



GCE AS EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AS**

SUMMER 2018

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 2018

COMPONENT 1: ANALYSIS OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT

General Comments

Generally, candidates had been prepared well for this unit, enabling them to demonstrate generally sound grasp of the assessment objectives; however, some candidates struggled to access the higher marks due to the lack of precision in their exploration of the texts' specific contexts. The stronger candidates made analytical responses which were precise, and confidently interrogated specific linguistic aspects related to the question focus. The texts chosen were appropriately challenging and produced responses across the mark range. Centres had taken some steps to address issues identified in previous examiners' reports, particularly pertaining to ensuring candidates were equipped to use a range of linguistic terminology (AO1) to make their points, and to sustaining connections for AO4 in Section A. Some candidates, however, still have a way to go to ensure they effectively address the demands of the assessment objectives. Elements of genre (AO2) had been clearly addressed both in Section A and Section B, however, some weaker candidates tended to miss opportunities to fully explore the texts' subtexts.

Section A: Spoken Language of the Media

Candidates had to analyse two transcripts from entertainment programmes in which participants discussed garden sheds. Although linked by topic, the discussions were distinctive in their particular contexts, as they were taken from different types of entertainment programmes.

Text A was a transcript from the morning chat and gossip programme on ITV, *Loose Women*. In the chosen extract, host Ruth Langsford and her regular guests engaged in a generally light-hearted conversation where they expressed their views on 'she-sheds', a new trend which had emerged. The emphasis in this spontaneous conversation tended to be on how this new phenomenon had enabled women to partake in a leisure activity that had previously been the stereotypical domain of men. The light-hearted nature of the exchange was aimed to engage both the live studio audience and the audience watching the programme at home on television.

By contrast, in Text B, a transcript from an edition of the long-running Radio 4 comedy panel show *Just A Minute*, the light-hearted tone was entirely the point of the speakers' interactions. Despite often appearing to display hostility towards one another when engaging with this topic, the discussion was more of a comedic riff on the randomly assigned topic of garden sheds.

AO1

The higher scoring candidates demonstrated a clear and secure focus on the question, which prompted them to analyse aspects of language used by the participants in order to both express their views and to entertain their audiences. These candidates made perceptive points about the roles of the hosts in both transcripts as agenda managers, whilst recognising that both conversations were founded upon humorous interactions of different types. Subtle points were made about how, for example, Text B appeared to have a more rigid structure imposed by the format of the programme and policed by the host and enforced in a mock-combative mood by the panellists, Sue Perkins and Sheila Hancock, but that this structure was treated as merely the launching point for comedic diversions from the topic at hand. Lower attaining candidates took the interruptions in Text B more literally, failing to recognise the mocking tone and instead examining the exchange as exemplifying literal Face-Threatening Acts. Where methods and approaches to answering this question were concerned, many candidates proved it was possible to score highly using a varying range of discursive strategies. It is worth reminding centres that candidates must use core linguistic terminology, such as word classes and noun phrases, as well as spoken terminology such as emphatic stress and rising intonation, in order to pick up marks for AO1.

AO2

Relevant points for AO2 seemed to be centred on gender stereotypes, which candidates felt were particularly noticeable in Text A, where the discussion of 'she-sheds' foregrounded the fact that the conversation was heavily influenced by women's experiences, not surprising considering the all-female make up of the hosts and guests; some candidates juxtaposed this with the pre-modified noun phrases 'good solid pine' and 'British craftsmanship' in Text B, which seemed to signal more stereotypically male descriptions of a garden shed. Further still, Band 5 candidates recognised the hyperbolic nature of Paul Merton's account of a fictitious shed, by commenting on his use of emphatic stress in the adjective 'magnificent', which foregrounded the flight of fancy aspect of his description; they recognised that cultural references, such as the proper noun 'Marie Antoinette' and the high register pre-modified noun phrase 'historical anachronism' signalled for the audience that perhaps Merton does not even own a shed but is instead engaged in an imaginative riff on the idea of doing so.

Some candidates made good use of power theory, and even gender theory; when linked to the data, this theoretical underpinning enabled them to score marks under AO2. It is worth, however, reminding candidates that high scores for AO2 can be achieved without requiring them to couch their discussion in theoretical language. Indeed in some cases, where candidates were less secure in their methods of analysis, theoretical discussion got in the way of more meaningful exploration as lower attaining candidates tended to impose their chosen theory on to the texts, without properly judging the appropriateness of their theory to the discussion at hand: for example, discussing the concept of Face-Threatening Acts as it pertained to the disagreements between guests in Text B without drawing attention to the mocking nature of the exchange led to discussions that were not sufficiently probing of the precise context of the exchange.

AO4

As in previous years, some chose to explore Text A in detail, before moving on to a discussion of Text B, drawing out the points of comparison and contrast between it and Text A. Other successful candidates took a more thematic approach, comparing and contrasting both texts throughout their response. There are merits in both approaches; done well, both can produce perceptive comparisons and insightful discussions of how speakers' language was used to entertain their respective audiences. It was pleasing to see that, overall, connections were well-embedded, and centres had taken on board previous guidance that AO4 was suitably covered by their candidates' responses.

Stronger responses made some good use of the links between the use of language and contextual information in both transcripts, considering the effect, for example, of the image of Janet Street-Porter's greenhouse in Text A and the function of the buzzer in Text B. These factors led such strong candidates to making fruitful points about how the participants' language in these moments was designed to entertain. By contrast, other candidates tended to produce generic links and seemed to use some spoken terminology, but ignored the plentiful examples of lexical and grammatical choices which also contributed to the construction of meaning in the transcripts thus not scoring as highly.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Precise selection of textual evidence and application of linguistic terminology (spoken features and core features).
- Sustained connections between the two texts.
- Insightful engagement with issues and genre elements.

Areas for improvement

- Avoid feature spotting.
- Ensure balanced coverage of both texts.
- Ground discussion securely in the texts' specific contexts, rather than discussing aspects out of context or imposing theoretical frameworks which are not necessarily appropriate to the texts themselves.

Summary of key points: considerations for centres

- Remind candidates that the genres of texts are outlined in the contextual information and therefore they must demonstrate that they are considering elements of genre for AO2.
- Remind candidates that connections between texts must be sustained throughout the response, since AO4 offers the greatest weighting of marks for this section of the examination.
- Terminology should support the discussion and not drive it, in order to avoid feature spotting.

Section B: Written Language

Section B produced some successful responses. As with last year, it was clear that candidates had been guided well to manage their time in the examination appropriately to reflect that Section B is worth 50% of the marks.

Candidates were asked to analyse an extract from a topical article which appeared in *The Guardian* newspaper; the predominant view expressed by the author, Stuart Jeffries, was a rejection of the current obsession with Black Friday. Candidates were required to evaluate how language was used by the writer to argue his point of view, and to consider how the language reflected a criticism of Black Friday as a cultural and economic phenomenon.

AO1

The bullet points accompanying this question provided some useful guidance to candidates on how to construct an intelligent method of analysis for AO1: candidates were advised to explore how the language reflected the writer's attitude towards Black Friday by examining different aspects of the writer's criticism. For example, they could focus on the religious connotations in the title in the pre-and post-modified noun phrase "consumerist circle of Hell", which foregrounded a sense of moral decay. They could also explore the economic argument against conspicuous consumption and endless acquisition of material goods.

As in previous years, it is also worth pointing out to candidates that it is only possible to access the highest marks if they use terminology frequently, precisely and purposefully; mere feature spotting is invariably limiting and often leads to responses in upper Band 2 or lower Band 3 for AO1.

AO2

For AO2, candidates were encouraged to consider the extent to which the article presented genre features typical of articles designed to argue a point of view and provoke strong reactions from readers. For example, they could examine the organisation of the text around debunking a range of myths which had arisen surrounding the Black Friday phenomenon. There were some unusual features which candidates could analyse here. For example, the use of the opening address, "Ladies and gentlemen...", which almost mimicked the opening of a speech or formal talk. This was used as a device to engage the reader's attention from the outset.

Further aspects of rhetoric typical of polemical articles include the use of hypophora ("What's that feeling? Buyer's remorse") and a variety of cultural references, such as references to canonical poets, like Dante Alighieri, or to influential economists such as Milton Friedman, and to fashion icons like Vivienne Westwood.

AO3

For AO3, candidates were required to consider how the use of language in the texts is affected by the contexts of production and reception. On this occasion, many candidates recognised how the writer employed a range of adverbials, such as "From now until closing time on Christmas Eve...", to anchor the text in the author's criticism of Black Friday as being part of wider trend towards a creeping materialism in modern life. This contextual point was emphasised by some candidates' reference to the final exclamatory sentence, "Merry Christmas, everybody!" which was employed ironically in order to strengthen the polemic nature of the writer, drawing attention to the writer's emphatic denunciation of this phenomenon.

By contrast, weaker candidates struggled to recognise the tactical timing of publication to coincide with the advent of the Christmas season; their discussion tended to be quite generic, focusing on graphology, layout and the more obvious aspects of rhetoric, such as alliteration. It is worth reminding candidates that they need to consider the context of publication quite carefully: some weaker candidates appeared to be confused between the features of tabloid and broadsheet article writing.

Overall the text proved accessible and provided some challenging opportunities for linguistic analysis.

Characteristics of successful responses

- Discussion was anchored securely in the specific context of the text's production and reception.
- Selection of textual evidence was precise and purposeful.
- Discussion examined how genre conventions were exemplified in the text both in the observance of those conventions and in the judicious manipulation of those conventions.

Areas for improvement

- Avoid a narrow range of textual evidence.
- Steer students to avoid surface reading of the text, and instead guide them towards looking closely at the author's perspective and attitudes and how these influence their language choices.
- Avoid feature spotting.
- Avoid confusion between tabloid and broadsheet.
- Avoid sweeping generalisations (e.g. 'all readers of broadsheets are expecting formal writing in a high register').

Summary of key points: considerations for centres

- Candidates are well advised to use the bullet points to structure their responses; this would ensure greater evenness in their coverage of the assessment objectives.
- Candidates should be guided to consider as many different aspects of contexts as possible for AO3. For example, when and where the text is published, and how the writer's persona influences the construction of meaning.

Conclusion

The texts in both sections were, on the whole, accessible but a number of candidates clearly found the material demanding. Candidates' preparation for this assessment is immeasurably improved if they are exposed to texts covering a wide and diverse range of genres and contexts. A crucial skill assessed in this paper is the ability to focus on precise textual detail whilst at the same time considering how that detail relates to the 'bigger picture' of each text.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

GCE AS

Summer 2018

COMPONENT 2: USING LANGUAGE

General Comments

It is clear that candidates were generally very well prepared for this unit. Candidates were able to demonstrate an increasingly sound understanding of the objectives assessed and were able to apply a range of precise terminology whilst probing for meaning. The corpus of data within Section A seemed to be well received by candidates, providing them with a wide range of points to explore. It is clear that the corpus provided differentiation and was accessible for candidates – providing the lower attaining candidates with the opportunity to develop competent discussion, whilst enabling others to obtain marks in the higher bands. The creative questions in Section B encouraged candidates to produce a wide range of engaging and lively responses, with candidates successfully demonstrating their abilities in writing both speeches and articles. The commentary task in Section B also encouraged a range of excellent responses, demonstrating that centres have prepared candidates well for this element of their assessment, addressing some of the key issues that were outlined in previous examiner reports, such as the need for candidates to focus on sound when approaching the low-tariff phonology questions in Section A. Candidate responses also appeared to be more extended and detailed overall, demonstrating that centres have better prepared candidates in terms of time management. It should be noted that some minor issues still remained with lower tariff questions (such as candidates who were unable to differentiate between the language levels), but these were less pronounced than in previous years and this is encouraging.

Section A: Investigating Data

Candidates were here required to analyse a corpus of extracts taken from restaurant menus. Restaurant menus function as brief, persuasive and carefully crafted descriptions of specific dishes, but they also play an important role in promoting the restaurant as a whole and reflecting the brand identity and philosophy. The extracts offered candidates a range of complexity in the features to identify and explore, such as Extract 1's use of French borrowing to add an element of sophistication and prestige ("Entrees Les Classiques"); a wide range of asyndetic and syndetic listing patterns to deliver information quickly ("Cos leaves, croutons, marinated anchovy fillets, parmesan shavings and Caesar dressing") and some playful humour to engage such as the puns and word play used in Extract 10 ("HOLY CREPE!") and Extract 7 ("Flipping Amazing!"). As with previous series, the questions within the section were designed to provide increasing challenge as candidates progressed through the paper. As with the 2017 paper, responses to the grammar question seemed strongest overall, with many candidates receiving higher marks for this question than the others.

Question 1a:

This four mark question required candidates to identify two different phonological techniques and briefly explain the effects created in each case. Candidates generally responded well to this question, with many successfully identifying the use of accent and implied emphatic stress in Extract 3 "FINISH WHAT YA STARTED" and the phonetic pun on the expletive phrase in Extract 10's "HOLY CREPE".

Characteristics of successful responses

Candidates gaining full marks were able to evaluate phonological features confidently, such as one candidate who explored the monosyllabic rhythm created in Extract 13's "STACK IT, RIB IT, WING IT" as 'reflective of the youthful, musical, carnival atmosphere of "street food"'.

Areas for improvement

Centres appear to have addressed some issues outlined in the 2017 report, as candidates generally were able to focus on sound when analysing their chosen quotations; however, in some cases, candidates still strayed away from sound and analysed semantics or grammar providing little opportunity for credit. As with the 2017 paper, some candidates incorrectly identified repetition of words or phrases as a phonological technique, such as exploring the use of the repeated proper noun "Jack Daniels" in Extract 3.

Summary of key points

- Candidates need to be prepared to differentiate between the language levels.
- Responses to phonological questions should always focus on sound.
- Candidates must remember to identify the technique, give an example and briefly explain its effect.

Question 1b:

This eight mark question required candidates to identify four lexical and semantic techniques and briefly explain the effects created in each case. Candidates were well prepared for this question overall, and although some issues still remained with a minority of candidates being unable to differentiate between the language levels, or failing to provide any textual support, it should be noted that the majority of candidates handled this question very well.

Characteristics of successful responses

The majority of candidates were able to successfully identify a wide range of lexical and semantic effects, such the use of initialism in Extract 9 ("At ITR") to create a modern, trendy feel and the use of word play in Extract 7 ("Flipping Amazing") to create an informal and approachable brand identity. Candidates receiving full marks were able to accurately unpick a range of techniques with precision.

Areas for improvement

As in previous reports, centres are reminded that candidates receive no credit for identifying word class without identification of a lexical/semantic technique, such as metaphor or direct address (please see the Specimen Assessment Material).

Summary of key points

- Candidates need to be prepared to identify lexical/semantic devices and differentiate between the language levels.
- Word classes do not count as a technique here and are classed as invalid unless linked to a technique.
- Candidates must remember to identify the technique, give an example and briefly explain its effect.

Question 1c:

This eight mark question required candidates to identify four different grammatical structures and briefly comment on the effects created in each case. As reported in last year's report, candidates were generally better prepared for this question than they were for 1 (a) and (b), demonstrating a more advanced ability to differentiate between the language levels and to select specific grammatical techniques.

Characteristics of successful responses

Many candidates were able to successfully identify an increasingly sophisticated range of grammatical techniques, such as Extract 11's employment of the parenthetical subordinate clause "(50p from your purchase goes to the charity Compassion in World Farming)"; Extract 13's use of linguistic patterning of imperatives: "STACK IT; RIB IT; WING IT"; and Extract 8's use of syndetic listing "croutons, marinated anchovy fillets, parmesan shavings". Higher attaining candidates were here also able to begin to evaluate the pragmatic choices within the menus, such as Raymond Blanc's choice to employ repeated minor sentences (SALADE BLANC) in order to reflect the understated sophistication of his restaurants.

Areas for improvement

It should be noted that some candidates lost marks this series due to incorrectly labelling exclamatory sentences as "exclamative" sentences. Centres should remind candidates that exclamative sentences usually begin with "what" or "how" and are usually used to express strong feelings or emotions.

Summary of key points

- Students need to be prepared to identify grammatical devices and differentiate between the language levels.
- Candidates will be rewarded for all correct identification of any technique linked to grammatical structure, including noun phrases and types of listing.
- Candidates must remember to identify the technique, give an example and briefly explain its effect.

Question 1d:

As a 30 mark question, 1d required candidates to produce a more extended and in-depth analysis of the corpus as a whole, making intelligent links between extracts. Candidates were required to analyse the ways in which restaurant menus appeal to their specific target audiences. The responses to this question overall reflected a continued improvement in the length and depth of candidates' answers, with very few unable to access the full mark range due to brevity. The majority of responses were extended and allowed for some sophisticated evaluation of the corpus.

Characteristics of successful responses

More able candidates were able to show a sophisticated understanding of the way in which the targeted demographic of a restaurant shapes the language used. These candidates produced detailed and wide-ranging responses, addressing all Assessment Objectives equally and engaging confidently with a range of textual examples.

Methods and approaches to the question continue to be varied, and candidates demonstrated (as they have in previous years) that it is possible to employ a range of strategies and still gain high marks. For example, some candidates chose to use the bullet points given with the question to structure their responses, whilst others used the language levels as a logical framework (e.g. writing one paragraph on each level: lexis, semantics, grammar, phonology, etc.). Others adopted a different strategy, which entailed taking a more thematic approach of comparing and contrasting the texts through theme and context (e.g. levels of formality and how this reflects targeted demographic; unique selling points, such as the growing trend in vegan options; references to social media and youth culture). It is to be noted that there are significant merits within all of these approaches, and centres are reminded that when these strategies are applied they enable candidates to produce increasingly perceptive and sophisticated analyses. As was mentioned in last year's report, it is important to note that AO2, AO3 and AO4 are equally weighted in this question, and so candidates should familiarise themselves with these objectives on a regular basis in order to ensure that these are addressed equally.

It was encouraging to see that centres have acted on the 2017 Examiner's Report as candidates seemed to generally use linguistic terminology across all language levels as a foundation for their responses. It is useful to remind centres that language features underpin all of the Assessment Objectives here, so language terminology should be central to every element of candidates' analyses.

Characteristics of successful responses

Typical conventions of successful responses for this question tended to focus upon subtle differences between the restaurant menu extracts with confident analysis of linguistic techniques. Most candidates achieving the higher marks were able to make increasingly intelligent comments regarding each restaurant's philosophy, such as the family-friendly and traditional ideology created by the Indian Tiffin Room; the religious and morally 'pure' connotations of the playful exclamatory pun "HOLY CREPE!" by Samphire vegan restaurant; or the informal American theme in TGI Friday's colloquial and imperative approach. Upper band responses were also able to identify more subtle marketing strategies, such as Extract 12's employment of gender stereotyping in the metaphor "feeds...2 cave men" with one candidate successfully commenting that: "this figurative language not only encourages the customer to see this meal as large, but also as a challenge, particularly to male customers for whom consuming large amounts of food can also be used to establish dominance and 'man points'."

Areas for improvement

It should be noted that some lower attaining candidates failed to engage with the corpus and instead produced vague essays that gave an overview of why restaurant menus are needed in general when dining out. Centres are reminded to continue to discourage this rather fruitless approach; engagement and discussion of the corpus, with a range of relevant textual support, is essential if candidates are to be successful in this question.

One other recurring issue in 1(d) was candidates' inability to correctly spell the word "restaurant", despite the fact that this appeared on the exam paper several times.

Summary of key points

- Focus on the subtle differences and similarities across the corpus, considering the typical conventions of the genre.
- Extended responses are the key to success.
- Overview of the genre and corpus must be clear.

Section B: Creative Writing

Section B was once again an opportunity for candidates to showcase their creative flair, and there were many very successful and highly original responses. The majority of candidates had clearly apportioned their time appropriately according to the 50:50 weighting of the marks across both sections. Unlike the 2017 series, it seemed that, overall, candidates had given themselves enough time to write both the creative piece and commentary, with only a small minority of candidates writing overly lengthy creative pieces. Commentaries overall were extended and provided a suitable foundation for candidates to effectively evaluate a range of linguistic approaches used in their creative writing.

Candidates were required to write one creative piece (from a choice of two questions) followed by an analytical commentary of their own writing.

2 (a)

Candidates were here required to write a lively article for a student magazine entitled "The Best Meal I Ever Ate". This option was slightly more popular with candidates overall.

Characteristics of successful responses

Successful responses were characterised by a subtle understanding of audience (such as references to social media and “Instagram-worthy” meals, use of hashtags and emoticons to establish rapport and the use of sociolect such as FOMO, YOLO and scrolling).

Candidates achieving the higher bands produced original responses with a lively and engaging sense of voice, often adopting the persona of a university student and approaching the task as a food review. During many introductory paragraphs there were humorous explorations into the mediocre world of the student diet, including one candidate who recalled “eating Tesco Value Hobnobs for an entire week before pay day”. These lively introductions set candidates up well to contrast these woes to their “best meal ever”. The corpus was used effectively as a spring-board by the majority of students, with many of them venturing into the French cuisine of Raymond Blanc or pitting themselves against the challenge of the MEATMEETEATPLATTER. The ability for candidates to place themselves into a variety of situations and write about them with passion and tangible excitement was a pleasure to read.

Areas for improvement

In terms of the genre of an article, the majority of candidates were clearly well prepared for this task and very few candidates struggled with the concept. Candidates achieving the lower bands had a tendency to write quite pedestrian articles, lacking a sense of personal voice and engagement, often describing their meals with clichéd language and a lack of linguistic enthusiasm.

2 (b)

Candidates were here required to write a speech for the opening night of a new restaurant. In the speech, candidates needed to outline the philosophy of a new restaurant to guests, imagining and placing themselves into the persona of the restaurant owner.

This question was slightly less popular with candidates overall, and responses were generally successful with a solid sense of what was required.

Characteristics of successful responses

Candidates who met the criteria for the upper bands were able to establish a well-crafted persona complete with original and engaging back-stories that added legitimacy and engagement. For example, one candidate created the persona of an Indian immigrant stating that they had “imported a Tandoori oven from India which ha[d] been in [their] family since the Second World War”. The development of these various personae allowed candidates to create colourful and meaningful voices within their speeches, allowing for a range of interesting approaches. Many candidates homed in on the rising trend in vegan restaurants (using Extract 10 as a stimulus), whilst others explored Extract 4’s informal and friendly approach to Italian cuisine.

Areas for improvement

Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of engagement with their audience and a very weak sense of voice. Candidates did not seem to struggle with the genre, although some could have made it clearer to a reader that this was a script intended for a wide audience at a public event. For some candidates, even a basic opening address to “Ladies and Gentlemen” helped to signal their understanding of genre and help them to establish a basic sense of purpose.

Summary of key points for 2a and b

- Ensure that candidates are exposed to a range of genres and explore their typical conventions.
- Candidates should employ a range of linguistic approaches suitable to the specific genre highlighted in the question.
- A sense of voice is the key to success.
- Planning can be useful and responses should be well organised.
- Excessively short or long responses are self-penalising.

2 (c) – Analytical commentary

Candidates were generally very well prepared for this question and most responses demonstrated the linguistic focus that is expected from a commentary of this sort. The question required candidates to write a commentary analysing and evaluating the linguistic and grammatical choices made in their creative response to 2(a) or 2(b). The question highlights that there should be focus on language features and their effectiveness. As mentioned in the 2017 report, short and undeveloped responses were rare.

Characteristics of successful responses

More insightful responses were able to produce extended, detailed analyses that successfully identified techniques from across the language levels, and demonstrated perceptive and increasingly sophisticated skills of analysis. A common feature of responses achieving the upper bands was the ability to reflect on personal language choices in an intelligent and thoughtful way, especially where candidates had made original and experimental choices in their creative tasks.

As with the 2017 series, candidates adopted a varied range of approaches, but it should be noted that more successful answers ensured even coverage of the language levels, including detailed and perceptive analysis of more challenging areas, such as grammatical choices and employment of specific genre conventions (such as the use of rhetorical devices in their speeches).

Areas for improvement

Candidates achieving the lower bands were unable to identify linguistic features, with some making generic comments regarding paragraph lengths and others failing to use textual support to support their claims. A feature of less successful responses was a failure to engage with AO3 (to analyse the construction of meaning and relevant contextual factors) but these cases were rare. A major error seen in this examination series appears to be a growing trend for candidates to engage in a fruitless dialogue about what they did not do. For example, one candidate began a page with: "I could have used more imperative sentences but I didn't. If I had used more imperative sentences then this might have engaged my audience more". Centres are reminded that such conjecture is unlikely to gain any credit, and candidates should focus on the piece that they have actually written, as the question requires.

Summary of key points for 2c:

- Linguistic terminology should underpin evaluation.
- Candidates should be encouraged to analyse the pragmatics of their choices.
- General comments such as "this draws my reader in" should be avoided.
- Precise, specific analysis should be encouraged.



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