**CPD 2017**

**Component 1: Commentary on exemplar response**

*This is not a model answer. It is an example of one approach to the summer 2017 Component 1 examination paper. Other approaches are valid.*

**Section A: Question 2**

**AO1**

The introduction focusses on the question straight away, bringing in all three texts. Expression is confident and fluent throughout with few flaws. The candidate organises material by drawing on the analytical framework to apply a wide variety of knowledge, with sections on viewpoint, form, grammar and syntax, literary techniques and phonology. The response uses an extensive range of terms accurately and purposefully, including demanding terms (possessive determiner, indefinite pronoun, prepositional phrase) and deals competently with literary as well as linguistic approaches. There are only a few minor errors. **Band 5+ 20/20**

**AO2**

Understanding of what the texts say about love appears clearly in the introduction. The candidate tries to discuss the impact of all the features identified with varying success but comments are at least sensible, often thoughtful and sometimes perceptive. It could be argued that the sheer number of points made may prevent the candidate from achieving greater depth and development on how meanings are created. The phonology section at the end, for example, is less successful and demonstrates some of the drawbacks of the framework organisation. Comments on phonology are often more successful when blended with the discussion of other techniques. On the other hand, the candidate must be rewarded for thoroughness and the amount of work attempted. Points on the unseen poem are well chosen and show secure understanding, with some range. **Band 4+ 16/20**

**AO3**

Contextual understanding of the chosen Anthology poems by Shakespeare and Barrett Browning features in the introduction. This is developed later through the idea of Barrett Browning as an early feminist, with brief comments on her life and faith as well as several references relating Sonnet 130 to conventional love sonnets. Points on contextual influences are accurate, relevant and integrated into the response. **Band 5 9/10**

**AO4**

Linking is organised through techniques, with many accurate points made. This is a difficult method and can result in alternating rather than linking the texts, as in this candidate’s paragraph on phonology. Elsewhere, the response manages to establish several similarities and differences, with some more developed comment in the middle of p.5. Some sustained comment on why the texts differ, in terms of situation, or change over time, would be needed for the top band. **Band 4 8/10**

**Question 2 53/60**

**Section B: Question 12 Part (i)**

**AO1**

The response is succinct and briskly paced with a single overview sentence as introduction. Wide-ranging knowledge is effectively displayed by combining terms (negated dialectal verb, parenthetic interrogative) and moving swiftly through the extract. Although the approach is mainly linguistic, the candidate also integrates the literary notions of juxtaposition and metaphor. Expression is accurate and fluent. **Band 5 9/10**

**AO2**

Analysis of meanings is sound with secure understanding and the SEA method is used throughout. Comments on the characters are very clear, avoiding repetition and picking up several of the most salient points. This candidate seems conversant with the AOs and does not digress into contextualisation. For band 5, further development, for example on gender and sexuality, would be required. **Band 4 8/10**

**Question 12 (i) 17/20**

**Section B Question 12 Part (ii)**

**AO1**

The strong performance on expression and terminology scarcely falters. Thorough knowledge is purposefully applied and a good range of linguistic terms is used. There is clear evidence of organisation and the question is firmly addressed throughout. **Band 5 10/10**

**AO2**

However, for a 40 minute essay, the written planning section is rather long and one effect is to reduce space where the Olinka section could have been developed. The candidate also includes too much from the part i) extract, which is not ‘*elsewhere* in the novel’ and cannot gain credit. Generally, however, selection of relevant material and analysis of language is secure and in places well developed, as in the first section on p.11. **Band 4 8/10**

**AO3**

This is the weakest element in the whole script. The long plan and repetition have contributed to a sketchy performance on context. The introduction does not connect the topic with key contextual factors. The reference to time and place which follows is undeveloped and context does not feature again until near the end of the response, with a broad overview including the reader and a sound conclusion on the writer and her purposes. **Band 2 6/20**

**Question 12 (ii) 24/40**