paper 2 of the Pearson Edexcel Level 1/Level 2 GCSE in English Language (9-1). This was the November examination for 2023.

The qualification consists of three components:

Unit 1: Fiction and Imaginative Writing - 40% (examination)

Unit 2: Non-fiction and Transactional Writing - 60% (this examination)

Unit 3: Spoken Language Endorsement (non-examination assessment)

This report will focus on Unit 2: Non-fiction and Transactional Writing.

The paper is assessed through a 2 hour 5 minute examination. The total number of marks available is 96. The reading and writing sections on this paper are linked by a theme.

This focus of this component is:

Section A – Reading

Study and analyse selections from a range of non-fiction texts.

This paper features two unseen non-fiction extracts from 20th- and 21st-century texts. One of these texts is literary non-fiction. The word count across the two extracts is approximately 1000 words. The minimum length of an extract will always be 300 words. The specification identifies that:

'Text types studied should include a range of non-fiction forms, such as journalism (for example articles and reviews), speeches, journals and reference book extracts. Text types should also include literary nonfiction, such as selections from autobiography, letters, obituaries and travel writing.'

The questions are on Text 1 (Questions 1 to 3) and Text 2 (Questions 4 to 6). Question 7 is on both texts.

There is a mixture of short and extended response questions on the extracts.

Candidates' ability to synthesise across two texts will be assessed in a separate question, 7a, which will focus on similarities in the texts. The final question of this section, 7b, requires candidates to compare the writers' ideas and perspectives and how they are presented in the two texts.

Section B – Transactional Writing

This section allows students to explore and develop transactional writing skills, for example letters, articles, reports.

There are two writing tasks, linked by a theme to the reading extracts. Candidates pick one question to respond to. It is possible for the same form (for example a letter, an article) to be present on both tasks in the same paper but with a different focus and/or audience.

For this series, the two tasks were to write a letter to the editor of a newspaper about city and country life or a review of a city or town the candidate had lived in or visited.

The Assessment Objectives for this paper are:

Section A: Reading

AO1:

- Identify and interpret explicit and implicit information and ideas (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q5)
- Select and synthesise evidence from different texts (Q7a)

AO2: Explain, comment on and analyse how writers use language and structure to achieve effects and influence readers, using relevant subject terminology to support their views (Q3)

AO3: Compare writers' ideas and perspectives, as well as how these are conveyed, across two or more texts (Q7b)

AO4: Evaluate texts critically and support this with appropriate textual references (Q6)

Section B: Writing

AO5:

Communicate clearly, effectively and imaginatively, selecting and adapting tone, style and register for different forms, purposes and audiences (Q8 or Q9)

Organise information and ideas, using structural and grammatical features to support coherence and cohesion of texts (Q8 or Q9)

AO6: Candidates must use a range of vocabulary and sentence structures for clarity, purpose and effect, with accurate spelling and punctuation (Q8 or Q9)

General overview

It was clear that candidates were all able to respond to unseen 20th- and 21st century non-fiction in the examination. They were able to read substantial pieces of writing, including whole and extended texts that make significant demands in terms of content, structure and the quality of the language. Throughout the qualification, candidates had been prepared very well and all had, at different levels, developed the skills of interpretation, analysis and evaluation.

It was also clear that candidates used what they learned about different text types to support their transactional writing, which is advised in the specification.

It was pleasing to see that candidates had been given the opportunity to practise a range of non-fiction writing techniques and planning and proofreading skills, with many using the planning box offered for the writing section.

The responses of candidates had many positive features. Examiners were impressed by:

- the level of knowledge of and engagement with the texts
- completion of the questions in the paper in the time available and the attempt to cover of all of the assessment objectives
- the inclusion of judgements at different levels for AO4
- the ability to make at least some meaningful comparisons for AO3
- writing that showed a range of ideas and suitable tone, style and register for audience and purpose
- the use of a variety of vocabulary and sentence structures in writing.

Less successful responses:

- struggled to comment on, explain or analyse structural points in terms of their effect on readers in AO2 responses
- failed to support points using appropriate textual evidence, or used textual evidence that did not support the point being made
- lacked focus on the question in Question 7. Parts a) and b) both ask a specific question, not just similarities between the texts and ideas and perspectives broadly
- lacked organisation in their writing
- connected but did not develop ideas enough in their writing
- lacked accurate spelling and secure control of punctuation.

Examiners reported that candidates engaged with the texts very well and that they appeared to engage with the writing questions and had varied ideas and perspectives.

Overall, examiners were very impressed with the performance of candidates and with the range of responses they saw – responses were placed in all levels of the mark scheme. As Principal Examiner for this paper and Chief Examiner for the specification, it is always a privilege to read responses and to see the engagement, interest and hard work in the responses candidates complete.

Question 1

The majority of candidates achieved one or two marks in this question.

The questions are designed with ramping in mind and to encourage achievement and this question in the main showed the confidence of candidates in reading the lines given and finding the information.

This question requires understanding of AO1: 'identify and interpret'. The important advice for this question is to read what is being asked for and select the correct information.

Common examples seen were 'palatial atrium' and 'trendy discotheque' although all of the answers from the mark scheme were seen to varying degrees.

The few candidates who did not achieve any marks chose wrong lines (with the majority who did this selecting 'Manhattan skyline' from line 1), or did not answer the question. Candidates must ensure that their answer responds to the question being asked. The assessment objective requires identification of explicit information, which for this question was 'two landmarks the writer says you may see'. Candidates who repeated the question in their answer, for example saying 'New York landmarks' did not achieve a mark.

Question 2

The majority of candidates achieved two marks in this question and there were a range of responses to choose from. The format of this question has gone back to the format from the earliest series, where the relevant lines are printed in the question paper.

This question requires understanding of both parts of bullet 1 of AO1: 'identify and interpret'. For this reason, responses that interpreted information from the lines and put this into their own words were acceptable. The question makes it clear that either quotations or own words are acceptable. All of the examples given in the mark scheme were seen in responses, either as quotations or own words.

Question 3

This question discriminates well on this paper. The mark scheme for this question indicates that 'The mark awarded cannot progress beyond the top of Level 2 if only language OR structure has been considered.' It was pleasing to see that the majority of responses had considered both language and structure and that candidates had been encouraged to be aware of structural points. The majority of candidates were able to pick out both elements of language and structure in the text using well-selected quotation/references.

Many responses referred to the landmarks and appearance of these features, including reference to alliteration, frequent use of adverbs, emotive language and personification. In structure there were many references to listing, ellipsis and triplets, use of punctuation and paragraph number and length.

The minimal responses where language AND structure were not dealt with were a good discriminator, as was the way the effects of language/structure had been explained. The best responses showed detailed and confident analysis of language and structure, weaving this with how techniques interested and engaged the reader. These responses were specific about how effects were created, and the analysis was closely linked to the evidence used. The most successful responses think about the type of text the extract is from and how this is designed and created for the reader it is written for.

The most successful responses were able to combine the effects of different methods, for example how the triplet, chosen adjectives and ellipsis worked well together. Responses at the top levels were commenting on both language and structure consistently, confidently and succinctly – often looking at the interrelationship between them. In the very best responses there was understanding of the text as a whole rather than exploration of particular moments. One examiner noted an analytical response that started out with the idea that the writer uses 'frequent personification to evoke in the reader the true sense of the character of the city' and developed this with the 'mixed metaphor contrasting biological elements e.g. adrenalin with non-biological.....electrifying.'

Less successful responses made were quite generic comments and explanations when writing about the use of punctuation. Responses that were in Levels 1 and 2 tended to indicate that language and structure 'is used to engage and interest the reader' which is a phrase used in the question and this did not allow them to meet the higher levels by looking in more details at how these are used to achieve effects and influence readers. Less successful responses also ended up feature-spotting without explaining how features were used or made very generalised comments such as 'uses short sentences to keep the reader interested'.

Structure remains a good discriminator in this question, with some very vague and generalised comments about 'sentence length'. The least successful responses just explained what the text was about and used quotations to 'support' their narrative.

Question 4

The majority of candidates achieved the mark available for this question and there were a range of points in the mark scheme to choose from. There was often a slight misreading of 'older people' as 'old people,' but the latter was a fair interpretation, and this was another question in which candidates were likely to provide more than one correct response in any case (possibly feeling that simply answering for example 'family' was too minimal to gain the mark). 'The Baltic Flour Mill' was a frequent incorrect answer, which could be because candidates saw the word 'group' in the question and possibly interpreted the Mill or its workers as a group. Less frequently, 'Anna Minton,' the writer of the report, showed up as a response, but as she is not herself a group this could also indicate candidates seizing upon what they see as a definite correct answer without careful attention to the wording of the question.

Candidates should be encouraged to be succinct in their answers where only one mark is available.

Question 5

Again, the majority of candidates achieved the mark available for this question and there were a range of points in the mark scheme to choose from.

The questions are designed with ramping in mind and to encourage achievement, and this question requires understanding of both parts of bullet 1 of AO1: 'identify and interpret'. Most candidates provided the full clause from lines 30-32 about the Quayside being transformed, which presented multiple opportunities for marks to be awarded despite the question only being worth one mark. Minimal responses such as 'culture and leisure,' and 'stunning riverfronts' were less frequent but still represented, and 'top UK holiday destination' was also a usual response. This demonstrates that most candidates understood well what was being asked of them. Incorrect responses were usually lifted from elsewhere in the text as they were objective positives, but obviously not from the lines to which the question had guided the candidates.

Again, candidates should be encouraged to be succinct in their answers where only one mark is available.

Question 6

This question differentiated well. Candidates in the mid-levels were commenting on and explaining ideas and events in the main, with straightforward opinion at the beginning and end of their responses, normally 'successfully', with appropriate and relevant references. The vast majority agreed that the writer was successful in creating excitement about Newcastle and Gateshead, and most candidates were able to use a reasonable range of evidence to support their ideas. As ever, the most successful responses used embedded quotations, whereas less successful responses were often more quotation than points.

Many candidates took the 'SITE'/'TIES'/'SPITE' approach, as was evident in notes/plans made, and this helped develop responses. Most candidates also attempted to use evaluative phrases in their responses in order to give their judgements.

Most candidates were able to find methods that caused 'excitement' – the fireworks and crowds were tangible features that were commonly noted. Overall, candidates' responses were focused and for many, relevant points were provided. However, many of the points lacked adequate development and a critical and sustained judgement was minimal which resulted in many of the responses failing to achieve marks in higher levels, even though the choice of relevant references was fairly successful.

Most candidates focussed on the 'palpable' feelings expressed in the extract; the 'buzz', the metamorphosis of a 'rat-infested swamp' into a modern Quayside/flour factory into an art gallery, for example. The use of the interview

with the cab driver was referenced in many responses as well as the diversity of groups enthused by the fireworks.

Even when a few chose an AO2-orientated approach, there were able to comment effectively on the positivity around Newcastle. The few more developed responses were able to pick up on development and regeneration of the city. One examiner noted:

'Writing about the rat-infested contrast and about the accolade from the US worked nicely as points - these two points were often explained well.'

Another commented:

'Strong responses evidenced knowledge through smooth integration of sustained judgement.'

The least successful responses tended to be narrative-based, with more focus on the descriptions of Newcastle and Gateshead as places. Some candidates just picked out the parts of the text they thought were effective and commented on those, for example the description of the bridges and landmarks.

The most successful responses considered the extract in its entirety. The quality of evaluative language was a good discriminator, as was the focus on the question. The mark scheme for this question indicates that 'References to writer's techniques should only be credited at Level 2 and above if they support the critical judgement of the text.' It was pleasing to see that in the main responses had attempted to be evaluative, even just at the level of 'successful' or 'effective' and that candidates had been encouraged to use evaluative language.

Question 7

Question 7a

Most candidates were achieving at least Level 2 for this question. The questions are designed with ramping in mind and to encourage achievement, and this question requires understanding of the second bullet point of AO1: select and synthesise.

Responses in the mid-levels offered at least two or three similarities, demonstrating clear synthesis and valid evidence. Responses at the highest levels gave a number of similarities, demonstrating detailed synthesis and appropriate and relevant evidence. Almost all responses were able to give at least one similarity, although with little synthesis or evidence. This series, as in previous series, some candidates did not read the question properly. The question is not about similarities between the texts, but similarities between the places. Examiners expressed some frustration that this was not being followed

by candidates, in spite of continued advice in reports. The simplest way of achieving marks here is to find similarities linked to the question.

The majority of candidates were successful and identified relevant similarities such as both describe the places as exciting, talk about the people in the places, mention the history of the places. There does need to be evidence of synthesis in order to move into Level 2 and 3, and in some cases detailed synthesis was lacking (usually linked to the lack of focus on the question) or some similarities which were not as clear/sound were offered, for example that both places had transport.

As one examiner noted:

'This was an accessible question. However quite a few candidates picked out similarities which were not to do with places but about the writers' style, saying both writers write in an engaging way.'

Some similarities were too vague or generic to move into Level 3, for example: 'They both show similarities about the cities'; 'Both texts are about places: one is about Newcastle and one is about New York'.

Some candidates did not support the comparisons with quotation or textual reference.

In a minority of cases candidates attempted to examine differences, and these differences were credited in the responses to 7b (these are marked together the online marking system).

Question 7b

It was pleasing to see that in almost all of the responses marked, candidates had compared the two texts to achieve at least Level 2. The mark scheme for this question indicates that 'Responses that are unbalanced will not be able to access Level 3 or above, where explanation of writers' ideas and perspectives is required alongside a range of comparisons between texts.' It was pleasing to see that almost all responses were able to compare texts, even at a basic level.

Responses at the mid-level of the mark scheme considered a range of comparisons between the texts, with comment and explanation of writers' ideas including theme, language and/or structure. At this level the use of references was appropriate and relevant to the points being made. Almost all candidates appeared to know that they needed to support their ideas with quotations from the texts.

The lack of focus on the question again was a problem for many candidates – there needed to be a focus on 'visiting'. This part of the question is NOT asking for a comparison of two texts. The question is very clear that ideas and perspectives are required about 'visiting a town or city'. In many answers, the word 'visit' was not mentioned at all. In some cases there was a brief reference at the end of the question.

Some candidates had a clearer focus, often concentrating on the differences between the two texts such as where Text One focuses on feelings, Text Two

looks at information or where Text One shows a sense of personal experience, Text Two is more objective/informative. In the best responses there were some interesting ideas, for example both use other sources to present their ideas and a sense of excitement. Some answers considered techniques, for example first and third person / length of paragraphs but mainly with no mention of visiting. Answers with a focus on visiting often developed interesting points, such as the fact that both places were changing suggested the need to visit / focus on activities and events – the helicopter ride in Text One and the fireworks in Text Two led back to the reasons for visiting. Details such as 'both writers were women' did not help the idea of visiting – this is an example of an obvious comparison which is unlikely to move out of Level 2.

The best responses weaved their comparison rather than exploring one text in a paragraph then separately approaching the next text, were successfully able to offer exploration and analytical comparisons of the texts as well as covering the 'wide' and 'varied' comparison. There were few examples of comprehensive comparisons in this series.

Responses at the lowest levels considered one or more obvious comparisons between the texts, with comment on writers' ideas. Lower-level responses which listed points sometimes achieved more 'range' but failed to develop points sufficiently.

The range of comparisons, level of comment on both ideas and perspectives and the use of references was a discriminator. Examiners felt that there was some imbalance between the comparison of the two texts - more candidates talking more fully about Text One than Text Two.

Writing

General Comments

The writing question is the final section of the paper. Candidates are advised to spend about 45 minutes on their writing and there are 40 marks available on both papers. Considered in the overall % of the marks available on the papers, this is significant. Examiners are always impressed by candidates' writing, and by the development they are able to achieve in the time they have, their individual style and level of thought and creativity. In an examination situation and a paper of this length candidates do incredibly well to produce a response to an unseen question.

The planning box continues to be used effectively by candidates when it is used.

It was pleasing to see that even at the lowest levels candidates were able to offer a basic response. They always had straightforward use of tone, style and register, with audience and purpose not always clear. At these lower levels candidates tended to express but not always connect ideas and information, with limited use of structural and grammatical features and paragraphing.

The main areas that discriminated the writing responses were:

- whether candidates could meet both parts of the first part of bullet one in the mark scheme for AO5. For example, they often expressed ideas to achieve in Level 2, but these ideas lacked the order for the second part of that bullet. In Level 3, they may have connected ideas but not developed them.
- the consideration of purpose and audience to achieve the high levels in AO5
- the success of tone, style and register in AO5
- the spelling of basic vocabulary in AO6, for example homophones, words with double consonants
- the accuracy of punctuation and use of varied punctuation in AO6, for example comma splicing, missing apostrophes, missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences, random capital letters
- the use of a range of sentence structures for AO6
- strategic use of vocabulary to achieve Level 5 in AO6 - seen where candidates really consider their reader and their message in the choice of words.

Examiners were impressed by the range and quality of responses, and noted that candidates were engaged, creating very enthusiastic, interesting and engaging responses, often using a lively tone. Examiners felt that all candidates engaged with the wider topic of travel/places, whether they answered Question 8 or Question 9.

Both questions showed candidates had the ability to style and shape their work to suit the style and tasks set.

Overall comments on AO5:

The first bullet point in the mark scheme is where examiners go first. Has the candidate written appropriately for audience and purpose? Candidates should consider who their audience is and what they are writing to do and for, in order to create a voice that is appropriate, effective or sophisticated. What do they want to do with their writing? Do they want to shock their reader? Advise and support them? Argue a case for something? Once they are clear on this they can ensure they sustain this voice. A lively, excitable voice can be difficult to sustain successfully throughout, and equally a straightforward tone which is essay-like and ends with 'In conclusion' can be straightforward and unsuccessful.

Overall comments on AO6:

The responses achieving the higher AO6 marks were fluent, used paragraphs well and had a good use of a range of vocabulary as well as grammatical features and punctuation. Successful responses used a wide range of accurate and ambitious vocabulary. The most successful responses focused on variety of sentence types and punctuation for effect, using complex and simple sentences with a range of paragraph structures, used for effect, including the use of short paragraphs for impact. In the best responses there was a strong use of varied sentence structures, and an impressive level of accuracy in spelling and punctuation.

Less successful responses had frequent errors, did not use paragraphs and wrote in a manner which was hard to follow (consider the need to 'express and order ideas' in the mark scheme at least). These responses often started sentences in the same way and vocabulary was in these cases quite repetitive and simple with many spelling errors of simple words. Common issues were using language within an appropriate context, 'chaotic' spelling, variable punctuation, lack of paragraphing, comma splicing, lack of sentence control, absence or misuse of apostrophes, homophones (weather/whether, your/you're and there/their, in particular) and problems with capital letters. Some candidates felt confident and used semicolons and colons in correct places. Others felt it more difficult to create a piece of writing with more than a full stop and capitalisation. Colloquialisms such as 'gonna', 'wanna' and 'anyways' were evidenced. While these could be used to create and craft a voice in imaginative writing, it is unlikely to be appropriate for audience and purpose in transactional writing.

As with the series of 2022 and summer 2023, handwriting remains an issue, often making it difficult to decipher what a candidate had written. Examiners will do their best to read responses, however, they cannot credit varied / selective / extensive vocabulary if they cannot read it.

Question 8

There were a range of approaches to this question with the vast majority of candidates having understood the requirements of the task, clearly grasping the appropriate register for the audience and purpose required. Candidates' responses to this question were, on the whole, engaged and convincing. They wrote with conviction and most confidently adopted an appropriate style, with some expressing indignation at the slights and injuries done to rural ways of life! They were generally able to structure their responses appropriately and used the bullet points effectively for guidance.

Many of the responses followed the three bullet points provided in the question and most candidates handled this question with maturity. Many of the responses flowed with relevant points on benefits and negatives of city/country life. One examiner commented:

'I really enjoyed reading lots of these responses. The most successful responses imagined elements of the fictional article they were responding to, so could offer counter-arguments to the fictional article.'

The clear discursive focus of this question examiners felt did lead to well-structured responses where candidates engaged in pros and cons. This question allowed candidates to express their thoughts about the city and countryside and many said they preferred the city. Some successfully imagined the details in the original article to which they were responding: 'You claimed that...' Most responses adopted a suitable tone and mood for a letter but a few set it out like an article with subheadings. Less successful responses wrote more of a personal account of things that had happened to them in a city and adopted a tone that was too personal and colloquial for a letter, for example 'Is the city cool? You bet!' They showed little awareness that the audience was the editor of a newspaper.

Almost all had a clear sense of purpose and audience, with sustained and, in most cases, pleasant, tone. The ideas were fairly standard in most cases, but diversity was an interesting idea that appeared quite a lot, plus jobs /easy access to shops and entertainment/social advantages, for example. Against the positives were costs/noise/crime/pollution.

Those who had lived in the countryside were able to tackle that aspect far more successfully and realistically, while those with no such experience were reduced to vague references to nature and sometimes health benefits, as a result of lack of pollution.

Some answers switched from positives to negatives effectively, for example 'Although the city presents many opportunities, people are also presented with an equal number of challenges.'

Question 9

This was noted as a 'lively and interesting question to mark'. This was shared by all examiners, with one saying:

'It was a pleasure to mark with some candidates raving about holiday destinations, or countries of origin.'

Another noted:

'candidates performed well on this question, with many paying heartfelt tribute to much-loved home towns and holiday destinations. Some struggled with the form of a review but were still able to write with enthusiasm and clarity about places they had visited, and many were able to create a highly convincing tone and register. As usual, they were a pleasure and privilege to read.'

There were some wide-ranging reviews including Dubai, Oslo, Tehran and Paris, all written from personal perspectives. London ('grubby charisma and unique charm') was a popular choice and then the less well-known such as Harpurhay, Barton-Le-Clay, Bookham ('doesn't have the urban benefits of Guildford but comes with the benefits of being slightly more rural'), Bradford ('have you ever had a more boring experience than Bradford?') and Peckham. Frequently-mentioned were London, New York and Newcastle, although others also appeared more than once, for example Corby (with an emphasis on crime) and Milton Keynes (with an emphasis on roundabouts). There were some effective titles, for example 'Alton: the Good, the Bad and the Ugly' (described as home to Jane Austen and a steam railway, for 'the elderly, the near-death and those looking for a retirement home') and 'Southport: a seaside town without the sea'.

Many of the best reviews were negative in nature where the candidates tore into their home-towns with a range of creative writer's techniques. Where candidates took a negative stance, these reviews were often very engaging and humorous and had strong features of the kind of sardonic review that might be featured in a broadsheet newspaper.

More usual was a balanced and almost tour-guide approach where the features of the town or city were listed with faint comment. There was some very

successful use of sarcasm and subtle irony in the very best responses. Stronger responses used the features of a review to evaluate the positive and negative aspects of a place and advise tourists on where to go and what to expect, using a high energy and often humorous style. Less successful responses were brief and were just purely descriptive about a place.

A final comment on Question 9 is from one examiner who summed up the quality of responses:

'My favourite question: lots of cities covered from Moscow to Mumbai to Bradford and Boreham Wood. A lot of the responses written by migrants from other countries evoked memories of childhood and family whilst some responses were hymns of praise to their chosen city or town. Slightly comic paeans to places such as Stockton-on-Tees were occasionally quite funny and the question offered scope for different approaches and perspectives.'

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on the paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- For short-answer Questions 1,2,4 and 5 ensure that you are responding briefly and selecting information, not just writing out a section. Highlight the relevant lines in your source booklet and read the question carefully. Ensure you answer on the correct text as well as the correct lines.
- For Question 3, it can be tempting to look out for the usual features of language (alliteration, personification, simile, metaphor) and structure (lists, repetition, short sentences, questions). These can be commented on well. The most successful responses, however, think about the type of text the extract is from, and how this is designed and created for the reader it is written for.
- In those questions where reference to the whole extract is needed, it is important to consider what references you will use and consider what examples are most significant. Discriminating references are seen where you pick out specific examples across the extract that link to your points, not just where you comment on every feature seen.
- For your evaluations, read the question carefully – what is it you are giving your opinion on? What do you think about whether the writer does whatever you are asked successfully? What would the opinions of others be about how well this is done? You do not need to comment on language and structure here unless this supports your evaluation. For example, you can think about the audience and purpose of the text and whether it would be successful for readers or not.
- For question 7a, always comment on similarities. You can comment on differences in 7b. There are only 6 marks for 7a, so be brief and succinct here.
- In 7b, link comparisons back to the ideas of the writers and their perspectives on the question focus.
- When you are writing, always think about your reader, what ideas you want them to understand and how you want them to react at different parts of your writing; then choose the most useful words, phrases or techniques available to you to achieve those effects.
- Plan your writing using the planning box, even just briefly. Think carefully about how you will begin to write so that it is engaging for your reader from the very start. As you begin to write, know where you will end. This will help you to write in a manner that is cohesive and coherent for your reader. If you start presenting an idea, make sure you are developing it.
- Take care throughout with accuracy: spelling, punctuation and grammar.

- Focus on timing during the examination and use the number of marks and space available in the answer booklet for each question as an indication of how long you should spend answering each question.
- Make sure you use the correct space for your answer in the answer booklet. If you need additional space, use an additional sheet, rather than any un-used pages in the answer booklet.
- Take care with handwriting. Examiners will do their best to read responses, however, they cannot credit your use of varied/selective/extensive vocabulary if they cannot read it.