



GCE AS EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AS**

SUMMER 2023

Introduction

Our Principal examiners' reports offer valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. They are written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and detail how candidates have performed.

This report offers an overall summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It goes on to look in detail at each question/section of each component, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.ⁱ

The information found in this report can provide invaluable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Edugas offers an extensive annual programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.edugas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 6 months after the examination.	www.wjecservices.co.uk or on the Edugas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and unit level. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the overall subject, rather than for each component/unit that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results and Grade Boundaries (edugas.co.uk)

Exam Results Analysis	WJEC Eduqas provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	www.wjecservices.co.uk
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.eduqas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	www.wjecservices.co.uk or on the Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with Eduqas.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with invaluable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Exam Marking jobs Examiner & Moderator Vacancies From Eduqas

Executive summary	Page
Component	
Component 1: Analysis of Texts in Context	5
Component 2: Using Language	9
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	14

Subject Officer's Executive Summary

This series' papers for Components 1 and 2 were of comparable demand to those of previous series and proved accessible to all candidates; there were good engagement rates for all questions. This series also saw the regulatory requirement to return to pre-pandemic standards.

It was noted in candidates' responses that there was less of a range of linguistic terminology – used meaningfully – than in previous series. There was a noted increase in the number of candidates achieving marks in the lower bands. The increase of candidates represented in the bottom two deciles of prior performance data, indicating a weaker cohort than in previous series.

Areas for improvement	Classroom resources	Brief description of resource
Examination time management to ensure proportionate coverage of all questions.	Essay writing skills	A great resource to help learners develop their essay writing skills.
Consistent evaluation (AO3) of the effects of language devices on a text's audience.	Language Levels targeting AO1, AO2 and AO3	A range of teaching materials specifically focused on highlighting use of AO1, AO2 and AO3 in learners' responses.
Using a range of linguistic terminology to support precise analysis at word, phrase, sentence, and whole-text level	How language is used to convey meaning - blended learning resource	This blended learning resource contains interactive self-study content covering How language is used to convey meaning. The resource is designed to complement traditional face to face teaching with an online learning pack that allows students to learn at their own pace.
Demonstrating a secure understanding when analysing written and spoken features.	English language knowledge organisers	These could be used for revision or as a starting point for creating knowledge organisers.
Developing creative writing from the stimulus materials.	Using stimulus material to develop creative writing - blended learning resource	The resource is designed to complement traditional face to face teaching with an online learning pack that allows students to learn at their own pace. It can be used as revision by students, as part of catch-up or for flipped learning.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

GCE AS

Summer 2023

COMPONENT 1: ANALYSIS OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT

Overview of the Component

This paper assessed candidates' ability to analyse both spoken and written unseen texts using a range of linguistic terminology with clear and coherent expression (AO1), to critically engage with concepts such as genre and audience and to consistently support responses (AO2). In Section A candidates were also required to explore connections across two spoken texts (AO4) whereas in Section B candidates were required to analyse and evaluate how contextual factors shape written language use (AO3).

In Section A candidates were assessed on their ability to engage with the spoken nature of the two texts and to analyse the transcripts using relevant spoken language and core linguistic terminology and concepts. In this section they were also required to compare both texts and to make supported connections and comparisons. The comparative element of the response (AO4) is slightly more weighted in terms of marks and is, therefore, significant.

In Section B candidates were tested on their ability to respond to an unseen written text selected from any genre and to provide detailed analysis and discussion informed by language study. They were also required to explore how contextual factors shape meaning and language choices. As this contextual element (AO3) is weighted slightly more than the other assessment objectives in Section B it is, again, an important consideration for candidates.

Candidates were overall well-prepared for this paper. There was no advance information given this year, so the texts and genres were genuinely unseen. Candidates were clearly able to understand the significance of comparison (AO4) in Section A. They were also able to effectively and accurately deploy spoken language terminology (AO1) in this section. There was a more limited use of core linguistic terminology in Section A this year and, notably, a narrower range of core terms employed in Section B. This became a limiting factor for some candidates. In Section B candidates were able to discuss the accessible content and arguments in the text, often with clear personal engagement. The responses for Section B were, in many cases, shorter and less developed than those for Section A. This is likely to be a timing issue so centres should emphasise that both sections are equally weighted at 50 marks and that candidates should divide their time evenly.

Candidates' performance this year shows a change from 2022 where advance information was provided. Despite the attempt rate for both sections being 100%, there was overall a drop in the mean mark for the paper and, particularly, a significant difference in the mean mark for Section B compared to that of Section A. Candidate responses for Section B this year were often much shorter and much less developed than those of Section A. Most candidates were able to effectively apply some spoken language terms in Section A and the strongest candidates were also able to a range of spoken and core linguistic terms in their analysis. In Section B, however, significantly fewer candidates were able to use more than a very limited range of core linguistic terms and the weakest responses were paraphrases of the text without support or language focus. The brevity of many Section B responses is also likely to be a timing issue so centres should emphasise the equal weighting of both sections and the need to allow equal time for both tasks.

The strongest candidates, as in previous years, were able to show confident engagement with the different genres of both spoken and written texts and were able to deliver precise, well-supported, language-focused responses which thoughtfully explored meaning in context.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Spoken Language of the Media

The transcripts selected for this section were accessible and engaging. Text A was an extract from a YouTube vlog featuring the make-over expert Trinny Woodall and her editor as they answered viewers' questions on fashion (particularly choice of colour). Text B, another vlog, was from teen YouTube personality JoJo Siwa in which she revealed her new 'candy' bedroom design to her online audience. Most candidates were able to engage meaningfully with the vlog genre and its conventions. Most were also able to identify the differences in tone between the texts (Text A professional, informative and Text B fun, excitable) and to explore how these were reflected in language use. Candidates were also able to compare how the participants engaged the older, adult audience of Text A compared to the young teen audience of Text B. Responses were structured in diverse ways – some chose to write in detail about Text A first, then move onto Text B while maintaining comparative focus. Others chose to plan a more integrated comparison, moving between the two texts throughout the response as they analysed various aspects point-by-point. Either approach is valid if there is reasonable coverage of both texts, and the comparisons and connections are maintained. Pleasingly, there were very few responses this year which did not attempt any comparison, so this point has clearly been reinforced by teaching in centres.

Characteristics of a Successful Response

In the strongest responses there was often fruitful discussion of the topics explored in each of the texts and how these were marked, for example, by semantic fields, subject specific lexis, and modification. The stronger responses were also able to make the distinction between the nouns which marked colour in Text A ('white,' 'cream' and 'ecru') and the more childlike palette of Text B with its adjectives ('rainbow' 'neon' and 'sequinny'). Stronger responses also identified the relative formality of Text A shown in Trinny's fluent, authoritative delivery and contrasted it with the excitable, over-enthusiastic informality of Text B, marked by many prosodic features such as raised volume, emphatic stress, and prolonged speech. Some candidates were also able to analyse in more detail how each text connected with its YouTube audience – this connection was particularly evident in Text B with frequent, direct address to loyal fans and followers ('you guys'). The most successful responses were also able to note the subtle promotion of Trinny's book embedded in her advice in Text A and compare it with the more direct marking of the JoJo 'brand' evidenced in Text B with the proper noun phrase 'JoJo's Closet' and the naming of the US department store 'Target.' Overall, the most successful candidates were able to explore what was linguistically distinctive about both texts, to consistently support their points with aptly selected evidence from the text and to use *both* spoken and core linguistic terminology accurately and frequently in their analysis.

Characteristics of a less successful response

Candidates who were less successful relied heavily on feature-spotting and often focused on exclusively spoken language features, many of which were normal, less significant, non-fluency features such as micropauses. Points about pauses, stress and raised volume were made in the weaker responses without any meaningful connection to context. In some responses there was an over-reliance on unsupported observations concerning formality and informality which formed the bulk of the response.

Although semantic fields were a valid area for exploration some of the ones cited were exceptionally vague (e.g., ‘a semantic field of loving fashion’) and unsupported. As in previous years, there was a tendency to force linguistic theory into some responses (as a replacement in most cases for close analysis using terms). Unsupported discussions using Grice, Face Theory and genderlect were often not relevant or successful. Finally, there appeared to be some confusion about the use of phonetic transcription and capitalisation in the texts to mark prosodic features. A number of candidates appeared unclear that they are used to indicate accent/pronunciation and raised volume, respectively, and it is *these* spoken language features that should be explored, not the spelling or capitalisation *per se*.

Areas for improvement Section A: key points for centres

- Avoid feature spotting without reference to meaning and context.
- Encourage careful selection of significant/ relevant features as the basis for comparison/analysis.
- Ensure that all points use support from the text and are analysed using relevant spoken language and/or core linguistic terminology.
- Avoid over-use and/or irrelevant application of linguistic theories (e.g. relating to gender and power) as a substitute for detailed language analysis.
- Encourage the use of precise core linguistic terminology as well as spoken language terms in Section A.
- Encourage the use of a range of terms to support precise analysis at word, phrase, sentence, and whole-text level.

Section B: Written Language

The text selected for this question, a powerful written statement from the actor Sacha Baron Cohen about the dangers of social media posted on the Anti-Defamation League website, was one which clearly engaged candidates. Most candidates were able to follow Baron Cohen’s argument and to meaningfully connect with the points he made. Despite the frequent mis-gendering of the writer (which was understandable and made no difference to the analysis or the way the examiner judged the response), most candidates were also able to identify some of the linguistic features of discursive writing in the text such as rhetorical questions, listing and use of inclusive pronouns. The publication of the ‘statement’ on a website and its multi-modal quality also allowed for a fruitful exploration and evaluation of features more commonly found in spoken discourse such as fronted conjunctions, minor sentences, and some phonological effects.

Characteristics of a successful response

The strongest responses demonstrated a confident ability to precisely identify the powerful linguistic features in the text and to connect them to effects they might have on a potential audience. Again, stronger responses were also able to identify this audience as comprising those already concerned about social media and its possible links to increases in ‘bigotry, hate and intolerance.’ Successful responses were driven by this evaluative quality and were, therefore, able to score highly on AO3 which is more weighted than AO1 and AO2 in this question. There was also careful selection of points for discussion and analysis in these responses, where candidates chose the most linguistically noteworthy features to explore and evaluate. These points were taken from across the text. In the most successful responses, there was also an understanding of the use of high register lexis and abstract nouns (‘autocracy,’ ‘democracy,’ ‘misogynists’) to create an authoritative tone and of the powerful, rhetorical device of antithesis with the writer’s repeated use of antonyms (‘lies’/ ‘truth’, ‘fake’/‘real’).

Overall, successful responses frequently deployed a range of linguistic terms specifically and accurately, moving beyond basic word classes to analyse the text at phrase, sentence, and whole-text level.

Characteristics of a less successful response

Candidates who were less successful relied, as in Section A, on feature-spotting without any development or links to context and/or effects (AO3). Weaker responses were often clearly engaged with the arguments of the text but were marked by a tendency to quote and then to paraphrase, without any subsequent analysis using accurate core linguistic terminology. This lack of precise language focus was a considerable limiting factor in some responses which otherwise showed clear understanding of the text's content. Less successful candidates often chose to identify and discuss features using rather vague terms such as 'alliteration,' 'jargon,' 'hyperbole.' There were also, in many cases, undeveloped and irrelevant applications of the concept of 'overt prestige' along with other sociolinguistic theories relating to power and gender. As in Section A, these concepts were referenced but unsupported and would have been more fruitfully replaced by close and accurate linguistic analysis. As mentioned previously, the weaker responses to Section B were often brief and under-developed indicating that candidates had not divided their time equally between sections.

Areas for improvement Section B: key points for centres

- Avoid feature-spotting without reference to meaning and context.
- Encourage careful selection of a range of linguistically noteworthy or distinctive features across the text as a whole.
- Make sure that there is consistent evaluation (AO3) of the effects of language devices on a text's audience.
- Ensure that all points are supported and that there is close analysis of language features and their effects using relevant core linguistic terminology.
- Avoid simple paraphrasing of a text's argument without language focus and analysis.
- Avoid over-use and/or irrelevant application of linguistic theories as a substitute for detailed language analysis.
- Encourage the use of a range of terms to support precise analysis at word, phrase, sentence, and whole-text level.

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE
GCE AS
Summer 2023
COMPONENT 2: USING LANGUAGE**

General Comments

Once again this year, candidates were well prepared for the demands of the paper, demonstrating sound awareness of what was required in order to address the different assessment objectives relevant to each section. Analytical questions were supported by sound knowledge of subject terminology, aptly chosen evidence, and some perceptive discussion of meaning linked to concepts and issues presented by the corpus of data and their own writing. There was pleasing, lively engagement with the corpus of data consisting of Netflix listings, which facilitated some thoughtful discussion of purpose and the relationship between text creator and audience, both in Section A analysis and Section B commentary writing, and clearly provided inspiration for many of the enjoyable Section B writing pieces. Those writing pieces, selected from a choice of an online film/TV review or dramatic monologue from the perspective of a 'superfan', frequently evidenced good levels of creativity, audience engagement and some sophisticated understanding of genre. With reference back to last year's report that raised the ongoing issue of clarity around acceptable choices for short tariff questions 1(a-c), it is pleasing to note that further progress around appropriate choices for phonological (a), lexical and semantic (b) and grammatical (c) features has clearly been made. A minority of candidates, however, had still muddled this slightly, and missed out on marks simply by failing to recognise what goes where. As previously mentioned, perusal of mark schemes should help to provide the clarity required for this. Time management, too, remains an issue for some candidates who are clearly running out of time for Q.4 (commentary writing) and thus depriving themselves of access to the higher achievement bands due to thin/undeveloped responses to this task. I would also like to refer readers back to my comments on the use of 'relatable' (and its newly-spawned cousin 'relatability') from last year's report. While it has, undoubtedly, found its way into general discourse, even to the point of being frequently used in broadsheet column-writers' argot: it quite simply does not make for productive contextual discussion, unless this is supported by further analysis concerning precisely what there is about the feature that its audience can 'relate' to.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Investigating data

Candidates were required to analyse a corpus of data consisting of a selection of Netflix listings, all published via the selection menus on their subscription platform. They were selected to provide texts used to inform and persuade potential viewers on a diverse range of films and series aimed at very different audience demographics, identified through age rating guidance clearly stated within the texts. The question pointed to the dual purposes of information and persuasion in order to steer candidates towards the type on conceptual/contextual points they might make and, in (d), the links they might make between the listings. As with previous exam series, the questions were designed to provide an increasing level of challenge: Q.1 (a)-(c) requiring candidates to provide reference to a valid feature and appropriate piece of evidence from the language levels of phonology, lexis and semantics, and grammar respectively, while (d) required a more developed analytical response. As the mark scheme shows, there is always a wealth of valid responses available to candidates for these short questions, and they should be aspiring to show the breadth of their knowledge here. Q.1 (a-c) are assessed under AO1 (4 marks for (a), 8 marks each for (b) and (c)), while (d) is assessed under AOs 2, 3, and 4 (10 marks each).

- Q.1 (a)** This four-mark question required candidates to identify and briefly discuss the effects of two different phonological features. While candidates generally responded well to this question, often picking up on the emphatic qualities of alliteration in 'Presents. Parties. Pizza' or 'fear can be fatal', (and sometimes linking this to the persuasive purpose of the texts), the drama of the rhyme in 'DRIVE TO SURVIVE', or the sensual entertainment provided by the onomatopoeia of 'swish...tap', there were still, despite the reference to this in the last two reports, a relatively frequent occurrence of two different alliterative patterns (e.g. sibilants of 'superhero sidekick' and plosives of 'Presents. Parties. Pizza'). Both points cannot be rewarded as the question specifically requests 'different phonological techniques'. Similarly, there were also a number of instances where the non-standard capitalisation of some of the listings' titles were referenced as a phonological point, rather than a lexical/semantic one. This confusion presumably comes from the study of spoken language, where capitalisation on transcripts signifies raised volume, or from the study of electronic language, such as text messaging, where it is similarly perceived. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, there were a number of grammatical features, such as tripling, which similarly could not be rewarded.
- (b)** This eight-mark question required candidates to identify and briefly discuss four different lexical or semantic features. Candidates appeared to be well prepared for this question overall, with some thoughtful engagement with semantic fields quickly defining the subject of the listing for the purpose of informing specific audience interests although, as above, there were a few instances where candidates failed to differentiate between the language levels and included phonological or grammatical points. In a similar vein to the issue with alliteration mentioned above, some candidates were using lexical set and semantic field as separate features when, in essence, they are broadly synonymous and cannot be rewarded twice.
- (c)** This eight-mark question required candidates to identify and briefly discuss four different grammatical features. There were lots of well-informed responses that successfully identified and discussed different sentence moods and types, linking these to tone, purpose and intended audience, with some productive analysis of features of grammatical patterning as a means to provide lots of information in a pithy and persuasive manner. As for (a) and (b) above, there were some occasions where material that would have been worthy of credit for those questions was presented here.
- (d)** This 30-mark question required candidates to produce an extended and in-depth analysis of the corpus as a whole, drawing links between texts and considering the influence of contexts on their meanings in order to present a clear overview of the selected texts as a genre. On many occasions, and entirely permissible within the parameters of the question to recycle their ideas from earlier in their response ('You may use your answers to (a)-(c) and your own knowledge to inform your response'), but the strongest answers were those that went beyond those examples in providing a significant number of ideas across the corpus, concisely quoted, and with confident conceptual and contextual awareness of genre, purpose and intended audience, with a good range of terminology and some productive links drawn between texts.

A strong overview of the corpus to set up the analysis was a frequent indicator of higher band work, while responses that limited themselves to lengthy broad discussion of a small number of the texts tended to limit achievement as this prevented higher scoring on both AO2 and AO4 due to a relative lack of engagement at a conceptual and contextual level.

Characteristics of successful responses

- A clear sense of overview, often presented as introduction or conclusion
- Selective, concise quotation from the corpus
- Accurate and frequent use of subject terminology
- Clear links between conceptual/contextual material (genre, audience, purpose) and meaning
- Productive connections between texts, often shaped by concepts/context.

Areas for improvement

- Ensuring all points are supported by both well-selected evidence and a range of linguistic terminology from across the language levels
- Avoiding feature spotting where ideas are not developed
- Ensuring comparisons are made between texts
- Working on time management to ensure 1(d) is fully developed.

Section B: Creative Writing

Section B provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate creativity, and awareness of genre conventions. There were many highly successful responses, some of which showed high levels of precision and flair. Candidates were required to write one creative piece (from a choice of two questions) followed by an analytical commentary of their own writing. As always, candidates were given the option of a non-fiction task (a review) and a creative fiction task (a dramatic monologue) in order for them to make a choice according to their individual preference. The review (Question 2) proved to be significantly more popular. Many candidates presented some excellent, engaging writing and thoughtful commentaries that supported some very interesting choices and showed strong linguistic knowledge. There were significant numbers, however, who wrote short, and therefore undeveloped, responses for both (or either) parts of this section, with a surprisingly sizeable portion who did not start the commentary at all. As stated above, time management is a necessary skill for this paper and candidates must be prepared to get through the whole paper if they are to achieve well. Qs. 2 and 3 are assessed under AO5, while Q.4 is assessed under AO3.

- Q.2** Candidates were asked to write a review of a film or television programme for a website. Many used one of the listings as direct inspiration (although others, perfectly acceptably, chose their own) while some used pleasing creativity through the adoption of some of the more interesting linguistic features from the corpus. Candidates were clearly influenced by the contextual detail of writing for a website in the task, adapting a rather more casual register accordingly, although the strongest responses balanced this with a clear awareness of the requirements of genre (e.g. field specific language to demonstrate expertise; use of parenthesis for additional specific detail; evaluative language; assumed knowledge references; avoidance of 'spoilers').

Successful responses maintained a high level of control and established a sustained sense of audience engagement through the shaping of an individual voice; less successful efforts lacked clarity and precision of expression and, frequently, straightforwardly retold the plot of the film/programme reviewed, rather than engaging in evaluation of the different elements of visual media representation.

- Q.3** Candidates were asked to write a dramatic monologue from the perspective of a super-fan explains their obsession with a film or TV programme. As mentioned previously, this task was significantly less popular with candidates, but those who did choose it often produced lively and engaging work. As with Q2, some chose to use one of the listings as stimulus material, but others went with their own ideas: either approach was equally acceptable. It was pleasing to see that all candidates who chose this task were clear on the necessary genre convention of writing in the first person in the single voice of their character. This time around, no candidates decided to use stage directions as a structural device (which also may have provided productive commentary material), but some created drama through the escalation of the obsessiveness of their persona's language, and there was some evidence of efforts to shape authenticity through a variety of informality features. As with Q.2, some candidates adapted some of the more striking linguistic features of the corpus to good effect within their own writing.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Clear, accurate written expression
- A strong sense of individual voice
- Immediate and sustained audience engagement
- Creative use of stimulus material
- Demonstration of confident genre awareness.

Areas for improvement

- Consider use of stage directions for dramatic monologue tasks as these can be effective
- Evaluative language, using field-specific lexis for review tasks
- Careful proof-reading to eliminate unnecessary errors of expression
- Time management to ensure candidates complete tasks to the recommended word count.

- Q.4** Candidates were asked to write a linguistic commentary on their response to Q.2 or Q.3. This was an opportunity for candidates to explain and justify their writing choices within the contexts of their production and reception. While some were clearly aware of the requirement to provide a strong linguistic focus to this task through the accurate application of linguistic terminology from across the language levels, in a significant number of examples, this was not the case. Equally, in order to analyse meaning shaped by their writing productively, candidates needed to quote frequently from their writing: this was not always the case. In order to access the higher bands on the marking grid, there needed to be a developed response, which was not always achieved by candidates whose time management needed attention. As stated in last year's report, the most successful responses were those that quoted frequently and concisely (showing evaluation through the selection of the most apt illustrations), applied a wide range of terminology and considered meaning within the broader conceptual contexts of audience, purpose, and genre.

There were a handful of responses that took the broad evaluative approach of speculating on what they might have done if they had the opportunity to write the piece all again; this is not recommended.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Accurate and wide-ranging application of terminology
- Concise quotation from candidates' writing, selected through perceptive evaluation
- productive discussion of meaning in context
- fully developed response that shows evidence of confident time management.

Areas for improvement

- General discussion of audience/purpose/genre without specific reference to the writing piece
- Over-long quotations linked broadly to terminology that is not convincing on knowledge shown
- Generalised evaluation without linguistic focus.

Summary of key points

SECTION A

- Clarity of knowledge regarding which features are acceptable for each of 1(a)-(c), particularly in terms of which would constitute repetition (e.g. 1(a) both sibilance and alliteration; 1(c) both semantic field and lexical set)
- Pithy explanations for 1(a)-(c) that do not consume too much of candidates' time but cut to the point of the feature's impact
- Writing a crisp comparative overview for 1(d) that sets up a purposeful contextualised analysis of meaning, concisely supported, and with a range of terms applied with accuracy

SECTION B – CREATIVE WRITING

- Clear knowledge of genre informs assured writing
- Developing a strong sense of personal voice is at the heart of effective audience engagement
- Accuracy and fluency are crucial, therefore proof-reading should be considered as an essential part of the writing process
- Candidates should look for the opportunities to demonstrate flair: risk and creativity go hand-in-hand.

SECTION B – COMMENTARY

- Plenty of short, embedded quotations facilitate productive analysis
- The application of a wide range of terms across the language levels is to be encouraged
- Evaluate through productive selection of evidence and thoughtful links to context
- Time management is crucial: candidates must give themselves the opportunity to access the higher bands on this task by getting to it with time to show their knowledge and support their writing choices.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team are on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.30pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 029 2240 4292

Email: gceenglish@eduqas.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [Eduqas AS/A level English](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | Eduqas](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

Regional Rep Team

Our regional team covers all areas of England and can provide face-to-face and online advice at a time which is convenient to you.

Get in contact today and discover how our team can support you and your students.

[Regional Support Team | Eduqas](#)

Eduqas Qualifications

We are one of the largest providers of qualifications for schools, academies, sixth form and further education colleges across England, offering valued qualifications to suit a range of abilities. Each and every one of our qualifications is carefully designed to engage students and to equip them for the next stage of their lives.

We support our education communities by providing trusted qualifications and specialist support, to allow our students the opportunity to reach their full potential.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk

ⁱ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.