



GCE AS EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AS**

SUMMER 2022

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC 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.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
Component 1	1
Component 2	6

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

GCE AS

Summer 2022

COMPONENT 1: ANALYSIS OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT

General Comments

Candidates were overall well-prepared for this paper. They were able to demonstrate a generally clear grasp of the assessment objectives in each section and particularly an awareness of the need for comparison (AO4) in Section A. Candidates' performance this year resulted in a slightly wider spread of marks than has been noted previously. Advance information may therefore have enabled candidates to access marks right across the mark range. The attempt rate for both sections was broadly similar (100% for Section A and 97.6% for Section B) which shows candidates' ability to manage both spoken and written texts. The performance in both sections was a little uneven, with a slightly lower mean mark for Section B compared to Section A. Candidate responses for Section B were sometimes significantly shorter and less developed. This is likely to be a timing issue so centres should emphasise the equal weighting of marks in both sections – 50 for each – and therefore the need to allow equal time to complete both tasks. Reliance on feature spotting rather than careful selection of significant language features in each text was an element in some of the weaker responses. Stronger candidates were able to show a confident engagement with the genre of both spoken and written texts and were able to deliver precise, well-supported responses which thoughtfully discussed meaning in context.

The texts presented in each section were very accessible, and candidates were given advance information about the genre of acceptance speeches for Section A which certainly helped many to open their responses with sensible and comparative overviews (AO4). There was a tendency for weaker candidates to provide a generic, rehearsed overview of the features of acceptance speeches without specific reference to the two texts in the question. Centres had clearly prepared their candidates well in terms of employing spoken language terminology and the strongest candidates were also able to employ a wider range of core linguistic terminology accurately (AO1). Although elements of genre (AO2) were generally secure for Section A (because of the advance information), in Section B confusion about the contexts for the advice text led to some weaker responses. The relative accessibility and contemporary nature of the text in Section B seemed to become a limiting factor for some weaker candidates who were unable to see beyond its informality. They were therefore unable to fully explore the way language was actually very carefully crafted in this text to engage and advise the reader. For this section, this led to a concentration of the marks in upper Band 2 and lower Band 3.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Spoken Language of the Media

Text A was a transcript from Olivia Colman's 2019 Oscar's acceptance speech. Colman's highly spontaneous speech reflected her surprise and shock at winning the award. She took some time at the beginning to compose herself and then effusively thanked her co-stars, other nominees, and her family.

Notable features included the point where she mentioned her previous job as a 'cleaner' as inspiration for other young girls and where she read aloud the message on the autocue. She concluded with emotional thanks to her husband, her production company, and to other fellow female nominees.

Text B, another televised award acceptance speech, was delivered by Bruno Mars for the 2019 Grammy Awards. Although Mars' speech opened by registering some surprise, it soon became clear that his speech was more prepared than Colman's. As an established live performer Mars was able to confidently deliver a self-assured anecdote about his teenage experience as a performer and to fluently recount his professional journey as an artist and musician. Like Colman he thanked other named performers, but in contrast these musicians (all male) were cited more as inspiration for his own creative development.

AO1

The most able candidates had a secure grasp of the demands of the question and were able to support their analysis with accurate use of a good range of spoken and core linguistic terminology. They also were able to precisely select evidence to support their analysis and to securely identify relevant features in context. A significant example was Colman's use of the colloquial 'a massive snog' in Text A. Higher scoring candidates were able to correctly identify this as a noun phrase (and not 'snog' as a verb Text A). Colman's Britishness here provided interesting contrast with Mars' use of American colloquialisms ('guys' and 'y'all'). Higher scoring candidates were also able to compare the use of past tense verbs 'loved' and 'did spend' in Colman's anecdote with the more dramatic delivery of Mars' anecdote which featured (historic), present tense verbs ('opening' 'dancing' 'celebrating'). Weaker candidates, however, tended to feature spot, focusing exclusively on simpler features such as micropauses and first-person pronouns. Many noted, for example, that there were longer timed pauses in both speeches, but were unable to differentiate their purpose. Colman's were clearly non-fluency features whereas Mars' were employed more deliberately as he worked with the audience response to increase the impact of his speech.

AO2

The question bullet points were focused on the emotions and identities of both speakers and on the texts as examples of award acceptance speeches. Stronger candidates were able to make sensible comments about how the use of language in Text A reflected Colman's excited and nervous state and her more down-to-earth persona as opposed to Mars' more self-assured and self-involved delivery in Text B. Stronger responses were also able to explore how Colman's Britishness and distinctive use of nouns such as 'snog' and 'telly' might endear her to a largely American audience while Mars' anecdote about his teenage performance in 'The Magic of Polynesia' was humorous and designed to engage the audience in the narrative of his journey. There was also some effective application of theoretical frameworks such as face and politeness theory. This was certainly not essential to achieve the higher bands, but when applied successfully with support from the text, did show valid conceptual understanding. Discussion in the weaker responses tended to focus on generic, unsupported descriptions of behaviour – rather than language use – or involved unsupported assertions in terms of the gender or 'genderlect' of each speaker.

AO4

Candidates chose to structure their essays in a number of different ways. Some chose to analyse Text A in detail first, then move onto Text B while drawing out the points of connection and comparison between the texts as they worked through their second analysis. Others chose a more selective and integrated structure, moving between the texts with a focus on language use in terms of the speakers' identities and audience engagement. Candidates had been clearly well-advised by centres about the importance and weighting of AO4 as there were very few responses where little or no attempt was made to connect or compare the texts.

The best performing candidates made sustained and thoughtful links between the texts – and included an overview in which points of comparison were made, and supported, from the outset. Rather than select simple shared linguistic features to spot in each text (such as use of fillers and/or prosodic features) better candidates would analyse the significance of these features in context (with support). For example, some mentioned that rising intonation in Text A often indicated an emotional moment for Colman compared with the flatter, less expressive delivery of Text B which reflected Mars’ greater composure and self-assurance. Stronger responses were also able to engage meaningfully with the content of both speeches. For example, some cited the differing semantic fields reflecting the film versus music industry and the use of first names and the lexis of family and friends in Text A suggesting a personal, closer relationship than the full names and proper nouns cited in Text B.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Detailed engagement with language use in both texts and how this relates to their respective tenors.
- Accurate use of a range of spoken and more general core linguistic terminology with precise and clear support.
- Sustained connections where points of comparison and contrast are carefully selected and relevant.
- Secure discussion of the genre and main features and/or constraints.

Areas for improvement

- Superficial feature-spotting as a means of exploring connections is to be avoided.
- Listing features without clear support from the text is to be avoided.
- Maintaining focus on language use in context, rather than general speaker behaviour, is advised.
- Increased precision in the use of both core linguistic and spoken terminology is advised.

Section B: Written Language

Section B did produce some very effective responses. There was evidence, however, that timing was an issue for a significant number of candidates. Given that Section B is equally weighted at 50% of the marks, it was a pity that some candidates were not able to develop their responses sufficiently to access the higher bands.

Candidates were asked to analyse an article from the news, politics, and culture website ‘The Huffington Post’ where the writer, Carina Kolodny, gave her readers advice about dating ‘in the digital age.’ The article was structured as a series of ‘tried and true’ ‘dos and don’ts’ in an accessible, informal style where Kolodny combined the semantic field of modern dating with that of modern technology to produce an engaging and yet authoritative guide. The implied audience for the text was female – and this was signalled where the female journalist used lexis relating to gender stereotypes. The question was focused on how language use reflected advice texts on dating, but candidates were invited to comment on genre features typical of advice texts and how the writer used language to engage the reader.

AO1

The most successful responses were able to identify the playful, yet authoritative tone of the text and were then able to select and accurately label language features that created it.

Some candidates worked their way through the text from beginning to end, others were more selective and discussed features which were relevant and effective at different points. Either approach could work, but when candidates were struggling with timing the top-to-bottom approach resulted in an exclusive focus on the opening section of the text. Precise selection of features with accurate use of terms and support was a hallmark of the stronger responses. For example, higher scoring candidates were able to note the mixed register of the article and the use of low frequency noun phrases such as ‘social faux-pas’ ‘courtship’, ‘future prospects’ and ‘dignity’ combined with more informal techniques such as initialisms ‘SMS’ and ‘IRL’ along with colloquial vocatives such as ‘kiddo’ and ‘ya freak.’ Weaker responses tended to focus exclusively on listing colloquial features in the text such as clipping (‘pic’ and ‘congrats’). A significant number of candidates were unable to identify the imperative sentence mood employed throughout the text – this was a certainly a limiting factor in their responses.

AO2

For AO2, candidates could discuss the language features identified in terms of the genre of advice texts. Understanding how the writer created a friendly, yet informed advisory tone was crucial here. The author’s inclusion of positive rather than too many negative imperatives could have been usefully explored here. Higher scoring candidates, for example, reflected upon the structure of each advice point which frequently had an imperative followed by a helpful declarative which expanded on the point (and arguably mitigated its tenor). Language was carefully crafted in the text to forge a relationship between writer and reader. Weaker responses, however, focused exclusively on the use of direct address or non-standard capitalisation, but others were able to cite more sophisticated features such as the use of negative, evaluative adjectives (‘over-thought, awkward and uncomfortable’) which revealed the writer’s possible personal experience, expertise and understanding of the pitfalls of dating in a digital age.

AO3

For AO3, candidates should have considered how contextual factors for this advice text shaped meaning. Some candidates were therefore able to comment on the fact that this article was published on a news, culture, and politics website and how this rather unusual context for a dating advice article may have influenced readership and audience engagement. In terms of audience, higher scoring candidates were able to see that although this text was aimed at a youthful (female) demographic it was still an implied adult one. Some candidates were able to spot the more risqué allusion in the declarative ‘a woman’s fingers are just as dextrous as a man’s...’ as evidence of this more sophisticated, adult tenor. Weaker responses took the writer’s use of a technological semantic field and colloquialisms as evidence that the article was aimed exclusively at teenagers – and this limited their understanding and evaluation (seeing, for example, the use of the vocative ‘kiddo’ and the declarative ‘Now you look like a child’ as problematic for teenagers, rather than playful irony among adults). A careful consideration of the different ways in which audiences engage with digital, as opposed to printed, texts also led some candidates to comment thoughtfully on brevity and the use of a helpful checklist format for advice. Candidates who successfully grasped the distinctive nature of the publishing context – dating advice delivered on a culture website by a female journalist – were therefore able to make the most meaningful evaluations of language features. Weaker candidates who did not engage successfully with context were thus limited to more generic evaluations such as ‘stops the text being boring’ and ‘has a friendly tone’ with limited development.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Careful reading of the text and consideration of its particular context.
- Sustained analysis of significant features throughout the text linking them to genre and to audience engagement.
- Precise use of a range of linguistic terminology with support for every term used.
- Sustained evaluation of the effects of language choices linked carefully to context and genre.

Areas for improvement

- Lack of precision in both identifying and supporting linguistic features: especially imprecise use of 'phrase' and 'simple' and 'minor' sentence.
- Limited use of sentence-level analysis and common mistakes in relation to sentence mood.
- Feature spotting rather than selection of more significant/relevant language devices.
- Making assumptions about context without careful consideration of signals in the text and in the contextual information provided.

Summary of key points

SECTION A:

- Encourage candidates to accurately use a range of core linguistic and spoken terminology to label evidence.
- Encourage candidates to use more precise linguistic terminology rather than use vaguer terms such as those derived from classical rhetoric (e.g. parallel syntax/parallelism or cohesion rather than anaphora).
- Discourage a purely feature-spotting approach by encouraging candidates to select the most significant features to form relevant points of contrast and comparison.
- Encourage candidates to think carefully about the specific contexts of each text and the contextual information they are provided with to help inform their analysis.

SECTION B:

- Remind candidates that both sections of this paper are equally weighted and that they should therefore devote the same amount of time to Section A and B.
- Support candidates in familiarising themselves with a wide range of written texts and diverse contexts to broaden their understanding of audience and genre.
- Support candidates to develop their analysis beyond basic language features such as typography and direct address thereby enabling them to use a wider, more ambitious range of linguistic terminology.
- Help candidates to develop and consolidate their understanding of core linguistic terms (word classes, sentence moods etc.) along with their ability to identify examples in context.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

GCE AS

Summer 2022

COMPONENT 2: USING LANGUAGE

General Comments

Candidates appeared to be well-prepared for this paper, with sound knowledge of the assessment objective requirements demonstrated across the range of responses seen. A good range of terminology was applied and there was some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning. Candidates appeared to engage well with the corpus of data consisting of horoscopes, which provided the opportunity to explore both linguistic features and contexts of production and reception, leading to some thoughtful and engaged analysis, which allowed for clear differentiation by outcome. The two writing tasks of Section B also stimulated some lively and creative responses, both in terms of the narrative fiction extract and speechwriting, with a very similar attempt rate. The accompanying commentary task also produced a range of appropriate responses, with candidates demonstrating the ability to comment productively on their own writing choices and the contexts within which they were produced.

While the last Principal Examiner Report (2019) suggested that one of the key issues of the previous report (2018) – differentiating between the language levels for the low tariff questions (a-c) – had been addressed, this is still an issue in some cases. It is disappointing for the candidates when perfectly valid phonological features (e.g. onomatopoeia) are referenced in 1(c), for example. This clearly needs further consideration; more familiarity with mark schemes for candidates may be a way in which this can be addressed. Also mentioned in the 2019 report was time management: this seems to have continued to improve. On a few occasions, there were very long responses to the Section B writing task (and this was usually the fiction task (a), where the creative urge of some candidates seemed to have overcome their consciousness of time constraints), leaving very little time to write the commentary. Both tasks proved equally popular.

One issue that does require attention is the increasingly pervasive use by candidates of the word 'relatable' as a means to explain linguistic context, in both sections of the exam. Candidates tend to see this word as a handy 'go-to', usually when endeavouring to explain the relationship between text and audience when, in fact, it is hugely reductive in terms of providing depth of analysis. It means that candidates who frequently use this word tend not to engage as deeply as they could, and the quality of their analysis suffers. If they are looking to explore the relationship between a text and its reader, they should consider what is so 'relatable' about it: Does the writer intentionally use language that is commonly used within the sociolect of the intended audience group? Then say it! Does the writer choose cultural references they know their intended audience will recognise and appreciate? Then say it! Does the writer 'dog-whistle' to groups who share a certain ideology? Then say it!

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Investigating data

Candidates were required to analyse a corpus of data consisting of a selection of written horoscopes, procured from a wide range of media, both written and digital, and with a range of tones, from pseudo-scientific to arch and playful. While they were linked by a generally advisory purpose and a clear sense of an expert voice, the identification of the place of publication was important to inform candidates' contextual discussion in support of the evaluation of linguistic elements. These generic similarities and audience-focused differences were often used productively by candidates to draw links between texts from the corpus. As with previous 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. Responses to the phonology question were the strongest, followed by lexis/semantics, then grammar.

- 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, for instance picking up on the memorable qualities of alliteration in 'group gossip' or 'fave film', the obvious audience engagement of the rhyme 'large and in charge', or the dramatic onomatopoeia of 'BOOM', there were a number of occasions when the fricatives of, for example, 'fave film' was presented in addition to another alliterative pattern. Both points could not be rewarded as, in essence, both were examples of alliteration, and the question specifically references 'different phonological techniques'. There was also a number of instances where the non-standard capitalisation of 'BOOM' was referenced as a phonological point, rather than a lexical/semantic one. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, there were a number of grammatical features, such as rhetorical questions, 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, although, as above, there were a few instances where candidates failed to differentiate between the language levels and included phonological or grammatical points. Particularly popular points for successful identification were the wealth of figurative language such as the metaphorical 'thunder and lightning', often explained successfully in terms of human relationships and the female personification of Venus as 'she' linked to a women's magazine; the lexical set of horoscope proper nouns e.g. 'Libra', 'Leo', and 'Scorpio' which both lent credibility to the predictions and identified specific audiences; the adoption of a youthful sociolect through the clippings of 'fave' and 'sesh', and the blend of 'CHILLAX'; and the assumed knowledge cultural references to 'Don Draper' and 'Selena Gomez' which linked the language of the texts to the interests of their respective audiences.

- (c) This eight-mark question required candidates to identify and briefly discuss four different grammatical features. It was pleasing to see such assured identification of sentence moods and their functions: for instance, the identification of frequent imperative mood to advise the reader, the use of the interrogative as a means of setting up uncertainty about the future and the exclamatory (although there was still occasional erroneous use of exclamation) to suggest enthusiasm or heightened emotional states. There was also acceptable reference to the triadic structures in extract 3: 'sleepover... fave film... pamper sesh' both in terms of persuasion and emphasis and highlighting activities particularly enjoyed by the target audience. Other features usually correctly identified were the minor sentences, e.g. 'Maybe not.' and 'In hot water again?' which mimic the spoken mode and exemplify the brevity of what is a genre where this quality is important. There were, however, a number of instances where these were either labelled as 'simple' (wrong) or 'short' (unspecific). As for Q.1 (a) and Q.1 (b), there were a number of occasions where features from the other language levels were presented, with the onomatopoeia of 'BOOM' being an example.
- (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 genre. The corpus of data made up of horoscopes provided ample opportunity to do this, particularly as there were a clear set of genre conventions but significant differences in register and content identifiable by where they were published and their target audiences. Most candidates managed their time effectively and produced adequately extended responses, though a few shorter responses were seen, which obviously affected the mark they could be awarded.

The strongest responses often provided an overview which clearly and succinctly identified the main conceptual foci of voice, purpose, and the fluctuations of these according to audience, while addressing the required Assessment Objectives through the close analysis of concise and well-selected textual evidence, demonstrating good linguistic knowledge. It was pleasing to note that almost all responses engaged with the corpus. Less effective responses tended towards generalised discussion without the application of terminology and frequent quotation, with general, rather specific comments on the genre.

This question was marked under AOs 2, 3, and 4, with equal weighting of 10 marks for each. As such, awareness of each of these was at the heart of the strongest responses and a lack of attention to any facets tended to impact upon the overall quality of a response. For example, a lack of comparison (AO4) often impacted on discussion of concepts and issues as, by drawing links between the different texts, the candidates were able to build up a sense of genre conventions etc.

A range of approaches was seen and were all entirely valid: from working through the language levels, to grouping the horoscopes according to intended audience or tone. Some candidates developed the ideas presented in brief in Q.1 (a)-(c), which was absolutely acceptable, although the strongest responses often looked outside of these ideas in order to provide the most effective overview of the corpus.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Insightful discussion of similarities and differences linked firmly to contexts of production and reception.
- A strong sense of overview.
- Precise analysis of meanings shaped by a range of linguistic features.
- Selective quotations from across the corpus, succinctly embedded into discussion.
- A good range of knowledge from across the language levels, applied with accuracy.

Areas for improvement

- Ensuring all points are fully developed in order to avoid feature spotting.
- Ensuring all points have a linguistic focus.
- Ensuring time management allows for a response of sufficient length: some responses to Q.1 (a)-(c) were overly long, leaving candidates without time to develop Q.1 (d), where contextual/conceptual discussion was better saved for the extended response.

Section B: Creative Writing

Section B provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate creativity, and awareness of genre conventions. There were many very 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.

Most candidates had managed their time effectively to complete both tasks fully, although, in some cases, the commentary was less fully developed. Only in a few cases were the writing pieces overly long to the detriment of writing a full commentary. Occasionally, the writing piece was also short, which had a knock-on effect in not providing sufficient material for the commentary. Obviously, those short responses were not able to access the full range of available marks.

- Q.2 (a)** Candidates were asked to write an extract from a story in which a prediction comes true. This was the slightly less popular of the two tasks. There were a range of original responses, with the corpus being used as inspiration in a variety of creative ways, such as having a character respond to a prediction either directly from reading a horoscope, or, rather imaginatively, from a dream. There were a wide range of settings, characters, and narrative approaches, the best of which focused on the crafting of writing in shaping tone and engaging the audience, rather than relying on elaborate, and sometimes unconvincing, plotting.

Successful responses, regardless of approach, all shared the qualities of clarity and accuracy of expression, consistent control, and adhered to the adage of 'show, don't tell'. They focused on what was achievable within the advisory word count of 350 words, and used imagery which was original and avoided cliché, dialogue which was used to characterise as well as to advance plot, and clear and crisp description.

The advice from 2019 was clearly absorbed, as there were significantly fewer attempts to construct and complete an entire short story, rather than, as the task required, an extract. This meant that candidates had the opportunity to craft, rather than push urgently to a sense of conclusion, which was the point of the exercise.

Even when a clear sense of denouement was reached in some cases, there was an implication that this sat within a larger narrative framework. That said, there were some less successful responses that failed to engage through technical issues such as lack of control, coherence, or focus.

- (b) Candidates were asked to write a speech for a public speaking competition entitled 'Advice: take it or leave it for a happy teenage life'. More candidates chose this task, and there was clear genre knowledge of rhetorical devices to be seen in almost all work, suggesting a high level of preparedness for a task of this genre.

The key to success here was recognising the balance required in writing effectively for a teenage audience within the wider context of the public speaking competition: the most successful candidates managed this through creating the appropriate level of formality: not too formal so that they would lose a teenage audience, but not overly colloquial (and certainly not shifting into slang, deviant spelling to mimic accent, or, as in some cases, taboo language) bearing in mind that wider context. Immediate engagement was another key factor, as was structuring a clear sense of beginning, middle and end.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Clarity of expression and precision of word choice and grammatical control.
- Clear awareness of language choices appropriate to genre.
- Efforts to achieve and maintain audience engagement.
- Creative use of stimulus material.

Areas for improvement

- Ensuring choices are appropriate for audience and purpose.
- For fiction: avoiding excessive plot complication; for non-fiction: avoiding the overuse of rhetorical features to the point where they lose impact.
- Proof-reading to ensure maximum accuracy.

- (c) Candidates were asked to write a linguistic commentary on their response to Q.2 (a) or (b). Most recognised the necessity for a linguistic focus for this response, with concise and effective evidence provided from their own writing, used as a means to justify their own language choices in terms of the effects they achieve. As mentioned previously, there were a reasonable number of occasions where candidates did not write a sufficient quantity here, which is perhaps reflective of the fact that this is the final task of the paper. As mentioned in 2019, broad and over-long contextual introductions are to be avoided unless they include specific analysis.

The most successful responses used a good range of terms from across the language levels, quoted precisely and with purposeful evaluation of what the best examples of each feature were, and developed the discussion of meaning with specific contextual reference.

Less successful responses tended to narrate what had already been written in the task and talked generally about linguistic features without the use of evidence or, conversely, quoted without the use of linguistic terminology to demonstrate knowledge.

While it was pleasing to see less of what the 2019 report called ‘a fruitless dialogue about what they [candidates] did not do or planned to do’, there was still a degree of uncertainty as to what constitutes ‘evaluation’ as part of AO3. Some candidates chose to interpret this as an opportunity to provide a gushing summative appraisal of the excellence and effectiveness of their work, but this is unlikely to accrue much in the way of reward. Instead, this element should be considered more in line with the selection of material to discuss from the writing task, and perhaps some consideration of how the writing has gone about matching language choices to audience and purpose.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Deep exploration of meaning shaped by linguistic choices.
- Accurate use of terminology from across the language levels.
- Provision of well-chosen and concisely quoted evidence from candidates’ own writing.

Areas for improvement

- Avoiding long, general contextual overviews which fail to engage closely with the text.
- General discussion missing terminology, quotation, or both.
- Broad and positive evaluation conclusions stating how effective writing is without analysis.

Summary of key points

SECTION A

- Candidates should be familiar with which features come under which language level to ensure success in Q.1 (a)-(c).
- Candidates should understand how to achieve succinct successful responses in the explanations for Q.1 (a)-(c), saving deeper analysis of concepts/issues/contexts/ comparisons for Q.1(d).
- Candidates should develop skills of embedding concise quotations into sentence structures: making reference to a technique or feature simply by saying which text it is from is seldom sufficient.

SECTION B – CREATIVE WRITING

- Further consideration of levels of formality appropriate for different writing situations.
- Practice of writing to ‘show not tell’.
- Tense control – practice writing – and staying in past and present tenses.

SECTION B – COMMENTARY

- Provision of points from across language levels, rather than just word class grammar should be encouraged.
- Evaluation should be more closely linked to textual analysis: finding the best piece of evidence to support a point is an example of good evaluation.
- Encourage candidates to manage time effectively to give them the chance of achieving well on this task.



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