



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In English Language and Literature (8EL0_01)
Paper 1: Voices in Speech and Writing

edexcel 

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code 8ELO_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

This unit comprises the first of two examined components of AS Language and Literature and has an explicit focus on the concept of 'voice'. It assesses understanding of how spoken voices are formed and how written voices are created in non-literary and digital texts as well as how texts are formed for specific audiences, purposes and genres.

Section A required candidates to transform a piece of reportage from the anthology into an extract from a television documentary script and Section B required a comparative analysis of an unseen interview from a newspaper and a speech from the anthology.

For Section A, there were many centres that had prepared their candidates thoroughly for TV and film formats and they were clearly practised in script writing; such candidates, who had also reviewed the source text thoroughly, excelled in this task and produced highly convincing and engaging scripts. Successful responses demonstrated understanding of visual scripts and familiarity with writing for a listening audience, with a confident grasp of crafting spoken language.

Less successful candidates often interpreted the task as an interview, thus limiting their ability to produce a convincing response. By creating a transcript rather than a script, the writing was not fit for purpose as planned material to be used in creating a television programme. While some interviews were entertaining, achievement was therefore restricted due to limited understanding of context and reception. At the lower levels, there was also significant over-reliance on the source text.

In Section B, the majority of candidates were familiar with the requirements of the task, demonstrating the care with which centres had prepared them. Very few candidates approached the two texts as separate entities and most had clearly practised a comparative approach, although the level of nuance and subtlety of the connections explored did vary greatly. There were many effective responses for this question where candidates were clearly confident in their discussions of the speech and understood the thematic link to the unseen text.

Successful responses resulted from careful selection of the most pertinent areas for comparison dependent on the nature of the unseen text and its links to the anthology text, such as the attitudes and values of the writers/speakers or the connected theme and context. Less successful responses relied on prescribed areas of focus to consider, such as level of formality or spoken language features. This approach was unhelpful as it was clear that candidates were searching for specific features to comment on rather than exploring the speech in the light of the new text, leading to insecure connections between the texts based purely on techniques. Candidates should be encouraged to draw links based on theme or context and then use language to exemplify these links. Similarly, they should be reminded of the value of making contrasts and comparisons as many responses were solely focused on finding similarities.

Overall, candidates produced work which was often engaging and insightful, showing how well centres had prepared them for the exam and the ability of the candidates to write creatively and analytically. Where centres should continue to focus this preparation is in exploring a wider range of genres and text types, identifying the different methods and techniques used by writers and speakers to shape meaning. Familiarity with a fuller range of forms and devices would better prepare candidates for the writing task as well as developing confidence with unseen texts, enabling them to make more subtle and perceptive points about meaning, rather than relying on a prescribed approach.

Section A - Question 1

The "Creation of Voice" task presented candidates with Jessica Read's first-hand account of encountering an earthquake while scuba diving, originally published in *The Guardian Weekend*, and asked that it be transformed into an extract from a television documentary script.

It was expected that candidates would exhibit the following skills:

- Understand contextual factors and genre conventions.
- Consider how the text is received, with confident crafting of the text.
- Control their own writing style by employing a clear structure and avoiding lapses in clarity.
- Produce a text that engages by using carefully chosen language features.

Many candidates were innovative and imaginative in how they approached this task. A variety of relevant documentary techniques were employed, including voice-over, re-enactment, archive footage, narration and talking heads to camera, as well as sound and visual effects. Some of the best responses also showed a perceptive understanding of how these techniques could be combined to keep a television audience engaged, conveying the information in the source text to a watching and listening audience. Many candidates were able to use appropriate language to convey audio and visual content whilst using conventions of script-writing in a creative manner.

At the lower levels, candidates struggled more with adopting a form, style and register appropriate for a television script. Some candidates produced texts that had more in common with transcripts of interviews, including supposedly spontaneous speech, often in an inappropriate register for a documentary programme. Others wrote dramatic, mainly fictionalised, re-enactments of the events in the account. Whilst short sections of interview were appropriate as part of a script using a variety of techniques, this type of discussion amongst presenters and participants should have been more obviously planned or scripted.

Similarly, re-enactments were appropriate, but only if included as part of a more varied documentary script.

It was encouraging that very few responses included extensive “lifting” of the source material. However, a small percentage of candidates produced responses that seemed intended for a reading audience, simply paraphrasing the source material with no clear sense of genre. A more significant proportion of candidates took a similar approach of paraphrasing the source material, but framed this as a simple voiceover or to-camera speech by one single presenter. This approach showed understanding of scripts intended for speakers to use, but showed little knowledge of the variety of methods used to present information to a watching television audience. There were also some candidates who seemed unfamiliar with the source material from the anthology, making comprehension errors.

Responses at the higher levels demonstrated clear understanding of how to write to engage a watching and listening audience, transforming Jessica Read’s written account into a script for speakers. These responses were well planned and included carefully chosen information from the source text; this kind of selective, organised approach produced the most convincing and relevant scripts. It should be noted that, although some of the anthology pieces may be similar in genre and theme, candidates should only use the given extract in the exam: some attempted to use the Chris Rainier “Tsunami Eyewitness Account” for this task.

Question 1 tasks provide the opportunity for the creative use of a range of literary and linguistic devices, such as those candidates have explored when reading or listening to other writers’ work. Candidates who attempt to imitate these interesting and imaginative writing techniques in their own work can be rewarded highly for AO5.

Script commentary Section A

- Set context

Answer ALL questions.

SECTION A: Creation of Voice

Read Text A on page 4 of the source booklet before answering Question 1 in the space below.

1 Using information provided in Text A, write an extract for a television documentary script based on the events in Jessica Read's account. You may use any appropriate television script and programme conventions to present the information to your audience.

Not drama
- Earthquake
- Jessica
- Dive instructor
- Narrator

You may develop points included in Text A but you must draw only on the factual information in the text.

You should:

- develop the content of your script extract in a way that is appropriate for a television documentary
- craft your script extract appropriately to the given context
- write to engage your audience.

(20)

I SURVIVED AN EARTHQUAKE WHILE SCUBA DIVING:

BOHOL EARTHQUAKE 2013

(row titles)

✓ Narrator:

~~NARRATOR~~ NARRATOR

N: For centuries planet earth and its inhabitants have needlessly been trying to control the outbreaks of mother nature. ~~earthquakes~~ From volcanic eruptions, ~~to~~ ~~to~~ Tsunamis, Landslides, the Bohol 2013 earthquake was no exception

(FOOTAGE FROM THE PHILIPPINES EARTHQUAKES)

~~NARRATOR~~: NARRATOR

N: This enormously powerful earthquake struck a staggering 7.2 on the ~~richter~~ ^{Richter} scale, ~~totally~~ killing 200 and leaving 1,000 injured, the impact of the earthquake was unimaginable.



With the landscape scarred and societies broken, the Island of Bohol would be in pieces, this earthquake having a large impact on tourism, leaving the economy to suffer.

(FOOTAGE OF SCUBA DIVERS)

~~NARRATOR:~~ NARRATOR

N: Despite the traumatic event that will scar the Philippines forever, several scuba divers will remember this earthquake as not only a life-breaking experience, but the thrill of seeing nature at its finest. Jessica Reed, one of several scuba divers, was submerged in the water ~~at the time of the earthquake~~ for the duration of the earthquake, here's Jessica's report.

(FOCUS ON JESSICA'S INTERVIEW)

E F/X: SPLASHING IN BACKGROUND

JESSICA:

~~JESSICA:~~ JESSICA:

J: At the time I was an experienced scuba diver, it had been 15 years but not once, not ever had I experienced anything like this before. That diving holiday in October is one I'll never forget...

I was submerged with my diving instructor, Jim



JHA:

J: It was astounding. Something I'll never get to experience again. Something I'll treasure, but similarly will haunt me every time I set foot in the water. The water once was my comfort, my release, but each time I feel the cool weightlessness of the water around me, I can't help but remember...

F/X: SINISTER MUSIC

(FOOTAGE OF PHILIPPINE ISLAND)

JESSICA:

J: It was a sunny morning, a usual day. In fact I had planned to go to Bohol that morning due to a constant earthquake - had I had gone, I'd be dead. ~~At the~~ At the last minute I decided to dive, best decision of my life. Diving saved me.

NARRATOR:

Jessica was in depths of around 20m, ~~but~~ after 45 submerged in an underwater paradise filled with ~~luminous~~ luminous corals, dotted with hundreds of tropical fish, an idyllic scene...

(FOOTAGE OF UNDERWATER SCENERY)

NARRATOR:

N: But this vision of paradise was soon to be destruction

F/X: SINISTER MUSIC



JESSICA:

J: We were only 45 minutes in, I was busy memorising the landscape so I could report back to my man back home. But that was when it hit.

(FOOTAGE: WAVES RISING)

JESSICA:

J: My breathing was drowned out by a low rumble, it was like an engine, deep powerful vibrations. I had no idea what was going on. Was a big boat passing overhead? Was there something wrong with my oxygen tank? I had no idea. At that point I had never even acknowledged the idea we were in the epicentre of an earthquake.

I remember turning to Jim.

JIM:

J: I was horrified. Eyes wide with confusion. Even after thousands of dives ~~that had no idea~~ and my experiences, I'd never encountered anything like this. I was paralysed. I didn't know what to do.

F/X: HEARTBEATS

JESSICA:

J: Despite being unable to hear my breath, my heart beat was thumping against my chest,



P 5 1 7 9 6 A 0 5 2 0

I looked up and couldn't see anything, I felt
trapped, panicked, my heart beat ~~start~~ choking
my throat.

~~JAN~~

JAN: I swam next to each other, staying close to the
side of the reef. It was just us two, just us
together. I felt mortified to have lost the
other divers. They were my team, my responsibility,
and I'd lost them. If they had died I
would've never been able to forgive myself.

JESSICA:

J: Then suddenly we were engulfed by waves,
enveloped by clouds of white mud mushroomed
up around us. I was terrified. Could this be an
underwater bomb? I had no idea.

~~JAN~~

N: But after a few moments, it came to Jessica,
at the moment of realization that this was
no underwater bomb - it was an earthquake.

JESSICA:

J: The vibrations were so strong I could feel it in
my bones. It suddenly turned into a deafening roar
F/X: RUMBLES

JESSICA:

J: There was no escape, I saw waterfalls of
sand pouring over coral, a few metres below



cracks began to form and sand was shelled down. That's when I realised. Only when I realised he roared was the earth ripping itself open, and grinding against itself

NARRATOR:

N: After 5 minutes, Jessica and Jim were reunited with the divers

JIM:

J: Relieved was an understatement. We were all paralysed. I'll never forget diving to the surface and the look of complete bewilderment on everyone's faces. That's the power of nature.

JESSICA:

J: I was overwhelmed. Not just with panic and adrenaline but what ^{my} eyes had just seen. There. The power of nature. The sudden contrast of overwhelming beauty, and overwhelming destruction. I was torn. Horrified by the disaster it had killed 200 people, but astonished at what I'd witnessed. It truly was a once in a lifetime experience. An experience which too, had the power to make it the last ~~experience~~ experience I'd ever see.

(ROLL CREDITS)

F/x: Theme song



This candidate was awarded a mark at the top of Level 4 for AO5 and at the bottom of Level 4 for AO3.

Throughout the response, the candidate shows secure and confident application of a range of conventions of scriptwriting, television programmes and documentaries. A narrator voiceover is used to speak over film footage of the earthquake and footage of scuba divers, demonstrating understanding of the type of information about what would be heard and seen on screen that could be provided to the makers of a television programme by the scriptwriters. A change of speaker is included to keep the viewer interested and the switch to Jessica Read and her diving instructor's narratives provides an engaging change in tone and register.

It should be noted that this response uses extracts of Read and her diving instructor speaking to provide a narrative to the visual information on the screen. Their speech is appropriately planned and scripted and not presented as a transcript of spontaneous speech, which would be implausible for this type of screenwriting.

This candidate does show some insecurity about how to present their script on the page and has clearly made some changes in presentation when checking through their work. A variety of approaches to graphology and layout were rewarded for this task and there was no expectation that candidates should have expert understanding of this aspect of screenwriting. Candidates were rewarded for any clear and relevant indication of how the multiple audiences of a documentary script were given the information about speech, visuals and sound. The script begins well, with a well-judged mix of details from the source material and language choices designed to engage the viewing and listening audience ("Despite the traumatic event that will scar the Philippines forever, several scuba divers will remember this earthquake as not only a life threatening experience, but the thrill of seeing nature at its finest"). The candidate uses a dramatic tone for the narrator and more lively, personal voices for Jessica and Jim, and this is entirely convincing for a television documentary programme.

As the response develops, it becomes less controlled and quite repetitive; the careful selection of material seen at the beginning is replaced by a quite lengthy reshaping of the entire source material in the second half. Visual and sound cues become less varied and specific, and the script settles into a simple voiceover from the same three speakers, which is unlikely to engage the television audience. For this candidate, a more selective approach with careful planning would have ensured that the high quality of response was maintained from beginning to end.

Candidates are advised to choose relevant information from the source material and to plan before writing; there is no obligation to use the whole of the source text. This task asked for an extract rather than a complete script, so the candidate could have produced a shorter response with more detailed planning and editing.

Section B - Question 2

The "Comparing Voices" section required a comparative response focussing on how writers and speakers shape language to create a sense of voice. The candidates were required to explore connections between two texts linked by the theme of the Cold War; the first John F. Kennedy's inaugural address taken from the anthology, the second a previously unseen extract from an interview with Steven Spielberg and Tom Hanks taken from The Telegraph. It was expected that the candidates would exhibit the following skills:

- Organise the structure of their response and write in an appropriate register and style.
- Apply appropriate concepts, methods and terminology.
- Support the exploration with a range of relevant examples.
- Display knowledge and understanding of how meanings are shaped in texts and of the writer's craft.
- Show knowledge of contextual factors and the ability to link this knowledge to how texts are produced and received.
- Explore connections across texts.

On the whole, this task was completed with confidence by candidates and they had clearly been prepared to adopt a comparative approach; centres appear to be developing the ways in which they teach students to explore two texts at once. Most responses considered a range of similarities within the two texts but candidates, on the whole, were reluctant to consider differences or contrasts, so this is an area on which most centres can continue to work.

At the higher levels, candidates approached the unseen text with confidence and were able to discuss both sources as whole texts, understanding what the writers and speakers were trying to achieve for their respective audiences, purposes and contexts and linking this explicitly to the linguistic and literary techniques employed in each text. Some students had an impressive academic register and knowledge of terminology and were able to use this to evaluate meaning across both texts with contexts of production and reception in mind.

Most centres had prepared candidates well for the Kennedy speech, including a thorough understanding of the context in which was produced and a secure understanding of the nature of the Cold War. This enabled many candidates to comprehend the thematic link to the interview and make sound comparisons in terms of when they were produced and the potential impact on their respective audiences. It was encouraging to see that many candidates, for example, noted the difference in context of reception with Hanks and Spielberg commenting

in hindsight as opposed to Kennedy's immediate task of reassuring a nation facing potential war and uncertainty. However, some candidates were not so well prepared and struggled to find meaningful links between the two texts.

Similarly, many candidates were well-prepared for the rhetorical nature of the speech from the anthology and the relevant devices employed, and many were equally ready to discuss the nature of an online article for a reading audience in the unseen text. This resulted in an appropriate balance of comment on the linguistic and literary techniques across both texts.

However, there was a tendency for candidates to make insecure connections between the texts based purely on these techniques, without considering the links of theme, context or ideas. At the lower levels, candidates were reliant on working through a prescribed list of features and had often adopted formulas for comparison, especially within lengthy introductions, producing generic responses that lacked genuine insight. The use of a formulaic list or a mnemonic for aspects of context or literary and linguistic methods were often indicators of candidates who were not prepared to fully engage with the question or the context of the texts in great depth. Candidates could be better prepared by developing confidence with unseen texts generally rather than learning a prescribed approach that considers a few set features.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, even at the higher levels, candidates were often far more confident on the anthology text than on the unseen, leading to imbalanced responses. Centres should continue to explore a wide range of unseen texts with candidates to increase their confidence in approaching new material in the exam. Many candidates would benefit from more careful planning of their comparative response, and this approach could be reinforced by centres through regular practice of annotating unseen texts and creating plans for a comparative analysis.

The range and relevance of concepts, methods and terminology explored were often a discriminator between the lower and higher levels. Higher level responses linked features to meaning and context, exploring the writer's choices and their effect in detail with relevant exemplification. "Feature spotting" occurred more frequently in lower level responses, particularly where linguistic understanding was limited to the labelling of word classes with little further explanation of how these words created meaning. Responses in the higher levels showed more careful selection of evidence and tended to explore these quotations in more depth, even where the comparisons made were perhaps a little obvious.

Script Commentary – Section B

SECTION B: Comparing Voices

Read Text B on page 5 and Text C on pages 6–7 of the source booklet before answering Question 2 in the space below.

- 2 Compare how the writer and speakers in Text B and Text C shape their language to create a sense of voice.

You must consider:

- the use of linguistic and literary features
- the influence of audience and purpose
- the contexts of the texts.

(30)

Text B & Text C share the topic of the cold war, however, Text B is an online interview in the online edition of The Telegraph, questioning Steven Spielberg & Tom Hanks about their forthcoming film 'Bridge of Spies', which whilst set in the cold war, is retrospectively looking upon the events considering the modern-day audience. In contrast to this, Text C is JF Kennedy's inauguration speech, during the height of the cold war. So whilst the audiences ~~was~~ of both texts would have existed in politics, whether present or past, the purposes of the texts differ greatly.

The purpose of Text B is entertainment primarily, however, given the historical context, it is also meant to be informative, sharing the personal story of Spielberg Sr, ~~and~~ with Spielberg Jr stating 'I knew it would hit the spot with my dad,'



Text C in comparison, as an inauguration speech is to declare the nature of Kennedy's term in office, stating what he wishes to achieve in his 'quest for peace'. As this speech marks the beginning of his term, Kennedy has to convey dominance and strength, this is achieved through literary & language features such as the balance in 'Strongly supporting', and 'Steady spread', and the coherence in 'mass wisely', and 'precise proposals'; these examples of alliteration not only increase the style & flow of the speech, conveying intelligence in the drafting of such a speech, but also produces an aural harmony, that in addition to Kennedy's tone when speaking would create a sense of gravitas that would entice the ~~reader~~ listener and make them believe that Kennedy is right, and thus support him in his role as ~~the~~ President. This gravitas is also demonstrated in the syntax of sentences such as ' - not because the Communists may be doing it, not because ~~the~~ we seek their vote, but because it is right', the abnormal sentence structure emphasizes the negativity of the first two statements and highlights the juxtaposition in the third, enhancing the sense of righteousness by



using the power of three. As speeches are both written and spoken texts, features such as these are important as they make the speech flow naturally, despite the artificial nature of a speech being pre-written after many drafts.

Despite Text B being an interview, it forgoes the typical transcript structure of adjacency pairs, and instead takes on the mode of an article, with Spielberg's & Hanks' answers quoted. This format is more befitting of a film interview as it allows a synopsis of the movie to be implemented seamlessly between information regarding the director, and Spielberg's & Hanks' answers. The register of this synopsis is high, containing many descriptive adjectives to 'set the scene' of the film and encourage readers to watch it upon release. With the topic of the Cold War, there is obviously a lexical field of war, including 'Soviet airspace', 'lootchase', 'smouldering', 'nuclear holocaust' and 'KGB', this enhances the realism of the plot. As per the interview genre, the register lowers in regards to the quotations gained from Spielberg and Hanks, with them using more colloquial terms, as spoken language allows. The personal pronouns 'I' and 'my' although ~~get~~ achieved from



a three-person interview, makes the text more conversational as the reader believes Spivey and Winks are speaking directly to them.

In comparison Text C uses the third person plural pronoun 'we', repeatedly, which in addition to phrases such as 'sovereign states', 'our neighbours' and 'Americans', promote a sense of collectivism and power by being inclusive and directly addressing the audience as a fellow power in the fight against communism. The Register is high, given the importance of the speech and there is also a lot of allusion, that clearly relates to the state of world affairs at the time of address. For example 'iron tyranny', is a reference to the iron curtain that Churchill claimed secluded Eastern Europe from the rest of the world; the 'beachhead of cooperation' may be a reference to the Bay of Pigs in regards to Cuban conversion to communism and 'jungle of suspicion', relates to the guerilla warfare in Vietnam, in which the Soviet Union and the USA backed separate halves of the country, pitting them against each other.



This candidate was awarded marks at the middle to top of Level 4 for AO1-3 and AO4.

To open, the candidate provides a succinct but accurate and perceptive comparison of the topics covered by the two texts and a suggestion of the connection between their relative audiences. This leads into a more detailed exploration of comparative purposes with some well-chosen examples to support the candidate's ideas. The response moves on swiftly from brief but relevant discussion of the unseen text to a much more confident and detailed analysis of the speech from the anthology. It is not surprising that they had much to say about the text studied in class but, like many other candidates, this was at the expense of more discriminating analysis of Text B, which limited achievement overall for AO1-3.

However, in their analysis of the speech, this candidate has taken a productive approach by suggesting ideas about Kennedy's intentions and purpose and exploring a number of quotations and techniques to support those ideas ("...Kennedy has to convey dominance and strength, this is achieved through literary and language features such as the sibilance in 'strongly supporting' and 'steady spread'..."). This kind of approach enables meaningful discussion of how techniques create voice as well consistently making relevant links to production and reception, rather than simply "feature spotting".

Similarly, in the next section of the response, where the candidate does move on to an insightful discussion of the unseen text, exploration of genre and topic are used as the starting point, with the specific quotations and techniques being used to provide evidence, thus avoiding superficial feature spotting.

Although this response does show consistent awareness of the connections between the texts, this is never truly integrated and the comparisons made are therefore fairly broad. The candidate alternates between lengthy paragraphs on each text, making logical and accurate links at the beginning of the paragraph but then focusing on that one text. More detailed analysis of the connections between specific aspects of the texts is required to move up to the top of Level 4 and into Level 5 for this task.

This response is carefully planned and logically organised, demonstrating the benefits of using planning and thinking time to produce a relatively brief but consistently secure and effective response.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Read the question carefully and follow its specific demands. This is particularly important for Question 1 but also for Question 2 where the description of the task can vary.
- Plan responses for Question 1 with a clear understanding of genre, audience, purpose and context. Focus on creating an appropriate voice, register and tone based on the task.
- Use a range of information from the source material for Question 1. Remember that this can be combined with additional points or anecdotes as appropriate and it is not necessary to follow the same structure as the original text.
- Try to make your writing as interesting and creative as you can for Question 1; you could try using some of the methods and techniques you have analysed in other people's work in your own creative writing.
- Develop a flexible "toolkit" of frameworks that can be applied to a variety of texts for Question 2, along with a range of literary and linguistic terminology, rather than relying on prescriptive mnemonics or lists of features, as this can lead to "feature spotting".
- Consider contrasts or differences as well as similarities in the approaches of the writers of the texts for Question 2.
- Always plan your comparative response and choose your evidence from the texts with care, making sure you have picked the most relevant example for every point.
- For Question 2, explore a range of other "unseen" texts to increase confidence when analysing and making perceptive connections with the anthology texts, particularly for audience and purpose.

