

Examiners' Report

June 2025

Int GCSE English Language 4EA1 01R

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 4EA1_01R_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

This report will provide exemplification of candidates' work, together with tips and comments, for Questions 1-7 of Paper 01R of the International GCSE English Language A linear version.

The specification consists of three components:

Paper 1: Non-fiction texts and Transactional Writing – 60% (this examination)

Paper 2: Poetry and Prose Texts and Imaginative Writing – 40% (examination) OR

Paper 3: Poetry and Prose Texts and Imaginative Writing – 40% (coursework).

There is also an optional Spoken Language Endorsement (non-examination assessment).

Non-fiction Texts and Transactional Writing is assessed through an examination lasting 2 hours and 15 minutes with a total of 90 marks. The paper is organised into two sections each worth 45 marks.

Section A: Non-fiction

This section is worth a total of 45 marks, tests reading skills and is based on an unseen passage (Questions 1-3) and a text from the International GCSE English Anthology (Question 4) with a total word count of approximately 2000 words. Question 5 asks candidates to compare the two texts. In this series, the unseen extract was adapted from *The Fearless Flyer* by Donna McCluskie in which she describes her meeting with helicopter pilot Quentin Smith. Smith is one of the two explorers whose rescue after their helicopter crashes is the subject of the article *Explorers or boys messing about? Either way, taxpayer gets rescue bill* by Steven Morris, which was the chosen Anthology text for this series.

Candidates are advised to spend about 1 hour and 30 minutes on this section.

Section B: Transactional Writing

This section, also worth a total of 45 marks, offers candidates a choice of two transactional writing tasks. A particular form will always be specified and for this series the two tasks were to write the text for a speech on the topic 'First Impressions'. (Question 6) or to write a magazine article about what makes a true hero. (Question 7).

The Assessment Objectives for this paper are:

Section A: Reading

AO1: Read and understand a variety of texts, selecting and interpreting information, ideas and perspectives (Questions 1-3)

AO2: Understand and analyse how writers use linguistic and structural devices to achieve their effects (Question 4)

AO3: Explore links and connections between writers' ideas and perspectives, as well as how these

are conveyed (Question 5)

Section B: Writing

AO4: Communicate effectively and imaginatively. Adapting form, tone and register of writing for specific purposes and audiences (Question 6 or 7)

AO5: Write clearly, using a range of vocabulary and sentence structures, with appropriate paragraphing and accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation (Question 6 or 7)

This is an untiered specification and the choice of texts and questions set are such that all candidates are able to access the paper and to show their abilities in reading and writing. The vast majority of candidates sitting the paper in this series responded very positively to all questions.

The two texts, offering differing views of the same people and incident, worked very well together and offered plenty of interesting points of comparison, particularly on perspective.

Candidates had been prepared well and all had, at varying levels, acquired and developed the skills of interpretation and analysis. Many examiners felt that the standard of writing across both Questions 6 & 7 was often very impressive; ideas were explored and examined with a good degree of maturity and insight and examiners noted that there were many entertaining and engaging responses.

Question 1

This question, which tests the skills of selection and retrieval, is intended to serve as a straightforward way into the paper and build confidence on the part of the candidates, almost all of whom were able to gain the two marks available. The question directed candidates to lines 1-3 of the unseen text and asked them to select two words or phrases that describe Drake Passage.

The important advice for this question is to look at the line references given and to select words or phrases from the passage, not to attempt to use own words and not to spend time giving comment or explanation which cannot be rewarded here.

On the few occasions where both marks were not achieved, this tended to be because candidates had selected material from outside the line references. There were a number of possible answers and all appeared at some point in responses. There were a very few candidates who thought Drake Passage was a person and therefore gave (incorrectly) 'Englishman' or 'the first Englishman to circumnavigate the globe' as an answer. It is also essential that there is some degree of selection in order to demonstrate understanding, so copying out the whole of the given lines will not earn marks.

1 Treacherous

2 oceans meet



Two valid quotations have been selected covering bullet points 1 and 3 have been selected.

2 marks

1 "treacherous" ~~body~~

2 "stimulated"



One mark could be awarded for 'treacherous' (bullet point 1) but 'situated' on its own does not describe Drake Passage.

1 mark



A single word can be sufficient to gain a mark but it must be valid and answer the requirements of the question.

1. "ink - black water"
2. "treacherous body of water"



The first quotation does describe Drake Passage but does not come from the given lines. However, bullet points 1 and 2 are covered in the second line of the response.

2 marks



Ensure that your chosen words or phrases come from the correct lines.

Question 2

This question moves on from Question 1 by directing candidates towards a larger section of the text. Nearly all candidates achieved the full four marks for this question, which requires them to select and interpret information. For this examination the question asked candidates to look at lines 8-22 and describe the experiences of the two men.

Examiners noted that the majority of candidates were able to select the relevant information and most candidates received full marks. It appeared that many candidates had been well-prepared and clearly understood that this is a straightforward 'retrieval of information' question. There were many possible points to be made; the most popular points were that the pilots were on their way to the South Pole, that the engine malfunctioned, that there was already a plan in case of an emergency and that the men possessed key information about ships in the area. Many candidates tried to ensure full marks by including an additional fifth point.

Candidates who did not achieve full marks sometimes repeated points, made fewer than four points or used quotations to make their points. There was evidence in a very small number of responses of indiscriminate copying from the passage, changing only one or two words into 'own words' or simply missing out selected words. A few candidates failed to focus on the given lines and provided more of an overview. Some candidates took 'experiences' to include the men's 'flying hours'; where this was linked to a point relevant to their experiences on the trip then it was credited.

It is important to remember that this question has the instruction *'In your own words'* and many candidates made admirable attempts to choose relevant points and describe them in their own way. There are always some words which are very hard to find synonyms for and this is taken into account in the mark scheme which specifies that candidates should answer 'in own words where possible'.

Overall, there were fewer candidates who adopted an AO2 approach but where they did, they tended to spend time making lengthy points which might only result in two or three marks. Examiners were concerned that these candidates may not have had sufficient time to spend on the later, higher-tariff questions. Candidates who sat the paper onscreen also often wrote far more than was required.

Examiners reported that, as always, the most successful approach employed by candidates was to make at least four clear discrete points. If these are set out separately then it can help both the candidate and the examiner to see at a glance how many points have been made. It is important to remember that the question asks candidates to 'describe' and therefore, although it is not necessary to write at length, it is not acceptable to simply list very brief points. The response must be written in full and complete sentences that clearly demonstrate understanding and secure interpretation. It is important that the given lines are read closely and carefully.

* Two pilot, Quentin Smith and Steve Brooks, are ~~the flying~~ using their helicopter to fly. But on the way they flying, the engine component broken, Q and Brooks coporated to fix the problem.



In this brief response, the candidate has covered bullet points 4 and 5 from the mark scheme with an attempt to express them in own words.

2 marks



Try to ensure that you make at least four clear points in answer to this question.

The men experienced engine failure in their helicopter over the Drake Passage. They had enjoyed ~~the~~ celebrations and comfort three months earlier at the north pole but now ~~the~~ as the ~~the~~ helicopter engine gave out they were tense and concerned. they then realised they ~~had~~ ~~to~~ were in an emergency.

In this response, three points are made that cover bullet points 4, 3 and 9 from the mark scheme. 'In an emergency' is a valid way of saying the men were in trouble or danger.

3 marks

Both pilots, Quinten Smith, - the teacher and his disciple Steve Brooks embarked on a journey to try and in the South Pole.

Furthermore, the helicopter had problems with its engine along the ~~dangerous~~ perilous Drake Passage.

The pilots had ~~an~~ a plan in case of an emergency ~~in~~ and stored the satellite ~~phone~~ contact details of ships in the passage in a water resistant pouch.

The disciple Steven Brooks questioned if the engine ~~to~~ problems were a concern to worry about.

The teacher, Quentin Smith ~~had~~ was an experienced pilot with over 12,000 hours of flying.



The candidate covers five points from the mark scheme: bullet points 2, 4, 5, 6, 8.

4 marks



It can be a good idea to include an extra point in order to try and ensure that you have 4 rewardable points.

Question 3

This is the final AO1 question; it is worth 5 marks and, like Question 2, requires candidates to show their understanding of the text by selecting and interpreting ideas and information. For this examination, they were asked to look again at lines 41-53 and explain Quentin Smith's memories of the incident.

Examiners noted that many candidates scored full marks on this question and most demonstrated a secure understanding of what was required. Where some candidates did not achieve full marks, it was because they made fewer than five valid points, repeated a point or went outside of the given lines. As with Question 2, it was noted that candidates who sat the paper onscreen often wrote far more than was required.

Successful candidates often worked methodically through the set section of the text identifying key points. There were very few who looked at information that was not in the relevant lines; a few candidates did not seem to realise that Quentin Smith was retelling the story long after the event, leading many to comment on how smoking a cigar as the helicopter went down showed how calm he is.

In Question 3, candidates are told that they 'may support' their points 'with **brief** quotations' and the vast majority did so to good effect. Some relied on integrated quotations to make a point but candidates should aim to offer 'own-word' explanations to act as evidence of comprehension; brief quotations can then be used to support these points. For example, stating that 'Quentin remembers thinking there was "no way to survive in such cold water"' simply uses the quotation to try and make the point. However, writing 'Quentin remembers thinking that he would die in the freezing ocean as there was "no way to survive in such cold water"' offers some interpretation and will signpost understanding to the examiner. One examiner reported that some candidates elided the crucial part of their chosen supporting quotations, but as long as the point had been securely made in own words then this was not an issue.

In summary, the best answers used a good balance of short quotation and some interpretation, paid attention to how many marks the question is worth and made five clear and discrete points. Setting these out separately, as with Question 2, can be useful to both candidate and examiner. Candidates should be careful not to spend a disproportionate time on this question; examiners raised concerns that over-lengthy responses that did far more than required might have led to candidates running out of time for the higher-tariff questions.

- Brooks hadn't had sampled with Q's orders
- Brooks had a higher chance of death because he had jumped early.



This brief response makes two valid points from the mark scheme: bullet points 3 and 2.

2 marks



The two points made come from the early part of the extract. Re-read all of the lines; there will always be plenty of possible points that could be made and you should aim for five.

In lines 41 to 53, Quentin Smith details his memory of the accident. He recalls providing Brookes with "two simple instructions". He then recalls coming to the conclusion that Brookes would "be dead" because of the fall from an altitude of "80-100 ft".

He then details his survival and spotting of the life raft close by. "It was so maybe 100 yards away." He then remembers grabbing "2 coffee flasks" and ^{using} ~~used~~ them to swim more efficiently.



This response covers four points from the mark scheme: bullet points 1, 2, 5 and 11.

4 marks



Aim to include some explanation in your own words rather than relying on a quotation to make a point.

Quentin Smith had given Steven Brooks clear ~~to~~ directions, "not to jump off the skid until I said 'GO!'"

Also, he ~~thought~~ ^{imagine} ~~envisioned~~, Steven Brooks to "be dead because he'd dropped too early".

~~Also~~ Additionally, he got ~~back~~ fortunate and "got a lucky wave and a little glimpse of the dinghy fully inflated."

Moreover, he ~~then~~ ^{was} worried that there was "no way to survive".

Furthermore, he could ~~feel~~ ^{envision} his insides moving, "I imagined my intercostal [rib] muscles separating".



This response earns full marks. The candidate has made their points concisely and supported them with an appropriate quotation. Bullet points 1, 2, 5, 7 and 8 have been made.

5 marks



Setting out points separately will clearly indicate to you and the examiner how many you have made.

Question 4

This question is on Text Two, the Anthology text, and is assessed for **A02:** Understand and analyse how writers use linguistic and structural devices to achieve their effects. It is therefore a more challenging and discriminatory question and is worth 12 marks divided over five levels.

In this examination, candidates were asked how the writer, Steven Morris, uses language and structure in the extract from *Explorers or boys messing about? Either way, taxpayer gets rescue bill* to influence the reader's opinion of the incident.

This piece contains a very wide range of features of language and structure as exemplified in the mark scheme, but these are just examples of possible points that could be made and any valid points that candidates make that are securely rooted in the text can be rewarded. There does not need to be an equal number of points on language and structure, but both should be addressed as, indeed, they were by the majority of candidates. It was noted that most candidates engaged with the text well and approached the question confidently. One examiner stated: 'This question was answered impressively; candidates were well-prepared and had been taught the text in detail.'

As stated earlier, most examiners found that candidates responded well to the question with many candidates achieving marks in Level 4 and few falling below Level 3. As such, nearly all responses showed a clear understanding of language and structure, supported by relevant textual evidence. The key discriminator was the degree of analysis of precisely why that language choice or structural feature might influence the reader's opinion. Where candidates did not quite reach Level 3 quality, it was generally because they adopted a descriptive or narrative approach. A few candidates bullet-pointed quotations, identified the technique illustrated and added a brief comment. These could be quite lengthy responses but could not move beyond Level 2.

The majority of answers started with an examination of the title; this gives some useful material but it is important to try and cover ideas from the whole text. Where candidates did work their way through the article, there was frequent discussion of the use of theatrical language, the list of rescue services, the inclusion of expert opinion and Ms Vestey's words at the end. In terms of vocabulary, the verbs 'plunged' and 'plucked', the adjective 'trusty' and the suggested punishment of 'bottoms kicked' provided much scope for analysis. The best answers explored the overall shape of the article as well as exploring the use and impact of techniques; examiners saw some good focus on the author's use of expert opinion, sarcasm and critical tone; some looked at how the men were portrayed as entitled and lacking a social conscience and others wondered about Morris' stance as a writer for *The Guardian*. Quotations were skilfully selected and integrated to support the points made.

This was the question that most commonly led to candidates requiring an additional sheet of paper to complete their answer. The three pages in the answer booklet reflect the number of marks allotted and should be sufficient to achieve the top level. Onscreen candidates, using the expanding answer box, also often overly long responses. Candidates need to ensure that they do not: spend too long on this question, attempt to write all they know without selecting what is relevant to the given question, include unnecessary generalised openings that simply restate the question or concluding paragraphs that sum up what has already been said.

Firstly, Morris influences the reader's opinion to
of the incident to present the adventurers as Reckless
by using language and structure. Morris mentions
that "their helicopter plunged into the sea" and
they "were plucked." The ~~contrast~~ verbs "plunged"
and "plucked" ~~are~~ create a cartoonish imagery
of the event, which makes the reader think that
these men are reckless and unserious. Furthermore,
Morris contrasts their helicopter's "single engine"
with the "hostile environment" to portray their
~~lack~~ lack of equipment to the reader, which makes
~~them~~ them seem reckless. Moreover, Mr. Morris
uses the ~~an~~ "Antarctic explorer" the opinion
of an "Antarctic explorer" that it was "nothing
short of a miracle that they survived" to highlight
the dangerousness of the incident to the reader.

Secondly, Morris also influences the readers to
present the incident as a waste of taxpayer money

The ~~fig~~ listing of the "Royal Navy, the RAF, and British coastguards" illustrates how so much resources were used to save the men, which could make the readers question ~~that~~ ~~the~~ who will pay for it. Additionally, Morris states that the incident "had cost the taxpayers or Britain and Chile" money, which would lead to a resentment and frustration by the readers that their money is being wasted on silly adventures. Furthermore, Morris includes that "it was 'highly unlikely' " that the money would be recovered, which depicts the adventurers as irresponsible and wasteful.

Finally, Morris also influences the reader's opinion to prefer the men in the incident as ~~childish~~ clueless. This is done by the use of expert opinion as the "experts questioned the wisdom of taking a small helicopter," displaying the lack of expertise at the ~~boy~~ adventurers and their false decisions. Alternatively, this also portrays the adventurers as reckless. Additionally, Morris mentions that there "was 'contusion' about their purpose, which makes the adventurers seem useless and incompetent to the reader. Finally, Morris says that they were described as "boys messing about" which makes the reader view them as childish men.



This response demonstrates a clear understanding of some of the text's language and structural features and how they are used. Points are not sufficiently developed to move into 'exploration' (a Level 4 requirement). The selection of references is appropriate. The response securely meets Level 3 descriptors and so was given a mark at the top of the level.

Level 3 - 7 marks



Try and look closely at individual words and phrases that you quote and explain their impact/effect as precisely as you can.

Steven Morris uses both language and structure to present two childish and immature explorers, and influence the readers to consider them as irresponsible for the ~~society~~^{society}.

Starting from the title, the writer addresses a question and gives his own opinion, which suggests the theme of the whole extract, that he is criticizing the expedition of the two "boys", stating that they are wasting the tax from people. The use of words "boys" and "messing about" is associated with the common phrases that describe children, which emphasizes that the two explorers are seen as immature and their action of the expedition is both ridiculous and unacceptable, no matter how they define their expedition. The title suggests the humorous tone of the extract. In the first paragraph, the writer starts immediately into the main event, which is the expedition and rescue due to the two pilots. The word "farce" indicates that the writer has bias towards the two men, and that their expedition is considered ridiculous, like a drama which is away from normal human sense. The word "farce" also echoes the title's "messing about", making the readers more influenced by the writer's view that the

adventure of the two men is irresponsible and ^{ridiculous} ~~rediculous~~.

The writer further influences the readers' opinion by describing the background and process of the expedition^{and rescue}. The rescue is described as "nine-hour" and "involved the Royal Navy, the RAF and British coastguards", which uses the "rule of three" to highlight the huge cost of both money and time for the rescue, making it more convincible to the readers. Their preparation is described as "the four-seater Robinson R44 with a single engine" which is ironic as it is contrasted with "hostile" environment, emphasizing how little their preparation is. The "trusty helicopter" is also an irony to criticize that the men are almost messing about with no responsibility for both themselves and the country. The explanation of the background information makes the readers agree that it is a silly action carried out by two "boys".

The writer uses short paragraphs, quotes from experts and listing of numbers to convince the readers of his opinion. There are lots of short paragraphs with only one or two sentences when describing the incident, this adds humour and irony to the extract, making the procedures of incident more like a farce or a play. The sentences from experts: "it was nothing short of a miracle" also suggests the view from experts that it is hard to comprehend the action of the two men. The listing of numbers like "180 miles"

"10.20 am" make the description more precise and the readers are more likely to believe it.



The candidate opens with a focus on the title and then moves through the text selecting relevant features, although they do not quite reach the end of the piece. A range of language and structure points is considered and the candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding and exploration of the way these are used to achieve effects. This quality is not quite fully sustained; for example, there could have been further expansion on how humour is created. The selection of references is detailed and appropriate.

Level 4 - 9 marks



Try to show that you have considered the whole text. For instance in this response, the candidate could have linked the word 'boys' in the title to Ms Vestey's words at the end of the passage.

~~At the start of the extract, Morris employs cartoonish imagery~~

At the start of the extract, Morris presents the men as reckless, ~~and naive~~. The writer employs cartoonish imagery, "plunged" and "plucked" emphasising the rash decisions made by the men. Moreover, the use of positives "plunged" and "plucked" suggest a sense of harshness ~~and to~~ and pain to the explorers expedition.

Alternatively, the writer employs positives to further critique the actions of the men and to ~~then~~ portray that the men deserved the consequences. Furthermore, the writer ~~is~~ implements triadic structure, "the Royal Navy, the RAF and British coastguards." The use of listing exemplifies the high risk adventure of the men and the resources needed to save them. Perhaps, Morris ~~target~~ criticises wealthy people ~~as~~ through the triadic structure as the ^{resources} ~~length of magnitude~~ used by the government to save wealthy privileged men. Also, Morris evokes a sense of disdain towards the men through ~~the~~ as he

encourages the reader to understand how entitled the two explorers are.

Later on in the extract, the writer presents the men as infantile. Morris uses the statement of Ms. Vestey where she claims that the men were "boys messing about with a helicopter". The use of the ~~verb~~ lexical choice "boys" presents the men as naive and inconsiderate. Additionally, it discredits the expertise of the men. Moreover, the use of the verb "messing" suggests the men did not know what they were doing and renders their actions as ~~rash~~ risky. Furthermore, the lexical phrase "emergency people" critiques the attitude of the men while presenting them as infants. Perhaps, Morris encourages the reader to feel pity for the men by portraying them as infantile. However, at the same time ~~pre~~ emphasises the irresponsible decisions made by the two men.

Towards the end of the extract, Morris ~~crit~~ questions the skills of the two men. The writer presents the men as "pushing" the helicopter to the "maximum" suggesting that the men wanted to prove a point. Additionally, ~~the~~ the lexical choice "maximum" portrays the men as rash and ~~agg~~ aggressive ~~aggressive~~ and frustrated while creating a tense atmosphere. Moreover,

~~the men "pushing" the helicopter~~ the verb "pushing" hints at the ~~mass~~ force the men were applying, suggesting the lack of skill. Furthermore, the men "pushing" the helicopter to the "maximum" is juxtaposed with flying conditions rendered as being "excellent". The adjective "excellent" further discredits the qualifications and skills of the men. Perhaps, ~~ex~~ enticing the reader to feel a sense of anger towards the men as a result of their poor decisions.



The candidate focuses on analysis of language and structure and how this might impact the reader throughout this response. At times, the development of some points is thorough (Level 4) rather than perceptive (Level 5) and, as with the previous response, the ending of the text is not covered but it meets all of Level 4 criteria and there is sufficient analysis to lift this into Level 5.

Level 5 - 11 marks



Note how saying Morris shows 'disdain' towards the two men gives a greater precision to his attitude, rather than simply saying he dislikes them.

Question 5

This question provides the only assessment in the specification of **A03**: Explore links and connections between writers' ideas and perspectives, as well as how these are conveyed.

This question is the most demanding of those in Section A and, with 22 marks distributed between five levels, carries almost half of the total marks available for reading. This year there were very few candidates who did not attempt the question or who wrote very brief responses and thereby missed the opportunity to gain a significant number of marks; examiners reported that the vast majority of candidates achieved marks within Levels 3 and 4. This is encouraging; careful time-management is crucial for success in this examination so it was also pleasing to see that many candidates had factored in time to plan with care the points that they wished to make.

Examiners recognise the challenge of the question and were impressed by the standard of responses; one examiner commented that 'most responses were remarkably thorough'.

The unseen passage worked very well with the Anthology text with the unusual dimension that both featured Quentin Smith and gave differing views of the same incident and people involved. Despite the information given that Text One was about the author's 'meeting with Quentin Smith (who is one of the two explorers featured in Text Two)', there were some candidates who did not appear to notice this. Sometimes this did not prevent candidates making some valid points of comparison but it did lead a few to make inaccurate contrasts such as thinking that one text described a terrible crash and the other did not or believing that Steve Brooks had died in Text One but not in Text Two. There were one or two who did not realise that in Text One, Quentin Smith was recounting events some years afterwards and therefore was not calmly smoking a cigar at a time of crisis.

Some candidates made a brief plan (sometimes, effectively, a Venn diagram) which often contributed to a more thoughtful, exploratory approach based on key elements of similarity or difference rather than an explanatory, chronological approach to the texts. Where points were then ticked off, it often led to a well-structured and coherent answer.

Lower-level responses tended to be brief and sometimes entirely narrative in response. Whilst examiners noted that candidates almost all wrote about both texts, they tended to focus on obvious, factual links between the texts. At this level, supporting evidence was not always precisely chosen and there was some confusion between what constituted first or third person narration.

Mid-level answers presented a range of appropriate comparisons and demonstrated a sound understanding of the writers' ideas and perspectives with most confidently contrasting the positive portrayal of Smith and Brooks in Text One with the negative picture conveyed in *The Guardian* article. Many candidates pointed out that Morris' focus was on the rescue, whereas McCluskie's article created more empathy by looking at the drama of the accident and retelling its harrowing events. The point that in Text One the helicopter was to blame for the incident and not pilot error, whereas in Text Two the fault was laid squarely at the door of the pilots was also frequently made.

Many candidates relished the opportunity to discuss writers' bias, purpose and methods of persuasion. There were some good observations about the difference between the more

personal interview style of McCluskie's piece, designed to convey the character of Quentin Smith, and the deliberately distanced account from Morris who, in the astute words of one candidate, 'denies the explorers a voice'. There were some candidates who felt that there was, in fact, some element of bias in Text One as the author clearly seemed impressed and fascinated by Smith, his 'lion-size personality' and his 'charisma'. There were some interesting gender-based interpretations including some that suggested that the evidence of Ms Vestey in Text Two served to emasculate the explorers.

The more successful responses focused almost immediately on comparing specific details of the extracts and looked closely at the writers' perspectives – often a discriminator – as well as their ideas. At the top level, responses included astute analysis of language, structure, purpose and tone and explored the subtleties of the extracts. Responses at this level were often impressed by the manner in which they dealt with the nuances of the texts and shifts in perspective and tone. One examiner noted that 'the strongest answers were able to make more fine-grained comparative points rather than broad brushstrokes'. At this level, there was skilful integration of a strategic choice of supporting textual evidence.

There are different ways to approach this question, but examiners noted that the most successful responses made each point a valid and appropriate comparison, with supporting references from both extracts; this led to the balance required for marks within Levels 4 and 5. The use of a comparative topic sentence at the start of each paragraph was also used effectively. Where candidates dealt with one passage at length before moving on to the second – and it was pleasing to note that this happened less often in this series – they often failed to make many actual points of comparison.

The most successful responses were able to select pertinent words/phrases within the lines being discussed, embed them effectively within their own sentences and, if looking at language features, offer some astute analysis and make apposite links between the texts.

It is important to remember though that language and structure are only two of the possible elements that can be considered. Some candidates became side-tracked into exploring these features of each text separately at the expense of drawing out comparisons. Examiners felt that some candidates fell into the trap of comparing by technique but this often had limited success as the technique was often used for entirely different purposes. Where candidates focused on the writers' use of language and structure, the most successful responses effectively linked these elements to the ideas and perspectives.

Both ~~texts~~ are about the same incident⁽²²⁾ that happened at the south of the meeting point of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, where Quentin Smith (Q) and Steve Brooks crashed.

Text 1 focuses on ~~the~~ what exactly happened the experience, what the pilots / what Quentin Smith remembers. While text 2 focuses on the overall impact, how others felt rather than how the pilots felt (Q's wife, taxpayers, rescuers, royal navy, etc...). Also text 1 talks more ~~about~~ about what the pilots did and how they reacted, compared to text 2, where it is about the signals they received, the ~~the~~ pilots' parts, and how the rescue happened.

~~Text 1~~ Donna McIntosh uses techniques such as statistics: '300, and 10000 flying hours' and 'January 2003' and '12-13 meter waves'. Onomatopoeia: 'splatter'. Metaphors such as: 'ink-black water'. Hyperboles like: 'my intercostal muscles (ribs) separating' and 'blood vessels breaking', etc...

Steven Morris however, focuses on creating more of an article compared to Donna's story-like text. He gives information about ~~the~~ the pilot's notorious reputation (Quentin Smith) for doing the ~~wrong~~ wrong things/ getting wrong things to make him famous. We can see a sort of contrast when on the adventuring pilots' website, they say 'trusty helicopter', when it in fact wasn't. Steven Morris says that experts say it wasn't wise to bring a small four-seater Robinson R44 with a single engine into such a hostile environment! Morris, similarly to Donna also uses statistics such as: 'nine-hour rescue', '40, and 42 years-old', at '1am British time', and '100 miles off Antarctica, about 36 miles north of Smith Island; etc...

In conclusion, both texts talk about this incident involving Steve Brooks, and ~~Quentin~~ Quentin Smith at the ~~Drake~~ 'notorious' and 'treacherous' Drake Passage'. However one talks about the experience, liveliness, and how it is 'one of the greatest heroic acts of behaviour ever'. While the other is more about bad reputation, economic impact/waste, and negative →

remarks. (Text 1 also has anecdotes such as:
'As he did so, he showed me ... I was about
7 years old at the time' - Line 66, Text 1).



The candidate makes a range of comparisons but not all of these, for example in the second paragraph, are supported by textual evidence. At other points, quotations are put into a list and not used effectively. In the third paragraph, Text Two is dealt with at greater length than Text One. There is explanation of the writers' ideas and perspectives. This response was awarded a mark within Level 3.

Level 3 - 12 marks



Try to avoid simply listing ideas or quotations; aim for some explanation of both.

Both texts are on the same two people however describe them much differently through their experiences. In text one: The Fearless Flyer they highlight the boy's previous success, "landing attempt match their... North pole" the descriptor for the landing being 'champagne-toasted' gives it value resembling exquisite champagne. However in text two: EOBMA their past flights were highlighted in a negative light Steven Morris talks initially about their extreme disaster in the past, "their last expedition... Bering Strait." The writer highlights this to give the reader a sense of them being highly unsuccessful.

Both texts highlight how they prepared. For text one they mention, "agreed emergency procedure with great... water proof bag" the long compound sentence's emphasizes to the reader the great extent they went to prepare further backing their expertise. However in text two the writer highlights the complete opposite, "though both wore survival suits... they had survived." The metaphor

'nothing short of a miracle' makes it seem their survival was via pure luck and that it had nothing to do with their precautions.

Both texts highlight the achievements of the explorers and their expertise. Text one highlights the difference in their understanding and experiences, "Brooks had 300 flying hours of experience... 12,000 hours as pilot in command." The statistics and numbers gives them a sense of professionalism and helped the reader in understanding how good they are. In text two it also highlights the two pilot's expertise, "Mr Brooks, a property developer... to countries in 15 years." Use of numbers allows the reader to picture their experience. However, as well as for Q, "Mr Smith, from also from... age of five." However the writer doesn't clarify them to the extent of text one as they state how he is a 'property developer' giving the reader a sense that he isn't a full blown pilot. Also stating Q "claims" to be flying since 5 giving scepticism and questioning the authenticity of the claim.

The endings to both texts reflects the authors view's on each on the pilot. In text one they highlight all of Q's achievements since he became a pilot, "A cornishman since birth"

highlighting his excellence since since birth as the writer views him as a legend. Such is his charisma, I don't hesitate... of flying in a helicopter" This charm clearly shows how he respects Q being able to change his mind. Text two is the complete antithesis addressing them as boys and not Q showing a lack of formal respect. As well as stating, "They'll probably have ~~some~~ the long way." Childish imagery reflects the way writer views them as kids which will be punished even though being full adults. Text one uses quotes from the pilot further showing respect bringing him for personal input. While text two uses from someone else's perspective hence the negative view.



Right from the start, the candidate makes some effective points of comparison. Despite occasional misunderstanding (e.g. of 'Cornishman') and some awkward expression, this candidate offers a wide range of comparisons, and explores ideas and perspectives. References are selected from the whole texts and are carefully balanced; there is some thoughtful examination of the language used and this response was awarded a mark securely within Level 4.

Level 4 - 17 marks



Note how equal weight is given to both texts in this response. Clear, effective points of comparison are signposted with words that serve to link the texts such as 'however', 'also' and 'both'.

Below is an example of a response that achieved full marks.

In both texts, the danger of the environment ^{is described.} ~~is represented.~~

In text one, the dangerous 'drone passage' is immediately described.

Donna McCluskie uses measurements and overwhelming conditions to portray to the reader the danger of the passage. The waves are described

as '12-13⁴ metres', this directly paints this image to the reader of a scary, ~~and~~ environment, one which 'has claimed the lives of many

sailors'. This urges the reader to idolize the pilots, and how regardless of the number of deaths, they have survived, portraying

the pilots as skillful. In contrast, in text two, Steven Morris portrays

the hostility of the environment to reflect the reckless decisions of

the men. The use of the dependent clause 'four-seater... single engine'

juxtaposes the following 'hostile environment', this conveys

the decision of using this mocked 'trustworthy helicopter' in such a

dangerous environment. The use of the inverted commas suggests irony

when referring to this 'safe' helicopter, reinforces this idea of reckless, uncalculated decisions.

In both texts, references to the experience and credibility of

the pilots are made. In text one, throughout the whole passage,

references to ~~the~~ both the pilots' achievements are continuously made.

When describing their present attempt of landing on the south pole,

McCluskie references the previous landing they had, using the symbolic adjective 'champagne-toasted'. This adjective has connotations of perfection and expertise, this Hence, the reader is inclined to build trust in the pilots' skill, using ~~ethos~~ this creates a sense of ethos, and allows the reader to trust these pilots, portraying them as skillful. Furthermore in the text, this credibility is reinforced by the metaphor 'his pants at a lion-size', the comparison of the pilots' position to a 'lion', which connotes power, and being the 'king of the jungle', portrays him as powerful and accredited. This claim is then strengthened when McCluskie explains 'he has the ability and achievement to match'. This continuous praise towards them as trustworthy and idolic, presenting their survival as an act of capability rather than one of luck. In contrast, text two ^{includes} uses the same references to credibility, however uses them as a form of discrediting and undermining experience. The intentional late mention of the men's experiences allows the reader to have already made an ~~un~~ a first impression of them as wasteful ~~and~~ towards their own money. Additionally, the use of the dependent clause 'a property developer from London' urges the reader to question why a man of this role is acting like an explorer, and worse wasting money and time. Moreover, when mocking their choice of helicopter, Stern Morris ~~uses~~ introduces the statement with the phrase 'experts questions', this portrays these explorers as not being experts, further discrediting their strongly present expertise to the reader.

In both poems, tone is used to portray the opinions of the writers on the explorers. In text one, regardless of the horrific circumstances they are found in, when McCluskie uses an encouraging, positive tone to reflect her admiration and respect of the survival of the men. The semantic field of hope and resilience through words like 'determined' and 'reluctant', as well as ~~against~~ the phrase 'against the odds', portrays the men as inspiring, and further fascinating to the writer.

Although text two also presents perspectives on writers through tone, it is ~~more~~ opposite and mocking, to convey hatred towards the men. Morris repeatedly uses passive verbs, wherein the pilots are not in control. He dismisses the details of their survival and instead negatively focuses on how they were 'plucked' and this survival was a miracle. The repetition of the verb 'claims' reinforces this mocking tone, ~~and how~~ which presents a strong dislike and ridicule of the explorers.

In both texts, the confidence of the explorers is presented.

In text one, McCluskie incorporates dialogue to convey the pride that 'A' had felt after 'executing an autorotation'. Although they find themselves near death, this stark confidence is portrayed. ~~and arguably~~ Moreover, the ambiguous statement from the pilot, describing the situation as 'one of the greatest heroic acts of behavior ever' begs the question if he refers to his own skill, or the rescue from the military services.

the adverb of time *ever* reflects his assurance in the statement.

R This perhaps portrays overconfidence or pride, as the writer only mentions the dialogue, but doesn't comment on its truth.

Similarly, text two also portrays the same sense of confidence, and ego, in the two explorers. This is presented through their reluctance to ~~again~~ stop those wasteful explorations. It was said that this ~~was~~ was 'not the first time ... wrong reasons', the fact that these men have repeatedly ~~wasted~~ wasted resources and money, and continue to do so, emphasises their selfish, inconsiderate behavior, portraying overconfidence and ego in their skills. The men are also presented as unappreciative towards the wasted money.

Both writers present how long the rescue was, describing it as 'nine hours'. In text one, the description of its length is used to emphasise the resilience of those men in the face of death. They fought and pushed against the odds, using the time as an intensification of ~~their~~ ~~own~~ their resilience in survival.

However, in text two, this same reference to time is contrastingly used as a representation of their ~~wastefulness~~ waste of resources, being 'nine whole hours of expensive searches which the taxpayer has to fund. This heightens the anger of the taxpayer.



The candidate has presented a varied and comprehensive range of comparisons, skilfully synthesising material from both texts. Right from the start, with the insightful statements about how the impact of the hostile environment is conveyed in the two texts, there is sustained and perceptive analysis throughout. In this extremely assured response, points are fully supported by discriminating references, balanced across both texts. It meets all Level 5 criteria very securely.

Level 5 - 22 marks



Whilst many candidates noted the figures giving the height of the waves in Text One, note how in this response that evidence is skilfully utilised to make a perceptive point about perspective and contrasted to that of Text Two.

Question 6

This question which asked candidates to write a speech on the topic of 'First Impressions' was the more popular choice and produced some impressive responses. One examiner reported that they saw many 'really interesting and entertaining pieces' with most candidates looking at both parts of the stimulus statement and producing some effective argument and counter-argument. Another examiner was pleased to see that the responses marked 'revealed our exam-takers to be a tolerant, open-minded, forbearing group'.

Generally, it was felt that candidates showed good awareness of the required form with effective use of appropriate rhetorical devices such as direct address, list of three, repetition etc and the audience of peers was usually addressed with a lively, friendly voice. Examiners stated that anecdotes were used particularly effectively this year with many candidates drawing on their own experiences of either judging or being judged.

Whilst the vast majority of candidates secured marks at the top of Level 3 or above, weaker responses took a narrow view of the topic or became distracted by rather rambling content. At the mid-level of achievement, there was often a straightforward approach repudiating prejudice and quick-fire judgements. There were a number of candidates who told of negative first impressions of people who later turned out to be good friends. Most included ideas about the importance of first impressions when starting at a new school, going for an interview etc and the limitations of first impressions on knowing someone deeply. 'Don't judge a book by its cover' seemed to be a recurrent theme, with many candidates using this to craft their piece and some using it as an extended metaphor throughout their writing.

At the higher levels, there was a more complex approach, discussing how it is only human nature to judge, that first impressions can be beneficial if instincts of danger prove correct but also considering how we might temper such instincts. One examiner was left with a lasting impression of a memorable response that 'described the actions of a famous and charismatic serial killer who was able to commit crimes as a result of making a good first impression – this was used as a cautionary tale not to put too much faith in our initial judgements and made for a colourful read'.

The majority of candidates made appropriate vocabulary choices but writing is most effective when candidates employ words that they understand. It is good to be ambitious in word-choice but it is important that such words are used appropriately and enhance the response rather than distract or confuse the reader. Basic punctuation was generally used correctly but there was evidence of comma splicing and odd use of capital letters. Examiners felt that candidates at all levels could consider how sentence structures might be varied and crafted for deliberate effect and consider how paragraphing can contribute to a cohesive structure.

Invented statistics and quotations from 'experts' were often included but these need to be used sparingly and convincingly and are not an essential element. Anecdotes were often used to good effect although it is important not to become distracted into telling a story at length. Examiners reported little evidence of planning and felt that some responses would have benefited from being shorter but more tightly structured.

Greetings fellow peers, Have you ever been scared or hesitant to talk to someone because of their looks or actions? Well if that is the case, I'm here to tell you that meeting new people is awesome and you should never shy away from it, because that person may become one of your close friends in the future. Before talking to someone new, your first impression has to be the best version of yourself (If you are regularly amazing then there is no need to worry), as the first impression is something people will judge your character by before further getting to know you. So make sure you are in the right mental space before going up and talking to someone new, because leaving a good first impression can take you a long way ^{whether} ~~as~~ that person is your ~~bas~~ new teacher, friends parents, or a new student.

It is natural to start making judgements before properly knowing someone but what's important is that you don't make assumptions and their character could be completely different to what you expected, & even I once thought someone comes off as a rude and mean person but I could not have been ^{any more} ~~any more~~ wrong and that person is now one of my very close friends.

That will be around all from me today but
make sure to never be afraid to talk to someone
new and when you do leaving a & good first
impression can really do wonders to your freindships
in the future. ~~That~~ Thank you very mach.



This is a good example of a relatively brief response which does meet the Level 3 criteria, but lacks the development to move to the top of the level. The candidate connects ideas and uses paragraphs, using a range of vocabulary and sentence structures. Inaccuracies are only minor and do not impede clarity.

A04: Level 3 - 15 marks

A05: Level 3 - 10 marks



The ideas in this piece are sound but would benefit from a little further expansion, especially in the second paragraph. Ensure you allow sufficient time to tackle the writing question.

I stand here today to inform you all of the complicated nature of first impressions. Look around you, find ~~the~~ a person whom you have never spoken to in your entire time at this school. Now, come up with three estimated guesses as to how the person would act in their daily lives based on nothing more than ~~their app~~ hair, the colour of their hair, the shape of their nose and the patterns of the clothes they are wearing. You may find this absurd and uncomprehendable but the same process comes up repetitively in our everyday lives.

According to a study made by MIT this Summer which collected 5 people unknown to one another and had them live together for a week, up to 50% of your thoughts and opinions towards a stranger is incorrect if they were merely based on first impressions of their appearances. Even after socialising for 1 day the percentage only drops by 5%. Shockingly, the same study has found that the estimations made may last up to a month! If anything, our minds work in a sophisticating and complex way that tends to take in information from our surrounding faster than we can truly process them and leads us into making unfair judgements about others from our very first impressions.

Why must we acknowledge the complexity of first impressions

you may ask? Many conflicts tend to happen within the initial period of meeting a new figure. - Some may even lead to severe consequences. Bullying, marginalisation, name-calling... the list goes on and on. The occurrences of such unacceptable behaviour has further escalated with teens and young adults as they become more dependent on the information fed to their minds by social media. When I was discussing the same issue with a professor well-known for her research on behaviour of the young generation she pointed out that "social media is now what we see the world with - it ^{puts} ~~compiles~~ different, unique individuals ~~into~~ into bland categories based on our looks and the way we speak".

As individuals, we are different and special. In a time where everyone seems to fit under tags and labels we tend to lose interest in strangers if they seem to be "too normal" or "too out of place". However it is never too late to change your actions and become more supportive for your peers! To alter and refresh our perspectives and judgements on those unknown to us, engage them in a conversation! Learn MORE about how they act, what they enjoy and what connects both of you. Quoting the old saying "never judge a book by its cover" - never be too quick to judge, especially using first impressions.

Thank you for your time!



This response meets Level 4 descriptors very securely, but lacks the sophistication and subtlety to move into Level 5. There is successful communication, secure realisation of purpose and effective use of tone and register. The candidate addresses the given audience of peers throughout ('Look around you', 'As individuals, we are different...') and employs other effective rhetorical devices such as use of first-person plural pronouns, listing, a rhetorical question and declarative statements. Ideas are managed well. The candidate has used a wide, selective vocabulary, accurate punctuation and uses a range of sentence structures for effect.

AO4: Level 4 - 22 marks

AO5: Level 4 - 15 marks



Note how it is possible to achieve well within 2 sides of writing if there is close focus on the task, technical accuracy and a tight, cohesive structure.

Below is an example of a response that gains full marks.

Good morning, fellow students and honoured staff.

I'm sure that all of you have worried about "making good impressions" on someone you've just met, whether it's trying to make yourself look cool, mysterious and wise, or just friendly and outgoing.

First impressions are quite important relative to a person's default position towards you. For example, when I first met Ms Anne, I was afraid of her because she had a loud voice. I first met my best friend and thought she was a very detached sort of person. A study done by Harvard University on this subject was carried out, and it turns out that 82% of people who made a good impression on each other became friends, while only 37% of bad first-impression pairs became good friends. First impressions are important to people because they have something to base their opinions on you.

When I was a child, my mother advised me to not put people on a scale. What she meant was, don't automatically give someone a 100% or 0% just by first impressions, but even to this day I struggle to not work off first impressions and frankly I don't think my mother ~~at~~ always sticks to her own advice as well. First impressions are incredibly hard to get rid of; they are the fundamental building

blocks of what another person looks like in your eyes. First impressions sometimes can help people decide their following interactions. If you only just meet someone and they're already swearing, smoking, drinking, that sort of thing, then you'll know that they're not trustworthy at all and should try to distance yourself from their bad habits.

First impressions are significant because it is your first reaction towards a person. Previous studies done by Princeton have shown that people remember the first and last items in a list the best, so it is the same with first impressions on a person - it's an indelible mark on their profile in your eyes.

However, even acknowledging the difficulty in erasing first impressions and noting their importance, I sincerely advise you to not make judgements too quickly, i.e. don't judge a book by the cover. I know this might sound contradictory, but first pre-impressions do not dictate who a person really is. They might appear haughty and devilish, but be soft and kind on the inside. This is certainly a story we've heard about in the films, right? Tony Stark is not just a flashy playboy and Merchant of Death; he has his soft spots and backstory also. Shrek is not "just" an ^{ugly, good-for-nothing} ogre, he's an ogre with "layers" and is kind inside. Snape is not evil and wishes to kill Harry Potter, he only became so because of his childhood. These

stories encourage us to dig deeper into a person's psyche and not just act or decide rashly based on appearances. First impressions may seem to be all a person is at the start, but there might be something below that initial shell that is different and perhaps more precious. After all, a mere cleaner can be a genius math professor, and a chemistry teacher might be a drugs dealer, and a hellish brute of a convict might be ~~the~~ a saintly man.

You may be wondering why I am making this speech. To simply discuss first impressions? To lecture like an old sage? No. I would ^{merely} like to give suggestions on connecting with other people on a personal level, which is important for school, family and work when we grow up. ~~If~~ Not judging people solely from ~~their~~ your first impression but still retaining your own thoughts about people and fitting the puzzle piece of "first impression" in is an important part of growing up. I mean, if Mr Mark were to see me as the rude 9th grader who would bug him through email, I'd be very embarrassed now, wouldn't I? The fact is, a person is always, always growing so your ~~first~~ initial opinion may be false by the time you need to connect with them again. Or perhaps that first meeting was on one of their bad days - you never know. In order to become a grown adult, we need to balance between our rash instincts and logical thought.

or if Mr. Nielson from the psych department will allow, between our ~~id~~ ^{id} and our ego. We need to find that balance between judging from emotion and judging from reason, as both are equally important.

Reversing this lens, we should look at ourselves too. Your first meeting with someone else will be important on how they see you, and this will be significant in your later interactions. In order to maintain a healthy relationship and to foster friendship, you should try to make first impressions meaningful. But by no means cower at their feet in fear of bad impressions; you have to keep your cool and act naturally to ~~be~~ present the best parts of yourself.

Well, if anybody has fallen asleep during any part of my speech which is quickly coming to its conclusion, first impressions are significant as it inevitably gives you a mark in other people's minds, or vice versa. However, do not despair if the first impression was bad - I mean, Jane Eyre first met Mr Rochester when he had a broken ~~poor~~ ankle in a pile of mud, but they still grew to love each other. Similarly, don't be overeager to denounce a person if they leave a bad impression on you - there might be more development in their character afterwards that you might grow to like.

So, let me conclude ^{you can}: [✓] judge a book by its cover, but if it looks plain, try it out anyway! And I hope some day in the future, we will all be able to act according to my mother's advice - even herself!

Thank you so much for your attention, and I wish you all a good day. Thank you again!



This is an extremely impressive response, which meets the AO4 Level 5 criteria very securely indeed and, perhaps, goes beyond them. It is sophisticated, perceptive and sustained. This response also meets all AO5 Level 5 criteria very securely indeed: the candidate manipulates complex ideas, uses a range of structural and grammatical devices, employs an extensive vocabulary strategically and crafts a range of sentence structures accurately and selectively for effect.

AO4: Level 5 - 27 marks

AO5: Level 5 - 18 marks

Question 7

This question required candidates to write a magazine article about what makes someone a true hero. Although fewer candidates opted for this task, examiners were impressed by the quality of the response; one examiner noted that 'there were some very well-argued and mature approaches to the topic' and another found that responses to Question 7 'were overall more creative than those for Question 6'.

Most candidates reflected on the differences between superheroes in movies and comic books and those who act as real-life heroes such as nurses and firefighters. Many used examples of sporting celebrities or people from the worlds of science or politics: Martin Luther King, Mahatma Ghandi, Rosa Parks and Marcus Rashford were all frequently cited. The 'not all heroes wear capes' idea was often movingly linked to family members: one examiner noted that it 'was not uncommon to read a script that praised a parent for their bravery in settling in a new country to secure a better life for their (often very articulate) child'.

Many candidates used the bullet points of suggested content as a helpful structural scaffold. As a result, the majority of answers included an explanation of the qualities needed to be a hero with most arguing that kindness, compassion and selflessness are key. At their best, responses were sophisticated and persuasive in their arguments.

A 'magazine article' is quite a broad genre and almost all attempts at it were deemed to be successful. Strong responses tended to make good use of catchy sub-headings, often in the form of rhetorical questions, to organise and develop their writing. Weaker responses, however, sometimes over-used sub-headings at the expense of producing developed paragraphs. Many candidates judiciously decided that the task did not lend itself to including 'statistics' or 'expert opinion' and sensibly relied on exploring and expanding their own ideas instead which often led a greater degree of authenticity and originality.

Generally, there was a good level of technical accuracy in the responses to this question with use of skilful subordination, signalling of development and progression and a wide and appropriate vocabulary choice.

Final feedback on the writing questions:

There was some evidence that a small number of candidates had memorised pre-prepared phrases or short sentences to use in their writing. This is not good practice as it leads to a lack of spontaneity and originality and such lines were often 'shoe-horned' inappropriately into the response.

To achieve the highest level in AO4, writing needs to be 'perceptive', 'subtle' and 'sophisticated' and there should be a clear focus on the appropriate form. For AO5, candidates should consider the ordering of their ideas, write in clear paragraphs and aim to link them effectively. There needs to be accuracy but also a 'strategic' use of an 'extensive vocabulary'. Candidates should not avoid using an ambitious vocabulary because they fear making spelling errors. They should also aim for an assured and controlled use of a range of carefully-crafted sentence structures 'to achieve particular effects'. Those who did achieve higher-level marks frequently opened their piece with an intriguing question, a powerful statement or a short sentence and proceeded to explore and develop their ideas with fluency, clarity and enthusiasm.

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

Chosen question number: Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

what I think make someone a hero is their personality, intentions and other elements

kindness

kindness is an important key factor of being a hero is because if you're kind to people - people will have a good impression about you

helping

this is another factor where of being a hero is helping if you help people or stop a robbery and doing something as little as help an old lady cross the road is good. as one day you will do something big and eventually lead you to being on television news etc where people will

See you as a hero.

respect

You should be really respectful towards other people. If you want to be respected if you respect people then people will respect you which will paint a good image of you in people's ~~mind~~ mind.

as people that have been true heroes have achieved that title with a lot of work and discipline. ~~Real~~ true heroes are the people who save people from ~~the~~ getting robbed help prevent crime. Do good deeds be nice to people. Do good things for environment recycle stuff make more use of products that can be recycled to help the environment.



Some fairly simple ideas about the qualities of a hero are communicated reasonably clearly. There is, however, limited development/explanation. Form, tone and register are straightforward. On a best-fit basis, this response was awarded a mark just into Level 3 for AO4. Ideas are ordered and expressed, although not fully developed and connected; there is some correctly spelt vocabulary (environment, recycling), but control of punctuation is inconsistent and there is a lack of capital letters.

AO4: Level 3 - 12 marks

AO5: Level 2 - 7 marks



Try and allow time to read through your work and check that you have used appropriate punctuation.

A True Hero

What makes someone a true hero

When we come to consider what makes someone a true hero, there are many factors we should include such as: the qualities that a hero has, what impact it left on us or a community, and more.

A real hero

Many may argue that a hero is a person who saves lives of people or animals, but it doesn't mean just because someone saved a cat, immediately becomes a hero. It's totally deeper than that. We need to reflect their actions and impacts upon us.

Who can be a hero

People such as: celebrities, parents, teachers even doctors, can all be represented as a true hero for the number of things they do for us and others. However, what really matters is have they

helped us?

Our hero

While many people may not agree, Scientist claims that parents are the best guider for their children. Let me ask you this, how many times has your parents been there for you when you needed it most? Its undeniable, parents help us: Study, relax, and provide so much for us. Yet we don't appreciate it. In contrast to other people, the only people you can open up to and share your feelings or struggles you may face, are your parents. Lets state the obvious, who has been there most your life, especially at your lowest?

Qualities of a Hero

A true hero is someone that has always been there to support us, always helped us exceed and grow, always guided us and pushed us away from negative things. Someone who truly matters to us, and puts your own gain before theirs.

Importance of a hero

Many may not realize, but, your parents ~~are~~ are the reason you stand here today, and it also matters who you choose your hero to be, because it can ~~be~~ either lead to good or bad. So we should value ~~that~~ that person and they should have a special place in our heart.



In this response, the candidate communicates clearly, with a clear sense of purpose and appropriate tone and register. Form is indicated through the use of straightforward sub-headings although a couple of the paragraphs that follow are made up of only one or two sentences. As a result, some elements are not developed but there is also, throughout the article, some repetition of ideas. Appropriate ideas and information are connected. There is use of a varied vocabulary (community, represented, undeniable) and spelling is generally accurate, as is punctuation.

A04: Level 3 - 15 marks

A05: Level 3 - 10 marks



Try and take time to plan your response; this can help to ensure that you cover a good range of points and avoid repetition.

What make a real
hero?

It's not about saving the world:
We have all heard the superhero tale
right? The fantasy of the capes ~~and~~,
superpowers and awesome names. That is the
generally ^{general} the picture that comes to ^{the mind of the} public
when they hear the word hero. But what is
a hero? I can tell you ^{now} ~~know~~, it's not
the muscular, eye laser shooting man you
think about.

The Comic Book Kind:

From a very early age, we are told that
hero's wear capes and save the world from
evil aliens. We are told that they all have
awesom costumes and powers. We are told
that they are respected by everyone in
the world, that they are practically
worshipped. ~~But no~~ However not here. In
~~the~~ real life, in our world, heroes
don't have those qualities. They are

regular people, with a regular life, ~~with a regular~~ And they fight for what's right.

Dont be a hero; be a human:

Studdies show that 60% of people between the ages of 15 to 40 fantasize about being a hero in their life. However, almost 100% of those people only dream of it for the fame that comes with it. The special treatment. This is not what being a hero means. In today's society, people are suffering, everyone is focused on themselves and more and more people are turning to a life of crime in result.

Hero's protect. Heros are selfless.

Heros dont do it for the reward.

Our History of Heros:

There are many remarkable people who have roamed this earth, ~~so~~^{so} many people who ~~share~~ have the qualities of a hero. ~~One~~^{One} ~~can~~ Many of them had to go through horrible conditions, but still remained strong. One example

of a modern day hero is a young woman, who took a bullet in the head when fighting for women's right to education. Because of her, women can now go to school, creating an increase of percentage in doctors, engineers and even pilots. Something that could still be impossible today, if it was not for this outstanding and selfless hero.

Moral of the Story:

Being a hero is not about your costume and teleportation skills. No. Being a hero is more than a fairytale. Being a hero is sacrificing everything for what is right. Being a hero, is being selfless. Being a hero, is entirely possible.



This response communicates successfully with thoughtfully developed ideas. The three sub-headings contribute to the successful structure that starts with the popular perception of a super-hero and returns to the idea at the end, having explored what makes a true hero; the final paragraph makes the 'message' of the piece very clear. There is effective use of form, tone and register throughout. This response is placed securely within Level 4 for AO4. Information and ideas are organised efficiently and some sentences have been manipulated for effect, especially in the final paragraph. Within the piece, the candidate has used a wide range of vocabulary (muscular, fantasise, roamed, teleportation), although there are occasional spelling errors.

AO4: Level 4 - 20 marks

AO5: Level 4 - 13 marks



Carefully thought-out sub-headings can help you to structure your response and provide focus for your ideas.

Below is an example of a Level 5 response.

Being a hero: Is it all about the cape?

Heroes differ. There are those with superpowers like flying and superspeed that can save people in the blink of an eye. There are also those who can lift a car with one finger to help a suffering cat. However, these are simply the traits ~~that~~ we think heroes possess. Realistically, ~~here~~ a hero is someone who can prioritize others before themselves, and becoming one requires having that sense of selflessness; not necessarily having extravagant skills or equipment. That being said, what makes a true hero?

Sculpting a hero:

Being sympathetic is a key trait of a hero. You need to be able to understand ~~that~~ others' suffering to be able to help them. ~~What hero goes into a battle~~ This is an absolute requirement to becoming a hero as you can not offer assistance without putting yourself in ^{other} people's shoes. ~~this would simply not make you would understand and how grave~~ simply be unable to understand how grave certain situations are if you do not consider people's struggles. Think about doctors, therapists and teachers; they are all heroes we encounter

on a daily basis and what brings them together is their ability to understand how others feel ~~and to~~ in order to offer aid. It is proven that 60% of patients at Thopt's Mental Hospital were able to recover from psychological problems by forming strong relationships with their therapists. Forming a ~~strong~~ powerful bond requires understanding the experiences, feelings and struggles of others, which is what therapists do to help patients. Saving lives in this way is truly heroic ^{their} and is a perfect example of why sympathy is extremely important.

Composure is a skill that most people do not possess. It is the ability to remain calm under pressure, which is one of the most important skills one should develop to become a hero. Picture a nurse finding out one of her patients' ~~heartbeats~~ ~~is~~ ~~unresponsive~~, do they crumble, panic and break down or ^{take time to} collect their thoughts ~~to~~ ^{and} think of how they can save them? The second one is what a hero would do. In a critical situation like that ~~there is~~ ^{it is} extremely risky and inconsiderate to lose composure, resulting in someone's life being lost ^{due} ~~to~~ ~~an~~ inability to control stress.

Finally, the last characteristic a hero possesses is faith. Having faith in one's ability is what actually ~~pushes~~ ~~them~~ encourages them to succeed in helping others. There is no such thing as a hero who does not believe in themselves. Albert Einstein is a hero who created multiple life-changing inventions despite facing constant failure. Faith, confidence and patience is what created most ~~the~~ things we use today. ~~if it were not for~~ we would not be able to go about our lives comfortably and easily if it weren't ~~for~~ were not for those who stayed up countless nights with full determination.

"Shouldn't a hero be ~~extraordinary~~ extraordinary?"

What most people think makes a hero stand out is what ~~a~~ skills they possess, such as being intelligent or ~~or~~ ^{abnormal} being stronger than ~~the~~ ^{extremely} others. However, a hero is anyone who can change lives in their own way. They do not have to possess something unfamiliar to us or be perfect, all they have to do is help.

~~That be~~

That being said, I do understand that our ideas on what a hero should be are influenced by previous examples and ~~the~~ common stereotypes, such as superheroes we

see in films. Therefore, I ~~do not think that~~
~~it is~~ see why most people would have
a false expectations regarding heroic
figures. However, I believe that we should
stop and look around us to realise just
how many heroes exist in our daily lives.
When that is done, ~~realisation will hit~~ the
realisation that heroes do not have a
specific formula will hit and people will
begin to understand that you do not need
to be extraordinary and above all to be
a hero.



In this response ideas have been developed thoughtfully and they are sharply focused on the task. Paragraphs begin in different - and carefully constructed - ways, with effective use of form, tone and register. Communication is successful; the ideas are perceptive, though perhaps not subtle, and they are often supported in a way that adds credence to them. Complex ideas are skilfully manipulated using a range of techniques such as list of three, rhetorical questions and varied sentence structures. There is an extensive vocabulary (traits, extravagant, composure) and although there are some slips in spelling, the degree of technical accuracy, including a range of punctuation, is good.

A04: Level 5 - 25 marks

A05: Level 5 - 17 marks



Aim to draw in your reader right from the start. Note here how the very brief opening sentence offers an idea that is expanded upon in an imaginative and engaging way through the first paragraph.

Paper Summary

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

- Be aware of the different Assessment Objectives to ensure that you focus your answers specifically on the varying question requirements.
- Highlight the relevant lines in the text for Questions 1-3 to ensure that your answers come from the correct part.
- Answer Question 2 in your own words as far as possible. Aim to make four clear and distinct points. They can be set out separately but must be written in full and complete sentences.
- You should make five clear points for Question 3; brief quotations can be used to support these points but quotations without explanation are not sufficient. Points can be set out separately but must be in full and complete sentences and offer some interpretation.
- Consider the effects of language and structure features within the context of the given extract in Question 4. Ensure that you focus on the question and avoid simply giving an overview; highlighting key words in the question can help.
- Make a range of comparative points in Question 5. Rather than simply comparing the ideas or events within the texts, try to link similar elements such as content, theme, tone, purpose, narrative voice, language and support points with relevant quotations or textual references. Ensure that references are balanced across both texts.
- Take time to make a brief plan for the higher tariff questions (5 and 6 or 7) and use it.
- Consider the given form and audience for the writing task and use these to inform register and tone. Try to use a wide vocabulary and varied sentence structures. Think carefully about how you can engage the reader right at the start and consider how you will end. This will help you to produce a structured, cohesive and complete piece of writing. Allow time to proof-read in order to achieve the highest possible degree of accuracy.
- Read all instructions carefully. Consider the marks allocated to each question and plan your time accordingly so that you are able to attempt every question. Try not to spend too much time on the low-tariff questions.
- Take great care with handwriting so that it is legible - examiners cannot mark what they cannot read.

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>

