

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCSE English Language 2.0 1EN2 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <https://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus>. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 1EN2_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Examiners commented that the texts about manners and behaviour were very accessible across the full range of abilities and candidates were able to engage with the texts and tasks and respond appropriately. There was clear evidence that candidates had been prepared for this examination.

More successful candidates were able to engage fully with both texts and respond thoughtfully and articulately. Their writing responses were often engaging and effective and were well controlled and accurate. Less successful candidates sometimes struggled to understand the texts and the questions. Their writing was often pedestrian or lacked coherence and had weak language controls.

Some candidates were not clear about the focus of the reading questions e.g. they responded to the evaluation questions (Questions 2, 5 and 6) as language analysis and the language analysis question (Question 3) as evaluation. Some examiners commented that rubric errors seemed more common – using the wrong text for Question 3 in particular.

Examiners did comment on a number of blank responses especially to the reading questions, in particular Question 3 and Question 6. These are quite high tariff questions. There were some indications that candidates may have attempted the writing question (Section B) first and run out of time to complete the paper. Examiners mentioned that some handwriting was challenging although still legible – just.

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

- evidence that the majority of candidates had understood and engaged with the ideas in the texts
- the ability to make some comments on language and its effects with some use of correct subject terminology for Question 3
- the inclusion of judgements at different levels for Questions 2, 5 and 6
- writing that showed a range of ideas and suitable tone, style and register for audience and purpose
- writing that used ambitious vocabulary and accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful responses:

- confused the texts, answering questions on Text One using Text Two and vice versa
- showed an insecure grasp of language with 'feature-spotting' or little or incorrect use of subject terminology in response to Question 3
- failed to support points using appropriate textual evidence, or used textual evidence that did not support the point being made
- did not attempt to make judgements in response to Questions 2, 5 and 6 or based their responses entirely on their own views with no reference to the text
- lacked organisation in their writing

- connected but did not develop ideas enough in their writing
- did not use a range of vocabulary and lacked accurate spelling and secure control of punctuation.

Question 1

This is a straightforward question on Text One which does not require candidates to use their own words.

Many candidates were able to correctly identify four points the writer makes about the manners of boys and girls. All the bullet points in the mark scheme were seen by examiners and bullet points 4, 5, 6 and 7 on the mark scheme were the popular ones and more successful as candidates only had to identify one word such as 'respectable/polite', 'disrespectful', 'unkind' or 'rude'.

The most common cause of failure to be awarded a mark was to give incomplete points such as for bullet point 3, where many said boys and girls were ashamed or were ashamed to speak in other people's houses, which is not what the text said. Similarly for bullet point 8 where several candidates did not offer the full point e.g. 'boys and girls were rude to their friend's mother/sister' but omitted the crucial information 'if they are rude to a friend's mother/sisters they would not be asked to visit again.' Other unsuccessful responses lacked clarity and offered points that were random copying, not focused on the question.

Question 2

This question requires the candidate to evaluate how successfully the writer shows how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home.

There was clear evidence of preparation in the responses. Some examiners commented that there were some detailed responses to this question however most examiners commented that while it was clear that most candidates understood the text, a significant number of candidates had difficulty in developing evaluative comments.

Many candidates did (correctly) use examples from lines 5-12 but examiners observed that there were a number who selected evidence from outside the line references especially 'a mistake that does a great deal of mischief' and 'Good or bad manners will show themselves first in our own homes'. Most of these responses only used one or two examples from outside the given lines. Reasons and evidence from outside the given lines could not be credited.

Examiners noted that a number of candidates treated this as a language question, identifying and explaining subject terminology which missed the evaluative focus of the task.

Candidates chose to comment on the contrast in behaviour between home and other people's houses. The reference to girls' and boys' behaviour outside the home was quite popular with comments about it showing that they knew how to behave but chose to misbehave at home. One candidate commented 'the comparison with speaking to a friend's mother shows how inappropriate the behaviour is at home'.

Many responses referred to 'many a boy and many a girl' commenting that it showed the extent of the problem, while others identified 'ashamed' and 'disrespectful, unkind and rude' as showing how unacceptable the behaviour is.

However, there were several candidates who lost focus on the evaluation and strayed into a discursive response by explaining why this might be the case.

Some candidates evaluated the bad behaviour of the boys and girls rather than how successfully the writer showed this.

Most candidates were able to find three reasons with evidence but examiners commented that some candidates only gave two reasons which limited their achievement. Some examiners commented that candidates were able to offer a sufficiently clear evaluative opinion, linked to a clear explanation of the writer's ideas. However other examiners noted that many candidates simply explained their three chosen references rather than making a judgement about how effective they were in showing the bad behaviour. Candidates used evaluative vocabulary such as 'successfully', 'skilfully', 'effectively', which sometimes helped them to focus on the question.

Better candidates fully addressed the evaluative nature of the question, providing three clear reasons supported by well-selected examples from the text that were not too long, offering analysis and critical evaluation. They were fully focused on the task of evaluating how successfully the writer shows how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home. These candidates made considered judgments about the success of the writer's portrayal of the bad behaviour, confidently using evaluative language such as 'effectively', 'clearly' or 'successfully'. They often

identified subtleties in the text, such as the children's ability to choose how to behave e.g. the use of 'can' or the didactic tone of the passage and explained how these enhanced the writer's message. These responses showed a confident grasp of both the content and the evaluative demands of the question. Another feature of these responses was convincing reference to the 19th century perspective.

Less successful candidates were sometimes able to find some relevant examples of bad behaviour but were not able to provide a valid comment to justify the examples selected. They often gave no evaluative opinion and merely described what the writer said in their chosen examples. Some less successful candidates paraphrased or retold the text, often with long quotations. Some listed three examples from the text with no comment. Other less successful responses did not reference much of the text and presented their own opinions on why young people misbehave.

This is a successful response to Question 2.

- 2** In lines 5–12, the writer is trying to show how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from lines 5–12.

(6)

The writer tries to show how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home. In my opinion, this is successfully achieved.

A quote that helps achieve this is "Many a boy and many a girl would be ashamed to speak and act in other people's houses as they do in their own." This quote highlights how negative their behaviour is. The use of the word 'ashamed' emphasises this. In the modern world, societal shame is bad, even more so in the 1800s. For something to be described as shameful tells the reader how serious the situation is, how badly behaved the boys and girls

are.

Another way in which the reader successfully conveys the boys and girls outrageous behaviour is by using the rule of three, listing their bad qualities: "... they are disrespectful, unkind and rude.". These adjectives describe the bad qualities the young people have. Using three examples emphasises the severity of the situation to the reader - it is almost a shock therapy. And the descriptions themselves have negative connotations. Today and in the 19th century. Readers would have been shocked when reading this information.

The ending quote "Let the boys and girls know that bad manners at home will ~~not~~ soon be known to the neighbours and friends." is a highly effective one. Publicity of these bad manners would cause disappointment, shock and outrage. If people found out, the boys and girls would be in real trouble. It would be horrendous for them and their family. The quote emphasises the problems this behaviour will cause, meaning the reader will be quite shocked.

In my opinion, the writer successfully achieves in showing how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home. This is done through strong sentences and a variety of language features. It would certainly leave a Victorian shocked.



Convincing analysis with developed evaluation of the writer's intentions and viewpoints, and their effects on the reader. Each point is expanded with consideration of how audiences might respond to the writer's opinions ("the reader will be quite shook"). Selection of references is apt with discriminating focus ("...the word 'ashamed' emphasises this"). A confident, critical response. Level 3 - 6 marks



Note how the response is focused on evaluation and offers three convincing reasons with references that fully support the points being made. Remember to include three reasons and to give your opinion about the success of the text.

This is a Level 2 response to Question 2.

- 2 In lines 5–12, the writer is trying to show how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Pecs purposely successfully

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from lines 5–12.

(6)

The writer successfully shows how badly behaved boys and girls can be at home. This is shown in the extract when it states "They can be respectable and polite when away from home while to their own parents and to their brothers and sisters they are disrespectful, unkind and rude." This suggests how badly mannered the boys and girls are.

The writer purposefully shows how badly behaved the boys and girls are at home. This is shown in the extract when it states "It is a shame for anybody to behave better away from home than at home." This ~~success~~ successfully shows the difference between when they're out then when they are at home and how badly they behave at home.

The writer successfully shows how badly behaved the boys and girls are at home. This is shown in the extract when it says "if a boy should be as surly and unkind to his friend's sisters as he is to his own sisters, we do not think they would be asked to visit that friend's house more than once." This successfully shows how terrible he treats his sisters at home with no manners.



A clear response of three points supported by appropriate selections. Each paragraph begins "The writer..." which supports focus on the text's ideas and themes. Comment on quotation is mostly explanation of meaning with some evaluation ('how badly/terrible'). The response is certainly not 'limited'. Level 2 - 3 marks



Find three reasons for your opinion and always find support from the text for each reason. Remember to focus on evaluating how successfully the writer presents their ideas.

Question 3

This question asks the candidate how the writer uses language to interest and inform the reader across the whole text.

Some examiners commented positively on the responses they saw to this question but many examiners noted that a significant number of candidates were not able to explain the effects of their chosen language features. Many examiners commented that there was frequently a lack of specific subject terminology and vague references to 'word' or 'phrase' and there was an increase in references to 'negative/positive/emotive language'. Although there was some evidence of the use of relevant subject terminology, it was incorrectly identified by many candidates e.g. mixing up adjectives and adverbs. Some examiners saw many responses that considered 'This is a mistake and a mistake that does a great deal of mischief' to be a metaphor, and 'If a girl should speak to her friend's mother as she does to her own mother' to be a simile. Many examiners thought that responses to this question were the weakest on the paper.

Most candidates were able to identify some words and language techniques the writer used although they often did not use subject terminology correctly. Most were able to offer an explanation of the text and comment on the writer's language. Most examiners commented that although candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the text and were able to identify relevant references, many candidates had difficulty in explaining the effect of their chosen words or phrases.

When candidates did identify language features their responses tended to be statements with little exploration e.g. 'The writer uses powerful words like disrespectful to show emotion and what the text is about'. Examiners commented that the majority of candidates were able to make some clear comment on 'disrespectful, unkind and rude'. They were able to give a personal response and explain the effect on the reader. However other examiners observed that the use of the triplet 'disrespectful, unkind and rude' was often identified but then re-worded e.g. 'This means they have no respect and can be insulting', rather than explained. Many candidates picked out the repetition of 'many and many' to indicate the large number of children exhibiting bad manners and the repetition of 'mistake' to emphasise the problem. In describing the effect on the reader, responses often utilised generic sentences like 'the reader would want to read on' and so lacked detailed explanation and consideration of the language choices on the reader.

More successful responses were able to focus clearly on the language used to interest and inform the reader and correctly identify subject terminology. They unpicked the language and considered how it contributed to our understanding. They demonstrated an excellent understanding of the text and the way the writer manipulates the feelings of the readers. They explored language in detail and were able to select precise discriminating quotations to support their ideas. Word-level analysis was sometimes a feature of these responses. Some candidates explored the use of modal verbs such as 'can', 'must' and 'should' to show how the writer conveyed ideas about behaviour and manners. There were some who explored the use of 'we'. One wrote: 'The use of the pronoun 'we' hints at multiple people writing the article and builds credibility and trust.' A few also commented on the imperative 'Let' used to 'act as a warning'. Some discussed the semantic field of home.

There was also some discussion of the difference between a Victorian and contemporary reader's

potential response. Others adopted an overview of the text that analysed the stark juxtaposition of positive and negative language used to describe children's behaviour, and what this demonstrated about the writers' intentions at the time of writing.

Less successful candidates did not focus on language and gave sometimes lengthy quotations and simply explained what they said. Some just wrote about the content of the passage rather than the language. These responses often made generic comments on the effects of their chosen features e.g. 'to make the reader read on'. There was often limited, incorrect or no subject terminology. Some examiners commented that there was also evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify correctly (or incorrectly) particular language features in the text but do not explain them.

Some candidates did not seem to understand the focus of the question and responded as if it was an evaluation rather than a language question, using evaluative language e.g. 'successfully'.

There were a significant number of blank responses to this question.

Occasionally candidates wrote a response to Text Two. These were rewarded but were penalised for using the wrong text (not reading the instructions carefully).

This is a very successful response to Question 3.

3 How does the writer use language to interest and inform the reader?

You should include:

- the writer's use of language
- the effect on the reader.

Use examples from the whole text and relevant subject terminology.

(8)

One way the writer uses language to interest and inform the reader, is by listing the bad qualities the boys and girls display. The ~~text~~ writer states that boys and girls are, "disrespectful, unkind and rude," and this hyperbolic tripling causes the reader to wonder ^{how} ~~why~~ the children have got this way, if they are so terrible.

Another way the writer uses language to interest and inform the reader, is by stating facts to inform us on the topic. The writer declares, "Good or bad manners will show themselves first in our own homes," and this declarative statement causes the reader to feel like they are reading a factual and correct article, which causes them to trust what is said more, and allow themselves to be informed, without wondering if the article is true or not.

The writer also uses language to interest and inform the reader, by ^{juxtaposition} ~~stating~~ what the children can be like, to what they are like. The writer says that boys and girls have the ability to be, "respectable and the power men away from home," and these ~~adjectives~~ ^{comparing adjectives} cause the

reader to feel at ease. However, this is sharply juxtaposed by the negative connotations of the character being, "wicked" and, "scurvy" which heightens the readers moral understanding and causes them to take a greater interest, as they are intrigued as to why there is such a difference in the character's behaviour.

Finally, the writer uses language to mislead and inform the reader by foreshadowing what will happen later in life to the badly behaved boys and girls. The writer states that, "bad manners at home will soon be known to the neighbours and friends" and the frame adverbial 'soon' suggests the boys and girls will get their comeuppance. This causes the reader to feel satisfied, as we are confident the boys and girls will be publicly embarrassed for treating their family so poorly.



This response meets all of the Level 4 criteria. At first glance some of the subject terminology (e.g. listing and juxtaposing) may appear structural but the candidate successfully analyses the language involved and identifies features such as 'hyperbolic tripling.' The response fully explains the impact on the reader and the use of references clarifies the points being made. All Level 4 criteria are met. Level 4 - 8 marks



Look at how the candidate uses correct subject terminology and focuses on exploring the writer's use of language and its effect on the reader.

This is an example of a less successful response to Question 3.

3 How does the writer use language to interest and inform the reader?

You should include:

- the writer's use of language
- the effect on the reader.

Use examples from the whole text and relevant subject terminology.

(8)

The writer uses language to interest and inform the reader by using repetition "this is a mistake and a mistake that does a great deal of mischief" this shows that it will lead to trouble if you don't fix how the children behave. The word "mistake" tells us that it's something wrong and could need fixing. The reader would imagine that not having any manners would lead to trouble and that it would need to be a bad thing.

The writer uses language to interest and inform the reader by using the phrase "ashamed to speak and act in other... in their own." this shows that they would never talk and act without manners and not behave. The word "ashamed" tells us that they would be embarrassed by the way they would act in their home in other people's homes. The reader would think that people would be embarrassed to act differently and not have manners in other people's homes.

house.

The writer uses language to interest and inform the reader by using the phrase "it is a shame for anybody to behave better ... than at home" this shows that it is not ~~acceptable~~ acceptable to act better in someone else's home rather than yours. The word "Shame" shows that you would feel horrible and probably embarrassed by doing it. This would make the reader imagine that not a lot of children would behave in someone else's company and not at home as they would feel shameful.



There is only one example of subject terminology in this response ('repetition') so there is limited evidence of relevant subject terminology. However, there is explanation of how language is used and appropriate references and so the best fit for this response is the lower end of Level 2. Level 2 - 3 marks



Try to use a range of correct subject terminology and to focus on the writer's language choices and the effects on the reader.

Question 4

Question 4(a)

This is a straightforward question on Text Two which does not require candidates to use their own words.

Many candidates achieved two marks on this question. The most common reasons identified were 'denied outdoor games' and 'have no books', although all points in the mark scheme were seen. The most common reason for not achieving both marks was using out of line references e.g. 'demoralised' or 'vulgar' and 'obstreperous.' A few did not include enough information e.g. 'wickedness' or 'crime' without 'learn'.

Question 4(b)

This question requires candidates to understand implicit meaning and ideas in a text. Many candidates used quotations to answer this question and some of these were appropriate responses but candidates should try to use their own words to show they have understood the implied information and ideas.

Most candidates were able to provide two ways the writer suggests to improve behaviour, commonly 'take a lesson from our French neighbours', 'go out with the family' and 'take them to a pleasure resort in the woods'. Incorrect responses included mis-readings such as 'learn French' and 'take French lessons' or 'pleasure resort in the woods' which was not enough as no action was specified. Occasionally candidates offered 'go to the woods' and 'go to the river' as two separate points when they are the same point 'go out/to the countryside'.

Question 5

This question required candidates to evaluate how successfully the writer persuades readers that there should be more facilities for all young people in London.

Some examiners commented that some candidates engaged enthusiastically with the text and constructed a more secure response to this question compared to Question 2. However other examiners commented that many candidates struggled to be evaluative and did not move much beyond explaining or paraphrasing the text. Similarly to Question 2, a significant number of candidates did not give three reasons. Examiners noted that there were quite a few blank responses and also those with very little written.

Most responses offered clear explanation of the text were able to provide quotations to support their ideas with some general evaluative comment (usually at the start of the response), although the explanations were often lacking in detail.

Most candidates felt the writer was successful in trying to persuade the reader that more facilities were needed. They were able to identify relevant phrases within the text that could be linked to the need for more facilities, e.g. 'plenty still remains to be done', 'ought to be properly lit up', 'opened free' and 'Polytechnics, art schools and free libraries' and were able to provide some evaluative opinion.

More successful candidates were able to fully evaluate the extract and were able to develop their responses analysing the writer's ideas and viewpoints and providing critical personal judgement on the success of the text. They considered the urgency and social need for more facilities for all young people in London with developed explanations, supportive embedded quotations and critical review of the impact on the original and modern reader. They not only recognised the types of facilities mentioned e.g. libraries, polytechnics, art schools and parks but also commented on how the writer used persuasive techniques such as listing and emotive contrasts to highlight the need for improvement. Some looked at the use of imperatives such as 'should be', 'ought to be' and 'must be' to emphasise the urgency of the situation. One interesting point was 'Children are cleverly described as 'our boys and girls' to encourage people to feel more responsible for them'. They often began their points with clear judgments e.g. 'The writer is particularly effective here because...' and explored the wider implications of the proposals. Some evaluated references against each other as they went through the text. For example, 'Later in the extract, the writer is even more successful when...' or 'this is less successful than their previous point but...'.

Some showed an appreciation of potential counter argument e.g. the fact that the writer says 'it is fair to admit that something has been done for young Londoners' and 'By increasing the number of parks...'

Less successful candidates often wrote very brief responses and there were sometimes lengthy quotations, followed by minimal comments and no evaluation.

Others provided limited evidence from the extract. Some simply copied out three quotations from the extract. Some compared the lack of facilities to modern day or offered their own opinion on why their own area should have more facilities for young people. Others evaluated the success of the facilities, not the persuasiveness of the writer's message, for example, making

comments such as 'this facility would be good, because...'.

This is a successful response to Question 5.

5 Read this extract.

It is but fair to admit that something has been done for young Londoners by the County Council. By increasing the number of parks and by establishing playgrounds, they have offered some children opportunities for at least passable imitations of country sports. But plenty still remains to be done. Some of the London parks ought to be properly lit up after dusk, so that they may attract the people from the polluted streets. The Crystal Palace and the Zoological Gardens should be purchased for the nation and opened free on most days in the year. Polytechnics, art schools and free libraries must be multiplied amongst us, until all our boys and girls can acquire the knowledge of practical craftsmanship and pleasant hobbies.

In the extract, the writer tries to persuade readers that there should be more facilities for all young people in London.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

idea
2 points
3
real

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from the extract.

(6)

In the extract, the writer shows how there should be more facilities for young people by implying the effects it would have, giving them "the knowledge of practical craftsmanship." This successfully shows the reader that people must only take a small bit, to give young people everlasting knowledge on crafting things. A reader of that time may feel left out, that they didn't get offered such experiences, and feel a call to action.

In the extract, the writer shows how there should be more facilities for younger people by listing what they could do. The writer says ~~that~~ "the zoological gardens should be purchased... and opened free on most days." He also says "free libraries must be multiplied." This successfully highlights the things people could do to change, if they were less ignorant. A contemporary reader could see how today there are

Still not nearly enough facilities for younger people.

The writer shows how we need more ~~the~~ facilities for young people through his acknowledgement that there are some people who try to help. He says "it is better to admit that something has been done", but "plenty still remains". This clearly shows readers that even though some people try help, it isn't enough, and more must be done. This could show a Victorian reader that they can make a difference if many people help each other.



There is convincing analysis and critical evaluation with the use of apt references. For example, in the first paragraph the candidate critically evaluates line 35 where they state, 'a reader at that time may feel left out' and 'feel a call to action.' The response achieved full marks. Level 3 - 6 marks



Note how the response is focused on evaluation and offers 3 reasons with support.

This is a response to Question 5.

5 Read this extract.

It is but fair to admit that something has been done for young Londoners by the County Council. By increasing the number of parks and by establishing playgrounds, they have offered some children opportunities for at least passable imitations of country sports. But plenty still remains to be done. Some of the London parks ought to be properly lit up after dusk, so that they may attract the people from the polluted streets. The Crystal Palace and the Zoological Gardens should be purchased for the nation and opened free on most days in the year. Polytechnics, art schools and free libraries must be multiplied amongst us, until all our boys and girls can acquire the knowledge of practical craftsmanship and pleasant hobbies.

In the extract, the writer tries to persuade readers that there should be more facilities for all young people in London.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from the extract.

(6)

The writer effectively persuades the reader that there should be more facilities in London when they say "They have offered some children opportunities". The word "some" suggests that not all children have the opportunity to do something and some are left with nothing to do.

The writer effectively persuades the reader again when they say "but plenty still remains to be done". The word "plenty" suggests that not a lot has been done for the young people in London and plenty of young people are still left with nothing to do and this could lead plenty of young people to crime.

Thank

The writer effectively persuades the reader again in the quote "people from the polluted street". The ^{adjective} polluted

Suggests that the places that the young people live is not a very nice area and quite a deprived area to live in. This could also tell us suggest there isn't enough funding from the government for facilities for young people to go to and socialise.



There is clear explanation of the writer's ideas and clear evaluative opinion rather than convincing analysis or critical evaluation. For example, in paragraph one the candidate uses lines 29-30 arguing the County Council has at least offered 'some' children places to go but not all and 'some are left with nothing to do'. Level 2 - 4 marks



Try to give your judgment on how successful the text is and support it with relevant examples.

Question 6

This question requires candidates to evaluate how successfully the text shows that there is a problem with young people's behaviour.

Generally, candidates were able to engage with the text and examiners commented that the subject matter about young people's behaviour was accessible to the candidates. Examiners commented that there were some interesting responses to this question. On the whole candidates' responses were securely focused on the text. Examiners saw some convincing responses where candidates showed developed analysis of the writer's ideas and critically evaluated how successful the text was in showing that there is a problem with young people's behaviour. Some examiners commented that the responses to this question were better and more focused than in previous series.

Some examiners, however, commented that some candidates had difficulty with this question and offered brief or unfocused responses or offered personal responses to the given statement, not basing them on an evaluation of the text.

Some examiners commented that a number of responses to this question only used the same material as for Question 5 which meant that they did not respond to the whole text. There were also a number of blank responses, which may be a timing issue, although there seemed to be fewer than in previous series.

Most candidates were able to give their opinion, informed by the text and were able to pick out supporting quotations about the behaviour of young people. Many responses were able to show a sound explanation of the writers' ideas particularly commenting on 'wander about', 'gambling', 'learning wickedness' and 'vile jokes' highlighting issues with young people's behaviour, but examiners commented that many candidates did not evaluate the text and only offered explanations of their chosen references.

Many agreed that there is a problem but the children themselves were not to blame: 'society is the problem and young people are working round it.', 'In my view the problem is the council.', 'I blame the irresponsible parents.' Several responses picked up on the first paragraph, in particular the word 'misfortune' and pointed out that it indicated the writer was sympathetic towards the children. In a number of responses, candidates referred to 'learning wickedness' and 'skilful crime' to show that anti-social behaviour was taught by others and some felt it was 'normalised' or 'grooming'.

Some disagreed with the statement and argued along the lines that 'Finding pleasure in vile jokes sounds normal for a teenager', 'roaming in groups is part of being sociable'.

There was considerable misunderstanding of the word 'juvenile', with candidates' only point of reference being juvenile detention centres, which led to some misunderstanding of the text. The word 'demoralised' was also often misinterpreted as lacking morals.

More successful responses were able to analyse effectively and focused on the whole text. They offered informed evaluative opinion with appropriate references, using evaluative phrases such as 'I fully agree with...' or 'I partially agree...'. These responses covered the whole text and produced a range of evidence including analysis to give a convincing evaluation of the statement.

They demonstrated a clear understanding of not just what the writer said, but how effectively the viewpoint was made.

They used evaluative language confidently and tracked the development of the argument across the text. Many candidates commented on ideas in the first paragraph of the text, referring to the advice to 'avoid a too-close contact' with young people and the use of vulgar and obstreperous' to describe them and some commented on the harsh and judgmental tone.

They also discuss the negative language throughout the text and the imagery this creates. Several referred to the negative behaviour modelled by adults, using examples such as 'slovenly' and 'yelling' to show how this influences the younger generation. The use of rhetorical questions was also noted by some, with thoughtful comments on how these might prompt the reader to reflect on solutions to the problem. Some responses demonstrated a balanced evaluation. These candidates explored both sides of the issue, agreeing that poor behaviour is depicted, but it comes from a lack of facilities such as the absence of books, being denied outdoor games and negative adult role models rather than being solely the fault of young people.

Some candidates argued that the writer's message was ultimately unsuccessful, suggesting that the real cause of poor behaviour lies in the lack of facilities and opportunities, which the writer acknowledges in the extract.

Less successful responses were often undeveloped and wrote very little or used very lengthy quotations and then briefly explained their meaning, with little explanation or judgement or just described the bad behaviour. Some brief responses often only referred to the first paragraph.

Some responses did not use quotations to support their responses. Some candidates began with the text as a starting point but strayed into discussing modern teenagers 'wandering aimlessly staring at their phone.'

Weaker candidates did not comment on the text. They would instead discuss their own opinions of why they believe there are not enough facilities now for young people in their area and how this leads to antisocial behaviour and knife crime.

However, some examiners commented that this was less prevalent than in previous series. There were some candidates who approached the task as a language analysis question and explored a range of devices used in the text, missing the focus of the question.

Occasionally candidates wrote a response to Text One. These were rewarded but were penalised for using the wrong text (not reading the instructions carefully).

This is a very successful response to Question 6.

The writer successfully shows there is a problem with young people's behaviour by saying there is no ~~optimism~~^{hope} for the future. This is ~~shown~~^{evident} in the first line when it says "If a man wants to feel optimistic about the future... he had better avoid a too-close contact with boys and girls." This quote ~~shows~~^{shows} that ~~in~~ in order to have any hope for the future, the younger people should be avoided. By saying this, the writer implies that young people are misbehaved and potentially uneducated which gives the impression that something needs to change in order to restore hope for a new generation.

The writer also successfully shows a problem with the behaviour of young people by using a rhetorical question. This is evident when the writer asks "What are we to do with this rising generation?" The question "what are we to do" implies that there is nothing to do and that they need new ideas. This also implies the younger generations' behaviour is in need of saving and all ideas are necessary.

to fix their behaviour crisis. Without needing an explicit answer to the question, the writer still catalyses the readers thoughts and starts to make them ask ^{themselves the} questions and think of solutions that could sustain society.

Another way the writer shows there ^{are} problems with the behaviour of youth is by saying "By these and similar means the demon of vulgarity may be driven out." The metaphor "demon of vulgarity" gives connotations of temptation, ~~and~~ death and hell. By using this technique the writer has yet again made the reader feel as though there is no hope for the new generation implying their behaviour is such a big problem that it may not be fixable. However, the phrase "driven out" ~~give~~ juxtaposes the metaphor and gives connotations of hope as they still believe their behaviour can be sorted even though it's a growing problem.



This is an impressively concise response with easy familiarity of the text and what it implies. There is a mature and detached overview of the text in this convincing answer. It starts with a 'no hope for the future' and clarifies the evaluation with convincing analysis of the writer's viewpoint. The use of references is apt and persuasive - the reference to the rhetorical question "what to do" is persuasive in its interpretation. The final paragraph is particularly succinct with the way it analyses, not only the language elements of the selected reference, "demon", "driven out", but brings it back to the initial focus of the evaluation. Level 5 - 12 marks



Note how the candidate uses examples from the text to support the evaluative points made. Remember to focus on making judgements about how successful the text is and to use the text to support your opinions.

This is another response to Question 6.

In my view, text 2 shows that ~~there~~ there is a problem with young people's behavior. This is shown when the writer suggests 'he had better avoid a too-close contact with boys and girls.' This gives sense that there is no hope in young people, the word 'avoid' connotes to stay away and keep distance. It is also explained 'that they are vulgar and obstreperous' this shows that they are disrespectful and not type of people to be associated with. The word 'they' connotes that it is just not a small group but every young person, also 'obstreperous' gives the connotation that young people don't care ~~are~~ about the people around them and they are anti-social individuals.

Another way this is shown is when the writer says 'learning wickedness and the basic elements of ~~skill~~ skilful crime.' This suggests that young people are evil and that they only cause bother for themselves and everyone around is affected.

The writer also mentions 'the demon of vulgarity may be driven out' this connotes that the young peoples behavior is demon-like. 'driven out' gives a sense that young peoples terrible behavior will be put to an end.



This is a response with a clear focus on the question. There is sound explanation of the writer's ideas, references are relevant and appropriate and support the points being made and have been chosen from the whole text. There is some sound personal judgement and evaluative opinion. Level 3 - 6 marks



Remember to focus on making judgements about how successful the text is and to use the text to support your opinions.

Question 7

This question asked candidates to write a blog about how to behave.

Some examiners commented positively about candidates' responses to this topic. One examiner said, 'The ideas shared showed our cohort to be a supportive, sensitive, considerate group, keen to support others' mental health and self-esteem.'

There were a number of blank responses.

A05

Examiners commented that candidates mostly engaged well with the task, with many writing accessible and relevant blogs.

Many candidates used the opening in the question in their own writing and this seemed to give them some confidence and direction. Where candidates used the opening, this could lead into a structured response that worked through a list of rules for good behaviour.

However, some examiners commented that copying out the opening was not necessary and wasted time. Most candidates successfully used blog features although some examiners felt that there was not much clear differentiation between the features of a blog compared with an article.

Most candidates were able to adopt a suitable tone and register for the purpose and audience and were aware of the need for linguistic and structural features. Many showed a good understanding of the conventions of a blog, adopting the appropriate register and making use of inclusive language. Common rhetorical devices used included rhetorical questions, triples and statistics.

Some examiners commented that more noticeably this series, statistics were used unconvincingly or overused at times. While statistics are an important consideration and used regularly in such responses, candidates frequently used unconvincing statistics e.g. 'Did you know 97% of the country's youths misbehave?'

Many chose to structure their piece by identifying the rules in separate paragraphs along with an explanation of why they matter as well as a discussion of how they could be implemented.

Most candidates were able to give a range of ideas on 'How to behave', some using ideas from the texts to prompt their responses. There was sometimes a tendency to list the points and not to develop them fully.

Most wrote about being kind, as well as helping around the house, being nice to parents, siblings and teachers. There was a huge focus on kindness and how smiling has such a huge impact on relationships with others.

Another frequent point was treating others as you want them to treat you. There was a wide variety of approaches here. Several took a list approach, outlining key behavioural points, with advantages of sticking to them and disadvantages of straying. These were sometimes grouped into age categories - how to behave around children, peers, adults, old people - or relationship

types such as friends, bullies, parents, teachers, employers.

Politeness featured a lot and the importance of creating a good impression or setting a good example: 'Make a positive impression and people will be nicer to you.' Some took a different approach and concentrated on a specific area e.g. how to behave in the classroom, at school, at youth club. One particularly effective response focused on how to behave on a building site, while training, with reference to leaving 'classroom antics' behind, in the interest of health and safety and developing new friendships.

Some wrote about addictions to social media being something that needs to be tackled, showing a real awareness of this as a link to poor behaviour or at least influencing it. There was also quite a lot of advice about how to behave towards people who were misbehaving. Apart from the obvious 'ignore them'/'don't get wound up', there was an underlying tolerance or sympathy e.g. 'remember that misbehaviour can be a cry for help'. Examiners commented that it was interesting that the peer group for many candidates is an older audience and this led to more of a focus on adult behaviour or behaviour in the workplace, sometimes very effectively.

More successful candidates sustained a sense of purpose and audience throughout and organised their material into a clear and logical sequence of ideas. These responses were lively and clearly crafted, using paragraphs in an appropriate manner with varied sentences and structural devices. They had a strong register and related to their audience effectively.

There were some excellent, lively responses that demonstrated a good understanding of blog conventions, showcasing a range of writing skills.

They employed a wider range of stylistic and rhetorical devices including humour, sub-headings, direct address and rhetorical questions, to create engagement with their audience. These candidates developed their ideas with more depth and provided clear explanations to support their points. They maintained a sophisticated yet authentic tone appropriate for a blog and demonstrated strong control over cohesion and coherence in their writing.

They produced informative blogs, addressing the reader as a friend or a younger student looking for advice and using a lively, conversational tone suited to a social media audience. Personal anecdotes were also used effectively to persuade the audience of their arguments e.g. 'I used to be badly behaved until I thought about the impact on other people...'

Less successful responses had difficulty with developing their ideas and focusing on the task. They often struggled with the correct form, tone and register for a blog and wrote short and sometimes unparagraphed responses or wrote almost the whole response in bullet points. Some produced responses resembled speeches, beginning with phrases such as 'I am here today to talk about...'. Others wrote articles or essays offering general points made about bad behaviour or why it is important to behave but with no real focus on providing 'rules that might help us all to get along better'. A noticeable number of responses focused on mental health and its connection to behaviour, which, while relevant, sometimes led candidates away from the broader task focus.

There were some responses that were brief and undeveloped with weak language controls which impeded meaning. Less successful responses wrote very little - some had clearly run out of time. There were a number of responses that wrote little beyond copying out the prompt on the question paper, however it was noted by some examiners that the prompt allowed some of the

least successful candidates to write something on the ideas provided.

A06

Most candidates were able to make some attempt to select vocabulary, sentence structures and punctuation to suit the task. They were able to express and order information and ideas with some correctly spelt vocabulary, some control of punctuation and some accurate paragraphing. Most candidates were able to communicate successfully even if there were errors. The use of a varied vocabulary showed some adaptation to the topic being written about.

Examiners commented that although vocabulary was often varied, there were spelling errors. Complex words were sometimes correct but there were frequent careless errors which suggested a lack of proof reading. Nearly all examiners commented on weak punctuation with some responses using very few full stops or capital letters. A few examiners thought that spelling was more secure than punctuation.

More successful candidates were selective with their word choices and used a range of appropriate linguistic techniques e.g. rhetorical questions and direct address to communicate their ideas. They used a wide range of vocabulary that was well-chosen for the task they had selected. These candidates wrote fluently with a range of structural devices. They had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful candidates were often repetitive with their word choices and sentence structures. They often used very basic sentences or did not punctuate sentences. These candidates sometimes had limited vocabulary and poor grammar.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: missing basic sentence punctuation; comma splicing; missing or misused apostrophes; problems with homophones; misspelling of basic vocabulary; not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun; missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and incorrect capitalisation of words within sentences; grammatical errors such as problems with sentence structures, subject-verb agreement and verb tenses.

Some examiners remarked that informal contractions such as 'gonna' and 'wanna' appeared in some responses possibly in an attempt at register but their use was not entirely appropriate especially as the responses were intended to be read not spoken.

This is a response to Question 7.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

Plan your answer to Section B here:

P1 - Expand on the start
P2 - Anecdote
P3 -

Write your answer to Section B here:

How to behave!

There has been a lot of talk recently about the way people behave towards each other. While it is important to have good manners, I have decided to come up with my suggestions for rules that might help us all to get along better. So here they are, together with my reasons why I think they are important.

I wanted to
make it
clear

Firstly, I truly believe that our
Society should be a place for
opportunity and a place where
everyone gets along. Not a place where
there is conflict in the streets,
~~for~~ civilians being scared of one ~~another~~
another. A place of peace. I believe
~~in~~ that the best ways to achieve
this is by acquiring the fundamental
skills of teamwork and communication.
Young people could apply for sporting
camps to grow in the social aspect
of both themselves and others and
understand what it feels like to
work with someone rather than against.

I remember when I first joined a sports
camp. I was probably like you, ~~some~~ ignorant
and the lack of motivation to change
my ways to make society a better
place. I started the camp off
with a sticking attitude and it spread
across to others which overall affected
the morale of the experience. But,

our coach taught us that it's not how someone perceives it's how they are perceived. ~~That was shock~~ The thought of being a threat to someone really made me want to change my ways. If ~~Sherto~~ Should change yours too!

Next time you and your friends are in a large group roaming the streets, remember how you are perceived. From first glance you are perceived as intimidating and can be seen as a threat to some people. All it takes is a simple gesture, like a smile to ~~make~~ firstly let them know there is no reason to be scared but also it could make their day. Have you ever made someones day? If you answered yes, think about how that made ^{you} feel. If you answered no, ~~think about~~ then think about how it would make you ~~feel~~ feel, then have a go and ~~make~~ make someones day.

So what's the problem with our community right now? ~~So~~ Firstly, people think they are better than each other which ~~signifies~~ signifies how they believe they're superior to others giving them authority to behave in a manner that is unacceptable. Others believe that violence ~~is a way~~ and crime is a way to fix things. Let me tell you it's not. It's only a path which leads you down a darker alley than you already going.

take the

So, So be ~~like~~ better, ~~be the~~ first step ~~for~~ ~~seems~~ to change what's slowly becoming a desperate need for to change. Don't be afraid to make the first step because of what others believe in. Be different...



AO5 – This response does communicate clearly and effectively. It makes reasonable points about perception and intimidation. It meets all the descriptors in Level 3. It is a very secure Level 3, so achieves a mark at the top of the level. Level 3 - 14 marks
AO6 – All Level 3 descriptors are securely met here, as there is a sound ability to write for clarity and effect. Varied vocabulary is used with accurate and varied punctuation. As with AO5, it achieves a mark at the top of the Level 3. Level 3 - 10 marks



Always try to develop your ideas and keep a focus on audience and purpose. Use the planning box to help develop your ideas in detail.

Question 8

This question asked candidates to write an article for a local newspaper about the lack of facilities for young people in their area.

Question 8 was the more popular choice. Examiners noted that many candidates engaged confidently with the topic of local facilities and youth behaviour. Many responses addressed all bullet points, offering relevant suggestions for improvements and demonstrating a clear understanding of the task.

Some examiners felt that responses to this question were more secure than those to Question 7. There were a number of blank responses.

A05

Most candidates were able to write an article for a local newspaper about the lack of facilities for young people in their area with the title 'More needs to be done.' Many responses provided an introduction to the area and outlined problems with young people's behaviour and then moved into suggesting facilities to engage and entertain the youth. They were able to communicate clearly, effectively and imaginatively. They demonstrated the ability to produce developed, imaginative responses with a selection of rhetorical devices to suit purpose and audience. Most candidates were able to use the bullet points to help structure their response, with the bullet points sometimes used as sub-headings. Most candidates were able to write with a clear point of view.

Candidates clearly had many ideas about how their local area might be improved.

The most popular suggestions were improvements to sporting facilities and either brand new sport centres or renovations to existing ones. There was a general feeling that this would 'get kids off of their phones' and lead to healthier lifestyles. Youth clubs and educational establishments were also seen as areas for improvement. Some wanted life brought back into towns where shops had closed. One candidate who lamented the closure of the local library said young people needed 'the mind of an author feeding the arid desert of their minds.' Improvements to outside spaces were commonly discussed and many offered specifics that appeared to relate to the areas they grew up in. Many responses reflected knowledge of community events and local issues presenting often deeply felt concerns about young people, their lives, potential and happenings in candidates' neighbourhoods which were often named.

A number of responses made reference to Text Two as a starting point and sadly, felt that nothing much has changed 'since the old days', with bored youths roaming aimlessly and falling into crime. There were also suggestions that with improved facilities, needed to come improved security to prevent them 'just getting wrecked'. Perhaps because candidates were often writing on issues of some importance to their lives, ideas were often communicated clearly and effectively, as though they wanted to be heard. There were some genuine pleas for whoever was reading a response to understand their situation and support efforts in community groups etc.

More successful candidates had secure or sophisticated ability to communicate clearly, effectively and imaginatively employing an authentic voice suitable for the intended audience.

These responses were introduced clearly and organised into clear paragraphs with a clear introduction, development and conclusion.

They used many features from articles with subheadings and sophisticated use of rhetorical features such as direct address, repetition, emotive language and inclusive pronouns to engage the reader. One candidate wrote 'We're the generation blamed for everything, but we're also the ones marching for climate change, supporting each other's mental health, and volunteering in our communities.'

Some used wit, sarcasm or humour effectively to enhance their argument. They were able to provide a thorough and well-thought-out argument that showed a careful consideration of the needs of the community. Some did write really persuasively about the need for new facilities and the dire consequences that could occur without these. There were frequent references to mental health.

Less successful responses had problems organising and developing ideas in any detail.

There was some focus on the task, but ideas were not really developed.

They were able to list facilities that would be beneficial, but struggled to expand on the exact reasons and write about them in an engaging or convincing way. They struggled to advance a clear argument and often did little more than state an opinion and could be inappropriately angry in tone, e.g. 'How would you like it if you had nowhere to go?'.

Some had a basic structure and some points but others lacked structure, included irrelevant content, or were overly informal or generic. Some candidates misunderstood the format and wrote letters or speeches.

Some of these less successful responses were very brief.

Some candidates made use of ideas from Text Two about types of facilities which some examiners thought was a good support for weaker candidates.

However other examiners observed that candidates lifted heavily from Text Two using ideas discussed in the text, sometimes with very little alteration.

AO6

The comments from examiners were the same as those for Question 7.

Most candidates were able to make some attempt to select vocabulary, sentence structures and punctuation to suit the task. They were able to express and order information and ideas with some correctly spelt vocabulary, some control of punctuation and some accurate paragraphing. Most candidates were able to communicate successfully even if there were errors. The use of a varied vocabulary showed some adaptation to the topic being written about.

Examiners commented that although vocabulary was often varied, there were spelling errors. Complex words were sometimes correct but there were frequent careless errors which suggested a lack of proof reading. Nearly all examiners commented on weak punctuation with some responses using very few full stops or capital letters.

More successful candidates were selective with their word choices and used a range of appropriate linguistic techniques, e.g. rhetorical questions and direct address to communicate their ideas. They used a wide range of vocabulary that was well-chosen for the task they had selected. These candidates wrote fluently with a range of structural devices. They had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful candidates were often repetitive with their word choices and sentence structures. They often used very basic sentences or did not punctuate sentences. These candidates sometimes had limited vocabulary and poor grammar.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: missing basic sentence punctuation; comma splicing; missing or misused apostrophes; problems with homophones; misspelling of basic vocabulary; not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun; missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and incorrect capitalisation of words within sentences; grammatical errors such as problems with sentence structures, subject-verb agreement and verb tenses.

This is a very successful response to Question 8.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

Plan your answer to Section B here:

Beginning - point, an anecdote, set the scene, 5
senses (taste, feel, ^{see} smell, hear, touch)

Middle - talk about problems, and what
needs to be done

End - how character is now, flip anecdote.

Write your answer to Section B here:

Imagine if you will, Anthony, a young teenage boy with scruffy hair, eye bags and acne all over his face. Anthony plays games on his xbox all day due to the fact that he has a very small friend group which consist of him and his dog, Luna. I know, a bit embarrassing right? But we've all been there at some point of our lives.

To my knowledge, there is a solution for this. The community could help poor Anthony here by creating youth clubs for teens like Anthony.

The youth clubs would consist of a gym, a swimming pool, several board games, ~~food~~ and refreshments and most of all a TV to watch footy. You might think, why can't people do this at home?

The answer to your question, my friend, is that it's necessary for ~~a~~ people like Anthony to go out and enjoy themselves especially when he's not in this alone.

Additionally, there might be a deeper message behind this article. Yes, I do wish that there is more facilities for young people but on the other hand I want them to grow into social butterflies. I want that everyone in the youth community come together and support each other to give them the safe environment that they need.

The fact that there is a lack of facilities in the first place is a big problem in itself. Studies from Dr Howell from the University of Manchester show that 1 in 5 teenagers feel like they don't have a place to call home. Me and you need to step up and help our angels who feel as though they are living in hell!

Here's the plan.

Everyone who wishes to raise money for a youth community centre can donate only as little as a pound on my gofundme. With all your help, there is a way we can reach £10,000!

Finally, picture this: Anthony ~~is~~ looking into his bright, blue bathroom mirror figuring out how to put shaving cream on. Wait, hold up... did you just ~~say~~ mention Anthony and shaving in the same sentence? I did in fact mention those two words in the same sentence. Want to know why?

Well, since you insisted on it, I'll tell you why. Anthony is getting ready to go to the youth club that you all helped with. I've never seen a bigger, cheerier smile ~~than~~^{on} Anthony's face ^{than} right now. He is finally getting out of his comfort zone. He looks a lot healthier too. I guess those swimming lessons are working.

Look at him all grown up... our social butterfly.



AO5 – From the opening paragraph the candidate manipulates complex ideas in order to shape the audience’s response. A convincing voice is adopted and maintained and the tone is managed carefully throughout, with direct address to the reader used very effectively and other rhetorical strategies applied effectively. The overall structure is controlled and the end cleverly circles back to the beginning. This meets all of the criteria for Level 5 and therefore was awarded a mark of 24. Level 5 - 24 marks

AO6 - The candidate uses a wide and selective vocabulary with accuracy – there are occasional slips but these do not detract from the overall effect. Punctuation is controlled – for example, the precise use of ellipsis – and there are carefully deployed single sentence paragraphs. This overall sense of crafting and control means that a mark of 16, at the top of Level 5, is most appropriate. Level 5 - 16 marks



Note how the candidate directly addresses the reader engaging them in the topic. The response is fully-focused on the task and develops the ideas with sophistication. The planning box has been used effectively to help the candidate organise and develop the ideas.

Paper Summary

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

- For short-answer Questions 1 and 4(a) ensure that you are responding briefly and selecting information, not just writing out a section. Highlight the relevant lines in your extract booklet and read the question carefully. Ensure you answer on the correct Text as well as correct lines. For Question 4(b) try to find ideas that are implied in the given text rather than just selecting phrases or quotations from the text.
- Remember to find three reasons for your opinion and support them with examples from the text for your responses to Questions 2 and 5. Remember to give examples from the correct lines in response to Question 2.
- For Question 3, make sure you use Text One and focus on language features e.g. alliteration, personification, simile, metaphor. Remember to focus on the effects of your chosen examples on the reader and not just explain their meaning. Try to use appropriate subject terminology.
- In Questions 3 and 6, 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 for comment. 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 responses to Questions 2, 5 and 6, remember that you evaluate every day, and more so than ever with online feedback and posting of opinions and ideas online. Read the question carefully – what is it you are giving your opinion on? You do not need to comment on language and structure here unless this supports your evaluation. Remember always to link your evaluative points to the text by using examples from the text.
- 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, even just briefly. You have been given a planning box to do this. 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 cohesive and coherent way. If you start presenting an idea, make sure you are developing it.
- Take care throughout with accuracy: spelling, punctuation and grammar. Try to give yourself time to proofread your writing.
- Focus on timing during the examination and use the number of marks available for each question as an indication of how long you should spend answering each question. Make sure you try to answer every question.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

