

Examiners' Report
June 2019

IGCSE English Language 4EB1 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2019

Publications Code 4EB1_01_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

The texts about after-study activities were accessible across the full range of abilities and candidates were able to engage with the tasks and respond appropriately.

Examiners commented that there was evidence of some good teaching and learning in preparation for this examination in the responses seen and many candidates seemed well prepared on the whole. It was felt that now that centres and candidates have access to past papers, as well as the Sample Assessment Materials, they are becoming more familiar with the requirements of this specification. Examiners saw some good responses across all the questions.

Stronger candidates were able to engage fully with both texts and respond thoughtfully and articulately. Their writing responses were often engaging and effective and were well controlled and accurate. Less able candidates sometimes struggled to understand the passages and the questions. Their writing was often pedestrian or lacked coherence and had weak language controls.

There were some candidates who made references to the pictures in their responses to Question 3, Question 6 and Question 7. This is not an appropriate way to respond to the texts as the pictures are not language or structural devices chosen for effect by the writers.

There were candidates who copied out all, or considerable chunks, of the extracts in response to Question 8. This can never be a successful way to respond as the candidate is required to produce their own work and show the ability to adapt the original texts for a different audience and purpose.

There was evidence of planning which is to be encouraged. However, the use of very long plans or draft essays is to be discouraged as they are not a good use of time. Candidates should be encouraged to plan their response in the answer booklet rather than on separate additional sheets.

Examiners commented on how much they enjoyed reading the responses to Section C.

Question 1

This is a straightforward question on Text One which does not require candidates to use their own words.

The majority of candidates responded correctly and commonly identified points such as: 'he did every talk for fundraising'; 'he took every sailing opportunity'; 'he charmed sponsors'; 'he persuaded big sailing companies to support the project' and 'his commitment and effort'.

Examiners did comment that many candidates were writing too much and giving too many points for this one mark question. A number of candidates used their own words for this question, which is not required and sometimes the meaning was not clear, so they were unable to access the mark.

Occasionally, candidates provided a point from the text which lacked the relevant detail, e.g. 'he persuaded sailing companies' or used points from outside the line references e.g. 'one of the outstanding sailors'.

Candidates must ensure they read the text **and** the question carefully.

Question 2

This is a straightforward question on Text One, which does not require candidates to use their own words.

Most candidates provided correct examples of the positive things learnt such as: 'understanding that you have to work hard to get what you want'; 'interpersonal skills' or 'resilience'.

Some candidates used references to other parts of the extract and ignored the line references mentioned in the question.

Other unsuccessful responses suggested that candidates did not understand the question as the phrases chosen were not about positive things learnt, e.g. 'rough weather' or 'being becalmed'. The latter was probably the most popular incorrect response.

Candidates must ensure they read the question **and** the text carefully.

Question 3

The question asks the candidate how the writer presents the achievements of the students taking part in the Grieg City Academy sailing programme.

Responses to this question were, on the whole, encouraging. Examiners commented that most candidates demonstrated at least some understanding of the text and awareness of the devices used to present ideas.

Successful candidates explored and analysed the range of language techniques used by Helen Fretter, paying detailed attention to the effects achieved. Where these candidates were highly successful they were able to discuss the text confidently, often synthesising points about language and structure within the same paragraph and identifying features of language and structure across the text. It was clear from these responses that candidates had been carefully prepared to discuss a range of features within a text and that they were confident in how these features and techniques might be used and why they were effective. These candidates offered secure analytical comment on their identified points often focusing on the use of statistics, the authoritative voice of John Holt and his enthusiasm. They also looked at the disadvantages that the students faced to showing the level of their achievements and how the writer used this as a medium to engage the reader—suggesting you can start from nothing and achieve something.

Examiners commented that most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of language techniques and how these were used to present the achievements of the students. Some responses began quite well, looking at the use of capitals, the structure of the text as a whole with the focus on one particular student then broadening out to tell the story, but then slipped into describing what the writer said rather than how.

Many candidates could identify the use of statistics e.g. '50 different languages', '73 per cent...disadvantaged', positive language e.g. 'prestigious', 'outstanding' and the capitalisation of EVERY. Some identified techniques like the use of statistics to show how disadvantaged the students were, but gave a generic answer like 'this adds credibility' instead of specifically linking it to the question's focus, i.e. 'this makes the students' achievements even more impressive'.

Many responses that did identify techniques failed to make specific reference to the writer's intended effects, saying little more than 'this emphasises' or 'this makes the reader want to read on'. There was also evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify (correctly) particular language features, but do not explain them.

Less successful candidates produced responses that were content based without much focus on 'how the writer presents the achievements'. These tended to focus on 'what' the writer said rather than 'how' the writer presented the achievements of the students. Some of the weakest responses were simply summaries or direct copies of the text.

Centres need to remind candidates that this question asks **how** the writer achieves his/her effects, and not **what** he/she says.

This is an extract from a successful response to question 3.

The author Fretter begins by setting the scene; a young boy awarded the 'prestigious' Young Sailor of the Year trophy of 2017.

He describes the boy, Montel, as 'outstanding', which immediately begs the question from the audience - 'why?'

However although the writer focuses on Montel at the start, using a quote posted online by his teacher Holt praising him of being committed ^{afterwards} "persuaded big sailing companies to support the project", it is clear from the opening that this is about all the students & the Academy.

Using facts & statistics, we find out from the article that the school ~~most~~ of that the team of 8 came from was not 'prestigious' and in fact a state school (which are largely excluded from events such as the Fretter Race) as 'over 70% of its pupils receive free school meals' & '73% are 'disadvantaged'.

This relates to the general motif of the ^{article} text, the students beating all odds. This is further reinforced by the fact that they are 'just state school to compete in the race'.

The Fretter shows us that initially the academy teachers did not expect the students to engage in the activity of being on the water, & 'made it up as we went along'.

The aforementioned motif is again reinforced by the fact that a 'dilapidated' yacht was bought on eBay, suggesting the boys did not have it easy, yet ploughed through & set their sights higher', eventually restoring the vintage yacht the Scaramacha, used in the fastest race.

The boys are presented as being determined throughout, 'there for the challenge' not the comfort.

An interview w/ Holt shows the audience the real hardship the crew has gone through: rough weather, intense personal skills & how to manage themselves. This is something Holt admires which resonates w/ the audience as we find that even Holt did not expect them to do so well - a nod to the motif.

Positive adjectives & verbs are used throughout, such as 'absolutely buzzing' & 'resilience', to describe the students, w/ the teacher stating 'I will never forget' suggesting the experience ^{of sailing thousands of miles together} was so meaningful it will be ingrained in the crew's memories forever.



Some perceptive understanding and analysis is evident in this response.

There is some discrimination of the selection of references. There is occasional description, however.

Mark = 9, Level 5.



Note how the candidate has focused on and analysed individual words and phrases to show how the writer presents the achievements.

The comments about 'the motif' show perceptive understanding.

This is an extract from a less successful response to question 3.

The writer presents the achievements of the students taking part in the Greig City Academy Sailing programme by talking about how ~~the~~ unexpected it was and how they pushed through to reach their achievements. "Around 73 per cent of pupils are statistically classified as disadvantaged" and "there are over 50 different first languages spoken at the school" showing how diverse the school is and even though there is a lot of different people they can still come together to achieve something good, for example; "eight of its boys completed the Fastnet race". Also the race was sponsored by "the exclusive Rolex watch company", meaning the race is quite a big deal and "they became the first state school to compete in the race" showing you don't need to be apart of a fancy private school to achieve things.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Some understanding is shown, which is clear in places and the selection of references is appropriate.

Comments such as 'showing how diverse the school is ... to achieve something good' do explain and show clear understanding.

Mark = 5, Level 3.



To improve the mark, the candidate would need to provide more examples of how the writer uses language and structure for effect and focus on the intended effects of the writer's choices.

Question 4

This is a straightforward question on Text Two, which does not require candidates to use their own words.

Most candidates answered correctly with 'looks good on college/job applications', 'shows employers/university admissions officers you are well-rounded' and 'shows employers/university admissions officers you are responsible'.

The main reason for incorrect responses was that candidates chose to use incomplete phrases or single words that did not address the task e.g. 'looks good', 'job applications', 'college' or 'well-rounded'.

Some incorrect responses took points from the text that did not show the way the after-study activities helped students, e.g. 'being a member of the French club'. Other unsuccessful responses used the wrong part of the text or used Text One.

A small number of candidates tried to re-word their chosen point, which is not required, and in some cases the re-wording obscured the actual meaning of the point they were making.

Centres need to make sure that candidates read the question carefully.

Question 5

This is a straightforward question on Text Two, which does not require candidates to use their own words.

Most candidates answered correctly with 'think about your interests/abilities/time', 'think about different roles' or 'try something new'.

A number of candidates split the point about interests, abilities and time into two separate points which could only be given one mark.

Incorrect responses were sometimes incomplete, e.g. 'different roles' without the 'think about', whilst others focused on specific examples given in the text, e.g. 'captain', 'participant', 'Being in charge teaches you leadership', 'being a member is less stressful' rather than the advice offered.

Other unsuccessful responses either chose material from outside the line references or from Text One. Some candidates attempted to re-word their points which often produced responses that were unclear.

Centres need to make sure that candidates read the question carefully, and understand that they do not need to use their own words to respond.

Question 6

The question asks the candidate how the writer persuades the reader to consider trying after-study activities. Some examiners commented that candidates coped better with this question than they did on Question 3; however, other examiners observed that candidates did not do as well on this question.

Most candidates were able to make some comment on how the writer persuaded the reader to try out after-study activities and were able to select a range of the more obvious language and structure features, e.g. rhetorical questions, sub-headings, bullets and lists, and identify the tone of the text as persuasive.

They were able to comment on the language used although there was often a tendency to explain what the language meant, rather than how it was used for effect. Many candidates chose to comment on the questions used at the opening of the extract, but examiners noted that sometimes candidates did not sustain their responses and then wrote about what the text was about. Some examiners observed that a number of candidates were able to comment more successfully on the structural features than the language ones.

Stronger candidates identified a wider range of language and structure features and demonstrated lucidly how these contributed to the persuasive effect using a sophisticated selection of references. They objectively and perceptively analysed the writer's use of language and structure within the text. These candidates were often able to comment on the writer's use of tone and it was pleasing to see that a few candidates had noticed that the language and structure chosen by Dowshen, had been carefully chosen to suit a teenage audience. Some also commented on the use of imperatives and also the reassuring tone of the final two paragraphs.

There was evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify (correctly) particular language features, but do not explain them. Occasionally, candidates adopted a list-like approach to this question identifying techniques and choosing appropriate references, but doing no more.

Some less able candidates copied out sections of the text and offered simple comment or tended to re-tell the events. The least successful candidates simply copied out sections of the text.

As with Question 3, centres need to remind candidates that this question asks **how** the writer achieves his/her effects, and not **what** he/she says.

This is an example of a response that shows clear understanding of how the writer persuades the reader to consider trying after-study activities.

The writer uses a rhetorical question to make the reader meet his own way of thinking. The writer says, "Bored? Looking for a new challenge?" This makes the reader have a feeling of reading what is next and engages the reader.

The writer persuades the reader to consider trying after-study activities by giving the benefits of it. The writer says, "You'll find friends, lots of youth programmes bring people together who are different as a way to break down barriers between people." To emphasise this point the writer uses a sense of wonder in the reader's mind because one might not have friends therefore this encourages and persuades the reader to consider the after-study activity.

The writer gives an advice to persuade the reader to ~~to~~ consider trying after-study activities. The writer uses a positive advice and this helps the reader to consider more. To illustrate this point the writer says, "It's important to keep a balance between schoolwork, after-study activities, a job,

social life, and your health." This persuades the reader in a certain way if the reader had questions on his mind. It creates peace and answers the reader's questions therefore it persuades the reader to consider after-studying activities.



Clear understanding is shown and the selection of references is appropriate and relevant.

The candidate follows a clear: 'point, example, effect' structure.

Mark = 6, Level 3.



To improve the response, the candidate could have considered a wider range of examples and explored their impact. For example, the comment on the opening of the text does explore how it engages the reader.

Always try to develop explanations of how the chosen examples have an effect on the reader.

This is an example of a less successful response to Question 6.

To catch the reader's attention the writer talks about the benefits of after study activities. He says "you get to explore your physical, creative, ~~social~~ social, practical and career interest". He talks about how you gain valuable experience in doing the activities like a social life or a creative mind.

He also says "participating in after-study activities helps you in other ways too. it looks good on college and job application and shows university admission officers and employers you're well rounded and responsible". In this quote the writer talks about how an after study activities can help you go to college and do a course. Or it can help you find a job, ~~also~~ also find you in a university.

The writer also talks about ~~how~~ how to find activities and says "review the activities on offer in your local area". He talks about how there are activities in your area that you should join.

Also the writer talks about how you can start ~~to~~ by ~~starting~~ stating many options like you can go online. Also he talks about what age or how physical you need to be to play in some of the class as they can be competitive.



Overall the response focuses on what the writer says, and not how language is used for effect.

There is some re-telling of content, but there are some relevant references.

Level 2 is a best fit. Mark = 3, Level 2.



Always remember to focus on how the writer presents ideas, and not what the writer says.

Question 7

This question requires candidates to compare how the writers convey their ideas and perspectives. Examiners commented that the majority of candidates were able to identify and discuss basic similarities and differences at a minimum, and some produced well-thought out comparisons of the extracts. Some examiners commented that candidates engaged well with the task, but others thought candidates found this task more demanding.

Most candidates did make comparisons between the texts and write about both. They were able to identify similarities and differences between the texts and support their ideas with valid references. Comparative points that were made covered the range of activities, positivity, persuasive elements in the texts, direct address to the reader and the use of formal and informal language.

Some examiners commented that the responses to this question mostly resulted in the selection of obvious points and a comparison of these with some supporting textual references. It was noted that a significant number of candidates did not support their points with references to the texts. Some examiners commented that candidates tended to compare content rather than how the writers presented their ideas.

Many candidates wrote about each text individually, and then wrote a comparative comment at the end. Examiners commented that these responses were not as successful as those which were comparative throughout, e.g. identifying points of comparison from each text such as the purpose of the texts, the use of examples of individual achievement or the inspirational qualities of each text.

Better responses did not make general or obvious comparisons, but were able to identify more perceptive points of similarity and difference between the texts.

These candidates identified that the texts dealt with the potential of young people (realised in Text One, offered as aspiration in Text Two) and the extraordinary outcomes we can see when young people stretch themselves. They were able to comment on the extent to which both texts were persuasive, with only Text Two being overtly so, and also the individual reactions in Text One and the lack of these in Text Two. They were able to structure their responses comparatively by taking the various features of the text and comparing/contrasting them throughout. Their responses were balanced. More successful responses focused on a wide range of writers' approaches in conveying ideas and perspectives, embedding relevant words and phrases as quotations alongside their own well-developed opinion.

Less able candidates either did not compare or made few comparative comments. These candidates sometimes gave summaries of the texts and concluded their response with a brief overview of perhaps one or two similarities which were often content based, for example that they are both about after school activities. In these responses references were often absent. Some less able candidates focused on the difficulty of the vocabulary, the fact that the texts included a picture, or that they thought one of the texts was boring. Some of them paraphrased the texts by retelling the passages or directly lifted them from the texts.

Very occasionally candidates answered this question as if it was Question 10 on the legacy specification. However, these responses were in the minority and the majority of candidates had clearly been prepared for the demands of this question.

Some examiners commented that there were more unfinished or blank responses to this question than any other. Candidates should be encouraged to respond to every task.

Centres will need to continue to work with candidates to make sure they have a clear understanding of valid ways of responding to texts. This should include how to analyse how writers use language and structure to achieve their effects and how to write comparative responses.

This is an extract from a very successful response to question 7.

Whilst both texts intend to communicate ~~they~~ their positive ~~the~~ view of after-study activities, they both also do this by seeming convincing to the reader. In text one, the use of ~~quoted~~ quotes from real interviewees such as, 'I honestly thought there would be bits of the Fastnet Race that they really might not like,' the writer is aiming to demonstrate how the text is not biased and is completely factual. This is further emphasised through the use of the word honestly. This makes the reader understand that all the positive statements about the club ~~and~~ ~~concepts~~ that they previously read are true and ~~are~~ ~~written~~ ~~as~~ as the reader seems credible. On the other hand, Dowden uses real examples of websites, for example, to seem more credible.

the fact that the writer is informed about these things makes him seem more convincing to the reader and persuades them to believe and take his previous advice which ~~the writer~~ will be trustworthy. Through this, the positive views of the subject are communicated successfully to the reader.

Finally, both writers ~~inform~~ make it ~~clear to~~ ~~different audiences~~ ~~that~~ make their positive ideas about after-study activities clear to different audiences through their use of lists. Fretter includes a quote from Holt where he mentions all that the students have gained from the experience: 'They've gained an understanding that you have to work hard... They've had to learn interpersonal skills'. ^{Holt's} ~~the writer's~~ use of 'they' communicates a sense of distance which may ~~reflect~~ reflect how the writer is writing about a ~~less~~ younger audience but for an older audience who will also perceive the students as a 'distant' group. The use of 'interpersonal' is ~~an~~ ~~more~~ sophisticated and a less colloquial word suggesting the text was written to inform a more mature audience of the advantages of clubs, who will ~~make~~ ^{gain} a deeper understanding of the subject.

Dowshen also uses lists to ~~mention~~ ~~both~~ ~~when~~ ~~mention~~ mentioning all the benefits of taking part in an extra-curricular club. ~~He gives~~ ~~the~~ However, unlike Fretter, he does so in a way which will appeal to

an younger audience. This is evident in the quotation 'you get to explore your physical, creative, social, political and career interests with like minded people'. The repeated use of a comma creates a sense of rhythm making the list seem endless and therefore highlighting the many advantages. Moreover the use of the ^{direct address} personal pronoun 'you' makes it clear ~~to the reader~~ that the text is addressing young people themselves. ~~on a personal level~~ ~~and~~ makes it seem personal. Through this the writer demonstrates to the reader how after-study activities should be undertaken and encourages them to consider the many benefits.



A varied and comprehensive range of comparisons are made with analysis of ideas and perspectives.

References are well balanced across both texts with discrimination. These fully support the points being made.

This is a full mark response. Mark = 15, Level 5.



Note how the candidate compares both texts throughout the extract.

This is a less successful response to Question 7.

Text two present ideas and perspectives better than text one.

In the beginning of text two there are four pictures where the reader can even guess the content of the text before reading it while in text one there is only one picture which is also hard to identify.

Text two is well more arranged and appealing to read as when the reader only wants to get ideas of how to involve in an activity it is easier for them to find it than when the reader is trying to get an idea from text whereby he will have to read the whole thing.

Text two is easier to read than text one as it's grammar is much easier to understand than in text one where some vocabulary are hard to understand.

Text two could gather a wider audience
as it has ideas and content that
many can relate to ~~than~~ are would
be interested in than in text one
where the content is minimized to
a small audience-



There are some general, obvious comparisons made between the two texts, but a lot of this is descriptive and basic.

This scores a mark just in Level 2.

Mark = 4, Level 2.



This could be improved by giving examples from the texts to support the comparisons and also not comparing the pictures.

Question 8

Section B

There was some evidence of good teaching and learning in the responses to this section. There was some evidence of planning, which was pleasing. The most useful plans were relatively short, but allowed candidates to focus and organise their ideas effectively. Plans should be in the answer booklet rather than on an additional sheet. Some examiners commented that candidates who planned their responses seemed to respond in a more focused manner.

There were a number of lively, well-written responses to this task. Most candidates understood the requirement of the task and were able to use the appropriate register for a letter to a local newspaper. It was generally felt that most candidates engaged with this task and some produced lively and convincing responses. The most successful responses had a strong sense of audience and purpose and included personal touches and rhetorical language to engage the audience. Many candidates were able to adopt an appropriate register and there was clear evidence of an understanding of the purpose, audience and format required, although some examiners commented that a number of candidates struggled to adopt an appropriate register.

AO1

Most candidates referred to the three bullet points and managed to cover a reasonable number of points. However, although relevant points were selected, they were not always developed and interpreted effectively enough. Many candidates tended to focus more on the last two bullet points: 'the types of activities that could be offered' and 'the benefits of after-study activities'.

The first bullet point ('reasons why there are not enough activities') tended to be covered in much less detail or depth. If candidates did not offer any comment on the first bullet point, then they could not access marks beyond Level 3. Some examiners also commented that candidates did not always use ideas from Text One.

The majority of candidates used the bullet points provided in the question to prompt the content of their letters, with some opting to use only the information provided in the two texts while others also used their knowledge of their local areas to provide further ideas for their letters.

Candidates had some strong opinions about the topic of after-study activities and how social media and gaming is having a negative impact upon society.

Some of the reasons given for why there were not enough activities were interesting, e.g. 'There are not enough activities for the youth of today because the government are allowing too many houses to be built on green spaces'. Another example was: 'Too many young people want to play on computer games rather than go out sailing. Even in school, we are made to sit down for far too long which is not good for us'.

Stronger candidates used ideas from the texts and developed them bringing in their own ideas. Where this was done successfully, candidates often synthesised the bullet points across the question, and some responses were highly successful and persuasive. They were able to refer perceptively to information and ideas whilst maintaining the required tone and register. They covered all three bullet points equally and produced clearly focused arguments.

Less successful candidates were able to select and interpret a small range of bullet points. In weaker responses, there was evidence of lifting from the original texts without any attempt to re-work the material.

AO4

Most candidates understood the format of a letter, offering a salutation and a sign off, but it should be noted that addresses are not necessary as it is the tone, style and register that should be appropriate for the task.

Some examiners commented on the inappropriate salutations used, e.g. to head teachers or local councillors, which did not demonstrate a secure sense of audience. Similarly, comments were made about candidates who thought that they were trying to persuade the newspaper to resolve the issues, which did not show a clear sense of purpose.

Examiners commented that many candidates were able to produce a successful letter explaining why there should be more opportunities for after-study activities using form, tone and register appropriately and effectively. They used appropriate language to convey their thoughts and ideas of why the given suggestions would be beneficial to the local community. These candidates were able to communicate their ideas clearly and sometimes persuasively, with a clear sense of audience.

More successful candidates used a wide range of techniques to communicate their ideas often adopting a highly persuasive tone and selecting techniques such as direct address, rhetorical questions and listing to communicate their ideas. They were able to write a coherently argued and persuasively written letter. Some of these argued that after-study activities were a good way of promoting social interaction and in so doing, promoted social cohesion. There were some very impassioned responses, drawing on candidates' experiences using some original ideas relevant to the candidates' home areas.

Some candidates only acknowledged the register at the beginning and ending of their response, rather than maintaining it through the whole response. Less successful candidates did not write in a style that resembled a letter and chose to write a speech or an article. Some of these candidates had problems sustaining the required register throughout their response.

AO5

There were examples of successful responses with high levels of accuracy.

Most responses were structured and organised reasonably effectively, although only the more able could use structural and grammatical features effectively and deliberately. There was some evidence of candidates attempting to use extended vocabulary when they really did not know how to use the words correctly. Spelling and punctuation were often correct and many candidates tried hard to use a range of sentence structures and punctuation for effect.

Stronger candidates subtly crafted a response with direct address to the reader utilising a range of techniques and sophisticated vocabulary spelt accurately, together with a wide range of punctuation used for effect. These candidates were adept at using a wide range of punctuation marks and sentence types in order to draw attention to particular information or to clarify and direct the reader.

Less able candidates sometimes struggled to communicate their ideas, and their language controls were not always secure, especially grammar.

Examiners commented that some candidates had problems with grammar, despite good spelling and punctuation.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: comma splicing, problems with homophones, misspelling of basic vocabulary, missing or misused apostrophes, not capitalising 'I' for the personal

pronoun, missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and grammatical errors.

Centres should continue to work to ensure candidates have a clear idea of how to adapt ideas from texts and how to write appropriately and accurately for different audiences and purposes.

This is a very good response to Question 8.

Dear editor,

Having recently read your helpful ~~report~~ article on pupils' involvement in after-study activities, I thought it both my right and my duty to express my opinions to you regarding this topic. Indeed, as a teenager, I believe that students are willing to engage in such activities, and take many benefits from them.

Firstly, the reason why Brent cruelly lacks proper after-study activities might not be, as you remarked in your article, that "teenagers are lazy good-for-nothings who spend their weekends stuffing themselves with Netflix and popcorn". Indeed, as my past experiences

suggest, schools and community centres are often reluctant to organise activities: they lack funding, ^{they} fear risks, and they need determined pupils - and adults - for it to work. Besides, some activities are physically demanding and cannot include younger students (for example sailing). Furthermore, at this age, teenagers are encouraged to focus on grades, and have to find a balance between their study time, their "relaxing" time, and after-study activities.

However, I firmly believe that pupils and schools can overcome these challenges. Teenagers can demonstrate impressive abilities to get involved in activities they enjoy. Moreover, the benefits of implementing extra-curricular activities entirely ~~so~~ surpass its drawbacks. Indeed, pupils can learn leadership and management skills, as well as fear being more responsible. Also, they can meet many people, ~~be~~ they interested in all kinds of topics and with various opinions, which enables teenagers to interact socially while developing other skills, such as mental and physical resilience. Believe me - all teenagers like a challenge, and participating in an after-study activity is fun, engaging and even

overwhelming. Finally, it also helps with university and job applications, as it shows responsibility and polyvalence.

I would also like to draw your attention to the infinite possibilities that the borough's support in this cause could bring. We could implement clubs for every child in Brent, and why not everywhere else in the UK? Indeed, a sea of activities exists: French, chess, music, drama, science, maths, and all the ~~physical~~ team sports we could imagine.

Of course, after-study activities are time-consuming and expensive for schools, but I am strongly in favour of them nevertheless. I hope that I have shown you the tremendous benefits they can bring - and the benefits teenagers can bring as engaged, proactive members of a society without barriers.

Thank you for your time reading this letter. I hope that other people will also wish to share their opinions regarding this topic.

Yours faithfully,



This is a full mark response.

A01

There is a wide range of relevant points and well-focused comments with perceptive references to information and ideas. Apt and persuasive use of the given bullet points.

Mark = 10, Level 5.

A04

Perceptive and subtle. Sharply focused and sophisticated use of form, tone and register.

Mark = 12, Level 5.

A05

Manipulates complex ideas and uses extensive vocabulary. Punctuation is accurate and aids emphasis with precision.

Mark = 8, Level 4.



Note how the candidate has covered all the bullet points and maintained an appropriate register throughout the response.

This is an example of a clear response to Question 8.

Dear Sir / Madam

RE: LET THERE BE MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR
AFTER-STUDY ACTIVITIES IN OUR COMMUNITY

I am a boy aged 19 and I am currently writing this letter about why I think there should be more after-study activities in our community.

Peterborough is a small city with a small community. Firstly, I would like to start with the first reason why there are not enough activities. In addition, there are lack of enough facilities to support the activities. However, I have noticed that a age limits these other activities. I have done my research and concluded that people do not have time. People are really working hard for their families and a social life. This decrease the number of activities people few people only participate.

Secondly, I would like to talk about the types of activities that could be offered. I was thinking of a community choir. This might empower elderly people who finds it difficult to do other activities which require a lot of energy. In addition, other activities that could be offered would be chess, music and drama. People are tired of athletics and other activities. I suggest that, may these activities I have mentioned be provided and there it will make a lot of people be involved.

Lastly, I would like to write about the benefits of after-studying activities. When one does after-study activity you find friends, may bring you in contact with people you did not know. In addition, you can get involved with groups as a way to get support from other students with your background. It also looks good on college and job applications and shows university admissions officers and employers you are well rounded and responsible. The last but not the least, you learn how to manage yourself. One of the greatest benefits is that lots of youth programmes bring people together with those who are different as a way to break down the barriers between people.

I hope I get a favourable reply

Yours faithfully



A01

Some relevant points are made with a secure appreciation of information and ideas. Covers all three bullets, even if not in great detail.

Mark = 5, Level 3.

A04

This letter communicates clearly with a clear sense of purpose and largely appropriate use of form, tone and register. However, this is not successful or effective, and a mark in Level 3 is warranted.

Mark = 6, Level 3.

A05

Uses paragraphs; expresses and orders information and ideas. Uses some correctly spelt vocabulary and punctuation with some control. The last paragraph is very close to the original text. There are several awkwardly phrased sentences including 'I suggest that may these activities I have mentioned...'.
This keeps the mark in Level 2.

Mark = 4, Level 2.



This could have been improved by having a wider range of ideas used from the two texts, using a stronger register and not using phrases from the given texts.

Question 9

AO4

Examiners commented positively on candidates' responses to this question. However, some examiners thought that some candidates struggled to develop and sustain a response.

Most candidates wrote about hard work in relation to achieving things in exams, sport or in a competition of some sort or for getting a job. Most candidates were able to communicate their ideas successfully and understood the nature of discursive writing. They were able to explain what is achieved by working hard and giving some good examples of why we should work hard and what will be gained. Candidates were able to put forward an opinion on whether they agreed with the statement. The vast majority agreed with the statement with the most common counter-argument being about inherited wealth.

Successful candidates often produced a balanced and well-reasoned argument in relation to the title exploring both sides in some detail, before coming to an overall conclusion. It was clear that these candidates had been fully prepared in meeting the demands of this type of task and had been prepared with a range of appropriate skills to tackle the task in a focused and sustained manner. These candidates often demonstrated a range of appropriate techniques for an argument and used them to skillfully craft their responses. There were some strongly argued and engaging responses with very competent writing and some very well-developed and well-expressed ideas. The majority of candidates were clear about the discursive approach required by this question. There was a good range of rhetoric present in the arguments and the purposeful inclusion of linguistic techniques, designed to convince the reader to their own side of the argument.

Less successful candidates had problems with both maintaining a clear argument and structuring their responses. These candidates sometimes recounted a story of a time they, or someone they knew, had worked hard. There was little or no attempt to write in an argumentative way and the responses became largely descriptive or narrative.

Centres need to ensure that candidates who choose this option are well prepared in argumentative, discursive and rhetorical techniques and are able to develop and sustain their ideas effectively.

AO5

Most candidates were able to develop and express information and ideas in suitable way with a conscious use of appropriate structural and grammatical features. They used a range of correctly spelt vocabulary and were able to punctuate with some control.

Better responses had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar. Successful candidates were able to use a wide range of structural devices together with accurate spelling of a wide vocabulary and correctly use a wide range of punctuation.

Weaker responses were often repetitive with their word choices and sentence structures and often had many errors. Less successful candidates had poor language controls and weak paragraphing.

There was evidence of good spelling and reasonably accurate punctuation, but most examiners commented on candidates who had problems with grammar and expression. Some of this was unidiomatic English, but there were also problems with tenses and sentence structure including missing words. These problems limited the effectiveness of the communication.

Centres need to focus on developing accurate and effective grammatical structuring and idiomatic English to enable candidates to express themselves clearly and access the higher mark bands.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: comma splicing, problems with homophones, misspelling of basic vocabulary, missing or misused apostrophes, not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun, missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and grammatical errors.

This is a response to Question 9.

~~Plan: Exams: work hard to don't block because some others aren't here to help us~~

~~- In class: some ~~are~~ have facilities in general while others have to work a lot~~

~~- Sport: practice but some get it quickly others not~~

~~- Poor: work hard to get money~~

"You have to work hard to get what you want", I think that it depends of the situation. For example, to get a good mark on an exam we have to practice and revise, but it

depends of the person. Some people have facilities and doesn't have to work a lot while others are not as good as the others and really have to work harder. And even more if nobody is here to help us during an exam. So it really depends on the person.

If it is in sports, yes people have to work hard to get achieve what they want and even more if they want to make the sport their job.

In term of language, it also depends of the person because some people can learn a language very easily and it also depends of the language (chinese: hard).

When a poor wants to get money, he will work hard to get what he want by trying to find a job or going on the road. They will work hard to live.

I will say that it really depends of the situation and the person. But in general, everyone work hard to achieve their dream and have the life they want. But people don't have to work too hard because it could lead to problems.

Some people work too hard and can do brain-out, or have health problems. Everyone has to take care and don't work too hard but not just enough to get the sufficient job. Some people are borned with facilities and are sometimes more intelligent. But it isn't because they are better that others have to stop their life because they already know that they will not succeed. Everyone can succeed if they work hard, but

not too hard, to then have the job they want and achieve their dream.

To conclude, "you have to work hard to get what you want" but it also depends on the person, the situation, and even the place. Some people have to work really hard because they aren't the best while others have facilities. Some have to work hard to live while some are working hard to enter a good university for example. ~~Like~~ And we shouldn't work too hard because it could create health issues. You have to work hard to achieve your dream, this is what I think.³³³



A04

This is a clearly communicated response with appropriate use of form, tone and register. There is a clear sense of purpose as valid arguments are presented.

All Level 3 criteria are met.

Mark = 12, Level 3.

A05

There are errors, but there is some varied vocabulary and punctuation is used largely accurately. Paragraphing is appropriate and ideas are developed and connected appropriately overall.

Mark = 5, Level 3.



Think about how more development of ideas and proof-reading might have improved this response.

Question 10

AO4

Examiners commented positively on the quality of some of the responses to the title 'The Prize'.

Some examiners commented that a few candidates confused 'The Prize' with 'The Price'.

Candidates interpreted this question in a wide range of ways. Many candidates chose to write about winning a lottery, personal goals, sporting events, winning competitions and passing exams. A proportion of candidates interpreted the title in an imaginative way and wrote short stories about quests, journeys and challenges. Some candidates chose to write about more morality based topics with the prize being realising they were lucky, loved or safe, for example. There were some who wrote about the prize being a ransom or reward for some gruesome kidnap or murder or to catch a murderer together with gruesome tales of death, ghosts and gun-running. These unpleasant plots sometimes struggled to maintain focus on the title.

Some examiners commented on weak openings and endings for the narratives. One examiner commented that there were a number of responses that started in a very pedestrian way, e.g. 'I got up and brushed my teeth'. Often candidates chose to reveal the prize at the end of their writing and, whilst in the majority of cases this appeared to be a deliberate strategy, occasionally it appeared that they had put this in at the end, perhaps having lost focus and realising that they needed to make a connection to the title at the very end of their writing. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of an effective ending as narratives often started well, but then lost momentum.

Most candidates were able to adopt an appropriate register and tone for a narrative piece and they tried to bring the qualities to their stories of surprise, of drama, of suspense and of excitement. They were able to develop and manage information and ideas in suitable way with a conscious use of appropriate structural and grammatical features. Most candidates were able to narrate successfully and employ speech to drive the plot. Their tone was appropriate and characters were developed. Most candidates were able to create a narrative which lead to the final focus of the prize.

Stronger candidates were able to write entertaining and engaging responses that clearly focused on the task. These candidates had remained focused on the form of the task and there was a real sense that they had planned and crafted what they produced. More engaging responses often opened with the candidate in the present, reflecting on the 'prize' and its significance in their lives. Successful candidates avoided the obvious interpretations of the title and chose a prize which was, sometimes, abstract, e.g. self-esteem, recovered confidence, a personal goal such as reconciling with an estranged friend or relative. They were able to write well-crafted stories, focused on their idea. Many were thought provoking and had twists or cliff-hangers for effect.

Less able candidates lacked development of ideas or the ability to maintain a narrative. They struggled at times with clarity, with muddled storylines and weak endings that were not closely related to the events that had unfolded. These candidates often wrote responses that showed evidence of prepared essays with little adaptation and also used films, television programmes, computer games and books for plot lines.

Centres need to ensure candidates have a secure understanding of narrative techniques and the ability to develop a coherent personal response.

AO5

Most candidates were able to develop and express information and ideas in suitable way with a conscious use of appropriate structural and grammatical features. They used a range of correctly spelt vocabulary and were able to punctuate with some control.

Better responses had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar. Stronger candidates were able to use a wide range of structural devices together with accurate spelling of a wide vocabulary and correctly use a wide range of punctuation. Often, these candidates successfully included some dialogue in their responses and they used vocabulary, punctuation and sentence structure to create a sense of place and/ or character.

Less successful candidates tended to use fairly basic vocabulary and attempts to use more varied and selective vocabulary was sometimes impaired by misunderstanding the meaning of words, and therefore, using them in an inappropriate context. These candidates often used fairly simple sentence structures throughout their responses and sometimes forgot to use simple punctuation (such as full stops). These candidates also had poor language controls and weak paragraphing.

There was evidence of good spelling and reasonably accurate punctuation, but most examiners commented on candidates who had problems with grammar and expression. Some of this was unidiomatic English, but there were also problems with tenses and sentence structure, including missing words. These problems limited the effectiveness of the communication.

Centres need to focus on developing accurate and effective grammatical structuring and idiomatic English to enable candidates to express themselves clearly and access the higher mark bands.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: comma splicing, problems with homophones, misspelling of basic vocabulary, missing or misused apostrophes, not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun, missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and grammatical errors.

This is a very successful response to Question 10.

In a field of rainbow-coloured soft toys and shrill shouts of excited children, the lonely, decrepit stand ~~looked just~~ looked and smelled just like the gates of Hell. It was suffocatingly hot, and rusty drops of what ~~to~~ might have been blood ~~sp~~ splattered from the dilapidated roof onto the burning, dying grass. Jeremy was curious. What was this ominous stand doing in a funfair? He approached it, almost on tiptoes, although all his senses ~~told him to~~ yelled at him to stay back.

In front of him stood an ancient man, as dirty as his stand, whose eyes were hidden by a once-yellow hat. He gestured at a small gun, and then at half-empty balloons staring into emptiness. Jeremy grabbed the gun with cautious hands, and shot. One balloon lay in ~~small~~ shredded pieces in the dirt, its swaying disappeared and its breath escaping into the summer air.

"Well done," croaked the man with a toothless smirk. "You have won this." He handed Jeremy a small bag.

"This is a special prize. In here

is a statue - a tiny statue - that will look verrrrry pretty in your living room. But remember, that you must not, and under any circumstances, touch the statue," he added slowly, each word with a stress.

Jeremy thought this made no sense - how could he even take the statue out of the bag without touching it? He ~~wanted to ask~~ was about to ask the man, when he realised that the stand and its owner had seemingly vanished into thin air.

Jeremy came back home and threw the bag in the bin - what nonsense it all was! The bag and the statue remained there until the following night.

Jeremy was in his bedroom, hidden under the covers, and his head was full of wild thoughts. His hands burned to retrieve the bag and at least look at the tiny statue, and his feet constantly kicked at the poor bed. His eyes had become marbles of terrifying milk, his cheeks boiled like a cooking lobster. He could not resist the temptation, and - alas! crept downstairs to the kitchen. Grabbing the bag with greedy claws, he opened

it. There was the statue, ~~as~~ a speck of greyish stone sleeping peacefully.

Nonetheless, this was not enough for Jeremy. His hands shook desperately in all directions, and he very nearly dropped the precious, precious, precious bag. The temptation was overwhelming - what could a mere glance bring, when all he had to do was to grab the statue? Quick! He thrust his hand into the ~~home~~ bag, and held the statue in front of his raging, maddening eyes. The last thought Jeremy ever had was that the statue looked exactly like him.

Two days later, the hellish ~~stand~~ man was back at the funfair, with his hat, his gun and his dirt-covered balloons. Out of these, only one remained surprisingly clean and full of air. It had the shape of Jeremy's head, the blue of ~~Jery~~ Jeremy's eyes, and the sound of Jeremy's shriek as another curious boy shot him it to ~~reddo~~ shreds. As the summer breeze flew away with the balloon's last breath, the old man's voice croaked once more:

"Well done! You have won a very special prize..."



This is a perceptive and subtle piece of writing. It is sharply focused and has a sophisticated use of form, tone and register.

This fulfils all Level 5 criteria.

Mark = 20.

A05

There is manipulation of ideas, with a range of structural and grammatical features used effectively. Vocabulary is extensive and punctuation is varied with precision and variety.

Mark = 10, Level 5.



Note the imaginative interpretation of the title that is always fully focused. The opening sentence immediately grabs the reader's attention. Note the wide variety of sentence structures used.

Question 11

AO4

Candidates produced some well written responses that were fully focused on the task of describing learning something new.

Candidates approached this title in a range of ways and chose a range of experiences and skills to describe. These included descriptions of learning to take part in various sports and activities, learning to drive or ride a bike or play a musical instrument alongside a number of responses that talked about more academic achievements, including learning English or another language or subject. Some candidates approached this task in a more abstract way and discussed life lessons that they had learnt. Some candidates wrote about a time when something had gone very wrong and what they learnt from it.

Examiners commented that a significant number of candidates did not focus on the descriptive nature of the task and wrote narrative responses focusing on re-telling the events rather than describing them.

Most candidates were able to write a reasonably sustained description. They were able to choose an experience or skill which allowed them to describe what it felt like not to possess it, describe the process and the difficulties involved in acquiring the skill or undergoing the experience and give some impression how it felt to master it (or not) in the end.

Better responses were detailed and lively with fully developed ideas. These responses had a sustained focus on description and were able to communicate a real sense of what the experience involved. These candidates created opportunities for themselves to demonstrate their ability to use and select vocabulary and engage with a range of techniques to communicate their ideas.

A minority of responses approached this as an argumentative task and discussed the concept of learning something new rather than describing a skill or experience.

Less able candidates often wrote about learning something new, but paid little attention to the word 'describe' in the question. Weaker responses were pedestrian, undeveloped or unclear.

Centres need to ensure candidates are aware of the techniques they can use in descriptive writing and also ensure candidates develop a varied vocabulary which they can use appropriately.

AO5

Most candidates were able to make some attempt to select words, sentence structures and punctuation to suit the task. They were able to write clearly, paragraph and organise writing appropriately and spell and punctuate accurately. Word choices showed some adaptation to the topic being written about.

Stronger candidates were selective with their vocabulary choices and used a range of appropriate linguistic techniques, e.g. metaphors, similes and alliteration to communicate their ideas. Vocabulary range was evident across their responses and well-chosen for the task they had selected. These candidates wrote fluently with a range of structural devices and developed descriptive and imaginative vocabulary. Better responses had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful candidates were often repetitive with their word choices and in particular with their

sentence structures. They often used very basic sentences or did not punctuate sentences. These candidates had poor paragraphing, limited vocabulary and poor grammar.

There was evidence of good spelling and reasonably accurate punctuation, but most examiners commented on candidates who had problems with grammar and expression. Some of this was unidiomatic English, but there were also problems with tenses and sentence structure including missing words. These problems limited the effectiveness of the communication.

Centres need to focus on developing accurate and effective grammatical structuring and idiomatic English to enable candidates to express themselves clearly and access the higher mark bands.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: comma splicing, problems with homophones, misspelling of basic vocabulary, missing or misused apostrophes, not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun, missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences and grammatical errors.

This is a response to Question 11.

Stood under the emblem of romance, her thick bronze legs towered over me. Legs bigger and stronger than mine, delicately latticed with heavy steel. Looking up at the gigantic Eiffel Tower as I wait for a local Parisian ^{friend} to take me to ^{the world famous} Café Paris, where I learnt how to cook french food.

I ~~see~~ ^{remember seeing} Pierre waving at me through the ~~thick~~ ^{thick} crowd of tourists, jumping with joy as he

neared me. I ~~met~~ Pierre, on my last visit
to Paris. ~~on a sublime last tour~~
~~He works at the world famous~~
~~the~~ grabbing ^{ing} my cold, clammy hand ~~and~~ ^{we}
~~raced~~ ^{raced} through the sea of people towards
Café Paris. As we got closer, I ~~could~~ ^{can recall}
~~the~~ ^{the} intense aroma of ^{French} onion soup
under my nose, the smell wrapped
around me like a silken scarf. I ^{remember} feeling
a ~~tiny~~ ^{quick} tug as Pierre enthusiastically pulled
me into the cafe.

~~I~~ Walking into the enormous white ^{walled} kitchen;
^{salad} pots, pans, utensils all lined up like
soldiers ready for war. I ^{stood silently and felt} ~~felt~~ a warm
grey apron being ^{carefully} wrapped around me as
if I were a fragile baby. My long
black hair hidden under a tight blue
hair net and a cosmic white chef's hat.
I am hoping the food turns out better ^{plonked on top of my} ~~than~~ ^{head}
my outfit!

The chef taught me everything from ~~the~~
proper use of utensils to creating a
marvellous master piece dessert, that will
blow everyones minds. I remember

Learning the delicate art of cake making. I use this method, even to this day. The ^{talented} Parisians do not mix with spoons, instead they use their hands. The gloopy squidgy mixture, tangled around my hands like ivy on a tree. Slowly adding the vibrant colours as ~~you~~ mixed the aromatic dough between ~~your~~ my floured hands. This was my favourite part about learning how to cook French food.

I recall standing back and looking at my wonderful master piece that I created. In awe. The luminous kaleidoscope of colours, carefully ^{looping} ~~wrapped~~ around each other, complimenting the colour next to it. I took a sharp cake knife and gently cut into the soft moist bake. ~~I took a bite~~ The sweet taste still takes tenancy in my mouth, my taste buds fizzing with excitement. This was by far the most amazing cake I have ever eaten.



A04

The response communicates successfully with a secure realisation of the purpose and some effective use of form, although tone and register are not always effective and ideas need to be more fully sustained.

Mark = 15, Level 4.

A05

A wide range of vocabulary is used with some errors. A wide range of punctuation is used for clarity. Information and ideas are managed deliberately.

Mark = 8, Level 4.



Note how the writer uses similes and adjectives in the descriptive writing.

Paper Summary

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

Most successful candidates:

- read the texts with insight and engagement;
- were able to explore language and structure and show how these are used by writers to achieve effects;
- were able to select a wide range of comparisons and explore the writers' ideas and perspectives;
- were able to select and adapt relevant information from the texts for Question 8;
- wrote clearly with a good sense of audience and purpose in an appropriate register in response to Question 8;
- engaged the reader with creative writing that was clearly expressed, well developed and controlled (Questions 9, 10 and 11);
- used ambitious vocabulary;
- wrote with accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Least successful candidates:

- did not engage fully with the texts;
- were not able to identify language and structure or made little comment on how these are used by writers to achieve effects;
- were not able to compare the texts or offered very limited comparisons;
- sometimes narrated the texts in response to Questions 3, 6 and 7;
- did not write in an appropriate register in response to Question 8;
- were not able to select and adapt relevant information for Question 8;
- sometimes copied from the original texts in response to Question 8;
- were not able to sustain and develop ideas clearly in response to Section C (Questions 9, 10 and 11);
- sometimes used prepared essays or plots from films, novels or games in response to Section C (Questions 9, 10 and 11);
- did not demonstrate accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

