

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/11
Reading

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, 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, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, 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 rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. However, 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 failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

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 to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was a news report. 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 letter (150 – 200 words) to the French President. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The characteristic features and conventions of a letter were clearly recognised by most candidates: they gave a salutation and a valediction, most wrote in a register appropriate to the audience and content showed unity, coherence and adequate development.

Responses usually showed some utilisation of paragraph structure to: briefly introduce the purpose for writing; include the main aspects of the issue in respect of the comparison of level of responses to the two fires; explication of the Amazon's environmental and ecological importance to the world; a request for the President to raise awareness of situation in the Amazon in France and sometimes in consultation with world leaders (including the mention of 'G7' and 'G20'); as far as possible, low frequency lexis was used throughout given the stature of the recipient, the President of France.

Most candidates' responses were clear in expressing a sense of outrage that the Amazon rainforest had received less coverage and less investment than Notre-Dame. They drew upon facts and statistics from the bulleted list in the given text in order to make their case.

The most effective responses employed direct address, emotive language and rhetorical questions to hone in on the specificity of billions being raised for a cultural monument. One insightful response stated, 'I respect and appreciate the culture and history of Notre Dame as much as anyone else, but will our history matter if we do not have a future? This letter is a call to action. I am imploring you to use your large platform ...'. Stronger responses subtly suggested – usually by implication – that the fire in the Amazon was of significantly greater global significance than that which destroyed Notre-Dame; these showed careful selection of a few facts at most to indicate the scope and seriousness of Amazonian fires such as, '20 per cent of the world's oxygen is produced ...'.

Candidates were often less clear on the need to write in an appropriate register when addressing the French President. One candidate began formally, courteously and discursively by appreciating the heavy demands of the presidential office, but immediately outlined a more pressing call to action in saving the planet, noting that their letter contained news about 'an issue that calls for your action not just as President of France, but as a world leader'.

Weaker responses offered straightforward summary of a number of facts about the importance of the Amazon's key role for maintenance of the global environment and ecological diversity under threat from the fires. These responses showed little discernible 'shaping' for purpose and audience; some candidates attempted to shame the President for not being concerned (enough)/not taking action (enough)/not leading a global response with reference to the Amazon fire. Furthermore, such responses suggested that the receipt of world-wide financial donations for repair of Notre-Dame should be at least reciprocated with French funding and provision of materials and personnel

to combat the Amazonian fires; the logistical obstacles of this suggestion were not recognised. Where misunderstanding occurred, candidates usually thought that ‘several cities’ were ablaze rather than being ‘blanketed’ in ‘thick smoke’.

These 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 quoted large amounts from the given text in their directed writing, 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 checklistng 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) 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 are related 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 a newspaper report – i.e. the inclusion of a headline, an impactful opening sentence, content in terms of who, what, where, when, why and how, and the inclusion of some quotation or references.

The most effective responses attempted to compare the ways in which conventions were adhered to in the texts. Candidates considered the title or headline of the news report and compared it to the salutation of the letter format e.g. the title of office. They compared how each audience – general versus specific; public versus private – was specified by the form adopted and how the context of each dictated both the register and the tone – formal and serious. Candidates compared the use of third person in the news report with the use of first and second person in the letter. They compared how both forms contained opinions with the use of quotations in the news report and personal viewpoint in the letter.

Points about structure were, generally, very limited; largely, comprising basic comparisons of paragraph numbers and lengths with passing reference made to the ‘Fast Facts’ section of the news report. One candidate attempted to explore the structural features of the news report by referring to the general convention of ‘front loading’ the most important information.

Successful responses often focused on a comparison of emotive and dramatic language. They referred to the writer’s use of, ‘catastrophe’, ‘tragedy’ ‘horrific’ and ‘devouring’ in the news report and why they had employed similar words to evoke the seriousness of the situation when addressing the French President. The informative purposes of each text and the inclusion of facts and statistics were selected for analysis. Most compared the use of rhetorical questions to engage an audience.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between a letter and its conventions and the conventions of the news report; these responses regarded the report and their own letter 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 on the news report – and occasionally entirely – 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 a news report; some referred to their own writing as a letter even though it clearly was not. Some merely pointed 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, i.e. the news report's use of emotive language (e.g. 'horrific fire'), but also how specific effects are created that relate to audience and shape meaning (e.g. the idiomatic use of 'Billionaires *emptied their pockets* ...').

Question 2

The text was generally well understood and the question 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 very few short answers.

Responses to form were generally limited. Most recognised that this was an 'open' letter from the rubric; a few commented on the anonymity of the letter from the salutation 'Dear Stranger' and Branson's opening sentence, 'You don't know me ...'. Several noted, however, that the letter had also been personalised with Branson's use of direct address. One candidate noted that the letter did not follow the 'normal' conventions of a letter with its informal valediction, 'Happy regards', but that this served to affirm the theme of the letter on 'happiness' and close on an optimistic note. The 'chatty' tone of the letter was noted and its purpose in being advisory.

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. Clear responses made reference to the impact of short sentences, coupled with Branson's use of the imperative mood. Overall, there was limited engagement on how the letter develops.

Many candidates responded to the theme and language of this text on a personal level rather than critically engaging with it. Clear understanding was demonstrated by candidates' engagement with Branson's use of emotive language in 'stressed, scared and sad' and the way in which his use of sibilance provided a 'comforting' voice. Candidates referred to Branson's reflective, confidential, honest and/or humble tone in divulging personal information, 'I've cheated death ... seen loved ones pass away, failed in business ...'. They commented on how Branson tried to create a level of trust with the audience and how he provided personal assurance: 'I promise you'. Repetition and the imperative voice were discussed and how these helped to support the encouraging and light tone: 'Be healthy.' Some candidates referred to Branson's element of humour in 'human beings and not human doings' and his use of sensory imagery in endorsing this message.

Stronger responses were often characterised by the greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. These stronger responses often focused on the versatility of the salutation 'Dear Stranger' that nevertheless could be taken as impersonal in respect of the open letter format; these responses appreciated the writer's habitual use of tricolon to amplify his feelings; they commented on aspects of Branson's life's achievements; they understood adverbial-fronted sentences, e.g. 'In order to be happy ...' to ensure the reader appreciated the writer's perspective; they referred to the use of anaphora, e.g. 'Stop and breathe. Be healthy. Be around ...' to emphasise particular points of view; the more insightful reasoned that some readers might respond with envy to Branson's lifestyle, especially where he describes aspects of the tropical paradise of his Necker Island 'at dusk'.

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 of the mark scheme.

Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower ‘orders’ of lexis and occasionally even ‘register’, where specific words were categorised as formal and informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates (and the accuracy of use), the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created. For example, there were instances of tricolon being used in reference to four phrases, ‘We’ve built a business empire, joined conversations ... attended many memorial parties ... met many unforgettable people.

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

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 weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/12
Reading

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, 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, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, 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 rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. However, there were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words. While there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

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 to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was a review. 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) for a magazine for young people. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The characteristic features and conventions of an advertisement were clearly recognised by most candidates: they gave the name of the product, what the product was and what it does, they used persuasive language, some included a catchy slogan, used hyperbole and rhetorical questions, and the more successful incorporated some form of endorsement.

Most responses employed a title with the most effective employing direct address and a range of rhetorical features. Often, the opening section of the advertisement took the form of a series of questions, employing hypophora; the Oaxis semi-smartwatch providing the antidote for all the audience's social, physical and technological needs and desires. Candidates selected appropriate material from the given text, including the price, from the original and adopted either 'hard sell' or 'soft sell' tactics or both. Often, product endorsement was utilised in the form of a contemporary sports personality, celebrity or the technology website itself.

Detailed responses paid attention to audience throughout, adapting language and content to suit a target audience of young people. The clichéd phrase 'We've got you covered' featured in many responses – this was, at times, abbreviated to 'We've got you'. An interesting attempt to connect with the target audience was the use of the word 'drip/dripping', such as 'out dripping your mates' or 'it's drip', referring to being up to date or being ahead of friends. Effective use of teen slang was employed to get alongside the reader or to position the reader as the future owner of the watch by way of using actualisation techniques.

The most successful responses showed an appreciation that an advert is part of a wider marketing campaign and gave Oaxis' website link for further details including local stockists; there was appropriate focus on the positive features of the watch – or successful redirection of features the reviewer criticised – and how these positive features could enhance a young person's busy lifestyle whilst complementing their varied wardrobe requirements; the soft sell tactics used included brief anecdotes focusing on instances where the watch would solve a problem or enhance the wearer's daily existence; rhetorical questions were used to highlight how potential buyer's needs and wants could be satisfied by the watch.

The most effective closures either called for action in one form or another or offered a guarantee regarding customer satisfaction. These more successful responses incorporated a sense of excitement about the semi-smartwatch often using 'lists of three', superlatives and alliteration, and included a range of interesting and stimulating vocabulary. These effective responses created a sense of urgency to purchase the Oaxis semi-smartwatch.

Weaker responses showed some misunderstandings of the text: Oaxis was not appreciated as the company's name, often being understood as the watch's name; the fact that the watch functions as a 'digital calculator' rather than resembling one – 'gets a touch of' – due to the appearance of the

screen; the watch has unique functions not found on a phone despite ‘it’s only replicating things your phone can do anyway’; ‘black’ and ‘white’ was attributed to watch colours and not their faces, and all five colours mentioned were often misunderstood as colours of watch straps; ‘software upgrades’ was interpreted to mean the watch had come on the market with significant design flaws, rather than a positive feature of ‘future proofing functionality’.

Some weaker responses interpreted the requirement ‘You work in the advertising department at Oaxis’ to indicate that a first-person perspective was required and therefore offered responses like the review, which minimised scope for contrast in **1(b)**. In the least successful responses, descriptive writing predominated which goes beyond the purpose and genre of an advertisement, or the characteristics of a report were adopted. Limited and basic responses simply duplicated the pros and cons of the original. It was also clear that several candidates had not fully digested all the elements of the rubric, such as writing from the point of view of an employee at Oaxis and/or understanding the context and audience of the advertisement. The latter impacted upon their comparative analysis.

These 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 quoted large amounts from the given text in their directed writing 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 checklistng the text.

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

- (a) 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 are related 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 a review – i.e. it can be subjective and give opinion, create rapport with the audience and include product detail, often giving a formal judgement – and an advertisement. They compared the purpose of each form: to provide a critique of the product and to promote the product. They explored the ways in which the writer of the review created balance through expressing both positive and negative opinions and the ways in which their advertisement created positive bias. They also compared the ways in which each piece employed personal pronouns. However, the colloquial use of second person in the review was not always clearly understood.

Many points about structure were limited, largely comprising of basic comparisons of paragraph numbers and lengths. Clear points about structure were made by candidates who considered how each piece created a ‘hook’ in the opening section: often through a title in the advertisement, but also through hypophora. Responses then compared how ‘listing’ was employed in each piece: the review providing a list-like structure (often referred to as chronological) of the pros and cons, then detailing the price of models and closing with a short summary, and ending on a final, ambivalent note; the advertisement employing a ‘card stacking’ device, then detailing the price of models and closing, most often, with a call to action.

Limited 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 referred to the jargon and technical details of the review and the ways in which they

had adapted language to suit a young audience, employing colloquialism and direct address. One candidate discussed how they had employed the AIDAS theory in creating their advert, as opposed to the review which provided a critique. A comparison of punctuation and mood featured in more detailed responses, with candidates considering the effects of each in creating a range of tones. Candidates also compared positive and negative lexical fields.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between a review and its conventions and the conventions of the advertisement; 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.

Limited responses were often brief, focused more on the review – and occasionally entirely – 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 a review; some referred to their own writing as an advert even though it clearly was not. Some merely pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without any reference to effect. Responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type.

Question 2

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

Stronger responses were often characterised by the greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', 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, 'stream of consciousness' and 'personification' were often used incorrectly. Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower 'orders' of lexis and occasionally even 'register', where specific words were categorised as formal and informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

Most candidates commented on the personal, friendly and/or chatty nature of the blog. They referred to its inclusive nature with its use of first person 'we' and its informal register with regard to the writer's use of contractions. Many understood that the text was both inclusive in its reference to the graduating candidates of 2012 and exclusive given that it was written for the 'Yale Daily News'. The more successful commented on the implied wider audience – that of beyond the class of 2012, consisting of the entire Yale community – but indicated that this was most likely freshmen, sophomores and juniors and interested lecturers and administrators, and possibly prospective candidates and their parents. Occasionally these successful responses specifically acknowledged the article's electronic form and how search terms like 'Yale' and 'student experiences' might yield the article as a result of an internet search. These stronger responses explored context in addition to meaning and audience.

Candidates who provided a detailed understanding of form commented on the above, and the stronger responses noted that alongside the expected discourse markers of a blog – 'of course', 'but the thing is' – the form was also a valedictory speech. In that regard, it contained many of the conventional, rhetorical features of a speech, including listing, repetition, tricolon and metaphor.

Many candidates showed a basic sense of structure, enumerating the paragraphs and commenting on their length and the range of sentence structures. Clearer understanding of structure involved candidates commenting on the partial repetition of the opening declaration at the end of the text. More detailed responses considered the cyclical nature of the structure and commented on the resounding, if not 'desperate', call to action of the writer's peers: 'we're in this together, 2012. Let's make something happen.' The writer's changes in tense and tone were explored as a structural feature, with candidates noting in particular the shift in tone provided by the hortatory conjunction, 'but let us get one thing straight ...'.

Successful candidates commented on language features that suggested a sense of unity, security and identity. These included the reference to ‘tiny circles’ and the metaphor of the ‘web’; the listing of ‘groups ... teams ... houses’; the tri-colonic definition of the above, ‘this elusive, indefinable, opposite’; the repetition of ‘we’re so young’; the metonymy of ‘the hats’ and ‘2012’; the references to Yale, med school, NGO and research. The complex emotions of the writer were largely explored in terms of tone. Candidates understood the initial sense of gratitude and fear in the opening paragraph. They commented on the sense of loss suggested by ‘we would not have ... we would not live’ and the sense of nostalgia suggested by ‘flashbacks’ of ‘cherished’ memories: ‘that night with the guitar. That night we can not remember.’ They referred to the writer’s sense of regret suggested by ‘our readings, that boy across the hall ...’. They also referred to the writer’s sense of failure, ‘it is somehow too late’. Responses sometimes explored the writer’s sense of uncertainty about the future suggested by the metaphor ‘sea of liberal arts’. The more successful usually showed recognition that a non-professional undergraduate degree course selection means choosing a future career path is more difficult, in opposition to ‘biology’ which would naturally lead to previously mentioned ‘med school’. Candidates also referred to the writer’s sense of humour and humility suggested by ‘the crazy people who win the prizes’. There was recognition of the writer’s sense of determination and optimism for the future: ‘I plan on having fun ... we MUST not lose this sense of possibility.’ One candidate commented that the piece was actually littered with ‘epistemic and deontic modality’, the latter capitalisation ironically implying that the writer was trying to convince herself rather than her audience. Another candidate commented that the writer’s range of emotions comprised an act of ‘mental acrobatics’.

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

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 weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/13

Reading

Key messages

- In preparation for this exam, candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech/word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, 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, relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing, 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 rubric was generally understood, with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. However, there were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words. While there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. There was a little evidence of a few candidates lacking the necessary language skills for text analysis.

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 to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from a magazine article. 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 podcast (150 – 200 words) for doctors. Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly and accurately, with relevant content, and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The characteristic features and conventions of a podcast were recognised by most candidates: the inclusion of a catchy title, the focus on a central idea; the concept of a host as central, the discussion element of the text and that the text would be listened to.

Most candidates began their podcast with a brief introduction and employed some kind of closing valediction. One successful response began with a title, 'Morgan's Medical Monday'. This was followed by a hypophoric pun, 'Is Epic really epic?' and brought their text to an effective closure with an endorsement of the product. Some responses offered a script with multiple voices and others a formal essay type response. However, responses were usually written in block paragraphs to contain the thoughts of a single speaker.

Candidates generally understood the need to address an audience of doctors, in second person, and understood the purpose of the podcast in promoting Epic. Most often, first person was employed together with personal endorsement. Responses included the positive features of Epic as set out in the extract – usually in the form of a list. Some employed an informal register and chatty tone to reflect the spoken nature of their pieces; there was some utilisation of informal phrasing to identify with fellow practitioners, which was usually in connection to Epic's features, e.g. paperless solution to record keeping, doctor may access patient's information directly either prior to or during consultation. Some responses closed on the tricolon 'greener, faster, better'.

Stronger responses included the recognition that a particular podcast might be one of a series devoted to issues encountered by healthcare professionals with each podcast focusing on a different topic each time, e.g. the inclusion of a conclusion of 'Next time we will be considering stress relief methods, be sure not to miss it!'. In these successful responses, the speaker was clearly self-identified as a doctor, usually with considerable experience, and there was purposeful utilisation (as opposed to merely inclusion) of positive points about Epic raised in the article without admission of any of its drawbacks. Sometimes humour, with careful use of information such as details on how to use Epic, and explanations of what it could do, were interwoven into a personal text that spoke directly to the audience.

Weaker responses showed some misunderstandings of the text: the lack of appreciation that 'doctors' is a sub-set of 'healthcare professionals'; candidates sometimes assumed that the trainer was a Justin Bieber fan; the writer's reliance on his 'ancient' (as attributed by the candidate) 'computer' experience directly accounted for the difficulties experienced in utilising Epic's more advanced 'tabs' interface and the requirement to input information in the correct 'fields'; there was the misunderstanding that the writer eventually reflects on 'three years' of experience in using Epic and not just the initial training session as many candidates assumed; there was the under-

appreciation of the role computerisation of records has played in lengthening doctors' 'average workday' which has led to them 'hating their computers'.

Some weaker responses resorted to hard sell tactics, e.g. 'you will definitely regret it if you do not get Epic', the purpose of their text being to generate sales and not offer advice with aim of enhancing colleagues' utilisation of time within their practices. In the least successful responses, descriptive writing and summary of the original text predominated, which goes beyond the purpose and genre of a blog.

These weaker responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses, frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several weaker responses quoted large amounts from the given text in their directed response, 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 checklistng the text.

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

- (b) To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them, 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 are related 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.

With respect to form, successful candidates compared the narrative sequence of the magazine extract with the shorter 'spoken' features of their promotional text. They compared the purpose of each – to inform and entertain in one; to inform, entertain and promote in the other. They compared the register of both texts and related that to audience and context. They compared how both forms contained personal opinions.

In terms of structure, stronger responses noted the declarative title of the magazine extract and compared it with the 'spoken' introduction of their podcasts. More detailed responses compared how hypophora was employed in both texts in order to arrive at an impactful conclusion. Limited responses merely compared the amount and length of paragraphs.

Most comparisons focused on the negative language features of the extract and the positive language features of the podcast. They compared the bias of each text and elements of humour, such as the allusion to Justin Bieber. Candidates compared tense, noting that the extract employed past tense until the last two paragraphs whilst their podcast employed present tense throughout to provide a sense of immediacy and endorse what some referred to as their 'lively, chatty tone'.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between the podcast and its conventions and the conventions of the article; these responses regarded the extract and their own podcast 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 on the article – and occasionally entirely – 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. Weaker responses mainly listed the conventions of an article or text intended for a listening audience; some referred to their own writing as a podcast even though it clearly was not. Furthermore, many weaker responses merely pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of

paragraphs without any reference to effect. Responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type.

Question 2

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

The characteristic features and conventions of an advertisement were generally recognised by candidates: the ‘name’ of the product/experience, what the product is and what it does, they commented on persuasive language, catchy slogans, use of hyperbole and rhetorical questions and endorsement.

Most candidates were able to apply their understanding of the conventions and characteristic features to the given advertisement. They commented on the bias of the form in both promoting and informing about a unique vacation in a unique and potentially dangerous setting (with reference made to the ‘complex personalities and behaviours’ of the gorillas and the list of volcanic mountain ranges) and considered a range of soft sell tactics, including the use of present tense and the present participle in creating a sense of immediacy; hyperbole in creating a sense of wonder – ‘one of the most beautiful places on earth’ – and the use of direct address in engaging the audience, ‘you will be impressed’. The link provided at the end of the advertisement was recognised as a characteristic feature of the form.

In terms of structure, successful responses commented on the division of the piece into headings and tips and the ways in which the headings provided a ‘hook’, an anticipatory mood and a ‘chronology’ of the experience. They noted that the middle sections of the text amount to a walkthrough of what a visitor might experience based on the writer’s narration, arriving at the climactic ‘there they are’. For one candidate the headings reflected a ‘childlike’ quality that suggested a ‘family audience’. Candidates also commented on the tips and how these tips provided advice and guidance and exemplified the expert knowledge of The Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International. They reflected on how the opening endorsement, ‘a life changing experience’, is reflected in the closing paragraph, ‘most memorable’, and that the final section emphasises how important ecotourists are in supporting the preservation of mountain gorillas given their precarious situation, with a link provided for further information. Responses offered some speculation that a booking form might be provided as a result of ‘learn more about visiting’.

With respect to language analysis, successful responses explored the emotive features of the text, including the use of the exclamative mood to express excitement and surprise. The vulnerability of the gorillas to ‘intruders’ (as one candidate suggested) was implied by the adjective ‘only’ coupled with the numerical detail given and the Fund’s focus on protection: tourists need to follow rules because they are a ‘potential risk to the gorillas’. The fragility of the environment was suggested by, ‘one of the few remaining tropical mountain forests’.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having ‘positive connotations’ or ‘negative connotations’, 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, ‘stream of consciousness’ and ‘personification’ were often used incorrectly. Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower ‘orders’ of lexis and occasionally even ‘register’, where specific words were categorised as formal and informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the critical vocabulary of the candidates, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

More successful responses noted that in the absence of a title, sub-headings successfully sign-post the advertisement’s content for ease of reference; detailed responses noted that together these amount to a précis of the content presented. These stronger responses commented on the use of numerical facts to support the impression that writer is knowledgeable; they also noted the many instances of nouns suitable for an informative text, some familiar and forming a natural world lexical field, e.g. ‘gorillas’, ‘species’, and other proper nouns which indicated a more exotic bearing, e.g. ‘Rwanda’, Virunga volcanoes’.

Such stronger responses often explored the use of imagery to sell this ‘product’ with its suggestion of exoticism and mystery: ‘the intense green of the dense vegetation’ and ‘dark shapes’. Comments were also included on the expertise and assurances provided by the Fund with the various factual references and the allusion to ‘expert gorilla trackers’.

Less successful responses focused on the narrative aspects of the text with the descriptive sentences concerning the gorillas and the two ‘tips’ for visitors. These weaker responses adopted a paragraph-by-paragraph approach, using the phrase ‘in the ... paragraph’, or an approach to analysis which ranged haphazardly across the text. It would be helpful for candidates to be aware that the discriminator ‘analysis is coherent and effectively structured’ and similar descriptors are a feature of the higher levels; a whole-text approach can often provide sophisticated and coherent analysis. Another consequence of the line-by-line approach was the repetition of the same point, such as the author’s use of alliteration. It is worth remembering that the same point can not be rewarded twice.

Basic responses offered very generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. Such 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 too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/21
Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B**.
- Candidates should focus on the key instructions in the questions they answer, which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 1(a)** the key instruction is to write the text for ‘your first blog entry’, creating a sense of ‘excitement and anticipation.’
- Candidates must write in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

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

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger responses focused clearly on the question, writing engaging blog entries and creating anticipation by indicating to the reader what the next blog might contain. Weaker responses consisted of simple accounts of the writer’s travels, often focusing almost totally on packing, obtaining documents and the journey to get there. Others demonstrated the need to read the question carefully, as they covered all 3 months in a single blog entry.

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 candidates focused mostly, or entirely, on the content of their piece of writing and therefore only provided minimal analysis of their writing by indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

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

Weaker responses in **Section B** generally lost focus on what the task required. For example, some responses to **Question 2** were purely narrative in form. 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 the visit to the café and the food and drink consumed, with little in the way of critique or personal opinion about the café.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You have recently left home and are spending three months living and studying in another country. You have decided to write a blog about the experience.

- (a) **Write the text for your first blog entry, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, create a sense of excitement and anticipation.**

Some candidates demonstrated a zest for adventure in their responses to this question. The majority of blogs were written in an appropriate semi-formal register, which created at times a lively and engaging tone.

Stronger candidates used helpful organisational features such as subheadings and clear topic sentences, and used evocative descriptions to reflect their excitement. One strong example from a candidate studying in England described, ‘seaside cliffs where salt-scented wind whips through your hair’; ‘famously English foggy mornings’ and ‘castles and palaces ... equally paragons of grand beauty and vessels of secrets and history’ – an example of effective description without reliance on common adjectives.

Stronger responses had a clear idea of where the writer was travelling to and what they would be studying. Candidates selected appropriate topics that allowed exploration of the theme presented in the question. It seemed that selecting a place that the candidate was familiar with resulted in better responses. In addition, better responses demonstrated an ability to adapt writing for an appropriate audience, and clearly these candidates had experience of practising this genre of writing. Stronger responses often established a tone of excitement from the very first sentence of the writing, as in these two examples: ‘This is awesome! My studies have taken me straight to Japan’; ‘Besides talking and learning about Italy, music is one of my favorite things ever. Adding Italy and music together is like adding ice cream to an ice cream cone.’ The best looked closely at their initial student experience and explored the emotions of being in a different place on one’s own, for example: ‘The high street explodes with colour and confidence on Sundays when the market is in full swing,’ and, ‘Being a new kid on the block is no shame in this slice of paradise.’

Weaker responses showed little variance in vocabulary: ‘Italy is a very nice place. The house I am staying is very nice.’ Many were vague and focused mainly on the journey, bringing in anticipation and excitement, but not dealing with the feeling of establishing themselves in a new area. Lots were filled with generic comments on wonderful culture or on language problems and eating new sorts of food. Some responses became too informal and word choice was too colloquial. Technical accuracy slipped as a result of informality and many weaker responses were hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but at times undeveloped. Many missed the requirement that this had to be the first blog entry, and degenerated into lengthy reports on what happened during the entire three months. In one or two extreme cases, events were described that could not possibly take place within three months.

- (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)**. Generally, responses would have been improved with greater attention to detail and by including evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response in the commentary.

Stronger responses showed an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the blog. They wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features. Such features included figurative language, humour, hyperbole and discourse markers. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader. For example: ‘By using first person pronoun “I”, and second person plural pronoun “you”, I make the text more personal as I address the reader directly and add to the conversational tone of the blog. Similarly, the slang contraction “JK” conveys the idea that I am talking to someone of my own age who I know.’

Weaker responses sometimes showed an ability to identify some basic language and structural features, but more difficulty was demonstrated in analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis but used general phrases such as, ‘This makes it easy for the readers to understand’. Many included basic general commentary on the content of their blog with no relevant language or structural points being made. Others wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs ‘to make the blog easier to read’ or having used commas ‘to make the sense clear’. They often struggled to reference specific words or phrases from their article 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, wrongly identified linguistic features, and had little or no comment on structure.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Descriptive piece

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

A significant number of candidates successfully used the technique of a framed narrative, typically describing a lesson from start to finish. For several 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.

Candidates who wrote stronger responses were able to keep to the descriptive stance throughout the piece and to create an image of the classroom as a vibrant place. Sound and movement were described with subtlety and precision. Some candidates used contrast and described the classroom at different times, for example before the day began and in the middle of a noisy lesson, observing the changes that had taken place. These candidates invariably established the descriptive form in the very first paragraph or sentence, for example: ‘Hundreds of feet stomp on the floor, some running, some swiftly walking, others taking their sweet time. The chatting and screaming of laughing candidates echo everywhere.’

In stronger responses, a variety of linguistic techniques was used, for example metaphorical language: ‘The sea of grey carpet hosted vibrantly coloured thrones for the children.’ One successful example used a zooming in technique; it started above the school then gradually arrived in the classroom, focusing on various details. Another brought some immediacy to the descriptions by writing in the present tense about the classroom in which they were sitting the exam: ‘His legs have started silently bouncing and his fingers drum his pen against the desk,’ and, ‘You are still entangled in hell with the sound of your arm drifting on your paper and the voices your pen produces as it rolls and stains your paper.’

Weaker responses were sometimes planned poorly, resulting in most of the piece being about what preceded getting to the classroom or was involved in the process of moving from one classroom to another. Some described various students in the classroom but focused mainly on the dialogue between them. Others began with some descriptive detail but ended up writing accounts of an incident which happened in the classroom or stories of disastrous substitute teacher lessons. Some of the weakest responses were lacking

in sentence control, revealed in sentence fragments such as, 'Watching the teacher pace back and forth. Doing their best to cram as much knowledge in your head as they can, like a child shoves food in his mouth.'

Question 3 – Essay

In class, you have been discussing whether it is worse to have too much money or not enough. Your teacher has asked you to write an essay on the topic, giving your opinion. Write between 600 and 900 words.

It would appear that many candidates took the lack of a form of transactional writing as reason to use fewer rhetorical devices, and at times responses would have been improved with some adaptation to audience. Many candidates organised their essays using discourse markers, a more appropriate approach than incorporating sub-headings.

Stronger responses assumed an authoritative stance and maintained the appropriate form. They presented a balanced argument showing both sides of the debate and revealed the candidate's own opinion at the end. The best answers were organised into paragraphs, each paragraph dealing with a different point and introduced by a topic sentence. They convincingly and effectively used rhetorical questions and statistics, and 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 coherently through the argument point by point to construct a convincing overall case. Stronger responses contained both an argument and a counter argument or had some sort of evaluation of each side of the argument. For example, more nuanced responses identified that, while in many ways a plentiful supply of money relieves someone of financial worries in everyday life, it can also make it difficult to trust the motives of those claiming to be friends.

Stronger essays often began with an opening statement to engage the reader, setting out a point of view, as in this response: 'It is time to face the fact – wealth is probably the most important factor in a person's identity in the modern world.' They used discourse markers to structure the response and to demonstrate clear development. Some candidates opted to use the sequential 'Firstly', 'secondly' and 'finally' approach, which gives clarity and an overall impression of ideas developed clearly in terms of structure. More effective and sophisticated responses incorporated phrases such as 'A different viewpoint' or 'On the contrary'.

Weaker responses 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. They often presented a one-sided argument, which was often a little repetitive with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of reasons. They often repetitively used the words from the question: 'It is worse not to have enough money than to have too much money', sometimes as much as three times in one paragraph, with very little effort being made to vary the lexis being employed.

Many weaker essays were not structured clearly, often without any use of paragraphs. In some cases, candidates did not employ sufficient vocabulary or control of sentence structure to express some of the more complex ideas, for example: 'Too little money can make your life very hard,' and, 'So, the point is that, when you can access anything there's not going to be emotions when buying them.' Responses were sometimes short or unfinished, while in many other cases ideas needed more adequate development.

Question 4 – Review

You recently went to a new café in your town. Write a review of the cafe, which will be published in your local newspaper. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Candidates who wrote stronger responses were highly adept at this particular genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated response. They maintained an authentic persona of an interested reviewer throughout and gave a clear account of the food, service and atmosphere. Some used humorous touches successfully. The best gave a clear idea of a café, possibly one the writer had frequented, and commented clearly on its qualities and failings. One more engaging review incorporated a lengthy description of a particular confection which the writer fondly remembered baking as a child with their grandmother and which they had not until now been able to find 'properly made'. This enthusiasm brought the scene to life. Such reviews gave the impression a good number of candidates had read pieces like this before.

Weaker responses, instead of focusing on the purpose of critically reviewing the café, focussed on the writer's own personal likes and dislikes in the way of food and beverages in a process of listing. Others didn't manage to create a clear picture of the place or were critical of a member of the café staff in a way which

would have made the review inappropriate for publishing in a local newspaper. Some weaker reviews contained little or no detail about the food or drinks. Such reviews often focused on the décor, service or the condition of the toilets, and needed to show greater awareness of the intended audience.

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. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B**.
- Candidates should focus on the key instructions in the questions they answer, which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 1(a)** the key instruction is to write the text for a ‘short speech’ to your school, ‘persuading everyone’ to lower their sugar consumption by ‘giving advice’ and creating a ‘sense of motivation’.
- Candidates must write in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

A number of candidates self-penalised on the grounds of rubric infringement: some **Section B** responses were appreciably short of the minimum word limit and some candidates failed to answer **Question 1(b)** at all.

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger responses focused clearly on the question, writing engaging speeches entries with an appropriate focus on the benefits of being in a large school. Weaker responses consisted of simple lists of the benefits, needing more in way of an attempt to engage the 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 focused entirely on the content of the piece of writing and therefore only provided minimal analysis, usually only indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

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

Weaker responses on **Section B** generally lost focus on what the task required. For example, some stories in **Question 2** were in need of a sense of drama or suspense. Some responses to **Question 3** were limited in development of opinions, while some **Question 4** responses were simple accounts of the event, needing more in the way of critique or personal opinion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You have been learning about why much sugar is bad for you. Your headteacher has asked you to give a short speech to the school, persuading everyone to reduce the amount of sugar they eat.

- (a) Write the text for the speech, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the atmosphere at your school, and give advice on improving diet, and create a sense of motivation.

Nearly all candidates clearly understood the purpose and audience for this task. Degrees of formality varied, which was to be expected given the range of cultural backgrounds across the entry for the examination. A minority of responses were too long, which often impacted on the candidates' ability to write a **Section B** response of the required length, whereas some responses were very short and did not fully utilise the 400 words at their disposal. Others wrote very short responses, sometimes with fewer than 200 words, which lacked development. The majority of answers were focused and often showed knowledge of the downsides of taking too much sugar. It was often referred to as 'an addiction', or even a 'poison' or as a 'silent killer'.

Stronger responses included relevant devices such as rhetorical questions, direct address and repetition to engage the audience. They often used an effective introductory sentence as a hook, as in this example: 'Imagine this: a highly addictive substance, condoned by the government, sold at every supermarket in every country during every hour of every day.' They clearly stated the purpose of the speech, such as in this example: 'We're here today to talk about an addiction. One that affects many of us, myself included. Sugar.' They maintained a close focus on the speech form as well as addressing the audience and establishing and sustaining an appropriate tone and register. They often concluded their speech with a motivational call to action, such as in these two examples: 'Take this step and change your life. Eat well. Sleep well. Live long and enjoy all that this world and this one life has to offer'; 'I know each of you has the will power to make this crucial change for the benefit of your future health.'

Many candidates effectively incorporated their own experience, real or imagined, into the speech and used this as one means of persuasion. Appropriate lexis was often employed, especially for medical conditions and discussion of food groups. A few candidates referred to suitable role models.

In weaker responses, attention to the speech form in the opening was often overlooked and this sometimes resulted in responses which were more article-like or essay-like in their form. They sometimes did not utilise a paragraph structure or any discourse markers, but occasionally included titles and sub-headings, which were not appropriate for the specified form. Some responses were in need of suggestions of ways to improve diet and often did not include any rhetorical devices. Such responses were often hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but at times undeveloped. For example, in this response, while content was generally relevant, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'These delights are wonderful, even the most healthiest person on this planet cannot resist them, I can bet my life on that but sometimes they get a teeny tiny bit too much for us which causes a lot of difficulties in our day to day lives.'

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

One approach that worked well was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of the response to **Question 1(a)**. Many responses would have been

improved with greater attention to detail and by including evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response in the commentary.

Stronger responses demonstrated an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the article. These candidates wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features, such as figurative language, humour, hyperbole and discourse markers. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader. For example: 'I also asked rhetorical questions, combined with the collective pronoun "we", to create a sense of shared identity between the speaker and the audience. The use of the collective "we" along with the imperative "must" emphasises a shared need to change our eating habits.'

Weaker responses sometimes showed an ability to identify some basic language and structural features but demonstrated more difficulty with analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis but used general phrases such as, 'This makes it easy for the audience to understand'. Many included basic general commentary on the content of the article with no relevant language or structural points being made. Others wrote about basic things such as having written in paragraphs 'to make the speech easier to read' or having used commas 'to make things clearer'. They often struggled to reference specific words or phrases from their article 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, wrongly identified linguistic features, and had little or no comment on structure.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Story

Write a story called *The Note*, about a message someone received unexpectedly from an unknown source. In your writing, create a sense of drama and suspense. Write between 600 and 900 words.

The strongest responses established and sustained a clear focus on drama and suspense, whilst the weakest responses tended to offer a list-like series of events and were needing in terms of engagement or narrative structure.

In stronger responses, candidates created drama and suspense from the first paragraph, for example in this opening: 'We could talk about many things but tell me what you want to hear about first. The day? The note? The incident? The worry?' This sense of drama was sustained in a clear and sophisticated manner all the way through the narrative. Another successful opening was: 'It had been a few hours short of four days. I really did not know what to do any more. All I could do was sit by the shore and hope.' Many candidates deliberately, and successfully, delayed any revelations about the contents of the note, and its sender, until the middle of the story. One such dramatic, and sinister, moment occurred during a concert: 'As I shuffled towards the instrument case to make my contribution, the hairy-faced performer stared at me without breaking rhythm and gave me a manic grin.' One candidate successfully used a diary format for their story, using reverse chronology, a novel approach; another very good response focused on a suicide note found by the speaker of the story: 'No iota of lamentation was under-explained as the sender mentioned their gradual descent from self-isolation, depression to gruesome self-harm, manic depression and ultimately the end.'

Weaker responses demonstrated a struggle to create a sense drama and suspense, often missing the 'unknown source' aspect of the question and consisting of tedious accounts, for example of a journey instigated by a mundane note with no dramatic implications. There were also quite a number of inconclusive endings, as if the candidate, having set up a suspenseful scenario, ran out of ideas at the end. Other weaker responses employed plots that were too elaborate, with too many characters involved, leading to a lack of narrative control and organisation, and drifting from one event to the next. Some used too much dialogue, which was often poorly punctuated. Too often the candidates used a 'telling' and not a 'showing' technique, which did not allow for a sense of drama to be created. There was a tendency to incorporate unrealistic occurrences and expression was often hampered by frequent errors, such as in this example: 'He looks at me again and say "Have you been here for a long time" he asked, removing my earphones "Sorry what did you say" I said to him "Have you been out here for a long time" he says back to me.'

Question 3 – Article

In class, you have been discussing the fact that people do not spend enough time together as a family these days. Write an article for your school magazine, giving your opinion on the topic. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most responses to this question showed engagement and were sustained, with a good number of suggestions as to how families could organise their lives to spend more quality time together. There were candidates who identified that this was not always desirable if a family was dysfunctional, and in these cases, candidates explored the options of creating your own family through a network of friends and other adults within a community.

Stronger responses worked logically through their points, signposting each point clearly through an aptly worded topic sentence or a subheading. Effective topic sentences included: ‘Although technology reduces the loneliness one might feel, it also introduces a barrier between loved ones,’ and ‘Family members often, at times without even realising it, put unnecessary and unjustified amounts of pressure on their children.’ Other candidates made use of effective subheadings, such as: ‘Is Technology the culprit?’, ‘Grieving the demise of Games Night’, ‘Eat, Pray and ... no Love?’ Stronger responses included a variety of sentence structures, including short sentences to make their main points clearly and complex sentences for developed explanations. They generally showed a maturity of thought and recognised problems faced through societal pressures for both parents and children within the family unit. Many also recognised the importance of maintaining close contacts with the extended family, whether face-to-face or via internet platforms where geographical separation was an issue. Blame for the loss of quality time with family was apportioned, in the main, to technology, social media, demanding bosses and schools, societal expectations and the pandemic. Many articles ended with a direct and meaningful message for the reader, for example: ‘There will be painful regrets when someone close to you passes away and the realisation of thoughtlessly prioritising a screen over a loved one truly hits home,’ and ‘Family is beautiful, family is love but family is not everything. Find balance; make time both for yourself and your family. You owe it to yourself.’

Weaker responses tended to focus on how busy individuals are in modern life; children with school work and social activities, parents with work and their interests or hobbies. Opinions were often left as assertions and needed to be justified with supporting evidence, even of an anecdotal nature. Such an approach produced quite repetitive articles which did not engage the audience. In weaker responses, candidates often recycled one or two main points without really developing them. They often tended to focus too much on the causes of the problem, usually the over-use of technology and social media and, in particular, the use of smartphones at the dinner table.

Question 4 – Review

You recently went to a local event which takes place once a year in your town. Write a review of the event, which will be posted on a travel website. Write between 600 and 900 words.

The question produced responses covering an array of events across the world. Many candidates wrote about local events, whilst others chose to write about events that they had visited or taken part in during a visit to another country.

Candidates who wrote stronger responses were highly adept at this particular genre of writing, employing a range of stylistic conventions in order to create a sophisticated response. They were able to confidently use techniques such as cynicism, irony or humour to criticise the event or to use appropriately formal language and register to comment and review effectively. They made reference to: the circumstances in which the event occurred; its significance to the community; how and why the event was of interest to non-locals; a clear focus on interesting features; merely passing mention of catering and merchandising opportunities; and comfort facilities. Some stronger responses included elements of caricature when describing individuals who were present at the event, or running stalls or games. A number of reviews ended with an effective conclusion, summarising the main points made in the review, such as in this example: ‘This event was mostly well organised and showcased a diverse range of musical talent, inspirational artists who rarely appear together on the same stage. Our team at S. Asia Travel Companion give it a qualified 4 stars out of 5.’ Others opted for a direct and enthusiastic concluding sentence: ‘Grab a friend and a camera and be sure to experience this festival for yourself next year!'

Weaker responses often merely described the event rather than reviewing it. Candidates provided personal accounts of what they did at the event and included very few, if any, of the qualities expected in a written review. Comments and opinions were typically quite simplistic and poorly expressed and punctuated, for

example: ‘The vibe of the event is so amoozing the weather is flowing a decent wind to comfort not much heat or not much cold its just amazing and fun to be there.’ Weaker responses were also repetitive, including a similar commentary for each aspect of the event to which they referred, sometimes focusing at length on aspects such as toilet and catering facilities, although these were only supplementary to the main purpose of the event. Such candidates were only able to achieve the task in part because the content was only partially or vaguely relevant.

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. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B**.
- Candidates should focus on the key instructions in the questions they answer, which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 1(a)** the key instruction is to write the text for a 'short speech' to the 'new candidates' about the 'positive aspects of being in a large school', focusing on the 'atmosphere' and the 'possibilities' that your school offers.
- Candidates must write in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences, and would do better to aim for clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the simple past tense.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

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

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger responses focused clearly on the question, writing engaging speeches with an appropriate focus on the benefits of being in a large school. Weaker responses consisted of simple lists of the benefits, and needed more in the way of attempting to engage the 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 focused entirely on the content of the piece of writing and therefore only provided minimal analysis, usually only indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

Stronger responses on **Section B** generally had a strong sense of the appropriate form for the task; (letter, 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 lacked focus on what the task required. For example, some letters in **Question 2** were limited in development of opinions. Some responses to **Question 3** were simple recounts of the documentary, with little in the way of critique or personal opinion, while some **Question 4** responses were narrative in form rather than descriptive.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

A small local school is going to close next month, and the candidates are all going to join your school, which is much larger. Your headteacher has asked you to give a short speech to the new candidates about the positive aspects of being in large school.

- (a) **Write the text for the speech, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the atmosphere at your school and the possibilities that it offers.**

Nearly all candidates clearly understood the purpose and audience for this task. A minority of responses were too long, which often impacted on the candidates' ability to write a **Section B** response of the required length, whereas some responses were very short and did not fully utilise the 400 words at their disposal. Some responses were fewer than 200 words, resulting in a lack of development.

Stronger responses tended to have a short, snappy introduction and to end concisely, rather than using up too many words to thank the whole school and staff. They communicated a feeling of warmth in the speech opening, showing the candidate had noted the instruction to welcome students from a smaller establishment to a larger one. For example, a casual, jocular opening was used by one candidate: 'Welcome everybody to your next stomping ground ... I'm your candidate nerd ...' while a slightly more formal, but equally relevant, opening was seen in this response: 'Welcome teachers, candidates, other members of the faculty and an additionally warm welcome to our new candidates ... Let this speech mark the beginning of our unity, as one.' Stronger responses showed the right idea about 'selling' a bigger school to new students and wrote well about the benefits such as there being more amenities, more chances to make friendship groups and more sporting opportunities. They also maintained a close focus on the speech form as well as addressing the audience and establishing and sustaining an appropriate tone and register.

Many candidates effectively incorporated their own experience, real or imagined, into the speech, such as in this example: 'When I was young, I lived in the worst neighbourhood imaginable ... Ever since I joined Greendale High, my life flipped around. How did this happen? How do you adapt to a new school?' Other successful responses utilised features of effective speech writing such as judicious listing as in, 'we want you to feel confident, safe and secure'; and affirmation as in, 'Rest assured ...'.

In weaker responses, attention to the speech form in the opening was often overlooked and this sometimes resulted in responses which were more article-like in their form. In a few responses, the candidates' writing was more like an advertisement for a school prospectus, and lacked some of the rhetorical devices that would have made for a stronger connection with the audience. Stylistically, tone was usually a little dull, as was the case in some responses which used a lot of listing of activities and therefore became rather tedious. Weaker responses were often hampered by grammatical errors, for example using commas instead of full stops between sentences. Ideas were mostly relevant but at times undeveloped. For example, in this response, while content was generally relevant, the range of language was limited, and errors were frequent: 'On the other hand, my school have more facilities. For example library, IT room, meeting room, science labs, indoor activities space, and a large field. You have all you need. Studying in a large school is cool. No confusions can be made.'

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

One approach that worked well was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of responses to **Question 1(a)**. Generally, responses would have been improved with greater attention to detail and by including evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response in the commentary.

In stronger responses, candidates used examples from their text, identified linguistic and structural features and commented on their effect. Many candidates began their commentary by reflecting on the form, purpose and audience for their speech; the best responses did this briefly and concisely, whereas weaker responses tended to recycle the question in unnecessary detail. Stronger responses showed an understanding of language and the need to provide some evaluation and analysis of how language functioned in the speech. They wrote in detail about the specific effects of structural and language features, such as hyperbole, figurative language and humour. They clearly identified their linguistic choices, gave quotations, explained the reasons for the choices and what effects they hoped to have on the reader, for example: ‘I address the audience in my writing successfully through the use of personification in “Peterhead prides itself ...” which ties into the relationship with the audience and helps ease the audience by giving the sense that Peterhead is not a mass of unknown candidates but a collective group.’

Weaker responses sometimes showed an ability to identify some basic language and structural features, but more difficulty was demonstrated in analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis but used general phrases such as, ‘I used simple language so the students would not get bored,’ or, ‘The choice of words makes it clear for the audience’. Many included basic, general commentary on the content of the article with no relevant language or structural points being made. They often struggled to reference specific words or phrases from their 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, wrongly identified linguistic features, and had little or no comment on structure.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Letter

You recently read a newspaper article called *Why all children should learn to cook*. Readers have been invited to write letters in response to this article. You decide to write a letter, giving your opinion. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Arguments in the response ranged from improving the curriculum to home cooking, and effective responses were often characterised by discourse markers such as ‘firstly’, ‘however’ and ‘moreover’. Many candidates produced a comprehensive and thorough argument to support the idea of children learning to cook, linking it to cognitive development and life skills. Many candidates wrote from a first-person point of view, some with greater success than others. Where a persona had been created, the writing tended to be more authentic and engaging.

Candidates who wrote stronger responses showed an ability leap into an imagined persona, and wrote convincing letters which began clearly, such as in these examples: ‘I am a recent retiree from a long-standing career as a chef ...’ and, ‘As a father of three children, I ...’. One candidate posed as a nutritionist, a successful persona as it enabled the candidate to adopt a knowledgeable tone of voice in the introductory section where some credible context was given about the rising levels of obesity and the impact of the pandemic on children’s physical health due to over-eating. The response was well developed with a number of arguments. Stronger responses were written in a concise, controlled style with relevant choices of vocabulary: ‘An appalling number of children are growing up with the normalisation of fast food, rather than home cooking, which is rather worrying.’ This candidate established an argument in favour of ‘involving our kids in the kitchen ... the sooner they become desensitised to the sight of broccoli or egg plant, the better ...’. Other candidates successfully used humour, such as in this example: ‘There is an obvious lack of drive when it comes to the admittedly frustrating task of teaching a child not to grate their own fingers while preparing a coleslaw dish.’

In weaker responses, candidates struggled to create a realistic persona and some lapsed into narrative, recounting their own childhood experiences of learning to cook and therefore not really addressing the question. Some candidates wrote one-sided answers supported by a list of reasons, often ending abruptly

with a one-sentence conclusion; meanwhile, a lack of structure was observed in a small number of responses, with more attention needing to be paid to the need for an appropriate letter format with opening and closing salutations and clear paragraphing. Other responses contained points that were made clearly but needed development.

Question 3 – Review

You have just seen a TV documentary about wildlife in the Arctic and Antarctic regions. Write a review of the documentary, which will be posted on a conservation website. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Many candidates who chose this question showed a genuine interest in the subject matter, which was usually reflected through positive and sometimes effective language. For example, one candidate described the landscape as ‘magical.’ The question was generally answered quite effectively, and most candidates grasped the particular language and structure needed for a review, whether positive or critical. There were few critical reviews, but they were sometimes very dramatic and insightful.

Stronger reviews were structured clearly, with some effectively deployed subheadings. They gave clear recommendations or criticisms, and provided plenty of detail to get across a real feel for the documentary. They fully engaged with the content and style of the documentary and were able to recount its strengths and weaknesses and to maintain a critical tone and style. The conventions of review writing were sometimes employed to good effect, for example using star ratings or marks out of ten. The website format was indicated by some, with the inclusion of website email addresses. Naming the programme also enabled candidates to write convincingly, for example ‘The King of Wildlife’. Candidates successfully employed emotive language to convey a strong point of view, such as in this example: ‘It was sickening to see how a polar bear could just die from starvation.’ Such reviews were structured well and clearly, concentrating on a different aspect of the documentary – for example music, voiceover narration and camerawork – in each paragraph. Many stronger reviews concluded successfully with summative comments, such as in this example: ‘Overall, this documentary is true art; life-changing, perspective-altering. This has to be one of the most powerful and emotional documentaries of all time. It combines the imagery of a multi-million dollar feature film with a genuine message to the people.’

Some weaker responses went little further than describing the content of the documentary, while some answers needed more in the way of development and felt list-like. A few weaker reviews omitted the expression of a view; such candidates were only able to achieve the task in part because the content was only partially or vaguely relevant to the form and purpose of a review.

Question 4 – Descriptive piece

Write a descriptive piece called *Top of the World*, about being at the top of a mountain. In your writing, focus on the sights and sound to help your reader imagine the scene. Write between 600 and 900 words.

In stronger pieces, candidates kept to the descriptive stance throughout and created an image of the summit as a beautiful place inspiring awe. Sights and sound were described with subtlety and precision. Some candidates described the summit at different times, for example in the morning, in the afternoon and before sunset, observing the changes that had taken place. Stronger pieces invariably established the descriptive form in the very first paragraph or sentence, for example: ‘It’s blinding white at the top. No footprints scar the snow as you ascend to the peak.’

Stronger pieces included a variety of linguistic techniques, for example personification: ‘The ground beneath you still bitter and angry that it has somehow been overcome, remains as treacherous and unstable as ever.’ Metaphorical language was also used well, as in this example: ‘Over the edge of the cliff, the clouds form a turbulent sea, rising up and heaving to this energetic wind.’ One able candidate used long, complex, accurately constructed sentences to create descriptive effects when personifying a river that ran down from the top of the mountain. The description included a number of less common vocabulary choices such as: ‘meandered’, ‘traversed’, ‘cascaded’, ‘pounding’. Also, more technical vocabulary was employed such as; ‘rivulets’, ‘glaciers’, and ‘gully’. The choice of vocabulary combined with the lengthy, complex sentences created a real sense of movement.

Weaker pieces sometimes included irrelevant content that was outside the requirements of the task, such as descriptions of the preparations for the mountaineering trip. Some candidates tried to convey the heat of the day through rather clichéd statements, such as: ‘deafening silence’ and ‘fluffy clouds.’ Some of the weakest

responses were lacking sentence control, with sentence fragments and commas used instead of full stops: ‘It all just seemed like a patchwork of colours, looked straight out of a van goh painting. The clouds touched my face, I could see the clouds in an eye level.’

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/31
Language Analysis

Key messages

Examination candidates entering 9093/31 are required to analyse sets of language data and provide cohesive commentary on their findings.

The key skills required by Paper 3 are provided as the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, the assessment objectives and their weightings are different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks.

There are, therefore, 25 marks available for each question. With that in mind, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the sections. In this series, some sustained and thoughtful work was seen in both sections, indicating that the examination time had been put to best use.

General comments

Overall, candidates engaged with the stimulus material at a good level in both sections of the examination paper. Content in each of the sections was found to be meaningful and most candidates presented sustained, cohesive responses using an appropriate register.

Some brief responses were seen. Such responses could only be described as ‘limited’ according to the level descriptors outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity and therefore undeveloped. In some cases, elaborate response plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain brief, meaningful, and comprise useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

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

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression with ideas expressed in a logical, fluent sequence of paragraphs which showed a progression of ideas. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology, whereas weaker responses described their findings in general terms.

The structure of stronger responses progressed ideas through a series of linguistic frameworks which included graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, morphology, pragmatics or semantics. Although it is not a

requirement for a response to be structured in this way, clearer analytical skills were demonstrated where such an approach had been taken.

Most responses acknowledged where on the developmental timeline of the English language Text A sat, although relevance of content was sometimes obscured by long and generalised historic or sociological consideration. This approach resulted in discursive writing which contained some irrelevant material, rather than the focused, analytical writing required by this paper.

Most candidates analysed all three sources to an extent, with the major portion of the analysis focussing on Text A. Weaker responses tended to provide analysis of each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper; stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis. Where cohesion was achieved, an increased level of development was demonstrated. Where there was no cohesion, a resulting lack of development of the overall work detracted from the crafting of the writing.

Conceptualisation

In this series, relevant linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches were referenced which indicated a broad range of wider reading. These included Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, Schmidt's wave model, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, technological development in printing, and Chen's S-curve model. Such references were generally clearly understood, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful. However, as Text A represented written material with no phonological representation, reference to Jesperson and the Great Vowel Shift was not necessarily useful, especially where it was applied to the lexical item *publick*. More useful was the occasional insightful reference to Bodini and Didot's typeface which removed the medial S during the 1790s, not long after Text A had been published. Nonetheless, the 9093 syllabus is not prescriptive with regard to appropriate theoretical examples and any which were cited relevantly were credited.

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory to which they made reference was relevant by making a careful selection from the texts. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but were not always fully developed or they were not applied to any text selection. This was seen particularly where technological influences were discussed; often there was brief mention of Caxton's invention but in weaker responses this was not investigated further in relation to any evidence.

The linguistic issue of etymology and the part it plays in language change over time was frequently referenced with some developed discussion of French and Latin influences, using *receipts*, and *Gratitude*, for example. Moreover, blending, hyphenation and compounding, pejoration and amelioration were generally understood well with examples such as *prosecute* from Text B forming the basis of some developed analysis.

Data handling

As in previous series, weaker responses misunderstood the use of the medial (or long) S in Text A, with some claiming it to be a phonemic symbol rather than the archaic grapheme which was in use at the time of writing (1739). Stronger responses acknowledged events and advancements which had contributed to its eventual obsolescence, to describe the approximate time of change and compare this feature to present day use. There was also some developed commentary on the use of ligature in a *ct* consonant cluster and the Greco-Roman *Œconomy*.

Mainly, however, analyses of change included lexical and orthographical items from Text A including *compleat* and *topick* and the use of apostrophe of elision in *look'd* and *distinguish'd*. Weaker analysis used mainly lexical items along with some grammatical items such as the compound *House-Wives* and hyphenated expression of *Great-Britain*. There was also much discussion of capitalisation of abstract and proper nouns as seen in Text A. Weaker responses tended to describe this feature as 'random capitalisation' rather than providing more thorough exploration of why *Advice*, *Assistance* or *Employment*, for example, had been capitalised.

Most responses attempted to analyse the sentence constructions of Text A, comparing them to those expected by a contemporary audience; not all discussion used accurate labelling of complex-compound constructions, but most understood the almost conversational yet perhaps overly polite register of the text and the effects and impacts that it may have had on its original audience.

The *n*-Gram in Text C offered the opportunity to analyse the comparative pragmatic uses of gendered terms of address. Graphic representation of the data was clearly understood, although there was a tendency in weaker responses merely to copy out the numerical data from the y axis without clear observations pertaining to language change. Such an approach is a form of paraphrase rather than analysis and as such offers no development to a response.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

A good level of understanding was demonstrated in most responses of how the IPA chart of phonemic representation of speech should be interpreted, although in Paper 31 responses this series, incidences of use of the transcription were infrequent.

Some weaker responses tended to focus solely on Henry's utterances in attempt to reveal whether his linguistic competencies were appropriate for his age. Such an approach led to missed opportunities to analyse the father's role in the conversation and the extent to which his scaffolding led to Henry's extended length of utterance and his overt use of imagination. Thus, the full dynamics of the conversation were left unexplored.

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

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

Conceptualisation

Analysis was quick to label Henry in terms of his level of linguistic competence. Weaker responses automatically assigned Henry to Piaget's preoperational stage and described him as post-telegraphic as his age (5 years) had been supplied in the preamble to the task. Insightful analysis revealed evidence of Piagetian concrete operational tendencies in Henry's utterances as there was some evidence of reasoning in the conditionality of his jokes.

Weaker responses made brief reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Bruner and Skinner, but did not develop analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source. In some cases, no data were provided and so there was no synthesis or cohesion. Moreover, where only brief mention of a theorist's name was provided, the reference was incomplete.

Confident responses analysed the father's scaffolding technique in relation to Bruner and in developed analysis relating to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. Such responses provided evidence from the utterances towards the end of the transcription with Henry's recasting of his own utterance, demonstrating his explanation of cause and effect to this father: *when we took off the label it was just broke by itself ... we just took the label off so we needed you to fix that*.

The transcription offered much opportunity for analysis in relation to Hallidayan functions, the imaginative function in particular. Henry's utterances also evidenced the representational, personal and heuristic functions: *I can do it with a glass, I need to have one now and why did ...*

There was some developed analysis supported by references to Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device and Universal Grammar, with negation in *have you never heard* and the virtuous error of past tense *buyed* being the items analysed most frequently.

Data handling

Some responses attempted phonological analysis to an extent and generally did not describe the glottal stop in /wɔ:θə/, nor offer opinion on why Henry's utterance in that particular instance might be different from

anything seen in the father's utterances. Weaker responses merely suggested that Henry had not reached his expected milestones.

There was general observation of competent turn-taking with fulfilled adjacency pairs and some cooperative overlap at line 10 acknowledged to be due to Henry's excitement.

Most responses included analysis of prosodic features. Weaker commentary explained that there was different pitch in the intonation of the father's questioning technique, whereas stronger responses explored more fully the nature of the pitch and whether it implied whether or not a response was necessary. Prosody was also analysed in the father's *WOW* and Henry's *EXPLODE* where each interlocutor used raised volume for a specific and different purpose.

Further data selections were made to analyse Henry's use of contraction, *I'll*, conjunction *and*, deletion of initial syllable in conjunction *cause* to separate clauses and virtuous error *ive*. Confident responses described these linguistic features using an accurate range of technical terminology and developed commentary.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/32
Language Analysis

Key messages

Examination candidates entering 9093/32 are required to analyse sets of language data and provide cohesive commentary on their findings.

The key skills required by Paper 3 are described by the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, the assessment objectives and their weightings are different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks.

There are, therefore, 25 marks available for each question. With that in mind, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the sections. In this series, some sustained and thoughtful work was seen, indicating that the examination time had been put to best use.

General comments

Overall, candidates produced sustained, cohesive responses using an appropriate register, although some brief responses were seen. Brief responses could only be described as ‘limited’ according to the level descriptors outlined in the mark scheme as they were limited by their own lack of development.

In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain brief, meaningful, and comprise useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

In general, although there were some lapses into generalised descriptions of linguistic features, candidates were able to use a good range of linguistic terminology.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

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

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression with ideas expressed in a logical, fluent sequence of paragraphs which showed a progression of ideas. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology, whereas weaker responses described findings in general terms.

Most responses acknowledged where on the developmental timeline of the English language Text A sat, although relevance of content was sometimes obscured by long and generalised historic or sociological

consideration. This approach resulted in discursive writing which contained some irrelevant material, rather than the focused, analytical writing required by this paper.

The structure of stronger responses also progressed ideas through a series of linguistic frameworks which included graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, morphology, pragmatics or semantics. Although it is not a requirement for a response to be structured in this way, clearer analytical skills were demonstrated where such an approach had been taken.

Most candidates analysed all three sources to an extent, with the major portion of the analysis exploring Text A. Weaker responses tended to provide analysis of each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper; stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis. Where cohesion was achieved, an increased level of development was demonstrated. Where there was no cohesion, a lack of development of the overall work detracted from the overall crafting of the writing.

Conceptualisation

The 9093 syllabus is not prescriptive with regard to appropriate theoretical examples and any which were cited relevantly were credited. In this series, relevant linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches were referenced which indicated a broad range of wider reading included Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, Schmidt's wave model, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, technological development in printing, and Chen's S-curve model. Such references were generally clearly understood, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful.

However, as Text A represented written material with no phonological representation, reference to Jesperson and the Great Vowel Shift was not necessarily useful. Candidates made this reference particularly in analysing Text C's *gaol* and *jail* where there was visible difference in the vowel/diphthong cluster, instead of concentrating on the change over time of the orthographic representation of the initial phoneme.

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory to which they made reference was relevant by making a careful selection from the texts. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but were not always fully developed or they were not applied to any text selection. This was seen particularly where technological influences were discussed; often there was brief mention of Caxton's invention, but in weaker responses this was not investigated further in relation to any evidence.

In some cases, responses were weakened to an extent with lengthy discussion on the literary qualities of Fr. Farnall's contribution to Text A, for example in *the mental darkness, the stubborn tempers, the hopeless spirits, and the vicious habits on which the master has to work* which was cited by the authors of the report. In 9093 Paper 3, it is important to sustain a linguistic rather than literary analysis. Where evidence from the text is embedded, quotes should be succinct to avoid wasting words and valuable examination time in copying out long sections of the stimulus material.

In close reading of the texts, the concepts of borrowing, narrowing, pejoration and amelioration were evident; these concepts were generally understood well with examples such as *juvenile*, *vice* and *want* forming the basis of some developed analysis.

Data handling

Most candidates acknowledged the formality of the tenor of Text A in that the material was extracted from a report from 1861 and were able to offer ideas concerning perceived graphological differences between the text and contemporary report writing. These included reference to Roman numerals rather than bullet points, closed as opposed to open punctuation and a similar clarity of paragraphing to separate ideas.

The text was rich in lexical items which could have been selected. Analysis by most candidates focused on *paupers*, *garrets* and *thither*. Weaker analysis used mainly those items which were provided in the notes which followed Text A, although there was some more confident exploration of *physiognomy* and *in loco parentis*. Both of these selections provided the opportunity to introduce reference to etymological consideration which developed the analysis.

Exploration of Text B, which illustrated change over time in pragmatic use of nouns alongside *class* led in some cases to long socioeconomic discussion which lost focus at times. Stronger responses related ideas from this text directly to *this neglected class of children* as seen in Text A to provide cohesion to the analysis.

The *n*-Gram in Text C offered the opportunity to analyse the comparative uses of nouns *jail* and *gaol*. Graphic representation of the data was clearly understood, although there was a tendency in weaker responses merely to copy out the numerical data from the y axis without any clear observations pertaining to language change. Such an approach is a form of paraphrase rather than analysis and as such offers no development to a response. Stronger responses referred to knowledge and understanding of the concept of etymology to analyse reasons for the orthographic change that the *n*-Gram demonstrated.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

In general, there was a good understanding of the nature and flow of the conversation; responses detailed a number of the characteristic features evidenced by the utterances of the interlocutors. These included competent turn taking, mostly fulfilled adjacency pairs, Aria's use of tense, negation, pronoun, preposition and pre-modifier, and sentence construction.

Some weaker responses tended to focus solely on Aria's utterances in attempt to reveal whether her linguistic competencies were appropriate for her age. Such an approach led to missed opportunities to analyse the mother's role in the conversation and the extent to which her scaffolding led to Aria's extended length of utterance *oh heres another big tower (1) look thats going down the tower* which was rich in linguistic complexity. Thus, the full dynamics of the conversation were left unexplored.

However, other more confident responses acknowledged the way in which the mother used child-directed speech in terms of questioning technique, intonation and positive reinforcement, and how this aided Arias's speech patterns to progress.

Confident responses used a wide range of technical terminology with accuracy, demonstrating a deeper understanding of the characteristic features. Some responses, however, merely described minor features in general terms and were in need of further explanation.

Conceptualisation

Analysis was quick to label Aria in terms of her level of linguistic competence. Weaker responses automatically assigned Aria to Piaget's preoperational stage and describing her as 'telegraphic' as her age (4 years) had been supplied in the preamble to the task. Insightful analysis revealed evidence of post-telegraphic utterances, seen particularly towards the end of the transcription. The stronger responses in **Section B** of Paper 3 will always analyse the data before labelling any child interlocutor's linguistic competence and stage of acquisition.

Weaker responses made brief reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists which included Bruner and Skinner, but did not develop analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source. In some cases, no data were provided and so there was no synthesis or cohesion. Moreover, where only brief mention of a theorist's name was provided, the reference was incomplete.

Confident responses analysed the mother's scaffolding technique in relation to Bruner and in developed analysis to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. Such responses provided evidence from the utterances towards the end of the transcription where Aria challenged her mother in *no no /ð/ the sheeps go (.) wet*. Where this utterance was embedded as evidence there was additional opportunity to introduce Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device and Universal Grammar, as the virtuous error of *go* was overt.

The transcription offered much opportunity for analysis in relation to Hallidayan functions, the interactional function in particular. Aria's *thank you* drew much discussion in terms of the child's behavioural competence; where discussion on this aspect retained its linguistic stance, focus was maintained.

Data handling

Analysis of prosodic features was attempted in most responses and this included that seen in the mother's raised pitch at the end of her questions and the raised volume in Aria's *HERES ONE*. Deeper analysis of prosody included the mother's stress in *no thats a horsie and thats a cow* which led to informed analysis of the role of deixis in the child language acquisition.

A further example from the data which was used confidently at times was Aria's pluralisation of *horsies* and her application of the same morphologic rule to the irregular *sheeps*. Nonetheless, very few candidates took the opportunity to develop such commentary by discussing the way in which the child-directed speech applied the diminutive form in an inconsistent manner.

Further data selections were made to analyse Aria's use of contraction and her simple subject-verb-object sentence construction in *we've found them*, which illustrated her overall fluency and competence in participating in conversation in a natural and relaxed fashion.

Overall, responses provided a careful selection of language data to evidence analysis which was at times synthesised in an insightful manner by confident candidates. Stronger responses described these linguistic features using an accurate range of technical terminology; where this was applied a strong linguistic approach was evident.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/33
Language Analysis

Key messages

Examination candidates entering 9093/33 are required to analyse sets of language data and provide cohesive commentary on their findings.

The key skills required by Paper 3 are provided as the four assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing AO2), conceptualisation (AO4) and data handling (AO5). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and the ways in which available marks are weighted under each one. **Section A** has the following marks available: AO2, 5 marks; AO4, 5 marks, and AO5, 15 marks. In **Section B**, the assessment objectives and their weightings are different: AO1 carries up to 5 marks; for AO4 there are up to 15 marks available, and for AO5, there are 5 marks.

There are, therefore, 25 marks available for each question. With that in mind, candidates are advised to divide the examination time equally in order for them to provide as full a response as possible in both of the sections. In this series, some sustained and thoughtful work was seen in both sections, indicating that the examination time had been put to best use.

General comments

Overall, candidates engaged with the stimulus material at a good level in both sections of the examination paper. Content in each of the sections was found to be meaningful and most candidates presented sustained, cohesive responses using an appropriate register.

Some brief responses were seen. Such responses could only be described as ‘limited’ according to the level descriptors outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity and therefore undeveloped. In some cases, elaborate response plans had been produced at the detriment of the full essay. Although planning is advised to an extent, these should remain brief, meaningful, and comprise useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

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

Writing

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear control of expression with ideas expressed in a logical, fluent sequence of paragraphs which showed a progression of ideas. Stronger responses made accurate use of a wide range of technical terminology, whereas weaker responses described their findings in general terms.

The structure of stronger responses progressed ideas through a series of linguistic frameworks which included graphology, orthography, lexis, grammar, morphology, pragmatics or semantics. Although it is not a

requirement for a response to be structured in this way, clearer analytical skills were demonstrated where such an approach had been taken.

Most responses acknowledged where on the developmental timeline of the English language Text A sat, although relevance of content was sometimes obscured by long and generalised historic or sociological consideration. This approach resulted in discursive writing which contained some irrelevant material, rather than the focused, analytical writing required by this paper.

Most candidates analysed all three sources to an extent, with the major portion of the analysis focussing on Text A. Weaker responses tended to provide analysis of each source in the order in which it was presented in the question paper; stronger responses interwove examples of data to achieve synthesis. Where cohesion was achieved, an increased level of development was demonstrated. Where there was no cohesion, a resulting lack of development of the overall work detracted from the crafting of the writing.

Conceptualisation

In this series, relevant linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches were referenced which indicated a broad range of wider reading. These included Hallidayan functional linguistics, the theory of lexical gaps, Schmidt's wave model, Hockett's random fluctuation theory, technological development in printing, and Chen's S-curve model. Such references were generally clearly understood, with stronger responses incorporating an increased level of detail, some of which was insightful. However, as Text A represented written material with no phonological representation, reference to Jesperson and the Great Vowel Shift was not necessarily useful, especially where it was applied to the lexical item *publick*. More useful was the occasional insightful reference to Bodini and Didot's typeface which removed the medial S during the 1790s, not long after Text A had been published. Nonetheless, the 9093 syllabus is not prescriptive with regard to appropriate theoretical examples and any which were cited relevantly were credited.

Confident responses provided examples of how and why the theory to which they made reference was relevant by making a careful selection from the texts. Weaker responses demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but were not always fully developed or they were not applied to any text selection. This was seen particularly where technological influences were discussed; often there was brief mention of Caxton's invention but in weaker responses this was not investigated further in relation to any evidence.

The linguistic issue of etymology and the part it plays in language change over time was frequently referenced with some developed discussion of French and Latin influences, using *receipts*, and *Gratitude*, for example. Moreover, blending, hyphenation and compounding, pejoration and amelioration were generally understood well with examples such as *prosecute* from Text B forming the basis of some developed analysis.

Data handling

As in previous series, weaker responses misunderstood the use of the medial (or long) S in Text A, with some claiming it to be a phonemic symbol rather than the archaic grapheme which was in use at the time of writing (1739). Stronger responses acknowledged events and advancements which had contributed to its eventual obsolescence, to describe the approximate time of change and compare this feature to present day use. There was also some developed commentary on the use of ligature in a *ct* consonant cluster and the Greco-Roman *Œconomy*.

Mainly, however, analyses of change included lexical and orthographical items from Text A including *compleat* and *topick* and the use of apostrophe of elision in *look'd* and *distinguish'd*. Weaker analysis used mainly lexical items along with some grammatical items such as the compound *House-Wives* and hyphenated expression of *Great-Britain*. There was also much discussion of capitalisation of abstract and proper nouns as seen in Text A. Weaker responses tended to describe this feature as 'random capitalisation' rather than providing more thorough exploration of why *Advice*, *Assistance* or *Employment*, for example, had been capitalised.

Most responses attempted to analyse the sentence constructions of Text A, comparing them to those expected by a contemporary audience; not all discussion used accurate labelling of complex-compound constructions, but most understood the almost conversational yet perhaps overly polite register of the text and the effects and impacts that it may have had on its original audience.

The *n*-Gram in Text C offered the opportunity to analyse the comparative pragmatic uses of gendered terms of address. Graphic representation of the data was clearly understood, although there was a tendency in weaker responses merely to copy out the numerical data from the y axis without clear observations pertaining to language change. Such an approach is a form of paraphrase rather than analysis and as such offers no development to a response.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

A good level of understanding was demonstrated in most responses of how the IPA chart of phonemic representation of speech should be interpreted, although in Paper 33 responses this series, incidences of use of the transcription were infrequent.

Some weaker responses tended to focus solely on Henry's utterances in attempt to reveal whether his linguistic competencies were appropriate for his age. Such an approach led to missed opportunities to analyse the father's role in the conversation and the extent to which his scaffolding led to Henry's extended length of utterance and his overt use of imagination. Thus, the full dynamics of the conversation were left unexplored.

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

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

Conceptualisation

Analysis was quick to label Henry in terms of his level of linguistic competence. Weaker responses automatically assigned Henry to Piaget's preoperational stage and described him as post-telegraphic as his age (5 years) had been supplied in the preamble to the task. Insightful analysis revealed evidence of Piagetian concrete operational tendencies in Henry's utterances as there was some evidence of reasoning in the conditionality of his jokes.

Weaker responses made brief reference to the approaches taken by a variety of theorists, which included Bruner and Skinner, but did not develop analysis by providing sufficient evidence from the data source. In some cases, no data were provided and so there was no synthesis or cohesion. Moreover, where only brief mention of a theorist's name was provided, the reference was incomplete.

Confident responses analysed the father's scaffolding technique in relation to Bruner and in developed analysis relating to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. Such responses provided evidence from the utterances towards the end of the transcription with Henry's recasting of his own utterance, demonstrating his explanation of cause and effect to this father: *when we took off the label it was just broke by itself ... we just took the label off so we needed you to fix that*.

The transcription offered much opportunity for analysis in relation to Hallidayan functions, the imaginative function in particular. Henry's utterances also evidenced the representational, personal and heuristic functions: *I can do it with a glass, I need to have one now and why did ...*

There was some developed analysis supported by references to Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device and Universal Grammar, with negation in *have you never heard* and the virtuous error of past tense *buyed* being the items analysed most frequently.

Data handling

Some responses attempted phonological analysis to an extent and generally did not describe the glottal stop in /wɔ:θə/, nor offer opinion on why Henry's utterance in that particular instance might be different from

anything seen in the father's utterances. Weaker responses merely suggested that Henry had not reached his expected milestones.

There was general observation of competent turn-taking with fulfilled adjacency pairs and some cooperative overlap at line 10 acknowledged to be due to Henry's excitement.

Most responses included analysis of prosodic features. Weaker commentary explained that there was different pitch in the intonation of the father's questioning technique, whereas stronger responses explored more fully the nature of the pitch and whether it implied whether or not a response was necessary. Prosody was also analysed in the father's *WOW* and Henry's *EXPLODE* where each interlocutor used raised volume for a specific and different purpose.

Further data selections were made to analyse Henry's use of contraction, *I'll*, conjunction *and*, deletion of initial syllable in conjunction *cause* to separate clauses and virtuous error *ive*. Confident responses described these linguistic features using an accurate range of technical terminology and developed commentary.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/41
Language Topics

Key messages

The key skills required by Paper 4 as outlined in the syllabus are illustrated by the three assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives.

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

Paper 4 is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory.

It should be noted that in Paper 4 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis was found in the November 2021 series and this diminished the relevance and discursive qualities of some responses.

In the November 2021 series, there was evidence that candidates had divided the examination time carefully between the two sections, which resulted in the provision of two generally sustained essays.

General comments

In general, the stimulus material in both sections drew thoughtful responses. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced to the detriment of the full essay. Planning is advised to an extent; these should form brief outlines with useful pointers to be used in the full response; at times it seemed that planning had left little time to write the final essay.

Responses should demonstrate candidates' ability to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material and an application of knowledge and understanding gained from wider reading of the topic. Focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; simply providing explanations of knowledge of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. Conversely, responses which do not present ideas and understanding gained from wider reading will offer no creditable material according to AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to points made in the text. These points included but were not limited to: the notion that English might be seen by some as *the world's top language* and perhaps *the world's favourite lingua franca*; the influence of machine translation on the way that English is used internationally; how

learning English might be affected if *computers can now do all the hard work*; the role of English in international business, and the influence or otherwise of English in popular culture.

When discussing points from the text, some limited responses relied on knowledge of historical context relating to the early development of the English language, which at times led to loss of focus. Weaker responses tended to paraphrase the stimulus material without development of the ways in which English is used internationally. On the other hand, clear or detailed responses took a series of ideas from the text and discussed much more fully why and how, for example, machine translation might become a *threat*, or perhaps the purpose and value of a lingua franca in an international scenario.

At times, discussion departed from the question and context and explored instead the more general and wider concept of *language change*, relying on the strands of knowledge and understanding relevant to 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of *English in the world*.

Writing

In clear or effective responses, work was structured logically into a sequence which followed a pattern of introduction, key points and conclusion. Sophisticated responses introduced counterarguments to points raised, demonstrating creative thinking on the part of the candidate. In more limited responses the introduction comprised an opening statement which was not tied to the stimulus material, nor the main points which were going to form the basis of the body of the essay. Often these included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally. Such knowledge, albeit commendable in part, would have been better and more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions merely repeated points seen previously, whereas confident conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Clear or effective responses maintained an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks. Sophisticated responses demonstrated a natural ease in their use of technical descriptors of linguistic issues, with ideas being developed fully and with fluidity. This second consideration is important as AO2 does not only reward accuracy of expression, therefore responses remained limited if insufficient development was provided, even where accurate control of expression was seen.

When considering linguistic issues, some responses presented their audience with rhetorical questioning. This approach was rarely successful as no clear answer was provided and the journalistic style detracted from the overall register of the work. Any questions posed should always be answered to provide development of the presented issue. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration which ran the risk of weakening the linguistic standpoint.

Conceptualisation

Overall, a clear but not detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. Crystal's notions in his *English as a Global Language* and Diamond's steamroller metaphor were those most frequently referenced, although often these could have been explored more fully. Other theoretical examples which were relevant and clearly understood included those from McCrum, Philipson, Widdowson, Tree and Wave models, Zero Translation theory and Modiano's Expanding Circles.

Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of detailed understanding was demonstrated.

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, sometimes including a diagram which had unnecessarily taken up valuable examination time. Limited responses tended to provide a full exploration of the Kachru model whereas insightful responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru might have moved since the 1980s, also providing thoughtful opinion on where such boundaries might sit in the future, noting as stated in the article *things are changing fast*.

Most responses also referred to learning English to some extent, exploring the ways in which using translation technology could mean that English lessons which are now compulsory in some countries may no longer be part of the curriculum in the future. Development of this issue often drew upon valuable personal or local experience.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included but were not limited to: ways in which different cultures might use language in relation to abstract concepts such as space or time; the influence of language in relation to gender in different cultures; construction of meaning in different languages, including metaphor, and the influence of metaphor on thought pattern.

Limited responses selected evidence from the text to discuss Boroditsky's findings of how language might be perceived to lay blame, often citing *one language tends to play the blame game* whilst tending not to explore whether, as in the remainder of the sentence, *speakers of those languages think differently about what happened*.

Confident responses demonstrated insightful understanding of what Boroditsky had described as *ingredients of meaning*. As well as citing the examples provided in the stimulus material, such as the Yaguan expressions of time, sophisticated responses demonstrated creative thought on why *intent matters* in transmission and reception of language and how variation in tenses details the *temporal information* our thought processes might rely on to understand deeper and more accurate meaning.

Developed discussion included reference to examples of metaphor in languages other than English, to support or refute Boroditsky's statement on how we *construct meaning without understanding patterns in metaphor and language*. This also led to development on the extent to which conceptual metaphor can influence thought and intentionally or unintentionally mislead.

Writing

In general, those responses which were sustained were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Overall, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology strengthened responses, and at times there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used naturally and with fluidity. This increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or misapplied terminology were frequently seen in weaker responses.

Some basic or limited responses sought merely to supply paraphrase of the stimulus material without introduction of ideas for development. It is important to note that AO2 does not only reward for clarity and control of expression; equal weight is carried for development of the work.

At times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by either the author or by Boroditsky. Discussion of irrelevant points led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material.

Most responses included quotes from the text which had been skilfully embedded. In some cases, overly long sections had been copied into the response which had taken up valuable examination time. Candidates should ensure that examples cited are brief and completely relevant to the discussion in hand.

Conceptualisation

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

In an attempt to demonstrate wider reading, responses which went into great detail describing Whorf's exploration of the Hopi or Inuit lexicon tended to lose focus on the stimulus material, which had provided ample examples of its own. Where focus on the text became lost, although it was clear that wider study had been carried out, the discussion ran the risk of becoming irrelevant.

In line 21 of the stimulus material, Boroditsky makes brief mention of gender, describing it as a *fundamental* consideration. Although there were no examples provided by Boroditsky, a number of responses sought to introduce the concept of gendered language supported by mainly appropriate references to genderlect theories. In some cases, the introduction of this topic was carefully crafted as part of the overall response. In some weaker responses, genderlect discussion formed the major part of the work with little or no reference to other specific points raised in the stimulus material.

Overall, a wide selection of issues, concepts, methods and approaches was referenced. These included Fodor's LOTH, Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, Plato's view of how language should be an accurate reflection of eternal ideas, Steinberg, Pinker, Vygotsky, and Tajfel. Some limited responses made mention of the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been represented in the stimulus material. Other limited responses named theories without citing authorship. In both of these cases, incomplete knowledge was demonstrated. However, where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed, clear or effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing which was at times presented as sophisticated work.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/42
Language Topics

Key messages

This paper is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to the candidate's wider linguistic study.

In Paper 4 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis was found in the November 2021 series and detracted from the appropriate discursive qualities of some responses.

Key skills required by Paper 4 are outlined in the three assessment objectives: understanding (AO1), writing (AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the demands of the assessment objectives.

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

In this series, there was evidence that most candidates had divided the examination time equally between the two sections in order for them to provide as full a response as possible to each question, thus most responses were sustained and included a variety of relevant and valid points for discussion.

General comments

Responses to both sections mainly demonstrated sustained work, particularly to **Question 1**. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their brevity. At times, there was evidence that much time had been spent planning, leaving insufficient time for writing a full response. Although planning is advised to an extent, plans should remain brief with useful pointers to be used in the sustained final response.

The demands are to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material as well as knowledge gained from wider reading of the topic. 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. In some cases, long historical or sociological discussions were made without reference to the stimulus material. By contrast, some responses did not present ideas gained from wider reading and offered no creditable material relating to AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question made clear reference to points made in the text, demonstrating a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article. These issues included how English may be used as a lingua franca, how the Moroccan government is seeking to bring about *controversial* linguistic

change with the possibility of *giving preference to English*, the *importance* of English in the workplace, employability for English speakers, potential cultural and/or personal identity loss and governmental linguistic policy.

Some limited discussion relied solely on the ideas presented by the respondents in Text B. Conversely, some candidates missed the opportunity to use points raised in Text B as springboards for development of ideas. More confident responses interwove ideas from both texts in order to provide synthesis and cohesion to the overall essay whilst demonstrating deeper understanding.

At times, weaker responses tended to lose focus on the causes and effects of the expansion of English in the world. Discussion became separated from the context, exploring instead the wider concept of language change, relying on knowledge and understanding required in 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of the demands of the question.

Writing

Ideas were generally structured into a logical sequence which moved through a short introduction, key points and short conclusion. Clear, detailed or insightful work included counterargument to, or thoughtful development of, points raised in the stimulus material. At times, weaker responses began with a generalised statement which bore little relevance to the main points of the body of the essay. These often included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally, which would have been more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions merely repeated ideas used previously, whereas confident, well-crafted conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Confident responses maintained tight control of an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology. Well-crafted responses provided detailed discussion of points raised in the text, developing ideas in a sophisticated manner. AO2 does not only reward for accuracy of expression – development of ideas is also acknowledged, therefore responses were self-limiting, however accurate they may have been, if there was insufficient development.

Some responses had taken a writing approach which included a number of rhetorical questions; this approach was rarely successful, as a clear answer to any issue should be provided by the response itself. Moreover, the rhetorical questioning detracted from the overall register of the work. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration. Where this was sustained throughout the response with little reference to the text, the linguistic standpoint was weakened.

Conceptualisation

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, positioning Morocco in the outermost of his concentric circles. Some limited responses provided a full explanation of the Kachru model without further reference to any other approaches. Furthermore, some responses had included diagrams of the Kachru model which were unnecessary additions to already lengthy explanations. However, more confident, and at times insightful, responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru in the 1980s might change with the expansion of English through the contemporary world. In particular, detailed accounts were provided of where Morocco might sit according to the Kachru model if English did indeed become the national or official language of that nation. Thus, focus was maintained on the texts, rather than them becoming supplementary to, or indeed omitted from, the theory.

Clear, but not always detailed, application of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was generally evident. Most responses referenced Crystal and Diamond but wider reading of McCrum, Graddol, Widdowson, Webber and Ho, McArthur's Wheel model and Galloway's Channels were also used. Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with the generalisation, 'Some theorists' or 'A linguist' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Thus, lack of detailed knowledge was evident.

Most responses also referred to language death to some extent, although in weaker responses this was only in passing and remained undeveloped. Confident responses provided detailed reference to UNESCO's stages of language death and their consequences on local cultures and beliefs, often providing valuable local or personal examples to develop the discussion.

A further linguistic issue which was discussed by most candidates was that of hybridisation. Detailed responses discussed whether or not a new Moroccan English may be developed in the future, following the path which had led to the development of Singlish, for example. Clear, detailed or insightful responses were developed with reference to how creation of pidgins and creoles can lead to hybridisation or eventual standardisation.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included how false presumptions may be made when hearing accents spoken, the potential demand for *accent reduction or modification*, the lack of *standardization* of accent, how accent might affect employability, *intelligibility*, what might make *a good communicator* and whether there might be positive aspects to accent.

The stimulus material offered the opportunity for discussion on the advantages or disadvantages of accent in relation to personal and social identity as well as exploration of how change in personal and social identities might bring about advantage. Limited responses tended to discuss the perceived unfairness of Miloshevych's situation. However, more confident responses demonstrated a much broader and deeper understanding of why and how her experiences had led her to her goal, having herself *sought out* proactively professional advice over a period of three years.

Although weaker responses were clear in their understanding of how her accent had affected the prospects of Miloshevych, they tended to make little use of the views of Munro and Gross, thus did not explore the whole of the stimulus material. Developed discussion incorporated ideas on how intelligibility is the fundamental issue in communication and sought to argue the positive aspects in a contemporary society where a mix of accents is heard. Thus, both sides of the question focus – *personal and social* identity – were addressed.

Writing

Weaker responses tended to paraphrase the stimulus material without introduction of the candidate's own ideas for development. AO2 rewards for development as much as it rewards for accuracy of expression; paraphrase or brief explanation does not constitute development of ideas and such responses will remain limited.

At times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by the writer of the text which is not required in Paper 4. Discussion of irrelevant points led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material.

Cohesive discussion was effectively provided in stronger responses. Clear or detailed responses were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Generally, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology was used in stronger responses. At times, there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used which increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or inaccurately applied terminology were seen in weaker responses, although most responses to **Question 2** were sustained.

At times, lengthy quotes from the text were copied into weaker responses. Stronger responses skilfully embedded succinct quotes to evidence ideas, which indicated careful crafting of writing.

Conceptualisation

In some basic or limited responses there was no reference to linguistic issues, concepts, methods or approaches when answering **Question 2**. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis was frequently referenced to some extent. There was some extended discussion of linguistic determinism and relativism, some of which was made relevant to the issue of language and identity. Limited responses did not always acknowledge the theoretical source; this incomplete referencing, which indicated a lack of depth of knowledge, occurred frequently.

Detailed responses referenced Ardener and Ardener's Muted Group and Tajfel's Social Identity theories, both of which were directly relevant to the topic of marginalisation of accented speech. Many responses also used Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory to support ideas on how individuals might become integrated into various discourse communities or wider society. Other relevant studies which were referenced were those from Cheshire and Edwards, Trudgill, Labov and Milroy, often in detail and fully appropriately.

Some responses sought to widen discussion to gendered language, attempting to apply genderlect theories to the topic of personal and social identity. Whilst this was plausible to an extent, focus was lost in limited responses where genderlect discussion was overdeveloped in relation to that of the concept of accent. Furthermore, there was some introduction of Bernstein's notion of restricted and elaborated code, which was not always fully relevant, nor fully understood.

Overall, responses evidenced a broad range of wider reading, much of which was relevant to the topic of personal and social identify.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/43
Language Topics

Key messages

The key skills required by Paper 4 as outlined in the syllabus are illustrated by the three assessment objectives applicable to the paper: understanding (AO1), writing AO2) and conceptualisation (AO4). Candidates should be aware of the demands of the assessment objectives.

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

Paper 4 is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key language topics by providing a sustained, logically sequenced and cohesive response to stimulus material. Responses should be supported by evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory.

It should be noted that in Paper 4 there is no requirement to analyse the language of the texts provided. Any such analysis becomes irrelevant content and this material is not rewardable: evidence of such analysis was found in the November 2021 series and this diminished the relevance and discursive qualities of some responses.

In the November 2021 series, there was evidence that candidates had divided the examination time carefully between the two sections, which resulted in the provision of two generally sustained essays.

General comments

In general, the stimulus material in both sections drew thoughtful responses. Short responses could only be described as 'limited' according to the levels of response outlined in the mark scheme, as they were limited by their own brevity. In some cases, elaborate plans had been produced to the detriment of the full essay. Planning is advised to an extent; these should form brief outlines with useful pointers to be used in the full response; at times it seemed that planning had left little time to write the final essay.

Responses should demonstrate candidates' ability to produce two discursive, cohesive essays which highlight understanding of the stimulus material and an application of knowledge and understanding gained from wider reading of the topic. Focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; simply providing explanations of knowledge of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. Conversely, responses which do not present ideas and understanding gained from wider reading will offer no creditable material according to AO4.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to points made in the text. These points included but were not limited to: the notion that English might be seen by some as *the world's top language* and perhaps *the world's favourite lingua franca*; the influence of machine translation on the way that English is used internationally; how

learning English might be affected if *computers can now do all the hard work*; the role of English in international business, and the influence or otherwise of English in popular culture.

When discussing points from the text, some limited responses relied on knowledge of historical context relating to the early development of the English language, which at times led to loss of focus. Weaker responses tended to paraphrase the stimulus material without development of the ways in which English is used internationally. On the other hand, clear or detailed responses took a series of ideas from the text and discussed much more fully why and how, for example, machine translation might become a *threat*, or perhaps the purpose and value of a lingua franca in an international scenario.

At times, discussion departed from the question and context and explored instead the more general and wider concept of *language change*, relying on the strands of knowledge and understanding relevant to 9093 Paper 3, **Question 1**. Stronger responses maintained focus throughout on the context provided, thus demonstrating clear, detailed or insightful understanding of *English in the world*.

Writing

In clear or effective responses, work was structured logically into a sequence which followed a pattern of introduction, key points and conclusion. Sophisticated responses introduced counterarguments to points raised, demonstrating creative thinking on the part of the candidate. In more limited responses the introduction comprised an opening statement which was not tied to the stimulus material, nor the main points which were going to form the basis of the body of the essay. Often these included statistics of the numbers of speakers of English worldwide, or the number of different languages which currently exist globally. Such knowledge, albeit commendable in part, would have been better and more relevantly placed to support points raised later in the discussion. Weaker conclusions merely repeated points seen previously, whereas confident conclusions confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

Clear or effective responses maintained an appropriate register using low frequency lexis and relevant linguistic terminology inside logically sequenced structural frameworks. Sophisticated responses demonstrated a natural ease in their use of technical descriptors of linguistic issues, with ideas being developed fully and with fluidity. This second consideration is important as AO2 does not only reward accuracy of expression, therefore responses remained limited if insufficient development was provided, even where accurate control of expression was seen.

When considering linguistic issues, some responses presented their audience with rhetorical questioning. This approach was rarely successful as no clear answer was provided and the journalistic style detracted from the overall register of the work. Any questions posed should always be answered to provide development of the presented issue. At times, relevance of content was obscured by political or sociological consideration which ran the risk of weakening the linguistic standpoint.

Conceptualisation

Overall, a clear but not detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. Crystal's notions in his *English as a Global Language* and Diamond's steamroller metaphor were those most frequently referenced, although often these could have been explored more fully. Other theoretical examples which were relevant and clearly understood included those from McCrum, Philipson, Widdowson, Tree and Wave models, Zero Translation theory and Modiano's Expanding Circles.

Limited responses often introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of detailed understanding was demonstrated.

Most responses introduced Kachru's approach, sometimes including a diagram which had unnecessarily taken up valuable examination time. Limited responses tended to provide a full exploration of the Kachru model whereas insightful responses detailed more succinctly how the boundaries originally identified by Kachru might have moved since the 1980s, also providing thoughtful opinion on where such boundaries might sit in the future, noting as stated in the article *things are changing fast*.

Most responses also referred to learning English to some extent, exploring the ways in which using translation technology could mean that English lessons which are now compulsory in some countries may no longer be part of the curriculum in the future. Development of this issue often drew upon valuable personal or local experience.

Section B

Question 2

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract provided. These included but were not limited to: ways in which different cultures might use language in relation to abstract concepts such as space or time; the influence of language in relation to gender in different cultures; construction of meaning in different languages, including metaphor, and the influence of metaphor on thought pattern.

Limited responses selected evidence from the text to discuss Boroditsky's findings of how language might be perceived to lay blame, often citing *one language tends to play the blame game* whilst tending not to explore whether, as in the remainder of the sentence, *speakers of those languages think differently about what happened*.

Confident responses demonstrated insightful understanding of what Boroditsky had described as *ingredients of meaning*. As well as citing the examples provided in the stimulus material, such as the Yaguan expressions of time, sophisticated responses demonstrated creative thought on why *intent matters* in transmission and reception of language and how variation in tenses details the *temporal information* our thought processes might rely on to understand deeper and more accurate meaning.

Developed discussion included reference to examples of metaphor in languages other than English, to support or refute Boroditsky's statement on how we *construct meaning without understanding patterns in metaphor and language*. This also led to development on the extent to which conceptual metaphor can influence thought and intentionally or unintentionally mislead.

Writing

In general, those responses which were sustained were paragraphed into logical and fluent sequences of ideas. Overall, control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was maintained. Low frequency lexis and technical terminology strengthened responses, and at times there was a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology used naturally and with fluidity. This increased the register of the response and enhanced the linguistic point of view. Lapses in register or misapplied terminology were frequently seen in weaker responses.

Some basic or limited responses sought merely to supply paraphrase of the stimulus material without introduction of ideas for development. It is important to note that AO2 does not only reward for clarity and control of expression; equal weight is carried for development of the work.

At times, irrelevant material was offered, including some analysis of the language used by either the author or by Boroditsky. Discussion of irrelevant points led to loss of focus on the question and the stimulus material.

Most responses included quotes from the text which had been skilfully embedded. In some cases, overly long sections had been copied into the response which had taken up valuable examination time. Candidates should ensure that examples cited are brief and completely relevant to the discussion in hand.

Conceptualisation

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

In an attempt to demonstrate wider reading, responses which went into great detail describing Whorf's exploration of the Hopi or Inuit lexicon tended to lose focus on the stimulus material, which had provided ample examples of its own. Where focus on the text became lost, although it was clear that wider study had been carried out, the discussion ran the risk of becoming irrelevant.

In line 21 of the stimulus material, Boroditsky makes brief mention of gender, describing it as a *fundamental* consideration. Although there were no examples provided by Boroditsky, a number of responses sought to introduce the concept of gendered language supported by mainly appropriate references to genderlect theories. In some cases, the introduction of this topic was carefully crafted as part of the overall response. In some weaker responses, genderlect discussion formed the major part of the work with little or no reference to other specific points raised in the stimulus material.

Overall, a wide selection of issues, concepts, methods and approaches was referenced. These included Fodor's LOTH, Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, Plato's view of how language should be an accurate reflection of eternal ideas, Steinberg, Pinker, Vygotsky, and Tajfel. Some limited responses made mention of the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been represented in the stimulus material. Other limited responses named theories without citing authorship. In both of these cases, incomplete knowledge was demonstrated. However, where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed, clear or effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing which was at times presented as sophisticated work.