

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/11
Reading

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, and pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)** the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their directed response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)** candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2** candidates need to comment on the form, structure and language of the given text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, and organise information in their answers using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words, and while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

In **Question 1(a)**, candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of a given passage to fit a specific form, purpose and audience. In this session the original text was an autobiography. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a report (150–200 words) for a sports section of a newspaper. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

A good working knowledge of linguistics is indispensable in responding to **Question 1(b)**. Here, candidates are assessed for their ability to demonstrate comparative understanding of texts with clear reference to characteristic features, and comparative analysis of form, structure and language and how a writer's stylistic choices relate to audience to shape meaning. It is very important that candidates employ some form of comparative approach in their response to **Question 1(b)**. A topical approach guarantees continuous comparison in which a conclusion can be used to emphasise the essential similarities and differences between the two texts. Those who adopted a topical approach tended to be the candidates who demonstrated the most comprehensive linguistic elements.

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language. In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text. Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates adopted several approaches to this task. Many chose to write in the present tense to provide a sense of the thrilling immediacy in witnessing this event, either from the point of view of the journalist or as a spectator. Others chose to write in the past tense to provide a recollection of the excitement of this 'historic' moment. Responses where the use of an internal monologue was adopted did not generally fit the task. Most candidates wrote as though providing a live commentary box speech and not a written report. Where characteristic features specific to a newspaper report were not applied, this resulted in inconsistency in purpose and audience.

In the least successful responses, descriptive writing predominated, which goes beyond the purpose and genre of a newspaper report. These weaker responses often displayed insecure use of tense. Generally, candidates wrote in either first or third person or a combination. Those who utilised third person throughout were able to develop clear comparative points in **Question 1(b)**.

Most candidates recognised the need to provide a sequence of events in chronological order. The following content was often included: the onomatopoeic opener; the explosive start of Richard Thompson; the stumble of Usain Bolt, the building of Bolt's momentum and his early victory celebrations. Many candidates suitably made use of a title and/or subheadings. These were generally straightforward; in some, Bolt's surname was used to create effect, such as 'A Bolt to the Finish Line'.

There were various attempts at zoomorphism with regard to Bolt's speed via simile. Adaptations of 'leading the pack' included wolves and cheetahs and these were generally successful, although candidates should be mindful not to slip into the realm of cliché.

Some limited responses indicated a need for candidates to take particular care when reading and interpreting the text, for example areas of confusion regarding Asafa Powell and the timely completion of the race. Some reports included unnecessary extraneous material, for example a history of the Olympic Games as background context. These weaker responses often showed errors in use of grammar and tense – frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses quoted large amounts from the given text.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the passage and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often the most effective writing came at the end of responses, when candidates were free of having to checklist the text.

Most candidates abided by the guidelines concerning the length of their responses (150–200 words). Several candidates wrote considerably longer pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

Most candidates wrote effective introductory paragraphs, showing their understanding of both texts and their purpose and audience. They showed understanding of the difference in terms of the purpose of the autobiography and report and elaborated on this. In addition to this, a common feature mentioned was the use of voice and personal pronouns and the distinguished differences between the two texts in terms of how this was appropriate to their purposes.

Limited responses were often brief, focused more on the article than on their own directed writing, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of an autobiography; many referred to their own writing as a report even though it was not. Some pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs but needed to make reference to effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type. These weaker responses gave basic comparisons of onomatopoeia and there was some misunderstanding of dialogue and monologue.

It is advised that candidates focus on the difference in formality, tone and registers, and collaborate language with form and structure to have a more robust response in terms of their analysis.

The majority of candidates demonstrated adequate knowledge and understanding of a range of conventions in the autobiography, but less so in terms of a newspaper report. They often began their comparisons by succinctly outlining the purpose and audience of each text. More than one candidate felt that a moral lesson could be drawn on 'not giving up' after a bad start.

In detailed responses, candidates made use of their linguistic knowledge to structure their writing, for example by proceeding from a line-by-line approach to whole text-level in their analysis. They correctly identified pertinent elements of form, i.e. typical text conventions of an autobiography and report; the ways in which each text appealed to the respective intended audiences and how the different purposes affected content. They commented successfully on structure: the text beginning with a one-word (onomatopoeic) exclamation; the use of one sentence paragraphs/exclamations and sentence type/ function and the sequencing of long/short paragraphs. They explored how the structure of the given text affected the pace and linked this to the subject of the text, then comparing with their own writing. Sophisticated responses noted the tense shifts – simple perfect to simple present/present continuous and the effect on the reader. These stronger responses explored the use of internal dialogue and alternating paragraphs – shifts from the external to the internal; the use of repetition, e.g., *Chill, chill, chill*, ellipsis and dashes and how these affect the pace of the text. They offered an integrated comparison of these elements with their own writing.

In terms of language, stronger responses made reference to exclamatory sentences and colloquial words and phrases e.g. *dude, chill, man*, and compared these with the language in their own writing. There was comparison in terms of tone, the use of verbs and the imperative verbs in the given text within the internal dialogue *Do not panic*, and *Get through your drivephase*. There was mention of the use of rhetorical questions in the given text which was compared with candidate's use of rhetorical features in some of these stronger responses.

Question 2

The text was generally well understood and was answered with obvious engagement by most candidates. There was a wide range of responses, with a significant number showing sophisticated understanding and analysis. There were several answers which achieved a genuinely sophisticated level of understanding, particularly in tracing the shifts in focus between the description of the trees, Peter Wohlleben, Wohlleben's book and the scientific research being carried out on the subject, which takes the reader on a journey: both through the forest and through the changing understanding of scientists on the subject of trees. There were very few short answers.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', needing further elaboration. Similarly,

a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as ‘creating an interesting image’ or ‘stopping the reader from being bored’. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels; for example, ‘stream of consciousness’ and ‘personification’ were often used incorrectly. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

Responses to form were, generally, rather limited. However, many candidates noted the audience of the article and made clear reference to what they deemed to be characteristic features of such a text (facts, stats, numbers and evidence as attempts to provide credibility to the theory). More detailed commentaries noted the ‘hybrid’ nature of this text with its combination of impressionistic imagery and factual detail. Such candidates went on to consider purpose (to inform, persuade and entertain) and to comment on how this combination related to a much wider ‘audience or demographic’ than simply those interested in science.

Clear and detailed understanding about structure was exemplified through engagement with how the text develops in response to the title question. Here, candidates focused on the ‘hook’ (often referred to as a rhetorical question) to engage the audience of the *science section* of the magazine and commented on how the text attempted to answer that question: first, through the writer’s initial observations ‘on the ground’; second, through the validation of a tree expert (the sales of his book and the fact that he is quoted were cited as evidence); third, through the validation of the scientific community (*latest scientific studies* and *well-respected universities* were cited); fourth, through refutation of previous ideology (the reference to Darwin was cited). One candidate noted that ‘the evidence’, such as it was, amounted in fact to very little, though the idea was an interesting one and was meant to persuade. Limited responses focused on basic points about the arrangement and number of paragraphs of this text. Many candidates also focused on sentence types; generally, this amounted to feature spotting rather than effective, critical engagement. Some of these limited responses offered over-earnest reference to the presence of short, long and complex sentences, needing to present more in terms of clear analysis.

In terms of language, many candidates’ approach was to focus on the characteristics noted above regarding form and to address the imagery of the text. Personification was explored rather better than simile. Candidates commented on how the writer brought the trees to ‘life’ with human qualities (*Wise old mother; Reckless youngsters*) and they enjoyed this feature. More detailed responses commented on the religious, familial and monarchical overtones of the imagery (*cathedral-like groves; kinship networks* and *two old friends; Crown princes* and *skeletal winter crowns*) and how the writer attempted to evoke sympathy from the audience; indeed, even pathos with the use of *tremendous struggles* and *death-defying dramas*. Sophisticated responses also noted the writer’s use of symbolism in the contrasting theories: forests were once seen as *battlegrounds* but are now seen as *alliances*. A few candidates made effective comments on the writer’s description of Peter Wohlleben and how his ‘metamorphosis’ into the *very tall and straight trees he most admires* endorsed his credibility as *a kind of tree whisperer* and, thus, persuaded the audience. Many candidates commented on the *fairy tale* setting in the opening paragraph with its *strange unmoored feeling* and the fact that the forest was populated with ‘figures’ usually associated with fairy tales. Very few noted the immediacy of ‘the child-like’ wonder of the writer (*I’m walking*) in the opening section. One candidate commented that the *revolution that has been taking place* had impacted the writer to the extent that he had undergone a ‘spiritual awakening’ in the grove of trees.

Many limited to clear level candidates adopted a paragraph-by-paragraph approach, using the phrase ‘in the ... paragraph’ or adopted an approach to analysis which ranged haphazardly across the text. It would be helpful for candidates to be aware that the discriminator ‘analysis is coherent and effectively structured’ is a feature of the higher levels; a whole-text approach can often provide sophisticated and coherent analysis. Another consequence of the line-by-line approach was the repetition of the same point, such as the author’s use of alliteration. It is worth remembering that the same point cannot be rewarded twice.

Less successful basic responses offered very generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text, generally at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at far too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

Candidates would also be well advised to avoid dependence on too formulaic an approach to the analysis of Reading texts. The categorisation of elements of a text as representative of ‘ethos’, ‘logos’ or ‘pathos’, for example, needs to be precisely developed by reference to exact effects of language.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/12 Reading</p>
--

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, and pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)** the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their directed response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)** candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2** candidates need to comment on the form, structure and language of the given text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, and organise information in their answers using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words, and while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

In **Question 1(a)**, candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of a given passage to fit a specific form, purpose and audience. In this session the original text was an autobiography. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a report (150–200 words) for a sports section of a newspaper. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

A good working knowledge of linguistics is indispensable in responding to **Question 1(b)**, where candidates are required to compare the text produced for **1(a)** with the given text analysing form, structure and language. Here, candidates are assessed for their ability to demonstrate comparative understanding of texts with clear reference to characteristic features, and comparative analysis of form, structure and language and how a writer's stylistic choices relate to audience to shape meaning. It is very important that candidates employ some form of comparative approach in their response to **Question 1(b)**. A topical approach guarantees continuous comparison in which a conclusion can be used to emphasise the essential similarities and differences between the two texts. Those who adopted a topical approach tended to be the candidates who demonstrated the most comprehensive linguistic elements.

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language. In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text. Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates with a clear understanding of form and structure gave their blog post a clear title and/or subtitles: 'My experience at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on women' and 'Reflection on Hillary's speech – Feminism: Celebrated, United and Empowered' are two examples. Such responses gave clear details such as the time and place of the event attended and then developed thematic details from the text. They employed direct address to engage their audience and first person to personalise the ways in which Hillary R. Clinton's speech inspired them, for example, 'celebrating women was really what resonated with me the most'.

Some limited responses were entirely subjective, reading more like a diary than a blog; there was a tendency in such responses not to make reference to the speech's content, and they focused almost solely on their reaction. In contrast, other responses at this level read like a summary of the speech.

The least effective responses described the setting of the speech and Hillary R. Clinton's dress code. Some focused on the devices that Hillary R. Clinton used. Several responses lacked engagement with the characteristic features of the text. There was evidence in such responses of significant lifting from the original text.

Candidates would benefit from considering voice. Recognising what creates an authentic voice in different forms is helpful when deciding how to write a directed response.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the passage and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often the most effective writing came at the end of responses when candidates freed themselves from checklisting the text.

Most of the candidates abided by the guidelines concerning the length of their responses (150–200 words). Several candidates wrote considerably longer pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

Most candidates wrote effective introductory paragraphs, showing their understanding of both texts and their purpose and audience. They showed understanding of the difference in terms of the

purpose of the speech and blog and elaborated on this. In addition to this, a common feature mentioned was the use of voice and personal pronouns, and the similarities between the two texts in terms of how this was appropriate to their purposes.

Weaker responses were often brief, tended to focus more on the speech than on their own directed response, and to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of a speech; many referred to their own writing as a blog even though it was not. Some pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without reference to effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type. Weaker responses gave basic comparisons of rhetorical devices.

It is advised that candidates focus on the difference in formality, tone and register, and collaborate language with form and structure to have a more robust response in terms of their analysis.

The majority of candidates demonstrated a more adequate knowledge and understanding of a range of conventions of the speech than of a blog. They often began their comparisons by succinctly outlining the purpose and audience of each text.

Some clear comparisons were made with regard to purpose: the speech to persuade, the blog to inform and describe. Several candidates compared structure: the formality of the opening address of both and the call to action. Candidates compared the use of inclusive language (speech) and direct address (blog). They compared the nuances of first person in both (mostly to create unity in the speech with the plural form and to offer an opinion in the speech with the singular form). Some candidates lacked evidence and/or development of comparative points.

In the strongest responses, candidates made use of their linguistic knowledge to structure their writing, for example by proceeding from a line-by-line approach to whole text-level in their analysis. They correctly identified pertinent elements of form, i.e. the typical text conventions used in the given extract and compared these with their own written piece; they explored ways in which the different purposes affect the content and style of the two texts and the ways in which the speech and their own directed response appeal to their respective intended audiences

These responses also commented successfully on structure: the way in which long/short paragraphs or sections are used in the text; opening and closing the speech by thanking the conference; the use of discourse markers and anaphoric/cataphoric referencing and the way in which the text develops the idea of the conference being 'a call to action'. They then compared these elements with their own writing in an integrated way.

In terms of language, these stronger responses made reference to: use of a positive lexicon; the use of repetition for emphasis; the way in which pronouns are used in the text for inclusivity; use of parallel structures; the frequent use of listing in the text; use of the subjunctive mood; the way in which contrasts are used in the text; the use of rhetorical devices notably triplets and allusion; the way in which sentences are used in the text including; sentence variety/function and the use of parenthetical structures. They offered an integrated comparison, as appropriate to the directed response.

Question 2

The text was generally well understood and was answered with obvious engagement by most candidates. There was a wide range of responses, with a significant number showing sophisticated understanding and analysis. This was a very topical passage and candidates particularly focused on aspects of the passage relating to climate change and the impact and lack of sustainability of over-hunting and over-fishing. There was much discussion about the writer's attack on humankind for our role in destroying the planet.

Detailed responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, limited responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', needing further elaboration. Similarly, a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as 'creating an interesting image' or 'stopping the reader from being bored'. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels; for example, 'rhetorical devices' were only seen as 'rhetorical question' and 'personification' was often used incorrectly. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

In terms of form, candidates generally recognised this as an argumentative and persuasive text rather than an opinionated one. However, several candidates recognised the writer's bold opinion and as one candidate stated, the 'compelling hook' in the title with its focus on *erase*. Only one candidate recognised the writer's 'wry' take on the UN's recommendations towards the end of the passage: depending upon 'political will for solutions to climate change may mean that we are "in trouble"'. Characteristic features of the editorial included references to facts and statistics (United Nations report, expert witness, figures and reputable bodies). According to one candidate, 'the writer hammers home the point' about 'sixth extinction' and 'catastrophe' and 'bolsters' his opinion with the findings of the UN report and both qualitative and quantitative data and he 'uses evidence to shut down any naysayers'. As an opinion piece, for one candidate, the writer 'lays the blame squarely on mankind's doorstep' with his use of first-person plural (*us*) but the use of *we* also prevents the audience from 'taking offence' because, as one candidate commented, this amounted to 'shared blame'. Candidates recognised the topical nature of the text and that, in being delivered in present tense, its message was dramatic and hard for an audience to ignore.

Clear understanding of structure was exemplified by candidates who considered how the writer endorsed the claim of the title of the piece (*Human activities could erase...*) in the body of the text. Candidates focused on the title statement, then the data that provided credibility to the writer's initial claim and then the solutions that are suggested: *So what is to be done?*, which was referred to as a rhetorical question by some candidates. More detailed responses commented on the writer's shift in tone from gloom and doom in *dire assessment* to a more 'upbeat note' with the potential solutions offered and such candidates then commented on the final note of urgency.

In addition to the characteristic features mentioned regarding form, candidates tended to focus on the emotive language of the text. Most candidates focused on the negative language and the ways in which the writer evoked guilt and fear: *humans uniquely dangerous*; the understatement of *It isn't pretty*; *ominous picture*; *bears the scars*; *extinction rates*. For one candidate, the writer's use of *eroding*, *deteriorating* and *decline* 'all paint a grim picture of the state of the world and ... its future'. Detailed responses considered some of the tempered positive language: *less intrusive* and *lower-impact* are examples. Some consideration was given to repetition: *Overhunting and overfishing*. There was also some exploration of listing regarding the recommendations of the report.

Many limited to clear level candidates adopted a paragraph-by-paragraph approach, using the phrase 'in the ... paragraph' or adopted an approach to analysis which ranged haphazardly across the text. It would be helpful for candidates to be aware that the discriminator 'analysis is coherent and effectively structured' is a feature of the higher levels; a whole-text approach can often provide sophisticated and coherent analysis. Another consequence of the line-by-line approach was the repetition of the same point, such as the author's use of alliteration. It is worth remembering that the same point cannot be rewarded twice.

Less successful basic responses tended to offer very generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text and they generally did this at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting great length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

Candidates would also be well advised to avoid dependence on too formulaic an approach to the analysis of Reading texts. The categorisation of elements of a text as representative of 'ethos', 'logos' or 'pathos', for example, needs to be precisely developed by reference to exact effects of language.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/13
Reading

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, and pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)** the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their directed response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)** candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2** candidates need to comment on the form, structure and language of the given text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, and organise information in their answers using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words, and while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

In **Question 1(a)**, candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of a given passage to fit a specific form, purpose and audience. In this session the original text was an autobiography. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a report (150–200 words) for a sports section of a newspaper. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

A good working knowledge of linguistics is indispensable in responding to **Question 1(b)**, where candidates are required to compare the text produced for **1(a)** with the given text analysing form, structure and language. Here, candidates are assessed for their ability to demonstrate comparative understanding of texts with clear reference to characteristic features, and comparative analysis of form, structure and language and how a writer's stylistic choices relate to audience to shape meaning. It is very important that candidates employ some form of comparative approach in their response to **Question 1(b)**. A topical approach guarantees continuous comparison in which a conclusion can be used to emphasise the essential similarities and differences between the two texts. Those who adopted a topical approach tended to be the candidates who demonstrated the most comprehensive linguistic elements.

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language. In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text. Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most responses showed a good degree of understanding of the forms and conventions of writing an opening speech. Some responses offered somewhat hyperbolic opening speeches, where organic food was portrayed as positively harmful and something to be avoided at all costs, suggesting some misreading of the original passage. More secure responses presented ideas around the status attached to eating organic foods, and how this had contributed to misleading advertisements.

The most effective responses had a sense of audience and formality regarding the occasion: they employed a title, for example 'Organic food, good for the body or good for the head?' and used first person singular or plural: 'Today, class, I will be establishing a basic outline of the debate's arguments'. These stronger responses outlined some of the pros and cons of organic food, employing third person and direct address: 'free of harmful pesticides'; 'employs traditional farming methods' so it's 'less processed'; 'healthier' and 'natural'; organic crops are 'contaminated'; organic meat may also be raised in 'crowded' conditions; claims about 'healthy and natural' ingredients are 'meaningless'; 'it's your brain telling you "it has to be the better choice"'.

Limited responses did not offer the 'pros and cons' as required by the task. This oversight led to speeches being one sided rather than a balanced overview. Speech conventions (greeting and ending with thanks) were often missing. Typically, these responses did not use appropriate structures, characteristic features or conventions of a speech, resulting in responses which offered an essay or personal account.

Basic responses to this question generally paraphrased the blog post or lifted much of the given text. At this level, frequent errors impeded communication.

Candidates would benefit from considering voice. Recognising what creates an authentic voice in different forms is helpful when deciding how to write a directed writing response.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the passage and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was perhaps to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often the most effective writing came at the end of responses when candidates freed themselves from checklisting the text.

Most of the candidates abided by the guidelines concerning the length of their responses (150–200 words). Several candidates wrote considerably longer pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

Most candidates wrote effective introductory paragraphs, showing their understanding of both texts and their purpose and audience. They showed understanding of the difference in terms of the purpose of the blog and speech and elaborated on this. In addition to this, a common feature mentioned was the use of voice and personal pronouns and the similarities in this respect between the two texts in terms of how this was appropriate to their purposes.

The majority of candidates demonstrated more adequate knowledge and understanding of a range of conventions of a speech than of the given blog text. They often began their comparisons by succinctly outlining the purpose and audience of each text.

Weaker responses were often brief, focused more on the blog than on their own Directed Writing, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively. Some pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs but needed to reference effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type. It is advised that candidates focus on the difference in formality, tone and registers, and collaborate language with form and structure to have a more robust response in terms of their analysis.

Clear comparisons included: some consideration of audience and then purpose ('the blog post is biased and, therefore, persuades'; 'the speech is more balanced and, therefore, informs'); mode of address (the blog is written in third person and is, therefore, 'indirect' – the speech employs second person and is, therefore, more 'direct'); some consideration of register; some consideration of tense; some consideration of language features, such as mood, colloquialism and imagery.

Some comparisons were content based. Attempts were made to justify this on the basis that the speech required evidence from the original text such as facts and statistics.

In the strongest responses, candidates made use of their linguistic knowledge to structure their writing, for example by proceeding from a line-by-line approach to whole text-level in their analysis. They correctly identified pertinent elements of form i.e. the typical text conventions used in the given extract and compared these with their own written piece; they explored ways in which the different purposes affect the content and style of the two texts and the ways in which the blog and their own directed writing appealed to their respective intended audiences.

These more detailed responses also commented successfully on structure: relatively consistent paragraph length and the effect of this on the reader; the way the text develops the idea that food labelling can be misleading / food consumption happens on a psychological level, as well as being a physical need; the way the text builds its argument with reference to research that has been carried out into organic food production; discourse markers and other cohesive devices, including tense agreement, anaphoric reference and substitution; the way in which the final sentence of the text encapsulates the writer's overall opinion on the subject. They then compared these elements with their own writing in an integrated way.

In terms of language, stronger responses made reference to: the use of the second person to directly address and engage the reader; lexis associated with food/eating, e.g. 'gustatory', 'satiated' and lexical fields associated with psychology and food production/consumption; the use of the idiomatic phrase, *Food for thought* in the opening sentence which cleverly ties together the subjects of food and psychology; the use of onomatopoeia (*chickens clucking in a yard*); the paradoxical phrase *organic, industrial complex* and its effect on the reader and the use of inverted commas to create a cynical/questioning tone, e.g. '*natural*', '*cage-free*', '*outdoor access*'. The very best mentioned the inclusion of the Latin phrase, *Caveat emptor* (let the buyer beware) and its effect on the reader. These were compared, as appropriate with the directed writing.

Question 2

The text was generally well understood and was answered with obvious engagement by most candidates. There was a wide range of responses with a significant number showing sophisticated understanding and analysis.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having ‘positive connotations’ or ‘negative connotations’, needing further elaboration. Similarly, a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as ‘creating an interesting image’ or ‘stopping the reader from being bored’. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels; for example, ‘personification’ was often used incorrectly. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

In terms of form, candidates generally recognised the reflective and narrative nature of this autobiographical text (suggested by *I remember ...*) and referred to the piece as ‘a vivid memory’ or ‘a thrilling day in the life of Sir Trevor McDonald’. Only the more successful candidates had noted from the text that this was a record of ‘one of the highest “thrills” of [McDonald’s] life as “a black man”’ and that his purpose was, therefore, both to inform and to entertain. Characteristic features of the form also included recognition of first person; there was often a need for candidates to show more development on this point. One candidate noted some of the ‘intimate’ details of the text: *I had dragged myself out of bed; I had telephoned friends*. Many responses would have benefitted from engagement with contextual details such as names, places and times.

Clear understanding of structure developed the narrative element of the text and referred to the ‘step-by-step’ features of McDonald’s day. Such candidates referred to the gloomy start to the day in the *semi-dark* and commented on McDonald’s narrative about the scene unfolding before him. Detailed responses noted the shift to a more cheerful mood: *Spirits were high*. These attempted to comment on the changes in focus of the text and how this related to audience. Analysis of structural features was generally in need of effective development and/or evidence.

Limited responses tended to offer opinions rather than critical engagement with the language of the text. Clear responses tended to focus on the celebratory mood as stated by McDonald and tried to provide some evidence that expressed what they saw as McDonald’s ‘joyful tone’ (*Spirits were high* and *I could almost taste the excitement* were most often cited). These candidates noted the sense of daily routine (*I had dragged myself out of bed ... [t]here was nothing unusual about that*) and the contrast with this day being ‘out-of-the-ordinary’ (*I was amazed at the sight of streams of people*). The more detailed responses explored the contrast between the cold weather and *the warmth of expectation* and commented on how this provided an entertaining aspect to the text together with figurative language such as the allusion to Lowry. The best commented on McDonald’s use of hyperbole in *transported to a distant planet*.

Many limited to clear level candidates adopted a paragraph by paragraph approach, using the phrase ‘in the ... paragraph’, or an approach to analysis which ranged haphazardly across the text. It would be helpful for candidates to be aware that the discriminator ‘analysis is coherent and effectively structured’ is a feature of the higher levels; a whole-text approach can often provide sophisticated and coherent analysis. Another consequence of the line-by-line approach was the repetition of the same point, such as the author’s use of alliteration. It is worth remembering that the same point can not be rewarded twice.

Less successful basic responses offered very generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text, generally at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at great length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

Candidates would also be well advised to avoid dependence on too formulaic an approach to the analysis of Reading texts. The categorisation of elements of a text as representative of ‘ethos’, ‘logos’ or ‘pathos’, for example, needs to be precisely developed by reference to exact effects of language.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/21
Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Candidates need to allocate a set amount of time to: identify factors for writing; plan to write; write; check; correct.
- Candidates should look at the key instructions in the questions they answer. For example, in **Question 1(a)** the key instruction is to write the text for a *news story*, focusing on *the atmosphere of the event* and *the impact* on students.
- Candidates should consider the following as part of the planning stage: the purpose of the piece, the prescribed form and audience as well as the most appropriate voice or persona to adopt, the mood and tone that they should try to create in their writing and the most suitable structure to employ.
- To perform well in this exam, candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops. Another common error was writing in sentence fragments.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

A number of candidates self-penalised on the grounds of rubric infringement: some **Section B** responses were appreciably short of the minimum word limit and some candidates did not answer **Question 1(b)**.

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger candidates focused clearly on the question, writing engaging news stories aimed at other students in the school. Weaker candidates wrote simple accounts of the talk, many needing to pay more consideration to the specified form and audience.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who maintained a close focus on their linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker candidates focused on the content of the **1(a)** piece of writing and analysis was therefore minimal, usually addressed indirectly by outlining the structure of the piece.

Stronger responses in **Section B** generally had a strong sense of the appropriate form for the task (description, essay or review), a clear focus on the question and included appropriate stylistic conventions as well as relevant content.

Weaker responses in **Section B** generally lost focus on what the task required. For example, some responses to **Question 2** were narrative in form. Some **Question 3** responses lost focus on the formality required of an essay and became repetitive, with the same point(s) made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons. Some **Question 4** reviews were simple recounts of the trip to the stadium and the specific music that was played, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion about the concert.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

A famous person came to your school recently to give a talk about their career and life. Your teacher has asked you to write a news story describing the event, which will be published in your school magazine.

- (a) Write the text for the news story, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the atmosphere of the event and the impact that the talk has had on the students.**

Many responses focused more on the career of the famous person and their rise to celebrity status than on the actual event. This often resulted in form becoming biography, missing the focus on atmosphere. Many candidates included quotations from the students in the audience which covered their impression of the famous person and what the visit had meant to them. In many cases, this was reasonably well done.

Stronger candidates wrote a clear introductory paragraph and used subheadings or structured their piece into short paragraphs typical of news reports. They were able to combine description of the event with comments on the atmosphere and impact that the talk had on students. Stronger responses were about a famous person whose life and career enabled the writer to give specific advice relevant to all students and not just those who had similar interests to the speaker. They gave a brief biography of the famous person, which they were able to weave into the news story without making it the focus of the entire piece. Choices of speaker ranged from musicians and sportspeople to politicians, whose credible details were incorporated into the response, along with a range of literary devices which then served as useful evidence in **Question 1(b)**.

One strong example had a speaker who was a renowned conservationist and who gave advice on some of the less well-known changes everyone can make in their daily lives to help to slow down climate change. Another was a former White House aide and medical expert who had been driven to resign because of conspiracy theories.

Weaker candidates often talked about 'a famous person' without naming them; they often would have been improved with the inclusion of an introduction to the event and by writing consistently in the past tense. Most attention was paid to the famous person's life story, often a rags to riches story or one about coming from challenging home circumstances. These candidates tended to make generic comments to address impact; for example, 'all the students began to cry.'

In weaker responses, more attention needed to be paid to structuring the news story, with many written entirely without paragraphs. Many weaker pieces were short, often under 200 words. This resulted in a lack of development in all aspects – atmosphere, detail and the impact the event had on the student audience.

Grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences, were common features of weaker responses. Ideas were mostly relevant but at times needed development. For example, in this response about the visit of a school police officer, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'Billy stated "I wear a green and black suit" to show how he is different from the students at school he talked about how he carries objects in case he needs to use one, one day here at the campus he's on.'

(b) Write a reflective commentary on your text, explaining how your linguistic choices contribute to fulfilling the task set by your headteacher.

One approach that worked well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. Many responses were limited in detail; candidates should remember to provide evidence from their **Question 1(a)** response in their commentaries.

Stronger candidates showed an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the news story. They wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features. Such features included parallel structures, figurative language, humour, hyperbole, direct quotations, puns, and discourse markers. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader. For example: 'In terms of structure I used discourse markers (such as 'Firstly ...') and chronological order to organise the text into sections which would make it easy for readers to understand and grasp the order of events. These features are conventional in news stories as they help provide an organised, time-based account of a specific event or occurrence.'

In weaker responses, candidates sometimes identified some basic language and structural features and struggled more with analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis using general phrases such as, 'This makes it easy for the students to understand'. There was a need in weaker responses for candidates to go beyond basic general commentary on the content of their piece and to make relevant language and structural points. Some wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs 'to make the text easier to read' or having used commas 'to make the sense clearer'. They often relied on simple identification of features without referencing specific words or phrases, and needed to analyse their effect and the ways in which they relate to audience and shape meaning. At times, language features were incorrectly identified.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Descriptive piece

Write a descriptive piece called *The Heat Is On*, about a park on a hot day in summer. In your writing, focus on colour, sound and movement to help your reader to imagine the scene. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Many candidates successfully used the technique of a framed narrative, such as walking through the park to meet a friend. In several responses, narrative details became the most significant feature of the response, so that the ideas related to the descriptive purpose of the task were developed in a limited manner.

Stronger responses maintained a descriptive stance throughout the piece created an image of the park as a vibrant place full of people and animals. Colour, sound and movement were described with subtlety and precision. Some candidates described the park at different times, for example in the morning, in the afternoon and before sunset, observing the changes that had taken place. Stronger pieces invariably established the descriptive form in the very first paragraph or sentence, for example: 'The sun was sizzling and scorching the grass as I entered the park.'

A variety of linguistic techniques were used in stronger pieces, for example metaphorical language: 'The once vibrant green leaves were now lifeless skeletons.' Personification was at times used well, for example: 'Mother Earth slurped up all the water from the lake.' Some candidates created descriptive effects by zooming in on details to create a vivid snapshot: 'The rays of sunlight dance on the leaves of the trees, slowly switching into different shades of green like a kaleidoscope: forest green, pale green, olive green.'

Other stronger responses used imagery to develop thematic ideas: 'The cracked concrete slabs that made up the sidewalk had hints of brown bursting through as the roots of several neighboring trees tried their best to show their supremacy to man.' Some used elaborate descriptions that made the reader see mundane objects through an engaging new perspective while also integrating sound, movement and colour: 'The house-like structure also included a dummy steering wheel that did nothing but spin and squeak when the red plastic of the wheel rubbed against the loose steel washer holding it in place.'

Weaker responses were sometimes planned poorly, resulting in most of the piece detailing what preceded getting to the park, with little descriptive detail, for example: 'I combed my long dark hair as I thought about

the day ahead; my mother cooked me a breakfast consisting of pancakes and fruit.’ Some described various games being played in the park, but focused mainly on dialogue between the participants. Others began with some descriptive detail but became narrative, such as stories of a failed barbecue or a lost dog.

There was a tendency in weaker responses to slip into cliché when trying to convey the heat of the day. The reaction to heat was often described in physical terms, such as, ‘More sweat is trickling down my back. As I feel the sun blazing on us.’ Some of the weakest responses were in need of sentence control, revealed in sentence fragments such as, ‘The crunching of the grass and dirt as I walk. The different birds chirping or communicating among each other. The distant barking of all dogs.’

Question 3 – Essay

In class, you have been discussing whether doing sport at school is a waste of time. Your teacher has asked you to write an essay on the topic. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates argued that doing sport at school is beneficial to students because it can help them build their resilience, develop their relationships, gain scholarships, keep them healthy physically and mentally, and help towards their future careers. Other candidates pointed out that doing sport at school may interfere with students’ education as it takes a lot of their time; in addition, it can cause injuries and stress. Overall, most candidates agreed that doing sport at school has more advantages than disadvantages.

Stronger responses were written from an authoritative stance and maintained the appropriate form. They presented a balanced argument and came up with their own opinion at the end. The best pieces were organised into paragraphs, each one dealing with a different point. Some candidates used rhetorical questions, statistics or examples of different disciplines of sports. The strongest responses were formal in tone, presenting arguments in a well-structured and convincing manner. They took a clear line of argument and took readers through the argument point by point to construct a convincing overall case.

Stronger essays often began with an opening statement to engage the reader, setting out a point of view, as in this response: ‘Sport throughout the year has presented a clear path for a healthy life and healthy living; thus, it would be hugely beneficial in schools.’ They used discourse markers to structure the response and to demonstrate clear development. Some candidates opted to use the sequential ‘Firstly, secondly and finally approach’ which gives clarity and an overall impression of ideas developed clearly in terms of structure. More effective and sophisticated responses incorporated phrases such as ‘Another/further argument’, ‘A different viewpoint’ or ‘On the contrary.’

Stronger essays included counter-arguments or had some sort of evaluation of each argument, for example that sports are an extramural activity that universities like to see on a student’s application, but observed that there are other activities that can serve that purpose just as well.

Weaker essays were written in a conversational style rather than with formality and sophistication. This resulted in the loss of the authority that the essay required. They often presented a one-sided argument, usually in favour of sports in school. The argument often became repetitive with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons. They also showed weakness in sentence structure, for example, ‘It can teach a student sportsmanship. Which is all about being ethical and respectful of the rules and others whether the team wins or loses.’ Many weaker essays were not structured clearly, often without any use of paragraphs. In some cases, the candidates did not demonstrate sufficient vocabulary to express some of the more complex ideas, for example, ‘Sports can end your life before it even starts’.

Some candidates took their point of view as the only point without expanding on their argument, for example, ‘Sports can make you rich and famous and pay for your college education so they are a positive thing.’ Other candidates talked mostly about personal experience with sports and needed to extrapolate a more general understanding of the issue. Responses were sometimes short or unfinished while in many other cases ideas needed more adequate development.

Question 4 – Review

You recently went to a concert in your town. Write a review of the concert, which will be posted on a website called *World of Music*. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Reviews covered concerts ranging from classical concerts to rock music and Korean pop. Most were enthusiastic reviews and positive recommendations were given to the reader. Most candidates discussed the venue for the event, the fans and people at the show in general, items for sale, including merchandise, the

performer's outfit(s) and interactions with the crowd. They then gave a recommendation as to whether the event was worth seeing and sometimes qualified it by saying who might or might not enjoy the concert.

Some candidates showed that they were highly adept at this particular genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated response. They maintained an authoritative persona throughout of a bored/enthusiastic/sophisticated/disappointed audience member, which lent the review authenticity. Some candidates described the whole experience rather than just the music and did so in a balanced, thoughtful way, so ensuring the weight of description focused on the bands and the music. A few made creditable attempts to describe the powerful, oceanic emotions they felt, singing and dancing and getting close to their icons. As one writer put it: 'We jumped! We swayed! We laughed! We cried! Emotions were so openly expressed and encouraged. This was a safe space for anyone who needed it.'

Some of the reviews criticised the music's quality. For instance, one candidate wrote, 'If you're looking to turn off your brain and enjoy a show, but not music, then West's concert is for you. Incredible performance, subpar music.' Another candidate criticised the food they bought, saying that 'it was lacklustre. Featuring a few famous restaurants, it tasted like low grade dog food. Seriously, forty dollars for a taco that wasn't even good was an instant regret trip to the bathroom.' Stronger pieces kept the form of review throughout the piece and offered well-informed opinions based on the evidence they presented. Some candidates made their descriptions of artists quite vivid: 'He certainly fit the description of a rapper, flaunting his dreadlocks and covered in jewelry from head to toe.' Stronger responses had evidence of convincing comments on the music as reflected in this example: 'As the audience started to cry at the sight of Michael leaving the stage, the drummer gave a cymbal crash.'

Weaker responses tended to be written in the form of an extended account of attending a concert, retelling what happened to them from the moment they arrived at the venue. Some went even further back, describing how they bought the tickets and providing details of the journey to the venue and finding a parking space; sometimes these responses were more akin to a personal diary entry than a review. Some weaker reviews contained little or no detail about the music. These reviews often focused on the parking, food outlets or the condition of the toilets, losing appropriacy to writing for a music website; comments on the music were treated as an aside at the end of the response. In weaker responses, the name or names of the performer or performers were not given, instead using the phrase 'the band' or 'the singer', which became repetitive. Some gave lengthy historical backgrounds of the band and its members; such responses were in need of the evaluation necessary for a review.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/22
Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Candidates need to allocate a set amount of time to: identify factors for writing; plan to write; write; check; correct.
- Candidates should look at the key instructions in the questions they answer. For example, in **Question 3** the key instruction is to 'write an article' and to focus on the 'challenges created by the speed of life' and to discuss 'how people cope with these challenges'.
- Candidates should consider the following as part of the planning stage: the purpose of the piece, the prescribed form and audience as well as the most appropriate voice or persona to adopt, the mood and tone that they should try to create in their writing and the most suitable structure to employ.
- To perform well in this exam, candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops. Another common error was writing in sentence fragments.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

A number of candidates self-penalised on the grounds of rubric infringement: some **Section B** responses were appreciably short of the minimum word limit and some candidates did not answer **Question 1(b)**.

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger candidates focused clearly on the question, writing engaging news stories aimed at other students in the school. Weaker candidates wrote simple accounts of the talk, many needing to pay more consideration to the specified form and audience.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who maintained a close focus on their linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker responses focused entirely on the content of the **1(a)** piece of writing and analysis was therefore minimal, usually addressed indirectly by outlining the structure of the piece.

Stronger responses in **Section B** generally had a strong sense of the appropriate form for the task (review, article or story), a clear focus on the question and included appropriate stylistic conventions as well as relevant content.

Weaker responses in **Section B** generally lost focus on what the task required. For example, some **Question 2** news programme reviews were simple recounts of the programme, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion about the concert. Some responses to **Question 3** only focused on one part of the question and were limited in development, while some **Question 4** responses were in need of a sense of drama.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You have seen an announcement in a local newspaper asking people to send in letters describing their favourite building in the town. The letters will be published in a special edition of the newspaper next month.

- (a) Write the text for the letter, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, describe the building and explain why you like it.**

A wide variety of buildings was discussed. Whilst many responses adhered to the specified form for the task, some responses read more like an article as they had been written without some of the conventions of a letter such as opening and concluding salutations.

Stronger responses were structured in a recognisable letter format. They gave detailed and clear descriptions of the building in question, together with some thoughtful reasons and explanations for having chosen it. They were appropriately organised, often focusing on the building's exterior, its entrance area and other internal spaces in sequence. They named the building and often described its surroundings before focusing on visual aspects of the building, such as colours, materials and architectural details.

Stronger candidates took care to examine their emotional response to the building by highlighting why the building they chose is special to them, rather than simply why it is liked, often linked to a childhood memory or a significant life event that occurred at the building. Sometimes significant emotional ties were conveyed by effective use of simile: 'The layout of the building is like walking through a real-life story book, each chapter a different section of the museum.'

More confident candidates employed descriptive lexis with purposeful concision, as in these two examples: 'This palace was not all sharp angles and glass. Interior parts of the building are soft and curved'; 'The owners had adorned the structure with dazzling fairy lights and blinking neon signs. The space was warm and buzzing with chatter. A receptionist stood behind a varnished mahogany counter and directed excited guests to their rooms.' A concluding paragraph prior to signing off the letter often provided a concise summary of the main ideas and a recommendation that the reader visit the building.

Weaker responses tended to slip into narrative and related first-hand experiences rather than describing the building to the intended audience, therefore losing focus on the task. They made generalised comments about an unidentified building or vaguely described a famous building. Some focused less on the building and its meaning and more on the activities and amenities associated with it, often reverting to listing as a straightforward technique; for example, 'checking the new action figures or a new style of clothing.'

Weaker responses showed a need for greater attention to structuring the response, very often having been written without paragraph breaks, for example. Other responses read more like advertisements for the building, with quite a few candidates describing the luxury and splendour of the interior of the building, almost as if it were a five-star hotel. Many weaker letters were short, often less than 200 words. Such responses lacked development in both required aspects: detail in description and the explanation of why the writer liked the building.

Grammatical errors were a common feature of weaker responses, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. For instance, in this response, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'The Burj Khalifa, also known as the tallest building in the world. Which is located in the United Arab Emirates, In the city of Dubai which is very popular and full of tourists.'

(b) Write a reflective commentary on your text, explaining how your linguistic choices contribute to fulfilling the task set.

One approach that worked well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. Many responses were limited in detail; candidates should remember to provide evidence from their **Question 1(a)** response in their commentaries.

Stronger candidates showed an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the letter. They wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features. Such features included figurative language, humour, hyperbole and discourse markers. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader. For example: 'The importance of the lighthouse to the local people is further emphasised when I mention that it is made up of the "blood, sweat and tears" of the people. This powerful phrase creates a sense of belonging and instils pride in the reader.'

In weaker responses, candidates sometimes identified some basic language and structural features and struggled more with analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis using general phrases such as, 'This makes it easy for the students to follow'. There was a need in weaker responses for candidates to go beyond basic general commentary on the content of their piece and to make relevant language and structural points. Some wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs 'to make the text easier to read' or having used commas 'to make the sense clearer'. They often relied on simple identification of features without referencing specific words or phrases, and needed to analyse their effect and the ways in which they relate to audience and shape meaning. At times, language features were incorrectly identified.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Review

You recently watched a new television news programme. Write a review of the news programme, which will be published in your school magazine. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates tackled the review with appropriate attention to the readership of peers, with some light-hearted comments. However, there was evidence that some candidates had not read the question carefully enough as they did not engage with the fact that the television programme was meant to be 'new'.

Stronger candidates were highly adept at this particular genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated response. They were able to confidently use techniques such as cynicism, irony or humour to criticise the programme or to use appropriately formal language and register to comment and review effectively. They usually adopted a chronological structure to focus on the different aspects of the news programme to clearly relate to their readers its constituent parts together with associated evaluative commentary. They made reference to: the scheduling of the programme to suit a target audience; the title sequence and the effectiveness of the associated theme tune; the professionalism and effectiveness of the news anchor; the dramatic qualities of 'on the scene' reportage; the informative nature of weather and sports segments and occasionally a local interest story. They often compared the new news programme with an established one on a competitor's channel, such as CNN, to achieve a balanced assessment, as in this example: 'I suspect many of you are as exasperated as I am with the obnoxious opening music announcing the start of most news programmes; this one provides much needed relief with a jaunty though not irritating tune.'

Weaker candidates tended to describe or retell an episode of the news programme and were therefore only able to achieve the task in part, as the content was only partially. The instructions were often misinterpreted as candidates responded to a new programme other than news. This led to a variety of inappropriate content, such as focus on various hobbies and pastimes such as arts and crafts or video-gaming.

Question 3 – Article

In class, you have been discussing the fast pace of modern life. Your teacher has asked you to write an article called *Slow Down!* In your writing, focus on the challenges created by the speed of life these days, and discuss how people cope with these challenges. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Candidates generally engaged well with this question and most responses were sustained, with a good number of suggestions as to how we could all slow down and reorganise our lives for the better.

Stronger responses detailed a range of coping strategies such as taking up hobbies, ensuring sleep and eating patterns were improved, or making sure there were adequate opportunities to visit outdoor spaces. Many started with a bold question or a scenario to draw the reader in, for example: 'It's crazy to comprehend that the sound of an electric buzzer coming from a device made up of wires and metal is what controls the start of your day'. Another effective response opened like this: 'Human civilisation is in the fast lane but the unfortunate fact is that no one knows where we are going. We simply do not have enough opportunities to contemplate why we are in such a rush to get to a destination we cannot perceive'.

A variety of sentence structures were used in stronger pieces, including short sentences to make main points clearly and complex sentences for developed explanations. Arguments centred on the proposition that the increased pace of life is associated with higher levels of workload, stress and psychological and physical maladies. Articles tended to end with a direct and meaningful message for the reader.

More targeted responses explored the symptoms of a fast-paced life such as the loss of family time which was then linked effectively to the burdens of advanced technology; for, example mobile phones at the dining table or misuse of time such as 'spending most of our time online.' Stronger responses included effective solutions, for example to 'disconnect' or 'play a board game' and concluded effectively by expounding on the crux of the issue, as in this example: 'The hard-hitting truth is that we have been conditioned to work hard every day only to work even harder in the future. The notion of relaxing and taking time for ourselves has become such a taboo that people are extremely hesitant to openly admit it is essential to wellbeing'.

Weaker responses tended to focus on one aspect of the fast pace of modern life, usually technology such as smartphones and the associated demands of constant engagement with social media. They tended to overlook the second element of the question and did not give sufficient weight to the ways people cope with the challenges of living in a fast-paced society. Such responses often gave some consideration to familiar issues like technology, peer pressure and industrialisation (including pollution and global warming), but needed to make identification and examination of the challenges they represent.

Weaker responses were sometimes accusatory in tone, bemoaning quantities of homework and exam preparation stress. Alternatively, they attempted to contrast the conditions of modern life with those of the past, usually in a simplistic way, such as in this example: 'People before us also lived their life without the internet they did not had the instagram and scapchat and frankly speaking they never looked for fake appraiseal the wishes the fake social circle we intend to have and then find peace in it'.

Question 4 – Story

Write a story called *How Did That Happen?* about a holiday which did not go according to plan. In your writing, create a sense of anticipation and drama. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Anticipation and drama were generally well-crafted into the stories, as very often was humour. The strongest responses established and sustained a clear focus on anticipation and drama, whilst the weakest responses tended to offer a list-like series of unfortunate events and needed to give more in terms of engagement and narrative structure.

Stronger candidates created anticipation from the first paragraph, for example in this engaging opening: "Come on girls! Hurry up, we don't have all day," shouted Sara's mom when she discovered copious amounts of clothing were still being packed, at a snail's pace.' This sense of anticipation or drama was developed in a clear or sophisticated manner all the way through the narrative. Another successful opening was: 'Alarms blazing, police sirens outside, a group of girls crying, the place was on fire and I was holding a flamingo. How did that happen?'

Many stronger candidates deliberately, and successfully, delayed any complications corresponding to a drama until the middle of the story. One such dramatic moment occurred during a charter flight's attempted landing in a storm: 'The pilot announced, "There is almost zero visibility and the wind speed is dangerously

high. I urge you all to remain seated. In case of an emergency oxygen masks will drop down in front of you.” Passengers immediately began to clamber for the emergency exits.’

The sense of anticipation and drama was a struggle in weaker responses, often involving descriptions of a family trip. Often, the anticipation came in relation to commencing the holiday and the drama comprised local difficulties encountered as the holiday progressed. Narratives often needed more focus on organisation, as they drifted from one event to the next. There was a tendency to incorporate unrealistic occurrences and expression was often hampered by frequent errors, such as in this example: ‘Our trip was planned for two days, so we decided to buy a lot of fruits because by eating fruits we will get a lot of vitamins which will give us power to explore mountains’.

Some candidates employed plots that were very elaborate, with many characters involved, leading to a loss of narrative control. Often, candidates used a ‘telling’ and not a ‘showing’ technique, which did not allow for a sense of drama to be created.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/23
Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Candidates need to allocate a set amount of time to: identify factors for writing; plan to write; write; check; correct.
- Candidates should look at the key instructions in the questions they answer. For example, in **Question 1(a)** the key instruction is to write a *diary entry*, focusing on *the atmosphere and the sense of excitement* of the concert.
- Candidates should consider the following as part of the planning stage: the purpose of the piece, the prescribed form and audience as well as the most appropriate voice or persona to adopt, the mood and tone that they should try to create in their writing and the most suitable structure to employ.
- To perform well in this exam, candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops. Another common error was writing in sentence fragments.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

A number of candidates self-penalised on the grounds of rubric infringement: some **Section B** responses were appreciably short of the minimum word limit and some candidates did not answer **Question 1(b)**.

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger candidates focused clearly on the question, writing engaging news stories aimed at other students in the school. Weaker candidates wrote simple accounts of the talk, many needing to pay more consideration to the specified form and audience.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who maintained a close focus on their linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker candidates focused on the content of the **1(a)** piece of writing and analysis was therefore minimal, usually addressed indirectly by outlining the structure of the piece.

Stronger responses on **Section B** generally had a strong sense of the appropriate form for the task; (story, speech or review), a clear focus on the question and included appropriate stylistic conventions as well as relevant content.

Weaker responses on **Section B** generally lost focus on what the task required. For example, some stories in **Question 2** were in need of a sense of drama or tension. Some responses to **Question 3** were limited in audience engagement or development of ideas, while some **Question 4** responses were simple recounts of a visit to the museum, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You recently went to see a famous band playing live in a large stadium. You decide to write a diary entry about the experience.

- (a) **Write the text for the diary entry, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the atmosphere and the sense of excitement.**

Many responses were in need of the basic conventions of diary writing. More successful candidates understood the required features and wrote convincing, entertaining responses. A minority of responses were too long, which impacted on the candidates' ability to write a **Section B** response of the required length. Conversely, some responses were very short and did not fully utilise the 400 words at their disposal.

More confident candidates moved smoothly through their diary entries, focusing on the atmosphere of the event and sense of excitement, both in the language used and in the sequencing of events in their narratives. They created a believable setting and experience that was well supported by specific details such as staging, costumes, sounds and selected moments from the concert. They created a sense of personal involvement, utilising the added freedom and possible intimacy of a diary entry. 'I screamed along with the rest,' one wrote, 'waving my arms around in a craze, it was an adrenaline rush'. For some it was the happiest day in their life: 'I was singing my heart out and felt like I was flying and could achieve anything.' This fan went on to describe how she climbed onstage and sang with the stars.

It was clear that quite a number of candidates had been to a concert and were able to recall and depict the experience in credible detail. One diarist got all but trampled underfoot. The sheer physicality of the occasion came over well in some accounts, the hot sun, the deafening sounds of the music and the audience chanting, the jostling bodies with their unsavoury odours. One example of effective writing included this description of the journey home after the concert: 'My whole body hurt and all I wanted to do was sleep, but I still had "17 Spoons" stuck in my head. I was humming the song the whole way home. The taxi driver probably thought I was some sort of lunatic for singing, "You won't hurt me but I'll hurt you with 17 spoons" under my breath. Good night diary!'

Weaker responses tended to take the form of an extended account of attending a concert, simply retelling what happened from the moment of arrival at the venue. Such responses would have been improved with some personal comment on thoughts and feelings, some detail about the music. Some writers went further back, describing how they bought the tickets and providing details of the journey to the venue and finding a parking space. A key technical problem in weaker responses was in maintaining tense forms. In responses in which the name of the performer or was not given, the resulting use of the phrase 'the band' or 'the singer' became repetitive. Some weaker responses included lengthy historical backgrounds of the band and its members, resulting in a piece more akin to an article than to a diary entry. Paragraphing was often absent from the response.

Grammatical errors were a common feature of weaker responses, for example the use of commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but at times needed some development. For example, in this response, while content was generally relevant, the range of language was limited and errors were frequent: 'I was excited plus the feeling of fear. When I got

inside the stadium there was a bunch of people sitting in their assigned set and everyone getting to know each other or communicate.'

(b) Write a reflective commentary on your text, explaining how your linguistic choices contribute to fulfilling the task set.

One approach that worked well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. Many responses were limited in detail; candidates should remember to provide evidence from their **Question 1(a)** response in their commentaries.

Stronger candidates showed an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the diary entry. They wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features. Such features included hyperbole, figurative language and humour. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader. For example: 'I used an informal register to create a more intimate and carefree feeling that comes with a diary entry. I used slang words like "cheesy" to indicate the youth of the narrator. Additionally, by using vocabulary such as "fandom" I am further cementing the idea of a young narrator.'

In weaker responses, candidates sometimes identified some basic language and structural features and struggled more with analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis using general phrases such as, 'This makes it easy for the students to understand'. There was a need in weaker responses for candidates to go beyond basic general commentary on the content of their piece and to make relevant language and structural points. Some wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs 'to make the text easier to read' or having used commas 'to make the sense clearer'. They often relied on simple identification of features without referencing specific words or phrases, and needed to analyse their effect and the ways in which they relate to audience and shape meaning. At times, language features were incorrectly identified.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Story

Write a story which begins with the following sentence: *It was in the middle of the night when I finally made up my mind.* In your writing, create a sense of drama and tension. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates wrote complete stories, though some responses did not have a clear ending.

Drama and tension were generally well-crafted into the stories. Candidates wrote about big decisions in their lives; leaving home, going to university, pregnancy, romantic difficulties and running away from home were particularly popular. Others foresaw conflict over a choice of career; one wanted to join the military, a second wanted to attend a distant university rather than stay at home and attend the local one, while a third wanted to go to art school against the wishes of her parents. All three accounts avoided stereotypical outcomes. The strongest responses established and sustained a clear focus on drama and tension, whilst the weakest responses tended to offer a list-like series of events that resulted in a lack of engagement or narrative structure.

Stronger pieces provided a seamless transition from the narrative opening supplied to subsequent paragraphs. They introduced a sense of suspense and drama, both in the language used and in the sequencing of events in their narratives. Also, some stronger responses included a plot twist to subvert expectations. Some stronger stories established tension from the first paragraph, for example in this engaging opening: 'My feet were sore from my pacing a path worn into the carpet that would never leave. Unlike him. I scowl at the lines I've trampled, a testament to the feelings I claim I don't have.'

In weaker responses, candidates had struggled to create a sense of drama and tension, often writing rather tedious descriptions of escaping from somewhere. There was some need for greater organisation in narratives that drifted from one event to the next. Some stories consisted of the protagonist relaying internal thoughts in a manner hampered by frequent errors, such as in this example: 'I'm set on what I want to do. Now as I walk in the living room my parent are having a conversation perhaps its gossips from work I didn't care though.'

Other weaker responses employed elaborate plots with many characters involved, which lead to a lack of narrative control. Where candidates had used a 'telling' and not a 'showing' technique, this did not allow for a sense of drama to be created.

Question 3 – Speech

You are going to take part in a debate at school about whether teenagers should get jobs or relax during long school holidays. Your headteacher has asked you to open the debate by giving a speech on the topic. Write the text for the speech, discussing both points of view and giving your opinion. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates discussed both points of view and gave their own opinion.

In stronger responses, candidates assumed an authoritative stance and maintained the appropriate form. They presented a balanced argument, showing both sides of the debate and came up with their own opinion at the end. They used a range of rhetorical devices such as rhetorical questions, statistics, a variety of sentence structures and powerful vocabulary. The best responses were organised into paragraphs, each one dealing with a different point. The strongest responses were formal in tone, presenting arguments in a well-structured and convincing manner. They took a clear line of argument and took readers through the argument point by point to construct a convincing overall case.

Weaker speeches were written in the form of essays, which resulted in the loss of immediacy that speeches require. They often discussed only one side of the argument and were frequently repetitive, needing to develop ideas more. Many weaker responses were written without paragraphs, which affected the organisation of ideas and arguments. In some cases, insufficient vocabulary was used to elaborate clearly on ideas. For example, one candidate wrote: 'Some can manage school and work but, it just makes it easier and they can work more and longer if they want to.'

Question 4 – Review

A museum in your town has recently reopened after a major redevelopment, and you have visited it. Write a review of the museum, which will be published in your school magazine. Write between 600 and 900 words.

This question was generally answered quite effectively, although few responses demonstrated a full grasp of the particular language and structure needed for a review, whether positive or critical. Many answers lacked development and felt list-like. Most reviews focused on good points; a few offered slightly more balance by including negative comments too.

Stronger reviews were structured clearly, with some effectively deploying sub-titles. They gave clear recommendations or criticisms, and provided plenty of detail to get across a real feel for the museum. The few critical reviews were the more dramatic and usually the more insightful.

Weaker responses tended to list and describe the museum's content. Other weaker work more resembled advertising copy than reviews. They often omitted to express a view, as is a defining feature of review writing.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/31 Language Analysis</p>
--

Key messages

Paper 31 is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their developing analytical skills using language data.

The main key message for Paper 31 concerns the key skills required by Paper 3, as outlined in the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, this is different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks. Understanding and taking account of the ways the different demands and weighting of the assessment objectives should assist candidates in the overall crafting of their responses.

With 25 marks being available for each question, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section. Longer responses were generally provided to **Question 1** and on occasion, very brief responses were provided to **Question 2**.

General comments

Overall, it was clear that candidates had engaged meaningfully with the stimulus material in both sections. Most candidates presented sustained, cohesive responses, using an appropriate register and crafted into a logical sequence of ideas. In general, there was a good level of supporting scholarship noted, with relevant referencing to wider study of linguistic issues, concepts and theories.

Brief responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme as they are limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate response plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain short enough – with useful pointers – that sufficient time remains for the candidate to write a full response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates used all three data sources to an extent. Where fewer than three data sources were used, it was not possible for marks to be awarded above Level 3 of the mark scheme. Candidates were instructed to refer to specific details from Texts A, B and C, as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of language change. Weaker responses either used the data sources without reference to wider study, or provided limited analysis of the data sources but made detailed reference to wider study. The strongest work was cohesive in its incorporation of analysis supported by relevant scholarship.

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression and structural organisation. Ideas were generally sequenced logically, moving through a series of linguistic frameworks selected from graphology,

orthography, lexis, grammar, pragmatics, morphology and semantics. Although it is not a requirement for a response to be structured in this way, more confident responses demonstrated clear analytical skills by using this approach. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology, which enabled them to move through the higher levels.

At times, relevance of content was obscured by historic or sociological consideration rather than linguistic analysis. Some responses relied too heavily on such discussion, which weakened their analytical standpoint and resulted in some loss of focus.

Weaker responses tended to analyse each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper. This approach led to a limited development of ideas. Stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis and, where cohesion was achieved, demonstrated an increased level of development.

Conceptualisation

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory referenced was relevant, making a careful selection from the three texts to illustrate ideas. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts and approaches; these candidates needed to develop such points more fully, or to ensure that they were relevant to the task. For example, such responses often referenced Jespersen on the Great Vowel Shift and the introduction of the printing press by Caxton; these comments were not generally relevant to the contemporary writing of Text A. More confident responses acknowledged that and instead used the more relevant support of McCulloch or Crystal, for example, in discussing how the electronic mode had begun and is continuing to bring about language change.

Overall, candidates referenced a wide range of relevant linguistic approaches. These included but were not limited to Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, tree and wave models, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, Aitchison's Damp Spoon or Crumbling Castle and Chen's S-curve model. Such references were generally clearly understood, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful and sophisticated. The concepts listed above are not prescribed by the syllabus and it was therefore clear that candidates had undertaken a broad range of wider study.

Data handling

Most candidates engaged very well with Text A, recognising how the contemporary writing was very specific to the electronic mode. Selection from the text included fragmentation, rhetorical device, construction beginning with conjunction, direct audience address, declaratives and imperatives, colloquialism and capitalisation. Confident responses demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the blog form and how and why their selections from the text were the form's distinguishing features, including the capitalised preamble advising readers about van Tongeren's affiliate links.

The use of 'rock' as verb and 'PERIOD' as a perceived phonological feature were both discussed at length; such discussion at times needed to incorporate ideas on how these colloquialisms had come into use or why they may only be short-lived according to the nature of language change.

Text B was often misunderstood in weaker responses which did not acknowledge the different word classes of abstract noun 'awe' and adjective 'awesome', therefore attempting to explain that over time, 'dread' had come to mean 'amazing', which was incorrect. Moreover, the use of the medial S in text B was often misunderstood in weaker responses.

The n-Gram of Text C was generally interpreted very well. Weaker responses provided an explanation of the data, while stronger responses went on to detail how 'FYI' had risen in use since the introduction of the internet and how, at the first introduction of the electronic mode, acronyms had become an economic necessity. There was insightful discussion on how 'For your information' had increased its level of use, whereas use of 'FYI' had begun to decline due possibly to changing economic factors or general popularity.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Most responses demonstrated a good level of understanding of how the appended IPA chart should be interpreted with regard to the phonemic representation of speech sound in the data source. Confident

responses used a wide range of technical terminology with accuracy, demonstrating deeper understanding of characteristic features through developed discussion.

Although the transcription included fewer utterances from Rui, these included characteristic features of their own – including negation, tense, contraction and fluency without pause – which were markedly different from those demonstrated in Carmini's utterances. These were generally not discussed in weaker responses.

Weaker responses often took a deficit approach, commenting on what Carmini was yet unable to say, rather than making a careful selection for developed discussion on her emerging linguistic competence.

Most responses acknowledged the father's use of child-directed speech in terms of questioning technique, intonation, recasting and positive and negative reinforcement, and how this aided the child's speech patterns to progress. Confident responses demonstrated understanding of how the father led the fulfilled adjacency pairs and how Carmini participated in turn-taking. Stronger responses also acknowledged the ways in which the child directed speech differed when the father was speaking only to Carmini and when he was speaking to both children together.

Conceptualisation

Weaker responses described the level of linguistic competence of both of the child interlocutors either as telegraphic or post-telegraphic, using only their ages as a guide. However, there was evidence in the data source to suggest otherwise, which was acknowledged in stronger responses. More confident responses analysed a variety of utterances before labelling each of the children's competencies, after careful consideration of relevant linguistic approaches.

For example, weaker responses which made reference to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development placed Rui in the preoperational stage because Piaget recognised that children under eight years of age demonstrated (at the time he was writing) certain competencies. Insightful responses acknowledged that contemporary childhood experience and education may have led to children approaching various stages of linguistic competence at a younger milestone than those indicated by Piaget.

Candidates made reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Chomsky, Bruner, Skinner, Halliday and Vygotsky. In weaker responses, candidates needed to develop their analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source; where no data were provided, this resulted in a lack of synthesis or cohesion. Examples of Hallidayan functions which were included in stronger responses were the representational – *yes i am going do my (.) do my name*; imaginative – *and its a big big policeman*, and regulatory – *dont do that never again*.

Stronger responses also analysed the father's scaffolding technique which led to Carmini reaching her Vygotskian zone of proximal development, and further explored how, in terms of Bruner's LASS, the father was progressing Carmini's linguistic competence by requesting choice: *or one of these?* and *which colours your favourite?*

Data handling

Overall, responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis, which was at times synthesised in an insightful manner by confident candidates.

Characteristic features which were analysed included Carmini's developing level of phonological confidence in voiced and unvoiced fricatives (*/dʊz/*), her use of double negatives and the vague verb 'do', and instability of consonant cluster (*/baʊn/*). Indeed, most responses attempted phonological analysis to some extent, although there was some confusion in labelling phonemes. Weaker responses described phonemes as letters, which misses the distinction between spoken and written word.

Reduplication was evident in *and its a big big policeman*, which was indicative of the extent of Carmini's vocabulary. Stronger responses contrasted her use of *big* with the polysyllabic *elephant* which was uttered in full without hesitation.

Carmini's egotistic tendencies were evident in a variety of ways in *i show you my paper cause i bought it for me (.) my my nana bought it for me (.) and (.) and she said oh/m/buy something for my daught (.) my my daughter (.) my carmini er (.) only carmini*. This utterance led to discussion on pronoun use and how Carmini may have misunderstood that the grandmother was not hers alone, ideation which was absent in Rui's

response, *no she said buy it for rui as well*, which offered an opportunity for analysis of the different cognitive abilities of the two child interlocutors evident in their speech patterns.

Use of varied tenses were evident in the utterances above from both children (*bought* and *buy*). A point that was rarely analysed was the interesting competence with which Carmini reported the grandmother's speech.



ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/32 Language Analysis</p>
--

Key messages

Paper 32 is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their developing analytical skills using language data.

The key skills required by Paper 32 are provided as the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, this is different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks.

There are, therefore, 25 marks available for each question. With that in mind, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section, indicating a need for the examination time to be put to better use.

General comments

Overall, candidates engaged with the stimulus material at a good level in both sections of the question paper. Candidates produced meaningful commentary on content in each of the sections, and most candidates presented sustained, cohesive responses using an appropriate register.

Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the level descriptors outlined in the mark scheme as they are limited by their own brevity, and therefore in need of development. In some cases, elaborate response plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain short with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were advised to refer to specific details from Texts A, B and C, as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of language change in order to produce their analysis. Most responses attempted analysis of all three data sources. However, where fewer than three data sources were used, it was not possible for marks to be awarded above Level 3 of the mark scheme.

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression with ideas expressed in a logical, fluent sequence. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology. Stronger responses progressed ideas through a series of linguistic frameworks selected from graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, morphology, pragmatics and semantics. Although it is not a requirement for a response to be structured in this way, more confident responses demonstrated clear analytical skills by using this approach.

At times, relevance of content was obscured by long historic or sociological consideration rather than linguistic analysis. This approach provided a discursive response rather than the analytical response required by this paper, with irrelevant material presented at times.

Weaker responses tended to analyse each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper, whereas stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis. Where cohesion was achieved, an increased level of development was demonstrated.

Conceptualisation

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory referenced was relevant by making careful selection from the texts. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts and approaches; these candidates needed to develop such points more fully, or to apply them to the given text(s).

In this series, a wide range of relevant linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches was referenced. These included Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, Schmidt's wave model, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, Jespersen's reference to the Great Vowel Shift and Chen's S-curve model. Such references generally showed clear understanding, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful. There was some loss of focus in analysis of the effect of the Great Vowel Shift on the medial S, as Text A represented written material without phonological representation.

Most candidates discussed technological influences, particularly the way that the invention of the printing press by Caxton influenced the presentation of printed material, both graphologically and orthographically.

The concepts of narrowing, blending, pejoration and amelioration were generally understood well, with examples such as *proud* in Text B forming the basis of some developed analysis.

The syllabus is not prescriptive with regard to appropriate theoretical examples, and any which were cited relevantly were credited. Other methods and approaches which were used by more confident candidates were Aitchison's PIDC model, references to Hartl and Clark, Aitchison's Damp Spoon, The Cuckoo's Nest Effect and de Saussure's Signifier and Signified.

Data handling

Weaker responses misunderstood the use of the medial, or long, S in Text A, with some claiming it to be a phonemic symbol rather than the archaic grapheme which was in use at the time of writing (1680). Stronger responses acknowledged events and advancements that had contributed to its obsolescence, to describe the approximate time of change and compare this feature to present day use.

Analyses of change generally included lexical and orthographical items from Text A including *sayles* and *beake* and the use of the apostrophe of elision in *mann'd* and *munition'd*. Weaker analysis used mainly lexical items along with some grammatical items such as the compound *to-morrow* and the regular past tense inflection being added to an irregular verb in *splitted*. More confident analysis explored fully the archaic third person verb form as in *dazeleth* and *seemeth*.

Most responses attempted to analyse the sentence constructions of Text A, comparing them to those expected by a contemporary audience; not all discussion used accurate labelling of complex-compound constructions, but most understood the didactic nature of the text and the effects that its construction may have had on its original audience.

The *n*-Gram in Text C offered the opportunity to analyse the comparative use of the base form of the copular verb *be*. Graphic representation of the data was clearly understood. There was a tendency in weaker responses to copy out numerical data without providing clear observations pertaining to language change.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

A good level of understanding was demonstrated in most responses of how the IPA chart of phonemic representation of speech should be interpreted alongside the transcription.

Most responses acknowledged the way in which the father was using child-directed speech in terms of questioning technique, intonation, recasting and positive reinforcement, and how this aided Maia's speech patterns to progress. Confident responses demonstrated understanding of how the father led the fulfilled adjacency pairs and how the children participated in turn-taking.

Weaker responses tended to focus solely on the utterances of the youngest child, Gina, and the father. This led to missed opportunities to analyse the full dynamics of the conversation.

Confident responses used a wide range of technical terminology with accuracy, demonstrating a deeper understanding of the characteristic features, rather than describing certain features in general terms and without further explanation.

Conceptualisation

Analysis was quick to label the children in terms of their levels of linguistic competence, with many responses describing both children equally as either telegraphic or post-telegraphic, referring to their ages for guidance. These candidates would have done better to analyse utterances before coming to conclusions. Similarly, weaker responses automatically assigned both children to Piaget's preoperational stage. Insightful analysis revealed evidence of concrete operational tendencies in Maia's utterances (precise lexis and complex structures), acknowledging that contemporary early years experience and education may lead to children approaching stages of linguistic competence at a younger milestone than those indicated by Piaget.

Weaker responses made brief reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Bruner and Skinner; these candidates needed to develop their analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source. Where no data were provided there was no synthesis or cohesion.

Examples of Hallidayan functions which were included in stronger responses were the representational – *she hasnt drunked*; imaginative – *with my money*; and heuristic – *what?*

In this series, there was some developed analysis supported by references to Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device and Universal Grammar, with the virtuous error of past tense *drunked* and pluralisation of *every colours* being used most frequently. However, weaker responses had a tendency to state that the correct form of *drunked* should be *drank* instead of the correct *drunk*.

Stronger responses analysed how the father and Maia were working in tandem in a scaffolding technique which led to Gina reaching her Vygotskyan zone of proximal development. They further explored how, in terms of Bruner's LASS, the father and Maia helped each other to progress Gina's linguistic competence.

Data handling

Most responses attempted phonological analysis to some extent and generally selected the colour /*wed*/ to exemplify the child's competence in pronunciation. Weaker responses used this to suggest that Gina had not reached her expected milestone, whereas stronger responses analysed the reasons for substitution of the rhotic phoneme.

There was general observation of competent turn-taking with fulfilled adjacency pairs and some mainly cooperative overlap or omitted response (lines 3 and 5).

Analysis of prosodic features was attempted in most responses. Weaker analysis focused on the intonation of Maia's and the father's questioning technique, whereas stronger responses explored more fully the stress of deictic references such as *and that one is* and what colour is *this*, the latter having to be supported by paralinguistic features, and Gina's understanding of increased volume for emphasis in *the PINK one*.

Confident responses compared and contrasted Gina's early competencies, which included correct use of the singular personal pronoun *i*, negation with a contraction in *hasnt*, determiners *my*, *every* and *the*, and preposition in *in the world* and *with my money*, with Maia's complex utterances such as *daddys rich because hes got twenty three pounds*.

Overall, responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis, which was at times synthesised in an insightful manner by confident candidates.



ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/33 Language Analysis</p>
--

Key messages

Paper 33 is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their developing analytical skills using language data.

The key skills required by Paper 33 are provided as the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, this is different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks.

There are, therefore, 25 marks available for each question. With that in mind, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section, indicating a need for the examination time to be put to better use.

General comments

Overall, candidates engaged with the stimulus material at a good level in both sections of the question paper. Candidates produced meaningful commentary on content in each of the sections, and most candidates presented sustained, cohesive responses using an appropriate register.

Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the level descriptors outlined in the mark scheme as they are limited by their own brevity, and therefore in need of development. In some cases, elaborate response plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain short with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were advised to refer to specific details from Texts A, B and C, as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of language change in order to produce their analysis. Most responses attempted analysis of all three data sources. However, where fewer than three data sources were used, it was not possible for marks to be awarded above Level 3 of the mark scheme.

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression with ideas expressed in a logical, fluent sequence. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology. Stronger responses progressed ideas through a series of linguistic frameworks selected from graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, morphology, pragmatics and semantics. Although it is not a requirement for a response to be structured in this way, more confident responses demonstrated clear analytical skills by using this approach.

At times, relevance of content was obscured by long historic or sociological consideration rather than linguistic analysis. This approach provided a discursive response rather than the analytical response required by this paper, with irrelevant material presented at times.

Weaker responses tended to analyse each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper, whereas stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis. Where cohesion was achieved, an increased level of development was demonstrated.

Conceptualisation

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory referenced was relevant by making careful selection from the texts. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts and approaches; these candidates needed to develop such points more fully, or to apply them to the given text(s).

In this series, a wide range of relevant linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches was referenced. These included Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, Schmidt's wave model, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, Jespersen's reference to the Great Vowel Shift and Chen's S-curve model. Such references generally showed clear understanding, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful. There was some loss of focus in analysis of the effect of the Great Vowel Shift on the medial S, as Text A represented written material without phonological representation.

Most candidates discussed technological influences, particularly the way that the invention of the printing press by Caxton influenced the presentation of printed material, both graphologically and orthographically.

The concepts of narrowing, blending, pejoration and amelioration were generally understood well, with examples such as *proud* in Text B forming the basis of some developed analysis.

The syllabus is not prescriptive with regard to appropriate theoretical examples, and any which were cited relevantly were credited. Other methods and approaches which were used by more confident candidates were Aitchison's PIDC model, references to Hartl and Clark, Aitchison's Damp Spoon, The Cuckoo's Nest Effect and de Saussure's Signifier and Signified.

Data handling

Weaker responses misunderstood the use of the medial, or long, S in Text A, with some claiming it to be a phonemic symbol rather than the archaic grapheme which was in use at the time of writing (1680). Stronger responses acknowledged events and advancements that had contributed to its obsolescence, to describe the approximate time of change and compare this feature to present day use.

Analyses of change generally included lexical and orthographical items from Text A including *sayles* and *beake* and the use of the apostrophe of elision in *mann'd* and *munition'd*. Weaker analysis used mainly lexical items along with some grammatical items such as the compound *to-morrow* and the regular past tense inflection being added to an irregular verb in *splitted*. More confident analysis explored fully the archaic third person verb form as in *dazeleth* and *seemeth*.

Most responses attempted to analyse the sentence constructions of Text A, comparing them to those expected by a contemporary audience; not all discussion used accurate labelling of complex-compound constructions, but most understood the didactic nature of the text and the effects that its construction may have had on its original audience.

The *n*-Gram in Text C offered the opportunity to analyse the comparative use of the base form of the copular verb *be*. Graphic representation of the data was clearly understood. There was a tendency in weaker responses to copy out numerical data without providing clear observations pertaining to language change.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

A good level of understanding was demonstrated in most responses of how the IPA chart of phonemic representation of speech should be interpreted alongside the transcription.

Most responses acknowledged the way in which the father was using child-directed speech in terms of questioning technique, intonation, recasting and positive reinforcement, and how this aided Maia's speech patterns to progress. Confident responses demonstrated understanding of how the father led the fulfilled adjacency pairs and how the children participated in turn-taking.

Weaker responses tended to focus solely on the utterances of the youngest child, Gina, and the father. This led to missed opportunities to analyse the full dynamics of the conversation.

Confident responses used a wide range of technical terminology with accuracy, demonstrating a deeper understanding of the characteristic features, rather than describing certain features in general terms and without further explanation.

Conceptualisation

Analysis was quick to label the children in terms of their levels of linguistic competence, with many responses describing both children equally as either telegraphic or post-telegraphic, referring to their ages for guidance. These candidates would have done better to analyse utterances before coming to conclusions. Similarly, weaker responses automatically assigned both children to Piaget's preoperational stage. Insightful analysis revealed evidence of concrete operational tendencies in Maia's utterances (precise lexis and complex structures), acknowledging that contemporary early years experience and education may lead to children approaching stages of linguistic competence at a younger milestone than those indicated by Piaget.

Weaker responses made brief reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Bruner and Skinner; these candidates needed to develop their analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source. Where no data were provided there was no synthesis or cohesion.

Examples of Hallidayan functions which were included in stronger responses were the representational – *she hasn't drunk*; imaginative – *with my money*; and heuristic – *what?*

In this series, there was some developed analysis supported by references to Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device and Universal Grammar, with the virtuous error of past tense *drunked* and pluralisation of *every colours* being used most frequently. However, weaker responses had a tendency to state that the correct form of *drunked* should be *drank* instead of the correct *drunk*.

Stronger responses analysed how the father and Maia were working in tandem in a scaffolding technique which led to Gina reaching her Vygotskian zone of proximal development. They further explored how, in terms of Bruner's LASS, the father and Maia helped each other to progress Gina's linguistic competence.

Data handling

Most responses attempted phonological analysis to some extent and generally selected the colour /*wed*/ to exemplify the child's competence in pronunciation. Weaker responses used this to suggest that Gina had not reached her expected milestone, whereas stronger responses analysed the reasons for substitution of the rhotic phoneme.

There was general observation of competent turn-taking with fulfilled adjacency pairs and some mainly cooperative overlap or omitted response (lines 3 and 5).

Analysis of prosodic features was attempted in most responses. Weaker analysis focused on the intonation of Maia's and the father's questioning technique, whereas stronger responses explored more fully the stress of deictic references such as *and that one is* and what colour is *this*, the latter having to be supported by paralinguistic features, and Gina's understanding of increased volume for emphasis in *the PINK one*.

Confident responses compared and contrasted Gina's early competencies, which included correct use of the singular personal pronoun *i*, negation with a contraction in *hasnt*, determiners *my*, *every* and *the*, and preposition in *in the world* and *with my money*, with Maia's complex utterances such as *daddys rich because hes got twenty three pounds*.

Overall, responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis, which was at times synthesised in an insightful manner by confident candidates.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/41 Language Topics</p>
--

Key messages

Paper 41 is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory. It should be noted that in Paper 41 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis found in the June 2021 series diminished the discursive qualities of some responses.

Key skills required by Paper 41 are outlined in the three assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives.

Section A and **Section B** both have the following marks available: AO1, 10 marks; AO2, 5 marks, and AO4, 10 marks. Observation of how marks are made available according to the assessment objectives should give clear indication as to how each response can be crafted for cohesion.

For future series, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section.

General comments

Candidates engaged well with the stimulus material in both sections and overall drew sustained and meaningful responses. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced to the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, plans should remain short with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

The demands of this paper lie in the candidates' ability to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material as well as knowledge gained from wider reading of the topic. However, throughout each response, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. On the other hand, responses which do not present ideas gained from wider reading will offer no creditable material according to AO4. In this series, occasions where candidates made no reference to their wider reading meant a loss of up to 10 marks in an otherwise sound response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to points made in the text. These included the notion that the English language *is forever in flux, as new words are born and old ones die*, consideration of how English might absorb vocabulary from other languages including *the infiltration of Japanese culture* and exploration of the

ways in which contemporary linguistic research can be carried out, following the example of *Jack Grieve at the University of Birmingham*.

Some limited responses relied on knowledge of historical context relating to the establishment of English in America, which at times led to loss of focus. Furthermore, weaker responses worked through the *hotspots* named in the text by way of a paraphrased list, needing to elaborate more developed ideas on how English was used in different ways in these regions. Confident responses took these examples and discussed fully why and how development was effected and affected by speakers of English in the areas exemplified by the text. Further development was created in strong responses which drew on global examples.

There was loss of focus at times where discussion departed from the context and explored instead the more general and wider concept of language change, relying on knowledge and understanding required in 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of *English in the world*.

Writing

Most responses were structured clearly in a logical sequence of introduction, key points and conclusion. At times there was evidence of sweeping statement in the introduction, which bore little relevance to the main points of the body of the essay. These often included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally and which would have been better and more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions repeated work seen previously, whereas confident conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Stronger responses maintained an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks. Such responses provided some insightful discussion using the stimulus material as a springboard for ideas; ideas were then developed in a sophisticated manner in well-crafted responses. This is an important consideration: AO2 does not only award for accuracy of expression – development of ideas is also covered, therefore responses that were insufficiently developed were self-limiting, however accurate they may have been.

Some responses used rhetorical questioning as an attempt at development. However, this approach was rarely successful as no clear answer was provided and the questioning detracted from the overall register of the work. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration. Where this was sustained throughout the response with little reference to the text, the linguistic standpoint was weakened.

Conceptualisation

Overall, a clear variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. Often, responses would have benefitted from more detail in this area.

These included but were not limited to Crystal, Diamond, McCrum, Philipson, Widdowson, Tree and Wave models, Zero Translation theory and Modiano's Expanding Circles. Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of detailed understanding was demonstrated.

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, positioning America in the innermost of the concentric circles. Whereas limited responses provided a full explanation of the Kachru model without further reference to other approaches, insightful responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru in the diaspora of the 1980s might change as English moves through the contemporary world.

Most responses also referred to language death to some extent, using the idea from the text that *as new words are born . . . old ones die*. Confident responses provided detailed reference to UNESCO's stages of language death and their consequences on local cultures and beliefs, often providing real life or personal examples to develop the discussion.

Contemporary concepts to which the stimulus material made reference were *technical jargon* and *gaming language*, use of acronyms such as *wce* and *idgt*, neologism – for example, *baeritto*, and music culture influences. In general, these were discussed well in most responses. Confident responses took the idea of influence further and provided developed discussion of how and why certain geographical locations such as New York could be centres of *linguistic innovation yet surprisingly these words did not have a large*

geographical reach. Such responses provided global examples of influences from, for example, Korea – detailing ways in which hybridisation might continue to vary the use of English in the contemporary world.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included the way in which the writer had declared *an obsession with war-like language in medical research* which may *unconsciously limit our creativity in finding new treatments*. Limited responses selected evidence from the text as lexical examples currently in use in the medical profession such as *smart bomb, elimination, triggered release* and *cell death* to demonstrate that the writer was correct in his ideas. More confident responses juxtaposed such examples with the writer's wish for *revisionist thinking* and therefore how linguistic revisions might achieve *holistic management of a chronic conditions*.

Confident responses demonstrated insightful understanding of how *the semantics of our descriptions can influence the way in which we think about a problem*. Such responses maintained focus on the key topic and provided opportunities for developed discussion.

Developed discussion included reference to other examples where war metaphor is used, for example in sports journalism, business or politics, stating how conceptual metaphors used to bolster a semantic, rather than lexical field, could influence thought and intentionally or unintentionally mislead. This also led to some interesting discussion on the extent to which we define ourselves by the images and metaphors that we use, which could be confrontational or cooperative in certain circumstances.

Writing

Brief responses were seen to this question, which were self-limiting as described above. Cohesive discussion was effectively provided in more confident responses. Such responses were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Generally, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used in stronger responses. At times, there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used which increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or misapplied terminology were frequently features of weaker responses.

Paraphrase of the stimulus material without introduction of ideas for development resulted in weakness to the overall response in some cases. Moreover, at times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by the writer of the text. Discussion of irrelevant points led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material: discursive responses should maintain relevance throughout.

Conceptualisation

Most responses made reference to the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis to some extent. There was some extended discussion of linguistic determinism and relativism which supported a careful selection of evidence from the text. Limited responses did not always acknowledge the theoretical source, although stronger responses juxtaposed Whorfianism with theoretical examples which challenged deterministic or relativistic notions, such as those from Lenneberg or Boas.

Responses which went into great detail describing Whorf's exploration of the Hopi or Inuit lexicon tended to lose focus on the stimulus material. Although from such responses it was clear that wider study had been carried out, the discussion became irrelevant at times.

Further irrelevant discussion was seen in attempts to apply Tannen's genderlect theories to try to ascertain the gender of the professor or Bernstein's notion of elaborated and restricted codes to gauge the writer's socio-economic status. Both of these approaches were outside the scope of this question.

Overall, a wide variety of theoretical approaches was referenced. These included but were not limited to Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, Locke's Empiricism, Plato's view of how language should be an accurate reflection of eternal ideas, Nietzsche, Kant, and Tajfel. Some responses were limited by mention of the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been

represented in the stimulus material. Where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed, clear or effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/42 Language Topics</p>
--

Key messages

Paper 42 is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory. It should be noted that in Paper 42 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis found in the June 2021 series diminished the discursive qualities of some responses.

Key skills required by Paper 42 are outlined in the three assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives.

Section A and **Section B** both have the following marks available: AO1, 10 marks; AO2, 5 marks, and AO4, 10 marks. Observation of how marks are made available according to the assessment objectives should give clear indication as to how each response can be cohesively crafted.

For future series, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section.

General comments

Overall, sustained responses were made to the stimulus material in both sections, particularly to **Question 1**. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced to the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, plans should remain short with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

The demands of this paper lie in the candidates' ability to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material as well as knowledge gained from wider reading of the topic. Throughout each response, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. On the other hand, responses which do not present ideas gained from wider reading will offer no creditable material according to AO4. In this series, occasions where candidates made no reference to their wider reading meant a loss of up to 10 marks in an otherwise sound response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to points made in the text. These included the irony of the way the English language was seen as *invasion* of Icelandic given Viking history, the extent to which the Icelandic language has been preserved over the centuries, how young people in Iceland are *picking up English at a much faster*

pace than before, the effects of foreign tourism on indigenous languages and continuing global economic factors which cause the expansion of English in the world.

Some limited discussion relied on knowledge of historical context relating to the establishment in part of English from Early Norse, needing fuller reference to specific points raised in the text. More confident responses demonstrated deeper and broader understanding of the stimulus material by beginning discussion with the writer's sentiments voiced at the end of the text: *And this, of course, leads to the question: what value does a language have?* This was followed by some insightful ideas on the ways in which endangered languages could be saved and why to do so would be *our moral obligation*.

Some loss of focus was observed at times where discussion departed from the context and explored instead the more general and wider concept of language change, relying on knowledge and understanding required in 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of *English in the world*.

Writing

Most responses were structured clearly in a logical sequence of introduction, key points and conclusion. At times there was evidence of sweeping statement in the introduction, which bore little relevance to the main points of the body of the essay. Often these included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally and which would have been better and more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions repeated ideas, whereas confident conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Stronger responses maintained an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks. Such responses provided some insightful discussion, using the stimulus material as a springboard for ideas; ideas were then developed in a sophisticated manner in well-crafted responses. This is an important consideration: AO2 does not only award for accuracy of expression – development of ideas is also covered, therefore responses with insufficient development were self-limiting, however accurate they may have been.

Some responses used rhetorical questioning as an attempt at development. However, this approach was rarely successful as no clear answer was provided and the questioning detracted from the overall register of the work. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration. Where this was sustained throughout the response with little reference to the text, the linguistic standpoint was weakened.

Conceptualisation

Overall, a clear variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. Often, responses would have benefitted from more detail in this area.

These included but were not limited to Crystal, Diamond, McCrum, Graddol, Widdowson, Platt, Webber and Ho, McArthur's Wheel model and Galloway's Channels. Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of detailed understanding was demonstrated.

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, positioning Iceland in the outermost of the concentric circles. Whereas limited responses provided a full explanation of the Kachru model without further reference to other approaches, insightful responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru in the diaspora of the 1980s might change as English moves through the contemporary world. In particular, detailed accounts were provided in confident responses of where Iceland might sit according to the Kachru model if English were to become the national or official language of that nation.

Most responses also referred to language death to some extent, using the question from the text, *is the Icelandic language at risk of disappearing?* Confident responses provided detailed reference to UNESCO's stages of language death and their consequences on local cultures and beliefs, often providing real-life or personal examples to develop the discussion.

A further linguistic issue to which the stimulus material made reference was *the ubiquity of English* around the world and the effect that has on Icelandic and other indigenous languages. Clear, detailed or insightful responses were developed with reference to how contact, borrowing, and creation of pidgins and creoles can

lead to hybridisation or standardisation. Examples such as Singlish or Hinglish were the most generally cited hybrids.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made by the extract provided. These included the way in which the McWhorter had declared from the outset that *Euphemisms are like underwear: best changed frequently*, posing the questions: *What work are they doing in our language and why do they expire?*

McWhorter's questions offered the opportunity for discussion on the linguistic value of euphemisms in relation to personal and social identity as well as exploration of how development of personal and social identities might require developments in language use. Limited responses selected evidence from the text as lexical examples previously and more recently in use, such as *crippled*, *handicapped*, *disabled* and *differently abled* to demonstrate how personal and societal values continue to change. However, more confident responses demonstrated a much broader and deeper understanding of why and how *thought changes more slowly than we can change the words for it*.

Most responses were clear in their understanding of how euphemism might be used to intentionally or unintentionally to protect the receiver and make the user feel more acceptable in society. Developed discussion included ideas on why in a *civilised society* our personal and social identity should avoid *loaded and abusive* terminology and how we can overcome any sense of harmful bias projected through language.

Writing

Some responses to this question were brief and therefore self-limiting. Cohesive discussion was effectively provided in more confident responses. Clear or detailed responses were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Generally, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used in stronger responses. At times, there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used, which increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or misapplied terminology were frequently features of weaker responses.

Paraphrase of the stimulus material without introduction of ideas for development resulted in weakness to the overall response in some cases. At times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by the writer of the text. Such discussion led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material: discursive responses should maintain relevance throughout.

Conceptualisation

Some basic or limited responses made no reference to linguistic issues, concepts, methods or approaches when answering **Question 2**. However, of those which did, most made reference to the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis to some extent. There was some extended discussion of linguistic determinism and relativism which supported a careful selection of evidence from the text. Limited responses did not always acknowledge the theoretical source, although stronger responses juxtaposed Whorfianism with theoretical examples which challenged deterministic or relativistic notions, such as those from Lenneberg or Boas.

Detailed responses took McWhorter's notion of *the eternal gulf between language and opinion* as an opportunity to support the work with relevant reference to Plato's view of how language should accurately reflection ideation. Confident responses also included relevant and effective reference to Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, Eckert's Jocks and Burnouts, Ardener and Ardener's Muted Group and Tajfel's Social Identity theory.

Some discussion was seen in limited responses which attempted to apply genderlect theories to the topic presented. These were relevant to an extent, as the question required responses on the idea of personal and social identify. However, at times genderlect discussion was overdeveloped, as was the exploration of Bernstein's notion of elaborated and restricted codes. This latter approach was outside the scope of this question and at best resulted in the presentation of irrelevant material.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/43
Language Topics

Key messages

Paper 43 is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory. It should be noted that in Paper 43 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis found in the June 2021 series diminished the discursive qualities of some responses.

Key skills required by Paper 43 are outlined in the three assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives.

Section A and **Section B** both have the following marks available: AO1, 10 marks; AO2, 5 marks, and AO4, 10 marks. Observation of how marks are made available according to the assessment objectives should give clear indication as to how each response can be cohesively crafted.

For future series, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question and a shorter response in the remaining section.

General comments

Overall, sustained responses were made to the stimulus material in both sections, particularly to **Question 1**. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced to the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, plans should remain short with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

The demands of this paper lie in the candidates' ability to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material as well as knowledge gained from wider reading of the topic. Throughout each response, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. On the other hand, responses which do not present ideas gained from wider reading will offer no creditable material according to AO4. In this series, occasions where candidates made no reference to their wider reading meant a loss of up to 10 marks in an otherwise sound response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to points made in the text. These included the irony of the way the English language was seen as *invasion* of Icelandic given Viking history, the extent to which the Icelandic language has been preserved over the centuries, how young people in Iceland are *picking up English at a much faster*

pace than before, the effects of foreign tourism on indigenous languages and continuing global economic factors which cause the expansion of English in the world.

Some limited discussion relied on knowledge of historical context relating to the establishment in part of English from Early Norse, needing fuller reference to specific points raised in the text. More confident responses demonstrated deeper and broader understanding of the stimulus material by beginning discussion with the writer's sentiments voiced at the end of the text: *And this, of course, leads to the question: what value does a language have?* This was followed by some insightful ideas on the ways in which endangered languages could be saved and why to do so would be *our moral obligation*.

Some loss of focus was observed at times where discussion departed from the context and explored instead the more general and wider concept of language change, relying on knowledge and understanding required in 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of *English in the world*.

Writing

Most responses were structured clearly in a logical sequence of introduction, key points and conclusion. At times there was evidence of sweeping statement in the introduction, which bore little relevance to the main points of the body of the essay. Often these included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally and which would have been better and more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions repeated ideas, whereas confident conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Stronger responses maintained an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks. Such responses provided some insightful discussion, using the stimulus material as a springboard for ideas; ideas were then developed in a sophisticated manner in well-crafted responses. This is an important consideration: AO2 does not only award for accuracy of expression – development of ideas is also covered, therefore responses with insufficient development were self-limiting, however accurate they may have been.

Some responses used rhetorical questioning as an attempt at development. However, this approach was rarely successful as no clear answer was provided and the questioning detracted from the overall register of the work. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration. Where this was sustained throughout the response with little reference to the text, the linguistic standpoint was weakened.

Conceptualisation

Overall, a clear variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. Often, responses would have benefitted from more detail in this area.

These included but were not limited to Crystal, Diamond, McCrum, Graddol, Widdowson, Platt, Webber and Ho, McArthur's Wheel model and Galloway's Channels. Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of detailed understanding was demonstrated.

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, positioning Iceland in the outermost of the concentric circles. Whereas limited responses provided a full explanation of the Kachru model without further reference to other approaches, insightful responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru in the diaspora of the 1980s might change as English moves through the contemporary world. In particular, detailed accounts were provided in confident responses of where Iceland might sit according to the Kachru model if English were to become the national or official language of that nation.

Most responses also referred to language death to some extent, using the question from the text, *is the Icelandic language at risk of disappearing?* Confident responses provided detailed reference to UNESCO's stages of language death and their consequences on local cultures and beliefs, often providing real-life or personal examples to develop the discussion.

A further linguistic issue to which the stimulus material made reference was *the ubiquity of English* around the world and the effect that has on Icelandic and other indigenous languages. Clear, detailed or insightful responses were developed with reference to how contact, borrowing, and creation of pidgins and creoles can

lead to hybridisation or standardisation. Examples such as Singlish or Hinglish were the most generally cited hybrids.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made by the extract provided. These included the way in which the McWhorter had declared from the outset that *Euphemisms are like underwear: best changed frequently*, posing the questions: *What work are they doing in our language and why do they expire?*

McWhorter's questions offered the opportunity for discussion on the linguistic value of euphemisms in relation to personal and social identity as well as exploration of how development of personal and social identities might require developments in language use. Limited responses selected evidence from the text as lexical examples previously and more recently in use, such as *crippled, handicapped, disabled* and *differently abled* to demonstrate how personal and societal values continue to change. However, more confident responses demonstrated a much broader and deeper understanding of why and how *thought changes more slowly than we can change the words for it*.

Most responses were clear in their understanding of how euphemism might be used to intentionally or unintentionally to protect the receiver and make the user feel more acceptable in society. Developed discussion included ideas on why in a *civilised society* our personal and social identity should avoid *loaded and abusive* terminology and how we can overcome any sense of harmful bias projected through language.

Writing

Some responses to this question were brief and therefore self-limiting. Cohesive discussion was effectively provided in more confident responses. Clear or detailed responses were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Generally, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used in stronger responses. At times, there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used, which increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or misapplied terminology were frequently features of weaker responses.

Paraphrase of the stimulus material without introduction of ideas for development resulted in weakness to the overall response in some cases. At times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by the writer of the text. Such discussion led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material: discursive responses should maintain relevance throughout.

Conceptualisation

Some basic or limited responses made no reference to linguistic issues, concepts, methods or approaches when answering **Question 2**. However, of those which did, most made reference to the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis to some extent. There was some extended discussion of linguistic determinism and relativism which supported a careful selection of evidence from the text. Limited responses did not always acknowledge the theoretical source, although stronger responses juxtaposed Whorfianism with theoretical examples which challenged deterministic or relativistic notions, such as those from Lenneberg or Boas.

Detailed responses took McWhorter's notion of *the eternal gulf between language and opinion* as an opportunity to support the work with relevant reference to Plato's view of how language should accurately reflection ideation. Confident responses also included relevant and effective reference to Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, Eckert's Jocks and Burnouts, Ardener and Ardener's Muted Group and Tajfel's Social Identity theory.

Some discussion was seen in limited responses which attempted to apply genderlect theories to the topic presented. These were relevant to an extent, as the question required responses on the idea of personal and social identify. However, at times genderlect discussion was overdeveloped, as was the exploration of Bernstein's notion of elaborated and restricted codes. This latter approach was outside the scope of this question and at best resulted in the presentation of irrelevant material.

