

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/11 Reading</p>

Key messages

- 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, 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 a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to meaning, context and audience. They need to organise information in their answers and write 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 selected texts for this paper offered different genre, style and context. The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some brief responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words. While there is no direct penalty for not adhering to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose (AO2). Candidates should remember that their responses are assessed for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was evidence that only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis. This session, there was evidence that some candidates struggled to manage their time appropriately, and consequently they often failed to complete their last response.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of the given text to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from an academic book. 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 an advertisement (150–200 words) that would be promoting tourism in the

Arctic. 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 candidates who adopted a topical approach tended to demonstrate 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 were asked to read an extract from an academic book about the people and culture of a region in the Arctic known as the 'High North'. They were then required to write an advertisement to be published in a brochure promoting tourism in the Arctic.

The characteristic features and conventions of an advertisement were clearly recognised by most candidates: they gave a name for the service, outlined what was involved, used persuasive language that would appeal to their identified customer, sometimes used a catchy slogan, and hyperbole and rhetorical features were common. Some made use of a 'customer' comment and some form of endorsement. There was also use of headings and subheadings. Most candidates wrote coherently and with adequate development. The second page of the extract was not used by many candidates and most took ideas from the first four paragraphs, in some cases leading to a narrow range of content.

In particular, candidates recognised the conventions of an advertisement and that its purpose, here, was to promote the Arctic (although this was often misspelled, for example 'Artic'). Candidates often created an effective title; among the most memorable were: 'Arctic Tour: Are You Up For the Chilling Challenge?'; 'Want to chill out?'; 'Come Enjoy a Chill Visit in The Arctic'. Many candidates adopted sub-headings to organise their responses. These included references to the weather conditions, methods of travel (the Hurtigruten cruise liner), activities in the region and its geography, the welcoming nature of the locals, local food, local industries and history.

The idea of the *High North* being *the world's breadbasket* was a popular area candidates chose to develop, with one candidate referring to the abundance of seafood in the area as 'the world's fish basket' whilst others merely lifted the phrase. More successful responses developed the idea that tourists could visit museums to discover the history and wealth of information concerning the military alliances formed in the Cold War and the plethora of industries developing in the area.

More successful responses referred to Bodø and the Hurtigruten, the historical heritage of the place and the Cold war with its geographical placement near eight other countries and 'great seafood'. These responses presented the journey on the Hurtigruten coastal steamer, and the delicious food provided with a hard sell of the wonderful views on offer from the cruiser. The issue of the cold and poor weather was handled well by most candidates. Some suggested that it was part of the adventure, or that the poor weather made this particular holiday different to the usual visits to beaches in hot countries. In less successful responses, candidates had copied the idea in the passage of the weather being problematic, which was not the intention of the advertisement.

Less successful responses generally focused on the 'North Pole', 'Huskies', 'Santa Claus' and 'skiing', which were not in the original extract. Some mentioned the importance of warm clothes. In these responses, content sometimes lacked relevance and development was limited. These less successful responses showed heavy reliance on lifted material such as *brutally hostile/intensely beautiful* and the *sumptuous lunch*; furthermore, they had little sense of an advertisement in terms of style, included too much historical and political detail and assertions of sights and activities that were not related to the extract, and often confused 'tourists' with 'tourism'.

Candidates mostly employed second person to engage an audience, though many employed first and even third person. Most adopted an informal register, employing colloquial language, rhetorical questions and imperatives, and the tone was usually enthusiastic and inviting. More successful responses ended with a call to action; some gave email and website address contact details.

Weaker responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses – frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses offered a summary of the extract and quoted large amounts from the given text, which was rarely justified.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text 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 shorter pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) Candidates were asked to compare their advertisement with the extract from the academic book, analysing form, structure and language.

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, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. 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 relate to audience and shape meaning.

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

Candidates generally understood the conventions of an academic book, i.e. coherence, the logical order, use of evidence to support opinion and argument and knowledge of a specific subject area.

Candidates attempted to compare the ways in which conventions were adhered to in the texts. They considered the title and subheadings of their own pieces but were often unclear or unsure about what to say about the original extract. They attempted to compare how each audience was specified by the purpose of each piece rather than the form adopted. The following proved to be a more successful strategy: the advert to promote to potential travellers; the extract to inform potential readers. Candidates then compared the register and the tone of each piece with the advert being informal and friendly or chatty and the extract being formal and serious or matter of fact. Only the more detailed responses considered the elements of informality in the extract together with the various changes in tone. Candidates compared their uses of number and person with that of the original. They noted the ways in which their own writing engaged an audience directly and the way in which the writer of the extract engaged an audience indirectly: *let it be known to the readers of this book*.

Points about structure were generally very limited, largely comprising basic comparisons of paragraph numbers and lengths. Detailed responses considered the first-person opening of the extract and the writer's first-hand observations of tourists. They noted the writer's shift to geo-political concerns about the region. One candidate noted the writer's use of chiasmus in the final sentence: *...how little we know about each other, and how others know even less about us*.

Candidates focused on rhetorical features, in particular where metaphor/simile was employed in their own work, compared to that of the extract. The writer's reference to *ice-cold winds threatening to tear apart their expensive handbags and coats* was often cited as an instance of personification. The simile *like some kind of cruel joke by the weather gods* was more clearly understood. Candidates compared their use of persuasive language with the writer's use of informative language.

Successful responses commented on a range of language choices in the given text to compare with their own, i.e. the inclusion of facts gives the text a sense of authority and expertise – *the Hurtigruten travels through Bodø. Eight countries border the Arctic Ocean, Arctic Ocean shipping traffic is increasing* –, the ways in which parenthetical structures are used in the text, the effect of the juxtaposition of *brutally hostile* and *intensely beautiful*, the description of the weather – *Arctic chill, harsh conditions* –, lexical field associated with sanctuary – *refuge, reprieve, shelter* – and the lexical field concerned with politics and economics – *negotiation's, global hydrocarbon resources, military alliances, defense, investment strategies, East meets West, diplomatic agreements, security policies* – and *Cold War*. Stronger responses also recognised the attitude of the writer towards tourists and that the reference to *bellies* is quite derogatory.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between an advertisement and its conventions and the conventions of academic writing; these responses regarded the extract and their own advertisement as of equal status and commented on both extensively. Such responses also offered a considerable amount of detail to illustrate points, showing a strong grasp of each feature and detail selected, and how each related to audience and shaped meaning.

Comparative points in limited responses were often straightforward with little attempt to provide evidence from each text or to analyse the features identified. These responses were often brief, focused more (occasionally entirely) on the extract than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, showing little awareness of how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of academic writing, merely pointing out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without any reference to effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type.

These weaker responses focused on a comparison of content and neglected language analysis. Clear reference was made to characteristic features by candidates who compared the register, tone and language features of each piece and how these had been utilised for each specific audience.

Candidates would be well advised to note that 'comparative' is the most discriminating skill in terms of reading and especially analysis; analysis that not only explains how a technique works generally but also how specific effects are created that relate to audience and shaping of meaning. Furthermore, candidates' responses would benefit from clear references to the relevant text; this is particularly important when following a topical approach.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read an extract from a review of a new electric car, published on a science and technology website called *The Verge*. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

The text was mainly 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 only a few short answers.

Responses to form were generally limited. Most candidates understood the conventions of a review. They commented on the writer's purpose: to inform; to entertain; to advise; to provide an opinion (several identified the text as persuasive). They commented on the context of the review and the target audience, with many noting its appeal to 'adrenaline junkies' and/or 'techies', like the writer, now concerned for their carbon footprint. Candidates recognised the first-hand, first person aspects of the text and the credibility that this lent to the writer's views on driving the Taycan for the first time, as a journalist, on this *five-hour course*. Candidates commented on the conventions of the headline and the strapline – although the latter was often referred to as a sub-head or by-line – and how these set both the theme and the exciting tone for much of

the text. Candidates recognised that the writer had followed the conventions of a review in weighing up the pros and cons of the Taycan's features in order to conclude with a measured but honest judgement about the car – even if it was somewhat biased. Many candidates, having noted that this review was written in the past tense, went on to comment on how the *jolt* from *the launch control* had left such a lasting impression on the writer that the impact from the turbo boost was *still rattling* in his *brain two weeks later*.

Responses to structure mainly focused on basic points about the arrangement and number of paragraphs. Many candidates also focused on sentence types but, generally, this amounted to feature spotting rather than effective, critical engagement.

Where candidates identified significant features of form, they could, generally, discuss aspects of structure in a more detailed way. The key point that was noted was the shift in tone and perspective at the beginning of paragraph six: *it was a shame*.... Further shifts in tone and perspective were noted in more detailed responses: the writer's shift to present tense at the beginning of paragraph seven *here's what's happening* to provide a sense of immediacy for the reader and to engage them in the test drive; the writer's continuation of present tense with the imperative *add to all of this* at the beginning of paragraph nine in evaluating the evidence to arrive at his final judgement; the writer's use of the prepositional phrase *despite all of this* in the concluding paragraph when noting that the car is *still very fun to drive*. A few detailed/sophisticated responses commented on the cyclical nature of the text with its focus on speed in the strapline and in the first paragraph, *I mashed the throttle*, and in the writer's final, humorous quip about breaking the *speed limit*. Generally, candidates saw this as a balanced and discursive review and many noted the writer's concern for safety, given his relief in driving on a *mercifully empty stretch of winding mountain road* and his concern about the *ludicrous speeds* of the car with their potential threat to the safety of new owners.

The usual features of language that invited comment were the onomatopoeic *SNAP* in the opening one-word paragraph. For most candidates, the italics, the capitalisation and the sensory nature of the word constituted the initial hook of this review. The informative elements of the review were noted: the details about speed; the details about cost; the detailed, car related jargon. The entertaining elements of the review were commented on in relation to the writer's use of simile, hyperbole and derision: the launch control was *like being caught in a human-sized rubber band that had been stretched to its limits*; the brakes were *like I was stepping on the brake pedal of a Prius*. The metaphor of *the steering wheel fought me* was usually cited as an instance of personification, but candidates noted that the writer's intention was to bring the car 'to life'. More discerning responses commented on the dangers implied in the writer's struggle for control. Other language features included the writer's focus on electricity, given the nature of the car. One candidate noted the repetition of the title in the opening paragraph, *Porsche's first electric car*, and then went on to comment on the lexical field associated with electricity: *rattling in my brain; jolt from the launch control; electric motors; energy; battery pack; effortless with its power; the spring, coil-like energy of a stretched rubber band*.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. The writer's advisory elements were commented on in effective responses. The irony of the Taycan's *dream car credentials* was noted in these responses. The writer advises that the Taycan's acceleration is violent, its brakes are *mushy* and its steering is *mushy* too. The surprise of the writer, himself, was noted in his juxtaposition of *the rock-solid mechanical braking ... expected from a car of this caliber*. One insightful candidate attempted to comment on the writer's opinion of the Taycan in his use of polyptoton: from the verb *mashed* and the adjective *mushy* to the noun *mushiness* and, finally, back to being somewhat bemused and 'lost for words' in describing the steering as *...a bit mushy?*

Clear responses identified the authority and credibility of the writer due to his first-hand experience and knowledge about cars and the history of the company, considering it an honest and authentic review. Some noted the use of colloquial language. These candidates were able to identify some of the language used (and noted above) such as *mushy* and *human rubber band* and comment on how the writer's choices shaped meaning. Many noted the use of the joke at the end about the police as a useful way to end the article on a humorous note or a warning to future drivers.

Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', with little further elaboration or definition. 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. These weaker responses listed techniques with no reference or example given or explanation. Most, however, noted the use of onomatopoeia *SNAP* to 'hook' the reader. These candidates were able to identify some of the language used such as *mushy* and *human rubber band* but needed to provide explanation.

These weaker responses mostly 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 is not be rewarded twice.

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 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 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 should be advised to use quotations, evidence and evaluation to produce precise, meaningful commentaries. They need to use appropriate language to link quotations and evidence with explanatory comments and integrate quotations and evidence into a cohesive argument.

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’ or ‘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

- 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, 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 a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to meaning, context and audience. They need to organise information in their answers and write 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 selected texts for this paper offered different genre, style and context. The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some brief responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words. While there is no direct penalty for not adhering to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose (AO2). Candidates should remember that their responses are assessed for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was evidence that only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis. This session, there was evidence that some candidates struggled to manage their time appropriately, and consequently they often failed to complete their last response.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of the given text to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from an academic book. 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) to a college in Chicago. 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 candidates who adopted a topical approach tended to demonstrate 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 were asked to read an extract from the novel *My Name is Lucy Barton* by Elizabeth Strout, about the narrator's love of reading and her aspirations to be educated. They were then required to imagine they were the guidance counselor referred to in the extract and write a report for the college in Chicago, about Lucy's suitability to study there.

The characteristic features and conventions of report writing were recognised by most candidates: the need for awareness of audience, a clear logical structure, formality, precise detail, relevant information and a recommendation. Some presented their endorsements in letter format and at least one candidate provided headings to organise their report: 'Educational Qualifications'; 'Scholarship Eligibility'.

Generally, candidates' reports were recommendations about Lucy Barton's suitability to attend college and they provided justifications as to why she was such a deserving case. Candidates adapted material from the source text, including reference to her 'underprivileged background', her diligence, 'excellent work ethic' with a 'powerful drive to succeed', and her record of achievement, for example: 'straight A candidate'. Candidates mostly concluded with a final endorsement, for example: Lucy Barton as a candidate who is 'brimming with potential' that deserves to be 'nurtured'. There were some delightful responses that dealt with Lucy's financial situation and her social issues sensitively, creating a professional cohesive text, although sometimes too much emphasis was placed on Lucy's interest in reading. Effective reports created a real persona for the guidance counsellor, with references to how long they had worked at the school and also the length of time they had known Lucy. Other successful reports highlighted how Lucy was 'a diamond in the rough', 'a complete gem', 'incredible' or 'a real asset'.

More successful responses referred to Lucy's analytical mind and survival in school against the odds; they also noted the quizzical thought behind the puzzle of the *pink ... fiberglass*. The most effective responses came from candidates who had recognised, from the extract, that Lucy Barton had already been invited to attend *a college just outside of Chicago... with all expenses paid*. Their reports addressed this in their openings, for example: 'as discussed previously in correspondence between yourself and Westfield High'.

Less successful responses typically wrote their report from the perspective of the college inviting Lucy to come and join them. These weaker responses wrote about how Lucy would be a 'great candidate' as she read a lot, liked books and had 'straight A's'. These responses were often not in report style and were very informal.

Weaker responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses – frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses offered a summary of the extract. These responses sometimes showed misunderstandings of the task whereby candidates merely lifted material inappropriately or wrote from the point of view of the college in Chicago about their courses and their suitability for Lucy.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text 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 shorter pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) Candidates were asked to compare their report with the extract from the novel, analysing form, structure and language.

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, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. 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 relate to audience and shape meaning.

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

Candidates generally understood the conventions and differences between a report and an autobiographical novel. They compared the purpose of each form: to provide a recommendation and justifications; to inform, describe and entertain. The more successful targeted their comments precisely at the context, audience and purpose of each. They compared the third-person perspective of the report format to the first-person narrative voice in the extract. They compared the formal register of the report to the informal register of the novel. They also compared the objective overview of the report to the subjective and reminiscent voice of the text.

Points about structure were generally very limited, largely comprising basic comparisons of paragraph numbers and lengths. Clear points were made by candidates who considered the organisational features of using headings in the report and/or logical sequencing and the 'meandering' sense of chronology suggested by the stages in Lucy Barton's personal development and the small but significant details of her 'life-changing events'. Successful comments on structure considered the way the given text is structured to reflect Lucy's very humble beginnings in the opening paragraph, to her arrival at college in the penultimate paragraph and her fearful return home for Thanksgiving in the concluding paragraph. Furthermore, these successful responses considered their own conclusions (usually with a final recommendation about Lucy) and the way in which the concluding paragraph of the given extract emphatically conveys Lucy's fear of being stuck in her home and not being able to return to college, and that this thought was *unbearable* to her.

Most candidates compared their matter-of-fact tone of the report and the factual details that they had included to the nostalgic tone and vivid imagery of the extract. They considered the changes in tone in the extract and compared the declarative voice of the report to the declarative and exclamatory voice of the text. Candidates commented on how sympathy was evoked by the narrative voice: the references to poverty, the references to loneliness. They commented on the specialised language of the report with its uses of academic 'jargon' to establish the 'credibility of the guidance counsellor' and, compared this to what many saw as the casual, 'conversational' features of the extract: *this is my point* and *I thought*.

Successful responses commented on a range of language choices in the given text to compare with their own, i.e. descriptive details about the garage, the elementary school, books (Tilly), and the college, repetition of puzzled/puzzle and the description of the fiberglass in the first paragraph, contrasting descriptions of the cold garage and the warm school, the frequent use of the

conjunction *and* throughout the text, and punctuation effects, specifically the use of colons, exclamation marks, dashes and parenthesis throughout.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between a report and its conventions and the conventions of narrative writing; these responses regarded the extract and their own report as of equal status and commented on both extensively. Such responses also offered a considerable amount of detail to illustrate points, showing a strong grasp of each feature and detail selected, and how each related to audience and shaped meaning.

Limited responses were often brief, focused more (occasionally entirely) on the extract than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, showing little awareness of how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of academic writing, merely pointing out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without any reference to effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type. Comparative points were often straightforward with little attempt to provide evidence from each text or to analyse the features identified. These weaker responses focused on a comparison of content and neglected language analysis.

Candidates would be well advised to note that 'comparative' is the most discriminating skill in terms of reading and especially analysis; analysis that not only explains how a technique works generally but also how specific effects are created that relate to audience and shaping of meaning. Furthermore, candidates' responses would benefit from clear references to the relevant text; this is particularly important when following a topical approach.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read an advertisement from an online shop, about the benefits of sleeping on silk pillowcases. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

The text was mainly 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 only a few short answers.

Candidates generally understood the conventions of the advertisement form. They commented on the rhetorical nature of the title: that what followed would not be a discursive review, suggested by the question, but rather a canny product endorsement strategy that attempted to hook its audience, which many candidates identified as largely female, given the references to *frizzy hair*, *face creams* and *other skincare products* from the outset. The more critical noted that the audience could include a range of people of all ages, sizes and genders, with many differing ailments. Many commented on how the strapline suggested the trendy nature of silk and built immediate credibility with its references to *beauty experts and bloggers extolling* the beneficial virtues of the product. Candidates understood the purpose: to inform; to advise; to persuade. They commented on the use of statistics; the use of advisory facts and expert knowledge and opinion; the uses of direct address to persuade.

Many candidates had a basic sense of structure, enumerating the paragraphs and commenting on their length. Many candidates also focused on sentence types, but generally this amounted to feature spotting rather than effective, critical engagement. Clearer understanding of structure involved candidates commenting on, for example, 'card-stacking' technique employed by the writer to arrive at 'the big, boastful reveal': *at Calidad Home, we only use the best kind of charmeuse silk*. Some candidates proposed that the text was structured in such a way so as to provide an affirmative answer to the initial question posed: *Can A Silk Pillowcase Really Be That Good?* The evidence was then stacked in such a way to make it seem as though 'the reader had reached that conclusion by themselves': *so you're convinced*.

Some candidates noted the use of contrast to highlight the differences between the nature of silk and cotton as material also used for pillowcases, which helped to develop the writer's argument further and candidates were aware of this. One candidate suggested that 'the use of contrast by comparing cotton to silk creates a 'societal norm' to avoid anything with negative connotations successfully persuading the reader to use silk rather than cotton pillowcases'.

The usual features of language that invited comment were the lexical field of luxury, for example, a silk pillowcase incorporates *beauty*, it has *sheen*, it *glides*. Not only that, but it is *gentle* and *robust*. Some

responses made reference to the writer's use of repetition that serves to endorse the appeal of the product with intensifiers: *high quality*; *unique quality*. The informal and humorous nature of the language, with its alliterative references to '*creepie-crawlies*' and '*night-time nasties*', some candidates pointed out, serves to provide friendly advice. They explored the lexical field of health and wellbeing, *hypoallergenic*, *eczema*, *psoriasis*, *chemotherapy*, and *medication*, concluding that these choices provide credibility and convincing the audience of the health benefits. Candidates commented on the writer's reference to anecdotal evidence. The product 'has been tried and tested' and could, therefore, be 'trusted'. Candidates noted the range of questions which served to continuously engage the audience. One candidate noted the pun on silk being *cool*.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Furthermore, they explored the use of interrogative sentence forms to involve the reader and create a conversational style; jargonistic lexis such as *momme count*, *charmeuse 22 momme* and *charmeuse weave*, the repeated use of the modal verb *can* and how this links to the writer's purpose, and that the use of contractions creates a less formal register and adds to the chatty, conversational style of the writing.

Weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', with little further elaboration or definition. 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. These weaker responses listed techniques with no reference or example given or explanation.

These weaker responses mostly 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 is not be rewarded twice.

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 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 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 should be advised to use quotations, evidence and evaluation to produce precise, meaningful commentaries. They need to use appropriate language to link quotations and evidence with explanatory comments and integrate quotations and evidence into a cohesive argument.

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' or 'logos' or 'pathos', for example, needs to be precisely developed by reference to exact effects of language.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

<p>Paper 9093/13 Reading</p>

Key messages

- 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, 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 a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to meaning, context and audience. They need to organise information in their answers and write 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 selected texts for this paper offered different genre, style and context. The rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some brief responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words. While there is no direct penalty for not adhering to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's relevance to purpose (AO2). Candidates should remember that their responses are assessed for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was evidence that only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis. This session, there was evidence that some candidates struggled to manage their time appropriately, and consequently they often failed to complete their last response.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by the language, style and structure of the given text to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from an academic book. 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 diary entry (150–200 words). 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 candidates who adopted a topical approach tended to demonstrate 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 were asked to read a report from the website of the global environmental organisation, Greenpeace, about forest fires in Siberia. They were required to write a diary entry following the visit from the Greenpeace representatives.

Responses to this question showed genuine enthusiasm and there were consistently imaginative and developed responses to the task which included the chosen resident's personal thoughts, feelings and reflections. They were aware that the characteristic features of diary writing can include detail, description and emotive language. There were often emotional and heartfelt diary entries with an appropriate understanding of purpose and register. There were some interesting uses of language to describe the fire and smog: 'amber beast' and 'smoggy smoke from hell'. To include the visit from the Greenpeace representatives, a number of candidates wrote two diary entries on different days.

In clear responses, candidates recognised that the diary entry was to be written as a resident. Good textual details were included, without unnecessary lifting of material from the passage, and some logical and credible development of ideas occurred. These responses often took a 'Dear diary' approach and used a sign off that expressed a future of hope and health, for example, 'For the first time I have a future to look forward to'.

In effective responses, tenses were clear and consistent, lifted material did not dominate and there was a credible sense of the diary form. These responses were written as one of the residents identified in the report and included details such as the inability to *breathe easily*, wider *respiratory conditions*, waking up in the night feeling ill and the *smell of burning*. These responses captured the frustration and anxiety caused by the fires, followed by the relief and success that Greenpeace Russia had managed to bring to the people of Siberia. Insightful candidates added that, although there was good news, it would not necessarily help the people of Siberia immediately. For some, this was expressed as an angry tone.

Limited responses showed some misreading of the text; a few candidates created a response from the perspective of a fire fighter, a rescuer or a Greenpeace representative. These weaker responses often struggled to amalgamate the information concerning Greenpeace into a personal diary on an emotional topic. A minority of these candidates reshaped their writing as a short story. Furthermore, these responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses, frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses quoted large amounts from the given text in their Directed Response, which was rarely justified.

The need for careful reading of the question was highlighted in several responses that did not acknowledge the requirement to write from a resident's perspective or the need to reflect on the events in the passage rather than introducing completely new material.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text 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 shorter pieces that did not best suit the form and purpose specified.

- (b) Candidates were asked to compare their diary entry with the report, analysing form, structure and language.

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, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. 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 relate to audience and shape meaning.

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

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 report and diary entry and elaborated on this. In addition to this, a common feature mentioned was the use of voice and personal pronouns and the distinguished differences and similarities between the two texts in terms of how this was appropriate to their purposes.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between a report and its conventions and the conventions of diary writing; these responses regarded the report and their own diary entry as of equal status and commented on both extensively. Such responses also offered a considerable amount of detail to illustrate points, showing a strong grasp of each feature and detail selected, and how each related to audience and shaped meaning.

In terms of language, these stronger responses referred to the references to time and adverbial phrases, they compared the effect of the quotations in the passage and the reshaping of these in their diaries and how factual information was used in the report but not always in the diary entry.

They often compared the lexical fields associated with health/illness – *headache, cough, pulmonary or respiratory conditions* – with the inclusion of this lexical field in their own writing. Stronger responses explored the use of emotive language in the report – *tragic, catastrophic* – with the resident's anguish represented by their own stylistic choices. A key comparative element in the stronger responses was use of triplicate structures within sentences in the report – *caustic smog seeps in through ventilation, a helicopter rumbles somewhere above us, a military plane passes by higher up, a fire engine overtakes us* – and the types of sentences used in their diary writing.

In detailed and sophisticated 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 original report and the candidate's own diary entry, and the ways in which the different purposes affected the content and style of the two texts. They also commented successfully on the ways in which the report and diary entry were relevant to their respective intended audiences, e.g. through the tone and register used in each text. These responses offered an integrated comparison of these elements with their own writing.

Clear responses compared the two texts throughout and referred accurately to specific techniques used in both, quoting them clearly and explaining the precise effects they created. There was no

generalisation such as ‘this really created rhythm’ or ‘this engaged the reader’, but precise consideration of the impact of individual examples on the reader. Responses such as these often fell into a clear pattern of identifying the technique, giving the example and the subsequent effect of its use as well as highlighting the broader effect in the passage. These answers also related the tone and purpose to precise features of the writing, realising that language use creates tone, rather than relying on a broad identification of tone unconnected to language use.

Limited responses were often brief, focused more (occasionally entirely) on the extract than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, showing little awareness of how writers’ stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of academic writing, merely pointing out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without any reference to effect. Some responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type. Comparative points were often straightforward with little attempt to provide evidence from each text or to analyse the features identified. These weaker responses focused on a comparison of content and neglected language analysis.

Candidates would be well advised to note that ‘comparative’ is the most discriminating skill in terms of reading and especially analysis; analysis that not only explains how a technique works generally but also how specific effects are created that relate to audience and shaping of meaning. Furthermore, candidates’ responses would benefit from clear references to the relevant text; this is particularly important when following a topical approach.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read an advertisement for a climbing holiday in Greece. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

The text was generally well understood and was answered with obvious engagement by most candidates. Almost all candidates discussed the different sections used in the passage, identifying the lists, itinerary, clear headings and bullet points. There were several answers which achieved a genuinely sophisticated level of understanding, particularly in tracing the shifts in focus between the beauty of the island, the details of the climbing destination, the itinerary, accommodation and the final fact check. There were very few short answers.

Stronger responses not only showed awareness of the characteristic features of an advertisement – i.e. that they name the product or service, explain what the service is and what is involved, the use of persuasive language that will appeal to the customer, the use of subtitles and a catchy slogan, that data is used to support claims and that an advertisement usually ends with a call to action – but also targeted their comments precisely at the context, audience and purpose of the advertisement. They were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. These responses recognised the relationship between the structured itineraries and the offering of choice and a relaxed experience through comments such as ‘We do not have a set list of crags’ and ‘geared towards your individual abilities’.

Clear responses and above showed understanding that the advertisement was for a niche audience of people who like climbing. Some suggested that the target audience was established climbers and others commented on the prospect that ‘outdoor types’ would also be interested, even if they were not already climbers. Most mentioned the use of the itinerary, and there was some attempt to comment on syntax. Some responses offered explanatory comments on the jargon used that only climbers would understand, for example, *single pitch* and *climbing grade F5 up to F7B+*.

Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having ‘positive connotations’ or ‘negative connotations’, with little further elaboration or definition. 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, *assonance* and *sibilance*. 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 (subheadings, the range of activities, attempts to provide authority and credibility about climbing). More detailed commentaries noted the hybrid nature of this text with its combination of imagery – *paradise* and *brehtaking views* –, precise detail – *steep caves with tufas* – and the final bulleted fact list. Such candidates went on to consider purpose (to persuade and inform) and to comment on how this combination related to a wide audience, *depending on where you are in your climbing career*.

Limited responses focused on basic points about the arrangement and number of paragraphs of this text. Many candidates also focused on sentence types, but generally this amounted to feature spotting rather than offering effective, critical engagement. Some of these limited responses offered over-earnest reference to the presence of short, long and complex sentences, without any clear analysis. Some responses demonstrated a lack of vocabulary to explain the effects created by the use of certain lexical features, relying on the ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ catch-all descriptors to explain terms such as *paradise*, *beautiful* or *amazing*. Some candidates offered narrative responses which demonstrated a struggle to understand the structure of the advert.

In terms of language, many candidates focused on the characteristics noted above regarding form and structure. More successful candidates commented on the use of the adjectival phrase *World-Class Climbing* in the first subheading, which suggests that Kalymnos is one of the best places in the world for climbing. They explored how the vocabulary used in the opening paragraph shapes meaning – *beautiful, fantastic, secluded, friendly, delicious, great, amazing* – and their effect on the audience. Such responses commented on the asyndetic listing in *Beach bars, snorkelling, kayaking, great food, fishing, diving, scooter tours, yoga* as emphasising the positive aspects of the island and experience. These more successful responses noted that the use of the present tense created immediacy, serving as scene setting, and when combined with use of the future tense, the audience is encouraged to imagine what the holiday will be like. Most noted the use of contractions and colloquial phrases such as ‘chill out’, and those more successful commented that this aligns the writer with the target audience, creating a conversational style. Limited responses were able to identify the use of first-person plural pronouns even if they did not comment on how this connects the writer with the audience and establishes the writer as knowledgeable about the holiday being offered.

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 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 and they 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 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.

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 adhere to the guidance of writing no more than 400 words for their responses to **Question 1a**. They should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the actual task. Candidates should also adhere to the rubric of writing a minimum of 600 words for their **Section B** response.
- 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 *diary entry*, focusing on both *the importance of your help* and *the impact of your actions*.
- 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.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, responses were weaker due to a loss of grammatical control in attempts to write in long, complex sentences. These candidates would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. Two errors that occurred quite regularly were those of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops and of writing in sentence fragments, rather than in complete sentences
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully.
- 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)** at all.

Stronger responses to **Question 1(a)** focused clearly on the question, writing engaging speeches aimed at other candidates in the school. Weaker responses consisted of simple speeches, without consideration of the specified audience.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who were able to maintain 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 were focused entirely on content and therefore only provided minimal analysis; this was usually 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 (review, description or letter), 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 **Question 2** reviews were simple recounts of the city tour and the specific sights, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion about the tour; some responses to **Question 3** were purely narrative in form rather than descriptive; some **Question 4** responses lost focus on the formality required of the letter and became repetitive, with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You recently joined an after-school club, which is now looking for more new members. You have offered to give a short speech to your year group, persuading people to join.

- (a) **Write the text for your speech, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the importance of developing skills and interests, and create a sense of enthusiasm for this club.**

Most candidates wrote an introduction which included a greeting to their audience of peers and a brief outline of the purpose of their speech. The majority of the responses were written in informal register and there was some use of teen language, such as 'y'all', 'c'mon guys', 'geeks' and 'nerds'. Many responses created a sense of enthusiasm by using exclamation marks and mentioning additional features of the club, like free pizza snacks on meeting days and occasional field trips.

Many stronger responses included engaging openings to the speeches, often by using a rhetorical question rather than a pedestrian welcome explaining the purpose of the speech. One example of this is in this speech opening encouraging students to join the school chess club: 'Have you ever wanted to engage in a battle of wits? Have you ever wanted to test your skill and dedication against others?'

Stronger responses gave specific names of clubs and focused on the objectives of the activities promoted and the skills developed as a result of membership, as well as their importance to the students' future. One strong example of this was: 'An officer of this club coached youth soccer for the entirety of his four years. Now, he has made it to the US National team! Think about that; one of our very own made his career based on a small coaching gig!'

Some stronger responses achieved a sense of purpose and audience successfully by demonstrating how the club would benefit fellow students. In one such example, the candidate showed in one complex sentence how the club would be beneficial, using a range of well-chosen vocabulary: 'Recognized and endorsed by the National Honors Society, we have worked together to provide new members with the experience to socialize and make new friends, assist the beachside community and marine life organisations and contribute to the development of critical skills to allow candidates to properly sprout into adulthood through character, integrity and good Samaritanism'.

Many responses were weaker where they were needing in terms of structure, very often being written without any paragraph breaks. Many of these weaker responses were short, often under 200 words. Some weaker responses focused too much on areas like the activities conducted by the club or how the club benefitted students in a general manner, without providing specific details. Some weaker responses concentrated on trying to convince the audience to join, but without elaborating on concrete reasons to persuade them. In many weaker responses, candidates did not specify the nature of the club being promoted. Some responses focused too much on the speaker's own narrative of personal experiences as a club member, which detracted from task achievement.

Weaker responses were often hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. For example, in this response, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'Making a game is not easy and it takes everything a game developer knows to make a game, you cant make a game that interest people if even you are not interest in it.'

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

Stronger responses were analytical and detailed, covering aspects of structural choice in addition to language and form. The best responses assimilated terminology fluently and illustrated points in detail, with apposite quotation. There were some strong evaluations of the conventions and ingredients of the speech format.

Stronger responses discussed the usage of features such as hypophora and asyndeton confidently. Success was often achieved through multiple short paragraphs naming the techniques one by one, giving evidence from their shorter writing, and explaining the effect on the audience. There were some examples of good practice in terms of succinct, precise quotation to support analysis, for example: 'Although mostly formal diction is used, I have also peppered the speech with colloquial language. Examples include "busy bunch" to describe the students, and "sizzling" and "cool" to describe some of the food at the parties. Colloquial language is more relatable to the student audience, keeping them more engaged and interested.'

Many weaker responses did not identify the linguistic and structural choices made in the shorter writing, or use appropriate linguistic terminology, as in this example: 'My speech was effective because of the language I used.' Others made little attempt to analyse the effect of linguistic choices, simply commenting, 'I used adjectives, similes and metaphor,' and, 'My rhetorical question will make people think.'

Many weaker responses included basic general commentary on the content of the speech with no relevant language or structural points being made. They were often in need of reference to specific words or phrases from the speech and tended to focus on simple identification of features with little or no analysis of their effect or the ways in which they relate to audience and shape meaning. Some responses were extremely short, with linguistic features incorrectly identified. The weakest responses simply described or paraphrased the speech.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Review

During a recent holiday, you went on a half-day guided tour of a city. Write a review of the guided tour, which will be published on an international travel website. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Half-day guided tours of New York City, Paris, London, Rio de Janeiro and other major cities were the most common topics. Most candidates discussed various aspects of the tour and then gave a recommendation as to whether the tour was good value for money, sometimes qualifying their opinion by saying who might or might not enjoy the tour.

Some candidates were highly adept at this particular genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated response. Stronger responses maintained an authoritative persona throughout of a bored/enthusiastic/disappointed tourist, which made the review feel authentic. Stronger responses consisted of credible, balanced reviews; many named the tour, using titles such as, 'Viva Miami' and 'Key West half-day City Tour.' They considered a wide range of aspects of the event, including a range of tourist attractions and activities, amenities provided during the tour, customer service, food options and value for money.

Many stronger responses were structured with subheadings defining the places or activities included on the tour of the chosen place. This resulted in coherent, clearly structured pieces of writing. Focus on specific spots of the city in each paragraph enabled candidates to describe the place, comment on the experience, and evaluate the service of the tour (as well as the tour guide) in an organised manner. A recommendation and star rating were often included, with the justification for the rating, as in this example: 'Booking this guided tour was truly one of the best decisions I think I have ever made. The tour was very well organised,

with a competent, knowledgeable guide, clear itinerary, interesting stops. My brain felt as though it would burst after all the information I absorbed, but in the best way possible.'

Most stronger reviews were concluded well, ending with a sentence or paragraph that gave further credibility to the review and the persona that had been adopted, as in this example: 'Overall, the tour did what it needed to do. We got around the town, we learned about history and my family were kept busy. However, the execution of the tour took it down to two and a half stars.'

Weaker reviews mainly focused on describing the place (which in some cases was not a city), food and activities without expressing personal views and evaluation of the guided tour itself. A list-like approach to the sites visited during the city tour contributed to some responses not reaching the minimum number of words required. Many responses lost focus on the task by describing preparations for the tour, or the flight to the destination. This compromised fulfilling the purpose of writing a review. Many weaker responses were written from first person point of view and often lapsed into narrative, recounting the events leading up to the guided tour. For example: 'I woke to see the sun rising through the cotton curtains,' and, 'my sister was playing with her toys while we got dressed. I wore jeans and trainers.' Sometimes these responses were more akin to a personal diary entry than an unbiased assessment for publication on a website.

Question 3 – Descriptive piece

Write a descriptive piece about a waterfall. In your writing, create a sense of atmosphere, and focus on sound, light and movement to help your reader to imagine the scene. Write between 600 and 900 words.

A significant number of candidates successfully used the technique of a framed narrative, such as walking in a forest and coming across a waterfall. For many candidates, the narrative details became the most significant feature of the response, so that the ideas related to the descriptive purpose of the task were only developed in a limited manner.

Stronger responses were those where candidates kept to the descriptive stance throughout the piece, describing sound, light and movement with subtlety and precision. Some candidates described the waterfall at different times, for example in the morning, in the afternoon and before sunset, observing the changes that had taken place. Stronger responses invariably established the descriptive form in the very first paragraph or sentence, for example: 'As I crossed the weak, wobbly wooden bridge, I looked up at the diamond-coloured waterfall, gleaming and glistening.' Stronger pieces sometimes presented elements of nature in a creative manner that made the descriptive piece both interesting to read and vividly imaginable. An example of this was one candidate's attempt to personify a water droplet: 'Tom was an average water droplet ... In his river, Tom lived a simple yet enjoyable life ... Tom darted forward through his river. Up, down, left, right. Each of the other droplets jostled around violently, each with his own thoughts of victory ... The river continued its motion towards an unknown destination.'

Stronger responses included a variety of linguistic techniques, for example metaphorical language, as in the following example: 'A sound as soft as wind chimes floated through the air like a dandelion, whispering magical music into my ears. As I followed the sound, it increased in volume, like the finale of a symphony, finally reaching a grand crescendo when I arrived at the origin of this whimsical music.'

Weaker responses were sometimes planned poorly, resulting in most of the piece being about what preceded getting to the waterfall and ending with the speaker leaving at the end of the day, with little descriptive detail. For example, this opening: 'I got up as usual, looking forward to the day ahead; my mother made me my usual breakfast of cereal and fruit.' Weaker descriptive pieces were generally limited to use of adjectives to describe the waterfall and its surroundings, and some of the weaker responses tended towards frequent sentence fragments using present participles such as: 'The burning sun shining over the water leaving a glossy top layer. The sound of the water splashing against each other. The warm mist in the air clouding over the clear blue sky.'

Question 4 – Letter

You have read a newspaper article which said that studying the arts at university is a waste of time, and that teenagers should be encouraged to take courses that lead directly to a particular job. You disagree and decide to write a letter to the editor of the newspaper about this. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Stronger responses demonstrated good use of planning and gave different points of view for the argument, supported by explanations and clear examples in each of the body paragraphs. Many stronger responses consistently referred to the greater advantages of an arts course by raising points like: ‘students placed in a creative environment freely express their ideas without the interference of a job’s guidelines or a course’s limitations. They can allow their imagination to grow and bond as one, formulating entirely new worlds and ideas that would not exist without the contribution from one another.’ A strong conclusion usually included a request for a specific course of action from the editor to fix the undesirable content that had been published: ‘I acknowledge that there is free speech and that it was not necessarily wrong for your newspaper to publish that article, but I hope that you will consider publishing another that shows the other side of things.’

Some responses evinced clear and effective arguments, for example: ‘Encouraging teenagers to take courses that lead directly to a particular job will leave many without a job. Overpopulating certain courses will cause many to suffer, especially during times like these, where uncertainty haunts the modern world. Unemployment rates are increasing day by day, while Artificial Intelligence has become prominent, eradicating many professions. Encouraging naive teenagers into certain courses that they are not comfortable in is truly a recipe for disaster.’

Candidates who developed convincing arguments often employed anecdotes, either from personal experience or reference to well-known entrepreneurs/celebrities: ‘Individuals can become innovative. An example of this is Tim Burton, whose childhood creativity followed him into adult life.’ Some responses referred to specific aspects of the original newspaper article, such as the imagined headline: ‘I recently read your article, Art is a Hobby, Not a Lifestyle.’ This enabled a sense of engagement and authenticity, as did quoting statements from the article in order to build counter arguments.

Weaker responses were characterised by generalised content which centred around the positives of studying an arts course but did not explore the benefits in much depth. Many responses would have been more successful with improvements in: clear punctuation, clear organisation, and signposting in arguments. Weaker letters often engaged in repetitive justification of art as a form of expression for young people. Some did not address the key point of the prompt about taking courses that lead directly to a particular job and confined themselves to the value of art in general.

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 adhere to the guidance of writing no more than 400 words for their responses to **Question 1a**. They should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the actual task. Candidates should also adhere to the rubric of writing a minimum of 600 words for their **Section B** response.
- 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 *diary entry*, focusing on both *the importance of your help* and the *impact of your actions*.
- 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.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, responses were weaker due to a loss of grammatical control in attempts to write in long, complex sentences. These candidates would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. Two errors that occurred quite regularly were those of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops and of writing in sentence fragments, rather than in complete sentences
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully.
- 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)** at all.

Stronger responses to **Question 1(a)** focused clearly on the question, with engaging diary entries. Weaker responses consisted of simple accounts of the event, needing more focus on the impact of the help given.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who were able to maintain 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. Many weaker responses focused entirely on content and therefore only provided minimal analysis; this was usually 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, essay 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 responses to **Question 2** were in need of a sense of drama or suspense; some **Question 3** responses lost focus on the formality required of an essay and became repetitive, with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons; some **Question 4** reviews were simple recounts of a visit to the new sports centre, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion about it.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

When you were in the town centre recently, you were able to help someone you did not know, who was in a difficult situation. You decide to write about the experience in your diary.

- (a) **Write the text for your diary entry, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the importance of your help and the impact of your actions.**

Diary writing seemed to be a familiar form for most candidates and there were many engaging and successful responses. Many candidates used the date as an indication that they were writing a diary, and candidates created a range of situations, with the strongest responses creating thoughtful and convincing situations, many occurring in busy shopping centres.

Stronger responses included a considered opening with evidence of temporal adverbs as in, 'Yesterday, I was at the Meridan centre,' 'A few days ago,' 'When I was in town yesterday'. Openings such as these helped to validate the required form, alongside the conventional 'Dear Diary' opening. In the best responses, candidates addressed the audience, using references to shared knowledge, as well as abbreviations and colloquial language, and the strongest responses read like a private conversation with a best friend. For example: 'Dear Diary – It's me again. Yeah, I know. It's been a while, but I just wanted to record what happened today.'

Stronger responses had an element of suspense and a build up to the difficult situation, which seemed initially to be quite ordinary, as in this example: 'I was at Fresh City. Specifically, the line at the check-out was quite short: only a corporate worker in a pristine suit with some milk and a very skinny waif of a girl with a carton of strawberries. Skinny girl stepped up to pay but her change was short.' The situation was rescued by the diarist and the diary entry was suitably concluded with the strawberries referenced again: 'I was feeling extremely accomplished and hoped that things turned out for her and that she enjoyed the strawberries!'

Another feature of more effective responses to this task was the inclusion of well-thought through reflections on the incident, as in the following example: 'This morning, I was able to save the life of a girl. Reality hit me hard today. It sent shivers down my spine as I kept pondering about how different people's lives can be and how privileged mine is. If I had not turned around when she poked me, if I had not looked into her eyes, if only this time I did not go to the candle aisle, this girl would have probably died.'

Weaker responses often presented a straightforward narrative with little sense of a diary entry and took too long introducing the situation. Consequently, such responses struggled to evoke an appropriate sense of mood and were often characterised by simple lexical choices. For example: 'Today something terrible happened. I saw a man having a heart attack and I helped to call an ambulance. It was scary, and I did not know what to do.'

Many responses were weaker where they were needing in terms of structure, very often being written without any paragraph breaks. Many of these weaker diary entries were short, often under

200 words. Such responses needed more development in all aspects – detail, personal reflection and the impact of the actions taken.

Weaker responses were also often hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but often needed more development. For example, in this response, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'I saw that 20 years old man who was sitting down at the bench, he is looking like someone who needed a help, he said yes he needed a help.'

(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 would have been improved with the inclusion of more detail by providing evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response.

Stronger responses were analytical and detailed, covering aspects of structural choice in addition to language and form. The best responses assimilated terminology with fluency and illustrated points in detail and with apposite quotation. Strong evaluations foregrounded the conventions and ingredients of the diary format.

Stronger responses discussed the usage of features such as hypophora and asyndeton confidently. Success was often achieved through multiple short paragraphs naming the techniques one by one, giving evidence from their answer, and explaining the effect on the audience. There were some examples of good practice in terms of succinct, precise quotation to support analysis. For example: 'I have used emotive language like "crying ... tears ... pleading" to highlight the importance of my help and the lasting impact of my actions.'

Stronger responses successfully addressed features of conversational style and informality, where appropriate, with some candidates mentioning the first-person format and using a confiding tone, such as in this example: 'Following the conventions of diary writing, it begins with a salutation to the diary and the time of entry ... The diary is personified as a person ... The structure of the text also pertains to the conventions of a diary with short sentences used ... The mood is pensive and reflective. This is created with words such as "daunting," "anxieties", "hate" and "smiling".'

Many weaker responses did not identify the linguistic and structural choices made, or use appropriate linguistic terminology, as in this example: 'My writing was effective because of the words I chose.' Others did not attempt to analyse the effect of the linguistic choices they had made, only identifying some basic language and structural features and making simple comments, as in these two examples: 'I used adjectives, similes and metaphors,' and, 'With good amount of adjectives used and description given, the reader can picture the scene.'

Many weaker responses included basic general commentary on the content of the diary entry with no relevant language or structural points being made. Some responses were extremely short, with linguistic features incorrectly identified, and had little or no comment on structure.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Story

Write a story called *Who am I?* about a person who suddenly loses their memory. In your writing, create a sense of drama and suspense. Write between 600 and 900 words.

There were some highly creative responses and impressive structuring and use of complementary narrative devices. Situations imagined included someone who had lost their memory as a psychological ploy aimed at forgetting hideous crimes they had committed in a 'previous' life, and a range of less original ideas including car crashes, various dystopian imprisonments, terrorism, identity fraud, hostages and unspecified surgical mishaps. There were some unexpected endings to entertain the reader and some narratives reminiscent of the Alfred Hitchcock genre of horror films. The story form was not always strictly adhered to, with some candidates opting for 'cliff hanger' endings.

Stronger responses often showed immediate engagement with the title and theme of memory loss, as seen in these three openings: 'I stumbled around like a blind man, vaguely seeing a pallid film of light coming in from a single small window high up on the wall'; 'This is the year 3000. Hundreds of years ago, people were selected to be frozen in time, farmers, politicians, beggars, businessmen. There was no prejudice, no bias, only a desire for an egalitarian future;' 'In the mirror I saw a face that looked like it had seen combat. I stared hard at the face. Whose face? I did not recognise it. I sat down, my body shaking.'

Stronger responses had a clear focus on suspense and tension, with a variety of scenarios, frequently examples where a person wakes up in hospital not knowing who they are or how they got there. There were some very convincing pieces of writing where candidates conveyed feelings of loss or disbelief. This section of writing conveys a mixture of confusion and humour: 'Towering people in white surgical coats crowded around me ... "He's awake." I blanked out again. "Do you remember me?" I heard. Mutely, I shook my head. I did not even know what I looked like, let alone what my "mother" looked like.'

More engaging and successful responses focused on feelings of confusion and in some cases panic as the protagonist tried to make sense of himself and the surroundings, as in this response where a man wakes up in a warehouse, not having any sense of how he got there: "The man looked himself up and down. He was in business attire, a badly torn shirt. Who am I? He thought. He reached into his pocket and found a note. "Leo." Is that my name?"

Some weaker responses consisted of overly complex plots which lost control or took place over years and so the structure became unclear, and many began with clichéd opening sentences such as, 'I woke up in hospital,' and then continued with the doctors telling the protagonist they had lost their memory. Less successful responses often established the amnesiac's situation but seemed less confident about developing or resolving it dramatically. Repeated ideas without development were another feature of weaker responses, for example: 'It was 4 years later and he still could not remember. I do not think he will ever remember.'

Question 3 – Essay

In class, you have been discussing whether it is better to study a wide range of subjects at school, or to specialise in a few subjects. Your teacher has asked you to write an essay on the topic. Write between 600 and 900 words.

A significant number of responses to this question were characterised by first-hand experiences of being overwhelmed by having to study a wide range of subjects as opposed to specialising in just a few. Successful candidates produced a balanced view and there were many convincing arguments in favour of a range of subjects for varied interest and scope for future careers. Equally, many candidates argued that a range of subjects led to stress and limited leisure time leading to poor mental health.

In stronger essays, candidates explored this issue well, often posing a question at the start of their argument, as in, 'In a modern world, should not we expect individuals to have a basic knowledge of all fields?' Some candidates focused on freedom of choice and the importance of a healthy mind: 'students need a life outside of school!' Other candidates referenced studies to bolster their arguments in more convincing responses: 'Children are 40 per cent less likely to suffer anxiety and depression if they take up fewer subjects as indicated by a study at the University of Chicago.' Other stronger responses showed immediate engagement with the task by using a title based on the question, as seen in the two following examples: 'Specialise or Diversify?'; 'School Curriculum: Time for Change'. Effective structure and development were characterised by the use of discursive markers, such as, 'On the other hand ... Conversely ... However.'

The best responses demonstrated an appropriate register and style, with a clear sense of audience. For example, one candidate wrote, 'Similarly, the benefits of well-rounded learners should not be understated. Almost all of the empirical evidence points to the fact that students exposed to more subjects are more developed critical thinkers and are highly employable. For example, I had a special dislike of the performing arts as a child.'

Weaker responses tended to be less discursive in style and many were in need of specific examples. Such essays were written in a conversational style which was lacking the necessary formality and sophistication; this resulted in the loss of the authority that the essay required. Although many candidates addressed both sides of the question, a clear verdict at the end was not always included. Many weaker responses would have been improved with clear, logically arranged paragraphs and discourse markers, to suit a discursive style essay. Some weaker essays talked mostly about personal experience and did not extrapolate a general understanding of the issue. Responses were sometimes short or unfinished, while in many other cases the

ideas needed more adequate development and elaboration; the absence of these led to repetition of key points and phrases and some failure to develop detail.

Question 4 – Review

You recently went to a new sports centre for the first time. Write a review of the sports centre, which will be published in your school magazine. Write between 600 and 900 words.

The strongest responses to this question were those which combined descriptive elements and details with some evaluation of the facilities, staff and prices, as well as utilising the review form effectively. Some of these responses addressed the problem of having the advantage of state-of-the-art facilities but also considered the high costs involved.

Stronger responses were stylish and authentic, adopting an upbeat magazine style of writing. Personal recommendations and a trial day enhanced the persuasive verve of some writing. Many candidates demonstrated full knowledge of what can be found in sports centres and wrote at length, as if they were giving the reader a guided tour of the facilities, using appropriate language to attract potential clients. One candidate opened their review in an engaging way by giving an assessment of the sport centre's facilities and architecture. They wrote, 'Being a person who has always been fond of watching, as well as playing, all types of sports, I must say that I was highly impressed by the conditions, offers and opportunities offered by this sports centre. According to globally famous architects, this building comes on the list of the top 10 well-built buildings. It is a tall, lean building – classy yet ancient, made with bricks imported from Russia and concrete from China.'

Some of the better responses established the form by the simple but effective use of a headline, as seen in this example: 'Killion Sports centre: Worth the Hype?' Effective engagement was subsequently established in the very first sentence: 'As a sports buff and self-proclaimed gym nut, I've been pretty excited to visit Killion Sports centre – a brand new facility on Wisteria Avenue.' Less common lexis and complex structures were used to give details of various new sports centres: 'The smooth, light brown hardwood basketball court coupled with the durable rims that are just as strong as the ones present in the NBA will surely appeal to every basketball player, whether a dominating dunker or a swift sharpshooter.'

Weaker responses tended to take the form of an extended account of visiting the sports centre, simply retelling what happened to the speaker from the moment they arrived. Weaker responses did not further connect and develop facilities and activities offered at the new sports centre to the reviewing purpose of the task. Many candidates created a list of selling points for the venue without then developing these points, such as in this example: 'Great equipment, low cost, early opening hours,' and, 'There are 2 Olympic size swimming pools, 3 indoor football courts, 5 badminton and tennis courts.' Such list-like responses did not generate any sense of enthusiasm for the new venture and this approach made for rather muted responses overall.

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 adhere to the guidance of writing no more than 400 words for their responses to **Question 1a**. They should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the actual task. Candidates should also adhere to the rubric of writing a minimum of 600 words for their **Section B** response.
- 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 an *email*, giving *reasons to support your opinion* on the topic.
- 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.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation. Often, responses were weaker due to a loss of grammatical control in attempts to write in long, complex sentences. These candidates would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. Two errors that occurred quite regularly were those of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops and of writing in sentence fragments, rather than in complete sentences
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully.
- 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)** at all.

Stronger responses to **Question 1(a)** focused clearly on the question, with engaging emails and clear opinions. Weaker responses consisted of simple, quite repetitive comments about the issue.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** were from candidates who were able to maintain 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 content and therefore only provided minimal analysis; this was usually 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 (essay, review or description), 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 responses to **Question 2** lost focus on the formality required of an essay and became repetitive, with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons; some **Question 3** reviews were simple recounts of the magazine's contents, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion about the new magazine; some **Question 4** responses were purely narrative in form rather than descriptive.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You have just read a newspaper article which said that it would be better if everyone in the world spoke the same language. You disagree, and decide to write an email to the editor of the newspaper about this.

- (a) **Write the text for your email. In your writing, give reasons to support your opinion. Write no more than 400 words.**

Nearly all candidates began and ended appropriately, with some including fictitious email addresses and a subject line. Nearly all candidates clearly disagreed with the viewpoint, with many similar, reasonable ideas discussed, including: loss of culture, learning a new language being good for your brain, so we need more than one and the need for different languages to provide secrecy or privacy. Most responses were appropriately formal and some were quite deferential. However, some candidates felt a personal attack on the editor was acceptable; some were quite rude, for example calling the editor ridiculous or ignorant; this kind of tone was not suitable to the task. There was also the misconception that the editor had personally written the article and that he/she might withdraw the article or amend it.

Some stronger responses included personal information or anecdotes, such as the writer's experiences of living in bi- or multi-lingual households, to add weight to their arguments; this was often successful. One candidate pursued a line of argument from a very personal perspective in a discussion about family history and the importance of language: 'As a second generation immigrant, I can assure you that language can be lost more easily than you think. There are thousands of lost cultures throughout the progression of human history: all have succumbed to one real curse: the destruction of diversity.' Many stronger emails concluded successfully, synthesising the argument as in this sophisticated response: 'We must preserve diversity in language. Homogeny is a pitfall we must avoid at all costs. As humans, we are fundamentally unique, and any type of action to damage this individuality is harmful.'

Weaker responses needing in terms of organisation, sometimes without any paragraph breaks, resulting in underdeveloped points and frequent repetition. Others included overly long explanations about how the writer was a regular reader who greatly enjoyed the newspaper, then describing how they usually read it over breakfast or while enjoying their coffee, before getting to the point of the email. Many weaker emails were short, often under 200 words.

Weaker responses were often hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but often undeveloped. For example, in this response, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'You will know a persons roots. Their heritage, their culture. Be able to make a conection and see where a person has been and my dear editor friend have you never wished to be able to talk to a friend in secret well theres your solution.'

(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 and did not provide evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response in their commentaries.

Stronger responses were analytical and detailed, covering aspects of structural choice in addition to language and form. The best responses assimilated terminology with fluency and illustrated points in detail and with apposite quotation.

Stronger commentaries discussed the usage of features such as triadic listing and hypophora confidently. Success was often achieved through multiple short paragraphs naming the techniques one by one, giving evidence from the shorter writing and explaining the effect on the audience. There were some examples of good practice in terms of succinct, precise quotation to support analysis. For example: 'Jargon such as "fail-safe", "insurance policy" and "documentation" provide a more analytical and logic-based tone for my argument.' In the following example, the candidate seamlessly filled their response with terms, examples and analysis: 'Referring to my mom as my "mother" cemented a more professional tone and allowed me to use the phrase "mother tongue", rather than "native language" to more dramatically convey my point in a more impactful instance of word play. My anecdote of my mother explaining Chinese idioms to me had a similar effect.'

Another candidate explained their choice of vocabulary clearly: 'By using far more positive vocabulary in this section, such as "beautiful", "inspirational" and "unique", both logical and emotional appeals are combined, generating a multi-pronged attack on the author's views, utilising both logos and ethos. This also maximises audience engagement.'

Many weaker responses were identified some basic language and structural features but needed more in the way of analysis. Often, appropriate linguistic terminology was not used, as in this example: 'My writing was effective because of the words I chose.' Others did not attempt to analyse the effect of the linguistic choices they had made, simply commenting, 'I wrote my letter to the editor with a formal tone,' and, 'I gave reasons for my opinion and disagreed with the editor.' Some candidates attempted analysis but used general phrases such as, 'This makes it clear for the editor to understand'. Many included basic general commentary on the content of their email with no relevant language or structural points being made. Others wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs 'to make the email easier to read' or having used commas 'to make the list of points clearer.'

The weakest responses simply described or paraphrased the diary entry and some candidates wrote very little, sometimes just a few sentences.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Essay

In class, you have been discussing the advantages and disadvantages of several generations of a family living together in the same house. Your teacher has asked you to write an essay on the topic. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates considered both the advantages and disadvantages of several generations of a family living together in the same house and many candidates used rhetorical devices to appeal to their audience and to engage and sustain interest. Being able to share the chores was a popular advantage, while cramped conditions, lack of space and lack of privacy were cited by many as key disadvantages.

Stronger essays assumed an authoritative stance and maintained the appropriate form. They presented a balanced argument, showing both sides of the debate, and provided an opinion at the end. The best answers were organised into paragraphs, each one dealing with a different point. Some candidates used rhetorical questions, statistics, or anecdotes of personal experiences or those of relatives in different countries. These added to the engagement of the essays. 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: 'When I was younger, my grandparents lived in the same house as I did. They would teach me manners and skills that are etched into my memory and have helped me in ways I cannot even describe.' These candidates 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 was clear, and such candidates generally developed their ideas clearly. More effective and sophisticated responses incorporated phrases such as 'Another/further argument,' 'A different viewpoint' or 'On the contrary.'

A significant number of stronger responses put forward arguments with grandparents at the heart of the debate: 'Some grandparents have stories of immigration, stories of adventure, of loss and heartache that can be shared and never lost.' Another candidate also wrote sensitively: 'Another advantage is the wisdom the younger generation will receive by living with grandparents/aunts and uncles.' Stronger essays concluded successfully, such as in this example: 'Do the benefits outweigh the challenges? The prevalence of families across the world in which several generations share one roof shows that in many instances, they do.'

Weaker essays were written in a conversational style which was lacking the necessary formality and sophistication. This resulted in the loss of the authority that the essay required. The argument was often a little repetitive, with the same points being made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons. They also showed weakness in sentence structure, for example, 'Having to take care of ten people, like making their breakfast lunch and dinner or doing their laundry. Now-a-days technology make things easier by going to buy food from Macdonalds or having a washer and dryer to the laundry.' Many weaker essays were not structured clearly, often without any use of paragraphs. In some cases, the candidates did not have sufficient vocabulary to express some of the more complex ideas, for example: 'I've lived with my family before. It was pretty fun if you ask me. My cousins and I played outside together and watched movies together. But sooner or later everyone moved out.' Weaker essays sometimes veered from the topic, or did not develop ideas beyond a few simple points.

Question 3 – Review

You have just read a copy of a new magazine about fashion. Write a review of the magazine, which will be published on a fashion website. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most reviews were enthusiastic about the new magazine and gave positive recommendations to the reader. Most candidates discussed the structure and content of the magazine and then gave a recommendation as to whether the magazine was worth purchasing.

Some candidates were highly adept at this genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated, credibly authentic response. They provided a strong sense of audience in their responses, with candidates making use of their own knowledge and expertise in fashion and fashion magazines in order to write an effective review. In several responses the candidate showed a clear sense of not only audience but also the unique selling point of the new magazine. For example, one candidate wrote convincingly: 'The issue I happened to pick up was the December 2021 issue – "Suit and Tie or Die?" – which featured Tiktok sensation Charli D'amelio on the front cover. Here's a secret. I always flip straight to the article mentioned on the cover whenever I read a magazine. "Suit and Tie or Die?" focused on the gender stereotypes in fashion, how men's "formal attire" is often thought to be pants and a shirt, while women's is thought to be dresses and longer skirts.'

One stronger response opened with initial disdain for the new publication: 'When I first glanced at the cover I thought to myself, "There we are, just another wannabe Vogue trying to hype the same clothing lines"', but also provided some constructive criticism: 'Although I thoroughly enjoyed reading the articles, there was too much information to absorb in a single sitting'. Another critical review objected to alleged body-shaming vis-à-vis models' perfection: 'Fashion generates a stereotype in people that make them feel that if you do not have blue eyes, blond hair, muscles and big lips you are not pretty and that makes people feel bad about themselves.'

Weaker reviews tended to take the form of an extended account of the content of the magazine, some describing irrelevant details, such as retelling when and where they had purchased the magazine. At times, the magazine was not named and such responses either lacked proper evaluation or the evaluation was rather simple.

Question 4 – Descriptive piece

Write a descriptive piece called *Rooftops*, about the view of a town from the top of a tall building. In your writing, focus on the sights and sounds to help your reader to imagine the scene. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates kept a descriptive focus throughout their responses. For several candidates, narrative details of how the narrator reached the rooftop became the most significant feature of the response, so that the ideas related to the descriptive purpose of the task were only developed in a limited manner.

Stronger pieces kept to the descriptive stance throughout the piece, describing sights and sounds with subtlety and precision. Some candidates described the rooftop view at different times, for example at a busy time of day and also at night, observing the changes that had taken place. Stronger responses invariably established the descriptive form in the very first paragraph or sentence, sometimes making imaginative choices of rooftop location, such as in this arresting opening: 'From the helipad on top of the Rhodes Tower, the buildings below look like small freckles dotting the face of the country. Without binoculars, you cannot see the cars crawling like termites down winding lanes, or the big hissing buses which spew suffocating smog – thick as a dense blanket!'

Some stronger pieces set an introductory scene: 'Sunrise seeps slowly through the town. Its warm yellow light soaks into the corners of buildings and flows down the quiet streets. Soon the sunlight reaches the edge of the tower I stand on top of.' They appealed to the sense of sound: 'The soft chatter of people below rises to envelop me in a comfortable blanket of resonant tones and indistinguishable words'. One candidate effectively described the sounds of a street musician: 'Music slips from her instrument, honeyed and sweet, stunning passers-by. When she finishes her performance, notes seem to hang in the air and her audience burst into cacophonous applause producing a duet with the clinks of coins and the rustling of bills thrown into her open instrument case.'

One more inventive response included a description that cleverly made clear at the end that it was a cat describing the view – which made sense of some earlier details about scary barking dogs and frightening loud thunder – while another described watching the town during a storm with some imaginative details about the rain cascading down the tiled roofs. Other candidates wrote about the surrounding landscape, countryside, wildlife, sky and weather, or the rooftop and its ascent, rather than a view of a town, yet still effectively evoked sight or sound to help the reader imagine the scene. An example was a candidate writing: 'To the east of the town lay the dormant but once violent volcanoes. I admired their snow-capped peaks and the thousands of trees jutting out of their sides like porcupines.' Another candidate described observing a pigeon: 'My eyes are drawn to some movement – the flitting of wings maybe two or three storeys below me. I can make out the elusive greens and purples that cover the pigeon's neck, along with its eyes, a shade of orange-red.'

In weaker pieces, candidates took a more narrative approach and spent too long explaining why they visited the rooftop, for example because they did as a child, detailing their journey to the rooftop and then describing how they got down or were rescued. Some used clichéd similes, such as people looking like ants, and descriptions of chirping birds. Errors in expression, spelling, sentence construction and tense selection were prevalent in weaker answers.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

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

Key messages

The main key message for Paper 31 in the June 2022 series concerns the key skills required. These are 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. Understanding and taking account of the ways the different weightings of the assessment objectives between the two compulsory questions should assist candidates in the overall crafting of their responses.

Section A has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. It is therefore important that responses provide as much analytical detail as possible, whilst demonstrating a fluent, developed control of expression. Ideas should be supported by relevant examples from wider study.

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. In **Section B**, therefore, the weighting of marks indicates the requirement for fully developed reference to wider study of relevant linguistic concepts and approaches pertaining to the topic of child language acquisition. Responses should be crafted by demonstrating understanding of the stimulus material, detailing the characteristic linguistic features it contains, and selection and analysis of the language data.

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 but only a short response in the remaining section. Longer responses were generally provided to **Question 2** and on occasion, very brief responses were provided to **Question 1**, where it is important to provide a cohesive response which includes commentary on all three sources.

General comments

In general, responses tended to be sustained and cohesive, with most responses using an appropriate register for work which was crafted into a logical sequence of ideas. There was a good level of supporting scholarship noted, although referencing to wider study was not always seen to be fully relevant to the language topic.

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 this series, fewer elaborate plans were seen; instead there was evidence of brief and meaningful planning which contained useful pointers which had then been used in the sustained final response. As such, a keener focus on sequencing and relevance was seen in the June 2022 series than in previous series.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The mark scheme is clear in its requirement for responses to incorporate all three data sources. Where all three data sources are not analysed in relation to each other, responses are unable to move further forward than Level 3 of the mark scheme. In the June 2022 series, most responses observed this requirement.

Weaker responses either focussed on the data sources without reference to wider study or made detailed reference to wider study with only passing reference to the data provided. The strongest and most confident work incorporated analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

At times in the June 2022 series, responses lost control of structural organisation. There was also some loss of register seen in weaker responses. For example, the noun 'lingo' was often used instead of 'language'. Colloquial discourse markers were also sometimes used to introduce new ideas, which detracted from the overall effectiveness in AO2. Candidates should be aware that if they find themselves using the discourse marker 'As previously stated ...' or 'As I said earlier ...' it is likely that their response is becoming repetitive.

Stronger responses were structured in developed paragraphs using an appropriate register, including a wide range of linguistic terminology. Often, more confident responses moved through a logical sequence of linguistic frameworks which included a selection from graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not a requirement of **Section A**, although those responses which were crafted in this manner demonstrated clarity of organisation and a direct focus on a linguistic standpoint which enabled them to move forward through the higher levels of the mark scheme.

In basic or limited responses, relevance of content was obscured by historic or sociological consideration where the focus should be on linguistic analysis. There is no requirement to supply an account of the history of the English language, although it may be useful to briefly identify the place of the stimulus material on a historical timeline.

Where responses analysed each response in the order in which they appeared on the question paper, only limited development of ideas was achieved. More sustained work took an approach where ideas from Text A were supported with those from Texts B and C, evidencing a more cohesive and sustained response.

Conceptualisation

Often, observation of AO4 was limited in weaker responses either to very brief mention of a theorist's name or to making reference to a theory which may not have been fully relevant. The basic discourse marker 'Some theorists believe ...' with no further referencing was frequently seen. Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts, such as narrowing, telescoping, broadening, pejoration or amelioration as seen in Text A could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

As Text A was from 1891–2, consideration of Jespersen and the Great Vowel Shift or Caxton's printing press could only provide basic support. These theoretical considerations may have been more appropriately applied to the first column of the Text B which indicated an orthographical change in *heinous*, although this required only minor reference.

Basic responses misunderstood the concept of collocation in Text B and provided discussion on how the adjective *heinous* had become the noun *car*, whereas stronger responses were clear on how – with reference to the Hallidayan method functional linguistics and the concept of lexical gaps – technological advancements had led to language change over time.

There were attempts to apply the concept of amelioration to the lemma *crime* whereas in fact the noun itself has not undergone amelioration. Instead, Text B's evidence demonstrates that the crime is treated in a different way in contemporary times where steps are taken to effect *prevention*.

Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, Aitchison's Damp Spoon or Crumbling Castle and Chen's S-curve were generally clearly understood, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated. The concepts, methods and approaches 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 well with Text A, noting the formal register and graphological features as appropriate to its genre. However, not all responses demonstrated how ideas from that text could be supported by relevant features from Texts B and C.

Basic or limited responses described *wayward*, *truants* or *incorrigibles* as obsolete terms – where terms may be unknown to the candidate it does not mean that they are no longer in use. Roman numerals were also often incorrectly described as obsolete, although when Text A's use of these was analysed more clearly an opportunity to scrutinise other Latinate lexis such as *magistrate* and *primarily* was taken to enhance the response.

There were frequent attempts to analyse modality in *ought* from Text A, with varying levels of accuracy. Many responses acknowledged the concept of language change over time by attempting to translate grammatical features such as *Little matters it* to what might be used in present day English; such translations were rarely successful and only provided weak analysis.

The *n*-Gram of Text C was generally interpreted well. Weaker responses provided an explanation of the numerical data provided on the axes, and would have done better to analyse how and why change in use of *wayward* and *incorrigible* may have occurred due to sociological progression.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of three parts of a conversation between Tia, Jadzia and Lola (all age 4 years). The three girls were playing in the school playground, watched by their teacher. Candidates were required to analyse ways in which the child interlocutors and their teacher were using language and to refer to specific details from the transcription, as well as to ideas and examples from wider study of child language acquisition.

Understanding

Overall, there was a clear understanding of the stimulus material and the ways in which the interlocutors interacted. Where phonemic representation of speech sound was provided in the data source, this was also clearly understood.

Confident responses made accurate use of linguistic terminology to describe characteristic features selected for analysis, which demonstrated deeper understanding of the language topic overall. More limited responses described minor linguistic features or used the transcription key to identify speech patterns which were then described in general terms.

Basic responses concentrated on the game of *I Spy*, the rules of which needed no further explanation to the Examiner or relied on the ways in which intonation was used.

Most responses acknowledged the way in which the teacher used child-directed speech in terms of questioning technique, scaffolding and euphemistic *bit of an argument*. Although the teacher's questions were frequently described as tag questions which was not correct, the resulting outcome of the teacher's intention was generally clearly understood.

Turn-taking and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly by confident candidates, as was negation and contraction *dont*, adverb *quickly* and reduplication *hurry hurry*. Clear, detailed or more sophisticated responses selected linguistic features as a framework for organisation of ideas, whereas basic or limited responses tended to demonstrate understanding by working through each of the three Parts A, B and C separately.

Conceptualisation

Limited responses described the level of linguistic competence of all of the child interlocutors either as telegraphic or post-telegraphic, using knowledge of the girls' age – 4 – as their only guide. Stronger responses analysed the utterances of the children independently in order to gauge to what extent telegraphic or post-telegraphic speech was evident, using careful consideration of relevant linguistic approaches.

Most responses which referred to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development placed the child interlocutors in his preoperational stage, although there was some differential consideration of the ways in which the concrete operational stage may be being reached in some more insightful analyses. The egotistical nature and its humorous aspects evident throughout the transcription drew much attention and were generally analysed with some confidence.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription, for example the personal function in *im not bossy* and the emerging representational function in *its important job*. As in previous series, Halliday's approach was described inaccurately in limited responses to comprise 'stages' rather than to explore how these functions operate in spoken interaction.

Vygotsky's zone of proximal development was explored with confidence in many responses in analysis of the teacher's role, as well as the way in which the Brunerian model led to a positive outcome in Part C of the transcription.

When addressing AO4, limited responses made reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Chomsky and Skinner. Analysis remained undeveloped, however, where insufficient evidence from the data source was provided. In some cases, no data were provided, with the entire response comprising a demonstration of a weak understanding of theoretical consideration.

Data handling

Insightful responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis. In the June 2022 series there was a considerable amount of phonological analysis attempted, most of which was detailed and accurate. For example, not only was the schwa identified in *friend/ə*, the reasons for the emphatic final phoneme were also considered using a relevant scholarly approach. In Jadzia's */sku:z/* there was often clear phonemic analysis, although some basic or limited responses attributed this part of her utterance in line 9 to a linguistic competence which was developing 'later than expected'.

Virtuous errors, for example *if she only doesnt be bossy*, were frequently identified. Some responses took a deficit approach in analysing these; often they were described in weaker responses as 'mistakes'. More fruitful analyses selected the data and developed commentary with relevant reference to Chomsky, and went on to say that although virtuous error was evident, other utterances – such as *we do not want her joining do we because* in line 31 – demonstrated the child interlocutor's ease with negation, plural pronoun, continuous present tense and conditional conjunction all in one selected fragment. Analysis such as this then presented a variety of opportunities for developed work in terms of a range of linguistic competencies.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

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

Key messages

The key message for Paper 32 in the June 2022 series concerns the required skills and techniques. These are 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. Understanding and taking account of the ways the different weightings of the assessment objectives between the two compulsory questions should assist candidates in the overall crafting of their responses.

Section A has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. It is therefore important that responses provide as much analytical detail as possible, whilst demonstrating a fluent, developed control of expression. Ideas should be supported by relevant examples from wider study.

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. In **Section B**, therefore, the weighting of marks indicates the requirement for fully developed reference to wider study of relevant linguistic concepts and approaches pertaining to the topic of child language acquisition. Responses should be crafted by demonstrating understanding of the stimulus material, detailing the characteristic linguistic features it contains, and selection and analysis of the language data.

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 each of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question but only a short response in the remaining section. Longer responses were generally provided to **Question 2** and on occasion, very brief responses were provided to **Question 1**, where it is important to provide a cohesive response which includes commentary on all three sources.

General comments

In general, responses tended to be sustained and cohesive, with most responses using an appropriate register for work which was crafted into a logical sequence of ideas. There was usually a plausible range of supporting scholarship noted, although referencing to wider study was not always seen to be fully relevant to the language topic. This was particularly evident in **Section A**.

Where responses were brief, they 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 other words, the ideas were fewer and they were undeveloped. In this series, fewer elaborate plans were seen; instead there was evidence of brief and meaningful planning which contained useful pointers which had then been used in the sustained final response. As such, a keener focus on sequencing and relevance was seen in the June 2022 series than in previous series.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The mark scheme is clear in its requirement for responses to incorporate all three data sources. Where all three data sources are not analysed, responses are unable to move further forward than Level 3 of the mark scheme. In the June 2022 series, most responses observed this requirement, although weaker responses either used only the data sources without reference to wider study or made detailed reference to wider study with only passing reference to the data provided. The strongest and most confident work incorporated analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

At times in the June 2022 series, responses lost control of structural organisation. There was also some loss of register seen in weaker responses. For example, the noun 'lingo' was often used instead of 'language'. Colloquial discourse markers were also sometimes used to introduce new ideas, which detracted from the overall effectiveness in AO2. Candidates should be aware that if they find themselves using the discourse marker 'As previously stated ...' or 'As I said earlier ...' it is likely that their response is becoming repetitive.

Stronger responses were structured in developed paragraphs using an appropriate register, including a wide range of linguistic terminology. Often, more confident responses moved through a logical sequence of linguistic frameworks which included a selection from graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not a requirement of **Section A**, although those responses which were crafted in this manner demonstrated clarity of organisation and a direct focus on a linguistic standpoint which enabled them to move forward through the higher levels of the mark scheme.

In basic or limited responses, relevance of content was obscured by historic or sociological consideration where the focus should be on linguistic analysis. There is no requirement to supply an account of the history of the English language (including Roman, Norse and French invasion) as it may result in irrelevant content, although it may be useful to briefly identify the place of the stimulus material on a historical timeline – in the case of Text A, 1769.

Where responses analysed each response in the order in which they appeared on the question paper, usually only limited development of ideas was achieved. More sustained work took an approach where ideas from Text A were supported with those from Texts B and C, evidencing a more cohesive and sustained response.

Conceptualisation

Often, observation of AO4 was limited in weaker responses either to very brief mention of a theorist's name or to making reference to a theory which may not have been fully relevant. The basic discourse marker 'Some theorists believe ...' with no further referencing was frequently seen. Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts, such as narrowing, telescoping, broadening, pejoration or amelioration as seen in Text A could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

Text A was written in 1759, therefore consideration of Jespersen and the Great Vowel Shift or Caxton's printing press could only provide basic support. There was some tenuous commentary on how the eventual loss of the final consonant in *mufick* could be attributed to GVS; more appropriate discussion related to the change over time in typographical fashion for the medial S and italicisation and capitalisation in *Mouth Harp*, for example.

As in previous series, there was some misunderstanding of the use of the medial S. Basic or limited analysis inaccurately attributed it to phonological change, where pronunciation had developed over time from sounding phonemes /f/ or /f/ to using phoneme /s/ instead. Accurate analysis of this grapheme correctly acknowledged borrowing of the classical Greek convention of writing grapheme sigma in different ways accordingly to placement within a given lexical item.

In analysis of Text C, the changing use in grammar of *is become* and *has become* was not always analysed in relation to Text A. However, it was clear that there was knowledge and understanding of Chen's S curve model which enabled some clear interpretation.

Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Hockett's random fluctuation theory and Hallidayan functional linguistics were the most frequently referenced theoretical models. Stronger responses incorporated an increased level of detail with regard to conceptualisation across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated.

The concepts, methods and approaches 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 well with Text A and B, although Text C – other than identifying the percentage scores shown on the y axis – was not always thoroughly analysed. Clear or detailed responses made a close inspection of the grammatical items *is* and *has* in terms of tense or levels of formality, sometimes also offering opinion on the reasons for the gradual obsolescence demonstrated by the graph.

Many responses demonstrated ideas for translation of the archaic forms into what would be used in present day English. Examples included the way that *the telling of tales* or *the more industrious turn of the common people* might be expressed in the contemporary world. In a way, this provides a basic reference to the overall concept of change, but some of the translations provided were inaccurate and in the case of *penny-ftone* and *ftone of ftrength* did not add to the analysis.

Basic or limited responses inaccurately described *Bagpipes*, *Vocal mufick* and *in vogue* as obsolete terms – where terms may be unknown to the candidate it does not mean that they are no longer in use. *Coits* and its contemporary *quoits*, and *chieftains* drew much attention in limited responses, whereas clear and detailed responses used these lexical items to introduce etymology and the instances of other French or Latinate lexis seen in Text A, for example *antient* and *antiquity*. Other lexical content under consideration included *disused*, often inaccurately described as being obsolete with the word 'unused' having taken its place.

Text B offered the opportunity to analyse the top ten topics related to 'amusement' from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (1990 – 2019) in relation to the use of *amufements* in line 7 of Text A. Basic or limited analyses did not relate this back to Text A, although they were keen to provide ideas on how the industrial revolution had brought about change in the use of the lemma following construction of amusement parks. Clear or detailed responses commented on the pragmatic shift whilst acknowledging that *amusement* is still in use to describe the way that people use their leisure time or can be entertained.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of a conversation between Luke (age 4 years) and his father, recorded at the home of the interlocutors. Candidates were required to analyse ways in which language was being used and to refer to specific details from the transcription as well to ideas and examples from their wider study of child language acquisition.

Understanding

A clear understanding of the stimulus material and the ways in which the interlocutors interacted was evident.

Confident responses made an accurate use of linguistic terminology to describe characteristic features selected for analysis, which demonstrated deeper understanding of the language topic overall. More limited responses described minor linguistic features or used the transcription key to identify speech patterns which were then described in general terms.

Basic responses concentrated on the ways in which intonation was used, whereas stronger responses noted not only intonation as a characteristic feature but also the possible pragmatic reasons that Luke and his father raised or lowered pitch at the end of their utterances.

The father's questioning technique was explored in most responses, either to elicit or confirm information, and as a form of scaffolding to assist Luke to provide longer and more complex utterances.

Turn-taking and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly in confident responses. There was also acknowledgement of raised volume and cooperative interruption from Luke due to his excitement (*JUICE*) and eagerness to respond to his father in *and i got (.) er (.) this many er (.)* although that led to some loss of clarity of thought for Luke, indicated by pause in his utterance.

Detailed or more sophisticated responses selected linguistic features as a framework for organisation of ideas, whereas basic or limited responses tended to demonstrate understanding by working through the transcription chronologically to identify individual characteristic features.

Conceptualisation

Limited responses described the level of Luke's linguistic competence either as telegraphic or post-telegraphic using knowledge of Luke's age – 4 – as their only guide. Stronger responses analysed carefully selected utterances in order to gauge to what extent telegraphic or post-telegraphic speech was evident, using consideration of relevant linguistic approaches as support.

Most responses which referred to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development placed the child interlocutors at the preoperational stage. There was some differential consideration of the ways in which the concrete operational stage may be being reached in some more insightful analyses.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription and were used relevantly in many responses. For example, the personal function was seen in *i really like juice* as well as the imaginative function in *i /sɪnkd/ it up*. As in previous series, Halliday's approach was described inaccurately in limited responses to comprise 'stages' rather than to explore how these functions operate in spoken interaction.

Vygotsky's zone of proximal development was explored with confidence in many responses, together with what was seen as the Brunerian approach of the father, where Luke extends his responses at the beginning of the transcription to include all of the relationships considered by him to comprise his family.

When addressing AO4, limited responses made a little reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Chomsky and Skinner. Analysis remained undeveloped, however, where insufficient evidence from the data source was provided. In some cases, very few data were provided, with the entire response comprising only a demonstration of a weak understanding of theoretical consideration.

However, overall a wide range of theoretical models and approaches were introduced, including Bellugi, Berko and Brown, Aitchison, Nelson and Crystal, all of which were relevant to the data under scrutiny.

Data handling

Insightful responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis. In the June 2022 series there was a considerable amount of phonological analysis attempted, most of which was detailed and accurate. For example, Luke's use of tense in *i /sɪnkd/ it up next year* provided an opportunity for analysis of his morphological knowledge and understanding as well as initial substitution of phoneme and early grasp of the abstract concept of time.

This fragment also gave rise to consideration of virtuous errors, another example being *it come from a surname*, which was frequently identified. Some responses took a deficit approach in analysing virtuous error – often they were described in weaker responses as 'mistakes'. More fruitful analyses selected the data and developed commentary with relevant reference to Chomsky, and then went on to say that although virtuous error was evident, this latter example demonstrated Luke's overall linguistic competence and cognitive development.

Although Luke's utterances were supplemented at times by paralinguistic features, competence was also demonstrated by negation *and dont forget*, contraction *thats all* and conditional conjunction *oh because*, as well as fulfilled adjacency pairing and emphatic stress. Confident responses detailed examples of these and further data in order to provide effective and sometimes insightful analyses of the ways in which the interlocutors used language to achieve a highly cooperative interaction.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

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

Key messages

The key message for Paper 33 in the June 2022 series concerns the required skills and techniques. These are 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. Understanding and taking account of the ways the different weightings of the assessment objectives between the two compulsory questions should assist candidates in the overall crafting of their responses.

Section A has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. It is therefore important that responses provide as much analytical detail as possible, whilst demonstrating a fluent, developed control of expression. Ideas should be supported by relevant examples from wider study.

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. In **Section B**, therefore, the weighting of marks indicates the requirement for fully developed reference to wider study of relevant linguistic concepts and approaches pertaining to the topic of child language acquisition. Responses should be crafted by demonstrating understanding of the stimulus material, detailing the characteristic linguistic features it contains, and selection and analysis of the language data.

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 each of the two sections. In this series, there was evidence of candidates providing a very long response to one question but only a short response in the remaining section. Longer responses were generally provided to **Question 2** and on occasion, very brief responses were provided to **Question 1**, where it is important to provide a cohesive response which includes commentary on all three sources.

General comments

In general, responses tended not to be sustained, although cohesion was seen at times. Generally, responses used an appropriate register for writing which was usually crafted into a logical sequence of ideas. As such, a keener focus on sequencing and relevance was seen in the June 2022 series than in previous series'.

There was a generally plausible range of supporting scholarship noted, although referencing to wider study was not always seen to be fully relevant to the language topic. This was particularly evident in **Section A**.

Where responses were brief, they could only be described as basic or limited according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, due to their own brevity. At times, elaborate plans were seen and it was clear that a considerable amount of examination time had been spent on planning, leaving not enough time to write a sustained response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The mark scheme is clear in its requirement for responses to incorporate all three data sources. Where all three data sources are not analysed in relation to each other, responses are unable to move further forward than Level 3 of the mark scheme. In the June 2022 series, most responses observed this requirement. Weaker responses either focussed on the data sources without reference to wider study or made detailed reference to wider study with only passing reference to the data provided. The strongest and most confident work incorporated analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

Overall quality of responses in relation to AO2 varied: at times in the June 2022 series, responses lost control of structural organisation with no paragraph demarcation to separate ideas. There was also some loss of register seen in weaker responses. For example, the noun 'lingo' was often used instead of 'language'. Candidates should be aware that if they find themselves using the discourse marker 'As previously stated ...' or 'As I said earlier ...' it is likely that their response is becoming repetitious.

Stronger responses were structured in developed paragraphs using an appropriate register, including a wide range of linguistic terminology. More confident responses moved through a logical sequence of linguistic frameworks which included a selection from graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not a requirement of **Section A**, although those responses which were crafted in this manner demonstrated clarity of organisation and a direct focus on a linguistic standpoint which enabled them to move forward through the higher levels of the mark scheme.

In basic or limited responses, relevance of content was obscured by historic or sociological consideration where the focus should be on linguistic analysis. There is no requirement to supply an account of the history of the English language (including Roman, Norse and French invasion) as it may result in irrelevant content, although it may be useful to briefly identify the place of the stimulus material on an historical timeline – in the case of Text A, 1737. Moreover, although Text A was written by a French writer describing her travels in Spain, any discussion of English as a global language became irrelevant material with knowledge and understanding better saved for **Question 1** of Paper 4.

Where responses analysed each response in the order in which they appeared on the question paper, usually only limited development of ideas was achieved. More sustained work took an approach where ideas from Text A were supported with those from Texts B and C, evidencing a more cohesive and sustained response.

Conceptualisation

Often, observation of AO4 was limited in weaker responses either to very brief mention of a theorist's name or to making reference to a theory which may not have been fully relevant. The basic discourse marker 'Some theorists believe ...' with no further referencing was frequently seen.

Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts, such as narrowing, telescoping, broadening, pejoration or amelioration as may have been seen in Text A could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

Text A was written in 1737, therefore consideration of Caxton's printing press could only provide limited support. However, some relevant discussion of the production of the first dictionary and the ongoing standardisation process proved useful conceptual references.

The concept of etymology and alteration of spelling due to the Great Vowel Shift as described by Jespersen was relevant in relation to *Cielings* from Text A and ceiling from Text B, and offered the opportunity for synthesis in the overall response. Appropriate analysis which related to the change over time in typographical fashion for the medial S and capitalisation in *Coolnefs*, for example, was also seen.

As in previous series' there was some misunderstanding of the use of the medial S. Basic or limited analysis inaccurately attributed it to phonological change, where pronunciation had developed over time from sounding phonemes /j/ or /f/ to using phoneme /s/ instead. Accurate analysis of this grapheme correctly

acknowledged borrowing of the classical Greek convention of writing grapheme sigma in different ways accordingly to placement within a given lexical item.

Analysis of Text C, an *n-gram graph for plaster, plaister, ceiling and cieling (1720 – 2000)* was not always analysed in relation to Text A and was discussed as somewhat of a stand-alone text. However, it was clear that there was some knowledge and understanding of Chen's S curve model which enabled some clear interpretation.

Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Hockett's random fluctuation theory and Hallidayan functional linguistics were the most frequently referenced theoretical models. Stronger responses incorporated an increased level of detail with regard to conceptualisation across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated.

The concepts, methods and approaches 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 well with all three texts: in Text A, lexical items such as *Looking Glaffes* and the grammatical device apostrophe of elision in past tense (*trimm'd*) drew most attention for scrutiny. Text C, other than identifying the percentage scores shown on the y axis, was not always thoroughly analysed

In Text B, many responses demonstrated misunderstanding of the concept of collocation and assumed that the column of the word table presented synonyms. Therefore, there was a considerable amount of inaccurate discussion as to how the abstract noun *fortune* could have undergone pragmatic or semantic shift to become to mean *health*, or that of *luck* having shifted to the same meaning of the plural count noun *patients*.

Many responses demonstrated ideas for translation of the archaic forms into what would be used in present day English. Examples included the way that *Thofe which are the worft lodged have fix or feven* might be expressed in the contemporary world. In a way, this provided a basic reference to the overall concept of change, although some of the translations provided were inaccurate and did not always strengthen the analysis.

Most responses discussed the lexis provided in the notes at the foot of Text A. Basic or limited responses were in need of expansion on the explanation provided in the question paper. Some sociological explanations were provided for the pragmatic shift of *Apartments*.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of a conversation between Mia (age 4 years) and her uncle, who were discussing the baby Mia's mother was expecting. Candidates were required to analyse ways in which language was being used and to refer to specific details from the transcription as well to ideas and examples from their wider study of child language acquisition.

Overall, there was a much stronger engagement with this question than was evident in **Question 1**.

Understanding

A clear understanding of the stimulus material and the ways in which the interlocutors interacted was evident.

Confident responses made an accurate use of linguistic terminology to describe characteristic features selected for analysis, which demonstrated deeper understanding of the language topic overall. More limited responses described minor linguistic features or used the transcription key to identify speech patterns which were then described in general terms.

Basic responses concentrated on the ways in which intonation was used, whereas stronger responses noted not only intonation as a characteristic feature but also the possible pragmatic reasons that Mia and her uncle raised or lowered their pitch at the end of the utterances. This was mostly seen in the uncle's questions to

Mia, his questioning technique being explored in most responses and seen as a scaffolding approach – either to elicit or confirm information, or to assist Mia in providing longer and more complex utterances.

Turn-taking and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly in confident responses. There was also acknowledgement of the uncle's cooperative interruption which indicated the close tenor between the interlocutors. This was also evident in the micropause and pause in seconds frequently used by Mia and her uncle, which were natural and did not lead to any uneasiness in the flow of the conversation.

Detailed or more sophisticated responses selected linguistic features as a framework for organisation of ideas. Basic or limited responses tended to demonstrate understanding by working through the transcription chronologically to identify individual characteristic features.

Conceptualisation

Limited responses described the level of Mia's linguistic competence either as telegraphic or post-telegraphic using knowledge of her age – 4 – as their only guide. Stronger responses analysed carefully selected utterances in order to gauge to what extent telegraphic or post-telegraphic speech was evident, using consideration of relevant linguistic approaches as support.

Most responses which referred to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development placed Mia in the preoperational stage. There was some differential consideration of the ways in which the concrete operational stage may be being reached in some more insightful analyses, using *im not scared of ANYTHING* to indicate Mia's own use of differentiation and acknowledgement of the concept of fear.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription and were used relevantly in many responses. For example, the personal function was seen in *i like them*, along with the representational function in *because its pretty*. As in previous series, Halliday's approach was described inaccurately in limited responses to comprise 'stages' rather than to explore how these functions operate in spoken interaction.

The Brunerian approach was identified where the uncle encourages Mia to continue talking and to make her utterances more complex, as seen in *because peter pan (.) peter pan has a cr crocodile in it ↗*. Although there is repetition, micropause and some hesitation in this fragment, Mia's use of conditional conjunction, reference to her reading and questioning tone provided opportunities to develop responses in relation to the uncle acting as her Language Acquisition Support System.

When addressing AO4, limited responses made a little reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Chomsky and Skinner. Analysis remained undeveloped, however, where insufficient evidence from the data source was provided. In some cases, very few data were provided, with the entire response comprising only a demonstration of a weak understanding of theoretical consideration.

However, overall a wide range of theoretical models and approaches were introduced. These included Bellugi, Berko and Brown, Aitchison, Nelson and Crystal, all of which were relevant to the data under scrutiny.

Data handling

Insightful responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis. In the June 2022 series there was a considerable amount of phonological analysis attempted, most of which was detailed and accurate. For example, knowledge and understanding of the phonemic representation of speech was clearly evidenced in responses which selected Mia's /ʒɒli:/ and the uncle's /u:w/ in his reply to Mia's *my favourite /æmɪnəlz/ are crocodiles and snakes* √.

This fragment also gave rise to consideration of whether Mia might be behind or in front of the expected milestones of linguistic competence at age 4. Such comments are not required; it is always more important to analyse what is seen and to analyse those competencies. The virtuous error *its a girl name* drew some attention and in limited responses was described as a mistake on Mia's part. More fruitful analyses selected this fragment and developed commentary with relevant reference to Chomsky but then went on to say that although virtuous error was evident, the utterance also demonstrated use of contraction, therefore demonstrating a level of competence in line with the post-telegraphic stage of language acquisition. This kind of approach – rather than a deficit approach – will generally lead to work which is clear or detailed rather than limited.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/41
Language Topics

Key messages

Syllabus requirements are that examination candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive responses to stimulus material. Discursive essays should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory.

The compulsory questions concern the language topics *English in the world*, presented in **Section A** of the question paper, and *Language and the self*, presented in **Section B**. There are 25 marks available in each section indicating that candidates should demonstrate examination technique by dividing their writing time equally between the two questions. In June 2022, although there was evidence that such technique had been employed, brief work was seen, meaning that weaker responses remained undeveloped.

There was evidence of careful crafting in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. The way in which marks are made available according to these assessment objectives provides clear indication to candidates as to how each of the two required responses can be crafted in order to supply cohesive and sustained discussion.

It is important to note that although AO2 offers fewer marks than AOs 1 and 4, it is not only the clarity and control of expression, for example spelling, punctuation, grammar and paragraphing, which is under consideration. This assessment objective also considers the extent to which ideas are developed and whether they are relevant to the direct focus which is presented in the question.

Because discursive rather than analytical responses are required, candidates should not analyse the language of the texts provided in **Questions 1** and **2**. This requirement is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093/31. For Paper 41, it is the ideas provided by the stimulus material which should be explored and discussed, not the language used by the writer. At times in the June 2022 series there was evidence that candidates had attempted to analyse the writing of the stimulus material; such analysis diminished the discursive qualities of some weaker responses because any such analysis ran the risk of becoming irrelevant content and was therefore not rewardable.

General comments

In June 2022, responses were generally sustained, although brief responses limited themselves by lacking in development. At times, it was clear that candidates had spent a considerable amount of time planning, which had then left them without enough time to write a full response. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins, but plans should not be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay in any way.

Although it was clear in some otherwise sound responses that there was an enthusiastic engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Question 1**, there was less engagement with the focus presented by the stimulus material. 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.

At times, responses contained long paragraphs which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In June 2022, the text provided for **Question 1** was an extract from an interview with Kalpana Mohan, author of the book *An English Made in India – How a Foreign Language Became Local*, published in 2019. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the changing use of *English in the world*. In doing so, they were asked to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *English in the world*.

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the interview, making clear reference to points made in the text. These included but were not limited to how Indian English might assume *the colour of India*, including *Indianisms* and *the humour of Indian English*, the implications of *an alien language taking root in an ancient country*, the characteristics of Indian English, the *different tang* or *distinct stamp* that new varieties of English (NVEs) had adopted, and the influence of American English in *a world of increasing multilingualism*.

Confident responses took these examples and drew comparisons and contrasts between the ways in which Indian English might develop further as a respected standalone variant, merge with standard British English or interact with other NVEs to increase or decrease the status of *English in the world*. Developed understanding was presented in sustained discussion with clear, detailed or insightful reference to Walcott's *This is my ocean, but it is speaking / Another language* and Mohan's response.

Writing

Strong responses were structured clearly in a logical, fluent sequence of developed ideas. Many weaker responses, however, began with an introduction that demonstrated wider study of the overall language topic *English in the world* but which bore little relevance to either the context provided or to the key points of the main body of the response. These introductions often included statistics of the number of speakers in the world, the number of languages currently existing globally or seemingly unconnected statements made by language theorists. This information would have been much more relevant if it had been tied in to support points raised later in the discussion. There were also some weaker conclusions which were long reiterations of previous points instead of reinforcements which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

In general, an appropriate register was used. Weaker responses lapsed into colloquialism – for example there was frequent reference to lingo – which detracted from the tone of the writing. Stronger responses used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside a logically sequenced structural frameworks of ideas.

As in previous series, some responses used rhetorical questioning as an attempt at development. This approach can only be successful where questions are followed by the candidate's own ideas and is not advised as it results in loss of register and does not add any discursive quality.

Conceptualisation

Some limited responses focused their demonstration only on knowledge and understanding of the colonisation of the *many countries that were part of the British Commonwealth*, or the ways in which the English language had developed over time during the colonisation of Britain by Germanic, Roman, Nordic or French invasion. Although very brief or minor indication of background knowledge may have proved useful according to the discussion in hand, this usually led to diminished focus and loss of examination time.

Overall, a clear but not always detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. These included reference to Crystal, Diamond's steamroller, McCrum's default position, Philipson's view on language imperialism, Widdowson's spread and distribution, Tree and Wave models, Modiano's circles and the channels described by Galloway and Rose.

Basic or limited responses 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.

Kachru's approach was referenced by most candidates, with India being positioned in the outer or second of the three concentric circles. There were often long paragraphs detailing the nature of Kachru's approach, which were not always fruitful. Stronger responses applied the model specifically to the context, with discussion becoming insightful with succinct exploration of the ways in which Kachru's original boundaries may change with the development of such NVEs as Indian English.

There was some confusion in weaker responses between the linguistic concept of hybridisation, such as Hinglish and the progression to standardisation of variants exemplified by Indian English which is a separate issue. Moreover the pathway from contact, dialect levelling, borrowing, lingua franca, pidgin, creole to standardisation was often misunderstood.

Section B

Question 2

In June 2022, the stimulus material for **Question 2** was an extract from a review of *Because Internet – a headlong embrace of the new*, a book published in 2019 by Canadian linguist, Gretchen McCulloch. The review had been published in a British newspaper and candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the ways in which language can shape and reflect personal and social identity. Candidates were also required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *Language and the self*.

Some thoughtful and sustained discussion was seen.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included the ways in which we might be experiencing a *revolutionary period in linguistic history*, the idea that *internet slang is enriching English*, the possibility that the internet offers writers *boundless creativity*, the ways in which *rule-bound formal writing* can *coexist* with colloquial, informal writing, the transitional nature of colloquialism, language and age, discrete social group formation, and examples of how typography is bringing about pragmatic and semantic shift.

Basic responses focused on the use of *memes* and *gifs* as they were well known but often labelled *acronyms* inaccurately as abbreviations. There was widespread recognition of the unique circumstances offered by the internet, such as *character limits* and *ever-changing internet slang*. Relevant examples were offered, although use of this one particular idea from the stimulus material did not lead to a demonstration of a developed understanding of the whole extract, nor did it indicate retention of focus on personal and social identity.

There were some insightful discussions on the ways in which McCulloch's notion of *many internets* could affect the ways in which internet users might find a way to develop personal and social identity, notably how different age groups could become *seen* or remain anonymous where the human need for inclusion or exclusion could be satisfied.

Writing

Brief responses were seen to this question despite the engaging content of the stimulus material. Brief work was self-limiting as described above. Some more sustained responses took McCulloch's ideas and discussed them in a chronological fashion, according to the way in which the text had presented them. This approach was fruitful to an extent as it provided a structural framework to the overall response. However, cohesive discussion was effectively provided in more confident responses which discussed a careful selection of McCulloch's ideas in a fully developed manner.

Overall, clarity and control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was generally maintained. Clear and detailed work used low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used, and at times there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology. Where this was evident, there was an elevated register and enhancement of the linguistic point of view.

As in previous series, some responses were limited by paraphrase of the stimulus material or by long quotes from the text being copied out. There was also some discussion of irrelevant points in an effort to

demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the overall language topic but which instead only demonstrated loss of focus.

Conceptualisation

Most responses made reference to the contrasting concepts of prescriptivism and descriptivism. McCulloch's liberal views towards the development of language and her *headlong embrace of the new* were overt throughout the stimulus material, but there was often only basic or limited acknowledgement of the ways in which prescriptivist theorists (for example Honey) or descriptivists (such as Crystal) might engage with her ideas. As such, the references were somewhat empty, with only basic or limited understanding of these approaches being presented.

The concept of linguistic prestige, either overt or covert, was also widely discussed, occasionally in some detail with reference to Trudgill, Kerswill, Fairclough or Labov. Although these references were made relevant there was sometimes rather too much detail being provided on the actual studies which had been carried out (for example Labov and rhoticity in New York) and less detail on the ways in which personal and social identity might be gained, developed and exhibited by linguistic prestige.

Milroy's Social Network Theory was widely referenced, with varying levels of understanding being demonstrated. As the notion of *weak ties* and *strong ties* was included in the stimulus material there was some invitation for exploration of the Belfast study, with some detailed responses indicating how density and plexity had become apparent in internet use.

Overall, knowledge and understanding of a wide variety of theoretical approaches was evidenced, which included Giles' Communication Accommodation and Goffman's Face-Work. Some clear or effective reference to how theoretical approaches were relevant to ideas presented by the stimulus material led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay writing.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/42
Language Topics

Key messages

Syllabus requirements are that examination candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive responses to stimulus material. Discursive essays should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory.

The compulsory questions concern the language topics *English in the world*, presented in **Section A** of the question paper, and *Language and the self*, presented in **Section B**. There are 25 marks available in each section indicating that candidates should demonstrate examination technique by dividing their writing time equally between the two questions. In June 2022, although there was evidence that such technique had been employed, brief work was seen, meaning that weaker responses remained undeveloped.

There was evidence of careful crafting in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. The way in which marks are made available according to these assessment objectives provides clear indication to candidates as to how each of the two required responses can be crafted in order to supply cohesive and sustained discussion.

It is important to note that although AO2 offers fewer marks than AOs 1 and 4, it is not only the clarity and control of expression, for example spelling, punctuation, grammar and paragraphing, which is under consideration. This assessment objective also considers the extent to which ideas are developed and whether they are relevant to the direct focus which is presented in the question.

Because discursive rather than analytical responses are required, candidates should not analyse the language of the texts provided in **Questions 1** and **2**. This requirement is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093/32. For Paper 42, it is the ideas provided by the stimulus material which should be explored and discussed, not the language used by the writer. At times in the June 2022 series there was evidence that candidates had attempted to analyse the writing of the stimulus material, particularly in **Question 2**; such analysis diminished the discursive qualities of some weaker responses because any such analysis ran the risk of becoming irrelevant content and was therefore not rewardable.

General comments

In June 2022, responses were generally sustained, although brief responses limited themselves by lacking in development. At times it was clear that candidates had spent a considerable amount of time planning which had then left them without enough time to write a full response. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins but plans do not need to be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay in any way.

Although it was clear in some otherwise sound responses that there was an enthusiastic engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Question 1**, there was less engagement with the focus presented by the stimulus material. 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.

At times, responses contained long paragraphs which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In June 2022, the text provided for **Question 1** was an article published on the New Zealand website *Stuff* in 2020: *How Māori and English languages mix in the modern world*. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the changing use of *English in the world*. Candidates were also required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *English in the world*.

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 concept of *language revitalisation*, how lexis and semantics might *flow from one language to another*, the concept of loanwords and why borrowing is necessary to fill *lexical gaps*, the ways in which *affinity with Māori culture and Māori language* is being achieved, and how the inclusion of Māori lexis into New Zealand English might affect *linguistic prestige*.

Confident responses took these examples and drew comparisons and contrasts between the ways in which New Zealand English might develop as a result of government policy in moving forward with the inclusion of Māori words or the ways in which *te reo* could become the more prestigious tongue, similarly due to government policy but becoming more widespread throughout New Zealand than English.

Although there was clear understanding of the ways in which *non-dominant languages* use loanwords from *dominant languages* and the wider ramifications of this and the other issues contained in the text described above, some basic or limited responses focused instead on misinterpretation of the writer's inclusion of *Slang* which led to some long discussions on the concept of slang, rather than the significant issues that were presented in the article.

Writing

Strong responses were structured clearly in a logical, fluent sequence of developed ideas. Many weaker responses, began with an introduction that demonstrated wider study of the overall language topic *English in the world* but which bore little relevance to either the context provided or to the key points of the main body of the response. These introductions often included statistics of the number of speakers in the world, the number of languages currently existing globally or seemingly unconnected statements made by language theorists. This information would have been much more relevant if it had been tied in to support points raised later in the discussion. There were also some weaker conclusions which were long reiterations of previous points instead of reinforcements which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

In general, an appropriate register was used. Weaker responses lapsed into colloquialism – for example there was frequent reference to 'lingo' – which detracted from the tone of the writing. Stronger responses used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside a logically sequenced structural frameworks of ideas.

As in previous series, some responses used rhetorical questioning as an attempt at development. This approach can only be successful where questions are followed by the candidate's own ideas and is not advised as it results in loss register and does not add any discursive quality.

Conceptualisation

Most responses acknowledged *one constant rule: language changes* from the stimulus material. Basic or limited responses provided a demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the general concept of language change which would have been better positioned in a response to a Section A question in 9093/32. Where such responses focused on colonisation as relevant to the discussion of New Zealand English, inclusion of the history of the development of the English language due to Germanic, Roman, Nordic or French invasion led to irrelevant content which was not creditable, diminished focus and led to loss of examination time.

More confident responses indicated that the concept of *language revitalisation* was understood well, with clear and relevant examples such as Welsh and Scots Gaelic being provided. Further detail was offered by discussions on how linguistic prestige, either covert or overt, might be gained with the inclusion of *foreign words*; Fairclough, Labov and Goffman were cited frequently in discussions on this latter concept, usually maintaining relevance.

With regard to the concept of *lexical gaps* from the stimulus material, a Hallidayan approach was taken to good effect; cultural transmission was the topic of some extended discussion, although the pathway from contact to dialect levelling, borrowing, lingua franca, pidgin, creole and standardisation was often misunderstood.

Overall, a clear but not always detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. These included reference to Crystal, Diamond's steamroller, McCrum's default position, Philipson's view on language imperialism, Modiano's circles, and the Kachru model. Basic or limited responses often positioned New Zealand in the outer of Kachru's circles, indicating a misunderstanding of how English was used as a first language in New Zealand or misinterpretation of the model itself.

Basic or limited responses 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.

Section B

Question 2

In June 2022, the stimulus material for **Question 2** was an extract from an article published on *The Conversation* website in 2018 – *Future tense: how the language you speak influences your willingness to take climate action*.

Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the ways in which language can shape and reflect how individuals think. Candidates were also required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *Language and the self*.

Some thoughtful and sustained discussion was seen.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included ideation that *languages without a distinct future tense ... care more about the environment than speakers of languages with future tense marking*, recognition of evidence of how research has shown that *speakers of present-tensed languages are more likely to engage in green behaviour*, how our culture might represent our perception of the world, and that use of language might also produce *tangible outcomes*.

Basic or limited responses focused on the use of the English and German examples of *It will snow tomorrow* and *Es schneit morgen*, with some acknowledgement of the strengths and weaknesses provided in the use of different tenses by different languages. Some relevant examples were provided, although use of this one particular idea from the stimulus material did not lead to a demonstration of a developed understanding of the whole extract, nor did it indicate retention of focus on the ways in which language can shape and reflect how individuals think.

There were some insightful discussions on the ways in which *climate action* could be achieved by language use in government policies in countries with future tensed languages, or how *stricter climate change policies* could be implemented by using language features other than tense.

Writing

Brief responses were seen to this question. Some more sustained responses took the series of ideas from the stimulus material and discussed them separately in a chronological fashion, according to the way in which the text had presented them. This approach was fruitful to an extent as it provided a structural framework to the overall response. However, cohesive discussion was more effectively provided in confident

responses which had made a careful selection of ideas from the article and discussed each one in a fully developed manner.

Overall, clarity and control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was generally maintained. Clear, detailed or sophisticated work used low frequency lexis and technical terminology. At times, a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology was seen. Where this was evident, there was an elevated register and enhancement of the linguistic, rather than socio-political, point of view.

As in previous series, some responses were limited by paraphrase of the stimulus material or by long quotes from the text being copied out. There was also some discussion of irrelevant points in an effort to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the overall language topic, but which instead only demonstrated loss of focus on the ways in which language can shape and reflect how individuals think .

Conceptualisation

Most responses included reference to *The Whorfian view* included in the article and the way in which *language ... reflects an entire way of perceiving the world*. In clear or detailed responses, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis was referenced more fully and developed by contrast and comparison with Lenneberg, Boas or Fodor's LoTH. At times, there was insightful discussion on how determinist, reflectionist or relativist views were relevant to ideas contained in the stimulus material and how they might correspond to an individual's *Weltanschauung*. In limited responses, there was often a long and unnecessary explanation of the Sapir-Whorf study into the Hopi race, rather than relevant application of the theoretical views it represented.

Although the stimulus material had included how the *representation of women in the labour market* could be seen as a tangible outcome of *concrete economic concern*, some weaker responses used a perceived genderlect issue as the basis for long discussion on genderlect theory, which veered away from the main thrust of ideas contained in the article. For example, Lakoff, Zimmerman and West, and Tannen were often cited as having noted the differences in speech patterns between male and female interlocutors: it was clear genderlect theory was understood, but it was frequently misapplied.

Overall, knowledge and understanding of a wide variety of theoretical approaches was evidenced, which included innatist, nativist and cognitivist models; therefore, it was clear that Chomsky, Piaget, Vygotsky, Locke, Plato, Nietzsche, Kant, and Tajfel were understood to some extent at different levels. Although some limited responses sought only to mention 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 clearly, effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing with some insightful commentary.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/43
Language Topics

Key messages

Syllabus requirements are that examination candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive responses to stimulus material. Discursive essays should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory.

The compulsory questions concern the language topics *English in the world*, presented in **Section A** of the question paper, and *Language and the self*, presented in **Section B**. There are 25 marks available in each section indicating that candidates should demonstrate examination technique by dividing their writing time equally between the two questions. In June 2022, although there was evidence that such technique had been employed, brief work was seen, meaning that weaker responses remained undeveloped.

There was evidence of careful crafting in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. The way in which marks are made available according to these assessment objectives provides clear indication to candidates as to how each of the two required responses can be crafted in order to supply cohesive and sustained discussion.

It is important to note that although AO2 offers fewer marks than AOs 1 and 4, it is not only the clarity and control of expression, for example spelling, punctuation, grammar and paragraphing, which is under consideration. This assessment objective also considers the extent to which ideas are developed and whether they are relevant to the direct focus which is presented in the question.

Because discursive rather than analytical responses are required, candidates should not analyse the language of the texts provided in **Questions 1** and **2**. This requirement is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093/33. For Paper 43, it is the ideas provided by the stimulus material which should be explored and discussed, not the stylistic features or intent of the language used by the writer. At times in the June 2022 series there was evidence that candidates had attempted to analyse the writing of the stimulus material; such analysis diminished the discursive qualities of some weaker responses because any such analysis ran the risk of becoming irrelevant content and was therefore not rewardable.

General comments

In June 2022, responses generally demonstrated engagement with the texts, although some responses were self-limited because of lack of development. At times it was clear that candidates had spent a considerable amount of time planning which had then left them without enough time to write a full response. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins, but plans should not be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay in any way.

Although it was clear in some otherwise sound responses that there was an enthusiastic engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Question 1**, there was less engagement with the specific focus presented in the stimulus material. 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.

At times, responses contained long paragraphs which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In June 2022, the text provided for **Question 1** was an article, *English does not just belong to the English*, which had been posted on the University of Manchester website in 2019. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the changing use of *English in the world*. Candidates were also required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *English in the world*.

Understanding

Some 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: how *different varieties of English* spoken around the world might *be recognised as equally legitimate* but that currently they may not be viewed in that way by different cultures and for different reasons; how use of the English language in the world may no longer *be considered as the sole domain of 'native speakers'*; how and why new varieties of English (NVEs), or *World Englishes*, should be seen as different rather than incorrect; *denigration* of language and culture, and how *Internet usage* might provide influence on *varieties*.

Confident responses took these examples and drew comparisons and contrasts between the ways in which English is being used as a lingua franca throughout the world; weaker responses referred only to the examples of India, Singapore and South Korea provided by the stimulus material, whereas stronger responses contained a broader range of knowledge and understanding, some of which was derived from personal experience.

Developed responses explored the ways in which English as a Foreign Language is currently taught, and the implications of difficulties faced in international classrooms. Three of these implications were provided by the article as bullet points, offering a springboard for discussion on multilingualism and foreign language learning.

Writing

Strong responses were structured clearly in a logical, fluent sequence of developed ideas. Many weaker responses began with an introduction that demonstrated wider study of the overall language topic *English in the world* but which bore little relevance to either the context provided or to any key points raised in the main body of the candidate's response. These introductions often included statistics of the number of speakers in the world, the number of languages currently existing globally, or seemingly unconnected statements made by well-known language theorists. This information would have been much more relevant if it had been tied in to support points raised later in the discussion. There were also some weaker conclusions which were long reiterations of previous points instead of reinforcements which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

An appropriate register was adopted in more confident responses. Weaker responses used generalisation or colloquialism – for example, there was frequent reference to 'lingo' – which detracted from the tone of the writing. Stronger responses used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks of ideas.

As in previous series' even those more confident responses attempted to use rhetorical questioning at times. This approach can only be successful where questions are followed immediately by the candidate's own ideas and is not advised as it results in loss of tone and does not add any discursive quality.

Conceptualisation

Many responses made some – though not always sound – reference to prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches. In general, these references were not fully explained or specific to any particular theorist. To develop the work, descriptivism could have been appropriately ascribed to Crystal, and Honey could have been relevantly cited in reference to prescriptivism.

Basic or limited responses tended to introduce linguistic concepts and approaches with, for example, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way

to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, this approach demonstrated a lack of detailed understanding.

Overall, a clear but not always detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. These included reference to Crystal's ideas in his *English as a Global Language*, McCrum's default position, Philipson's view on language imperialism, Widdowson's spread and distribution, cultural transmission, Krashen's learned system and Modiano's circles.

Taking the example of the South Korean *Grand Open* as seen in the stimulus material, some responses presented further examples from wider reading or personal experience of how NVEs might include grammatical items which differ from standard British English. These inclusions were effective only where they were used relevantly to support ideas.

Section B

Question 2

In June 2022, the stimulus material for **Question 2** offered two texts. Text A, *It's Time for 'They'*, was an extract from an article published on the website of *The New York Times* in 2019. Text B, *Preferred Gender Pronouns: For Faculty*, was from a university guide for staff.

Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the texts relating to the ways in which language can shape and reflect personal and social identity. They were also required to refer to specific details from the texts as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of *Language and the self*.

Some thoughtful and sustained discussion was seen from more confident candidates.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included how the author sees the singular 'they' as *inclusive and flexible*, how language can be used against *the stifling prison of gender expectations*, how standard English pronouns are *uselessly gendered*, and whether or not *elite cultural institutions ... still encourage all this gendering*.

Some confident responses observed that as Text B offered advice to university faculty staff, Text A's *elite cultural institutions* may in fact be drivers for change in the use of gendered pronouns rather than the opposite view which was presented in Text A.

Most responses engaged with the view that inclusivity is an important aspect of how individuals wish to develop their personal and social identity, expressing agreement with the idea that we should all be able to choose our own preferred gender pronouns. There were also developed discussions based on the idea that it is *important to respect people's PGPs* and some strong counterarguments which refuted the idea, all of which led to animated overall response.

Writing

Some very brief responses were seen to this question despite the engaging content of the stimulus material. Brief work was self-limiting as described above. Some more sustained responses explored the ideas from the texts and discussed them in a chronological fashion, according to the order in which the texts had presented them. In general, responses used Text A and Text B as separate items. This approach was fruitful to an extent as it provided a structural framework to the overall response. However, cohesive discussion was effectively provided in more confident responses which synthesised a careful selection of ideas from both texts in a fully developed manner.

Overall, clarity and control of expression was clear and an appropriate register was generally maintained. Clear and detailed work used low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used. At times, with an increased level of accurate labelling being used to describe pronouns and their use, there was an elevated register and enhancement of the linguistic point of view.

As in previous series, some responses were limited by paraphrase of the stimulus material; there was also a pattern of very long quotes from the text being copied out. Some discussion of irrelevant points was provided

in an effort to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the overall language topic, but which instead only demonstrated loss of focus on how language might shape personal and social identity.

Conceptualisation

Most candidates were able to supply examples gained from their wider study of how and why gender-neutral pronouns are used to benefit personal and social identity. Often these examples were tied into the concept of politeness. Although weaker responses referred to 'the politeness theory', more confident writing included explanations of Brown and Levinson's study and where speech acts including PGPs might sit within a pragmatic framework. Pinker on euphemism was also widely cited; as was Rik Pinxten, where responses led discussions which indicated that the use of PGPs would encourage interaction between discourse communities which had previously had clear and different identities.

There was a considerable amount of reference to a variety of genderlect theory, some of which was relevant. Weaker responses tended to work through a list of theorists such as Lakoff, Tannen, Zimmerman and West, and Cameron without real identification of how or why their work was relevant to points raised in the stimulus material.

Overall, knowledge and understanding of a wide variety of theoretical approaches was evidenced which included Giles' Communication Accommodation, Goffman's Face-Work, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and Boas-Jakobson's development of it. Some clear or effective reference to how theoretical approaches were relevant to ideas presented by the stimulus material led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay writing.