Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In English Language B (4EB1)
Paper 1 & Paper 1R

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

November 2020
Publications Code 4EB1_01R_2011_ER

Introduction

The majority of the comments in this report relate to paper 4EB1/01 because the entry for 4EB1/01R was very small. Where it is appropriate, comments are made for the 4EB1/01R paper.

The texts about losing things (4EB1/01) and the weather (4EB1/01R) were accessible across the full range of abilities and examiners commented that candidates were able to engage with the tasks and respond appropriately.

Examiners commented there was evidence of some good teaching and learning in preparation for this examination in the responses seen and candidates seemed well prepared on the whole. However, examiners did comment that a significant number of responses to Question 3 and Question 6 did not focus on the writers' techniques and their intended effects. Examiners saw some good responses across all the questions but several examiners commented that there were fewer higher level responses than in previous series perhaps reflecting the disruption to education caused by the pandemic.

Stronger candidates were able to engage fully with both texts and their responses were sometimes thoughtful and demonstrated exploration and analysis. 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 brief 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 a valid way to respond to 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 parts, of the extracts in response to Question 8 on both papers. This is not a successful way to respond as candidates are required to produce their own work and show the ability to adapt the original texts for a different audience and purpose.

There was some evidence of planning and proofreading 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.

Some examiners commented that candidates' handwriting was less legible than in previous series.

Section A (Questions 1-7)

This consists of two short retrieval questions and a question on the writer's use of language and structure to create effects on each text and a question requiring candidates to compare the two texts.

4EB1/01R: Section A responses were the least strong; at times it felt as they had been answered at the end of the exam.

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 on both papers.

On Paper 01 some candidates referred to points from different sections of the text, most commonly 'official things drawer'.

Candidates must ensure they read the text and the question carefully, ensuring they select material from the correct section of the text.

Question 2

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

The majority of candidates responded correctly on both papers.

Candidates on Paper 01 provided correct examples of the writer's difficulties, most commonly 'gasping for breath' and 'looking for the Irish Embassy'. Occasionally candidates misinterpreted the text: 'she was in Ireland' or 'she had a flea in her ear'. Some candidates referred to the wrong lines and mentioned that she had lost her passport or she needed a photograph.

The most common responses on Paper 01R referred to the lightning and the majority of candidates correctly identified a relevant point.

Candidates must ensure they read the question and the text carefully, ensuring they select material from the correct section of the text.

Question 3

The question on both papers requires the candidate to explore how the writers use language and structure to present their experiences.

4EB1/01

Some examiners commented that responses to this question were on the whole encouraging but examiners did comment that they did not see many higher level responses.

Examiners commented that most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of language techniques and how these were used to present the writer's experience. Most

candidates were able to identify the use of metaphors, similes and hyperbole with appropriate examples but they did not always explain how these features helped the writer to achieve her effects. Some examiners commented that a number of candidates, who were knowledgeable about the features of the text, selected references that were not entirely appropriate for the points that were being made. Examiners noted that many candidates tend to identify any question as a rhetorical question.

Successful candidates were able to explore language and answer the question in detail, with appropriate integrated references used to support points made. They wrote comprehensive answers showing a thorough understanding of language techniques and a thorough exploration of the effects of the various features. They were able to correctly use terminology to identify language features e.g. 'like I was a man parachuting into enemy territory' (simile), 'My heart almost leapt out of my chest with panic' (metaphor), 'tragic tale' (hyperbole) as well as changes of pace in diction, the creative use of punctuation and paragraphing, and variations in sentence length. They identified the use of military imagery and also the use of humour throughout the text. These candidates explored the effects of their chosen features.

Less successful candidates produced responses that were content based and lacked focus on the writer's techniques. They wrote about 'what' the writer said rather than 'how' she presented her experience of losing her passport. There was also evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify (correctly) particular language features but do not explain them. Less able candidates re-told the text. Some did use quotations but these were used to support the narrative response. Expressions were used such as 'she explained', 'she presented', 'she lists', but these were followed up by references to content, not to 'how' the writer achieved effects. The least able responses were simply summaries or direct copies of the text.

4EB1/01R

Most candidates were able to identify and comment on some of the techniques employed by the writer such as similes, metaphors and repetition, however often the explanation consisted of simply giving generalised statements, such as 'to make the reader think.'

A few stronger candidates were able to develop points and show understanding of language through focusing on the specific effect of words and devices.

Less able candidates often either copied out some of the text or paraphrased it into a narrative, failing to make any comment other than use the question stem as a sentence opener. Some used quotations to support what was essentially a narrative response. There was also evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify (correctly) particular language features but do not explain them.

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

Question 4

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

Most candidates responded successfully on both papers.

The correct responses on Paper 01 covered all the suggestions in the mark scheme. Responses to Paper 01R mainly referred to 'paths had disintegrated' and 'impassable mud'. The main reason for incorrect responses was using the wrong part of the text.

Centres need to make sure that candidates read the question carefully and select their points from the correct part of the text.

Question 5

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

Most candidates answered correctly on both papers. On Paper 01 the most common responses were 'neon post-it notes', 'trackers' and 'apps'. On Paper 01R candidates identified points referring to the muddy conditions, losing a flip flop and the leeches.

Candidates occasionally lost a mark because they only gave one response.

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

Question 6

4EB1/01

The question asks the candidate how the writer presents advice about finding lost items. Some examiners commented that candidates' performance on this question was similar to Question 3.

Most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the writer's techniques and how these were used to present advice. They were able to identify features such as the use of experts, direct address and subheadings and make relevant comments on the effects of these features.

More able candidates were thorough and supported their points with appropriate quotations, whilst exploring the effects on the reader. They understood the language of instructing and advising. They identified the use of authoritative citations – authors, professors, doctors, lecturers, PhD students and researchers – to add weight to the passage's impact. They were able to analyse how the writing was structured in order to make it clear and easy to understand.

Some less able responses identified techniques but gave a generic answer such as 'it makes the reader want to read on'. There was evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify (correctly) particular language features but do not explain them. Some less able candidates copied out sections of the text and offered simple comment. Less able candidates tended to paraphrase the content. The weakest candidates simply copied out all or sections of the text with no comments of their own.

4EB1/01R

Many of the comments made for Question 3, apply to this question too.

Most candidates were able to engage with the text and responses were marginally better than Question 3.

Stronger candidates would often make a range of good points, but lost marks as these points were not always supported by appropriate references.

Less able candidates re-told the text occasionally with quotations to support a narrative response. Often there was feature spotting but little comment.

As with Question 3, centres need to remind candidates that this question asks **how** the writer achieves his/her effects not **what** he/she 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 comparisons and a few produced well-thought out comparisons of the extracts. Some examiners commented that candidates did not support their comparisons with relevant textual references.

4EB1/01

Most candidates were able to identify some relevant comparisons and use some valid references from the texts as support but they did not always develop their responses sufficiently. Comparative points that were made covered the different purposes of the texts (to entertain and to advise) and the personal nature, the narrative structure, anecdotal style and dialogue used in Text One as compared with the objective, advisory and informative perspective of Text Two. Examiners commented that some candidates limited their comparisons to the techniques used by the writers rather than exploring the ideas and perspectives. There were some candidates who made good comparative points but offered no support for their points.

Stronger candidates explored the similarities and differences of the two texts, comparing a range of ideas and perspectives and supporting these throughout with evidence. They were able to analyse the writer's impacts on the readers whilst comparing their ideas and perspectives. They were able to structure their responses comparatively by taking the various features of the texts and comparing and contrasting them throughout. Their responses were balanced. They were able to focus also on the techniques used by both writers, with many considering the use of first-person form, anecdotal content, expert opinions and humour. Comparisons also included the use of imagery, rhetorical questions, positive and persuasive language, quotations and information from experts and subheadings. Some more able candidates systematically and comparatively linked the advice in Text Two – don't panic, search systematically, move from one locale to another, don't retrace your steps, be organised – with everything that Marion Keyes did in her fruitless search for her passport in Text One.

Less able candidates either did not compare or made few comparative comments. They wrote about one text and then the other without making comparisons or had a brief comparison at the beginning or end of their answer. Sometimes the texts were only linked by a single sentence, e.g. 'Whereas in Text Two…'. Less able candidates sometimes identified some obvious comparisons, e.g. sub-headings and commented that Text Two had them and Text One did not. Others just gave brief unsupported points of comparison. Some less able candidates retold the content of the texts with little attempt to compare them.

Examiners commented that a number of 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 candidates whose responses were comparative throughout.

Examiners noted that some candidates are still responding to this question as if it was Question 10 on the legacy specification explaining which text they preferred and why. This is not an appropriate way to respond to this question and should be discouraged.

4EB1/01R

Most candidates were able to make obvious comments on both texts. However, many did not support their comparisons with relevant textual references. Many would go through each text individually, making a range of points supported by quotations and with a few comparisons at the end and no supporting references for these comparisons.

The stronger candidates were able to make a wide range of comparisons, some varied and extensive. They extended the initial technique spotting and offered explanation and occasional hints of exploration of how both language and structure were employed to present ideas and perspectives. Embedded quotations supported their ideas and were often selective and word focused.

Less able candidates often did not compare at all. Some less successful responses were simply a synopsis of each text.

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.

Section B (Question 8)

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. Examiners commented that candidates who planned their responses seemed to respond in a more focused manner.

4EB1/01

Examiners commented that most candidates engaged with this task and some produced lively and convincing responses. Most candidates understood the requirement of the task and were able to use the appropriate register for a talk to peers. The most successful responses had a strong sense of audience and purpose and included personal touches, humour and rhetorical devices 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 some candidates struggled to adopt and maintain an appropriate register.

AO1

The majority of candidates used the bullet points provided in the question to provide the content of their talk and some were able to make appropriate use of their own experiences to develop their points.

Most candidates were able to select and interpret the relevant information and were able to include details from at least two of the bullet points. The first bullet point 'important items that may be lost' was sometimes less developed than the others with candidates tending to list the different items with no additional development. Some concentrated on one lost item rather than giving examples of different things that could be lost.

There was an understandable leaning towards using more ideas from Text Two because of all of the advice it provided, however most candidates tried to use ideas from both texts.

More able candidates used a wide range of appropriate points of information from both texts, supported with perceptive comments. They covered all the bullet points in detail, selecting the most relevant points from the texts and developing their ideas. A few used their own ideas successfully.

Less able candidates were sometimes able to select and interpret a small number of relevant points but their responses were often very short and therefore did not include many details. Many less able candidates copied large sections from the texts without any attempt to re-work the material.

Examiners commented that a number of candidates lifted information from the texts especially whole sentences. This affects the quality of the responses as candidates are expected to adapt the material and use their own words.

AO4

Most candidates were reasonably confident with having to write a talk for peers. They were able to communicate clearly with their audience but sometimes examiners commented that

candidates lost the register of a talk after a lively introduction. Some responses tended to be quite pedestrian in places. Most candidates were able to use a range of rhetorical techniques to communicate with their audience. They used some sort of structure and included an opening and closing address to the audience.

Occasionally candidates used sub-headings. It was not entirely obvious if these were for the benefit of the examiner (showing the question was being answered) or if the titles were to be considered as part of the talk.

Some examiners commented positively on candidates' ability to demonstrate a sense of audience and purpose.

More able candidates were able to create a lively and engaging style that suggested they had a well-developed understanding of the required approach. More successful candidates established and maintained a friendly and reassuring register while delivering the relevant information. They used a variety of rhetorical techniques to great effect. Some used personal details (e.g. forgetting homework for the maths class) to engage the audience. A few used an engaging humorous tone. Many used features like direct address and rhetorical questioning within their speeches.

Less successful candidates communicated at a basic level and had problems sustaining the required register throughout their response often only acknowledging the register at the beginning and ending of their response. Some less able candidates did not convey any sense that this was supposed to be a talk to peers often writing in a style that resembled an article or essay.

AO5
There were some examples of successful responses with high levels of accuracy.

Most candidates were able to use spelling, punctuation and grammar appropriately to deliver their message. They were able to communicate clearly with reasonably accurate sentence structures and a range of vocabulary. Spelling was often correct and many candidates tried hard to use a range of sentence structures and punctuation for effect. However, some examiners commented that punctuation was not always secure.

More able candidates used a good range of correctly spelt vocabulary with some ambition and had a good range of punctuation including the correct use of apostrophes, commas in lists and other devices. They used a range of different sentence structures and punctuation to help them create particular effects. These responses employed accurate paragraphing which could be for effect. There was often evidence of proofreading.

Less able candidates sometimes struggled to communicate their ideas and their language controls were not always secure, especially grammar. Some examiners commented that weaker candidates had problems with grammar, despite good spelling and punctuation. Other examiners noted that punctuation was an issue with candidates writing long, one sentence paragraphs or using very little sentence punctuation.

4EB1/01R

AO1

Most candidates were able to select and interpret all three bullet points, although there were some strange interpretations of extreme weather and some candidates misunderstood the task as one about climate change alone. They demonstrated understanding of the texts through the comments made and incorporated ideas from both texts.

More successful candidates were able to use all three bullet points, taking information from the texts and extending and personalising these, to produce convincing and persuasive contributions. They made clear references and avoided simply citing information from the texts laboriously.

Less able candidates were all able to offer something. Often, they only focused on one bullet point, generally the first. With these candidates, there was the most direct lifting from the two texts.

AO4

Most candidates were able to communicate clearly and addressed audience, purpose and form, although purpose was the weakest. Some responses were more essay-like and formal. Most did draw their ideas from both texts.

More able candidates were able to use the features of a website contribution effectively. This was often demonstrated in the structure, tone and purpose. They clearly wrote persuasively and assertively.

Less able candidates often offered up prose, not always clearly marked as a website contribution. Some misunderstood the task and lost focus on the task. Some simply copied from the two texts.

AO5

Most candidates were able to write in full sentences, paragraphing their ideas with varying success. A range of punctuation was used mainly successfully, although this could have been developed. Spelling was usually accurate but there were errors in grammar and particularly the omission of the article.

More successful candidates were able to employ tightly paragraphed ideas to link their points. They used a wide range of punctuation and sentence types to inform and debate. Vocabulary was varied and at times extensive. They had clearly proofread and edited their answers.

Less able candidates used basic structural features and simple sentences. Punctuation was often limited to some full stops and capital letters. Some ran out of time and ended mid-sentence.

Common errors on both papers commented on by examiners were: missing basic sentence punctuation; comma splicing; missing or misused apostrophes; problems with homophones; misspelling of basic vocabulary; not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun; missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences; verb tense and other 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.

Section C (Question 9, 10 and 11)

There was evidence of some good preparation and teaching in this section.

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.

Some examiners commented positively on evidence that candidates had proofread their work, but other examiners observed that candidates would have benefitted from proofreading their work more carefully.

Examiners commented as always on how much they enjoyed reading the responses in this section.

Question 9

4EB1/01
Examiners did not see many responses to this question.

AO4
Some examiners commented positively on candidates' responses to this question. However, other examiners thought that some candidates struggled to develop and sustain a response. The majority of candidates focused on issues like education, career aspirations, marriage and financial planning, discussing why it is important to plan, but also the disadvantages of over-planning. According to some examiners COVID-19 and how it might impact future plans was a popular topic.

Most candidates were able to write in the appropriate discursive style, offering a range of points on the benefits and drawbacks of planning. Most considered that planning was essential for a successful life although some recognised that well-organised planning would not necessarily deliver the expected outcome without fail. They were generally able to construct an argument or discussion – some presented one side of the argument only, whereas others considered both sides in some detail.

More able candidates adopted a persuasive and argumentative tone and had clearly been prepared to write this kind of response. They wrote in an engaging and lively manner, offering strong arguments with some balance where they considered both sides of the discussion before completing with a strong conclusion. Their arguments showed maturity. They wrote about the balance between planning and having fun and the need for spontaneity, often using examples effectively.

Less able candidates had problems with both maintaining a clear argument and structuring their responses. Their answers were often quite long but tended to repeat points and struggled to advance a clear point of view. These candidates sometimes wrote long sections about themselves and their futures, without the discursive element.

4EB1/01R

AO4

Different interpretations of the title included physical challenges such as overcoming injury or disability or a mental challenge, such as overcoming bereavement or failing in their studies. Most were fairly uplifting, trying to educate the audience that with a positive mindset anything was possible.

Most candidates were able to communicate their ideas successfully and understood the nature of discursive writing. Ideas were well sign posted and the reader was appropriately addressed, with a range of ideas.

More able candidates were able to write in depth and breadth. Their tone, form and purpose were convincing and persuasive.

Less able candidates made some attempt to answer and address the statement. Sometimes it was one sided, which limited their ability to showcase higher order writing skills.

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.

Question 10

Question 10 was the most popular question on paper 4EB1/01.

4EB1/01

AO4

Some examiners commented positively on the quality of some of the responses to the title 'Just in Time'.

Some examiners commented on weak endings for the narratives which may have been because of issues with timing. Often candidates chose to reveal the opportunity at the end of their writing and, whilst in the majority of cases this appeared to be deliberate, occasionally it seemed to be an afterthought. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of an effective ending as narratives often had good openings but weak conclusions.

Candidates interpreted this question in a wide range of ways. The majority of stories were about the possibility of being late for something, covering a range of experiences both real and imagined e.g. nearly missing an exam, a flight, a hospital appointment, a job interview, an audition, a wedding, childbirth or a deathbed. Some wrote about being rescued or rescuing someone or something. There were usually predictable obstacles to being on time, e.g. over-sleeping, defective alarm clocks or a traffic jam.

There were some who wrote unnecessarily gruesome stories. These unpleasant plots sometimes struggled to maintain focus on the title.

Most candidates were able to communicate with clarity, with an appropriate sense of purpose and some apt use of form, tone and register. Often, they were able to write a well-paced story giving a good sense of the panic felt by the narrator although some examiners did comment on the rather pedestrian narratives.

More able candidates offered responses that were increasingly successful, secure and effective. They wrote with subtlety and sophistication, sharply focused on impressing the reader/examiner. These candidates wrote a compelling story with a real sense of pace and culmination at the end. They were able to evoke drama, excitement and suspense and create a sense of tension, often building up to 'just in time' appearing at the end. The plots were controlled rather than convoluted.

Less successful candidates lacked development of ideas or the ability to maintain a narrative or tended to write simplistic narratives without any great awareness of form, tone and register. They struggled with clarity, with over-complicated or muddled storylines and weak endings that were not closely related to the events that had unfolded.

Examiners did comment on vocabulary, e.g. 'nefarious', 'mellifluous' and 'cacophony' all used within a few lines, and expressions, e.g. 'people moved around like ripples on an undulating river' and 'sky looked like a dome of plasma blue', that were not used successfully or appropriately.

4EB1/01R

AO4

The responses to the title 'Time for a Change' most often related to a change in behaviour and the benefits that change brought.

Most candidates were able to narrate successfully and employ speech to drive the plot. Their tone was appropriate and characters were developed.

More successful candidates were able to write well-crafted stories, focused on their ideas. Many were thought provoking and had twists or cliff hangers for effect.

Less able candidates gave often a lengthy narration, with repetitive and unfocussed plot ideas. Some grasp of the purpose was evident, but there were too many unrelated details.

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

Question 11

4EB1/01

AO4

Some candidates produced well written responses that were fully focused on the task of describing a helpful person. There were good images evoked of helpful people who made a difference. Candidates wrote about a range of people e.g. a teacher who helped a student with mental difficulties, a teacher who helped a student to learn to write, a friend who took the blame, a doctor who helped the writer to hospital, a surgeon. Most focused on someone in their own lives who had helped them, generally a friend, parent or sibling. A few chose famous people, e.g. Barack Obama, but these were not always successful as they tended to be factual rather than descriptive.

Most candidates were able to express and order information and describe the chosen person and focus specifically on the nature of the help and the effect that it had. They were able to use some level of description especially of physical features.

More able candidates wrote in a perceptive and insightful manner, sharply focused on impressing the reader. They developed their responses using wide-ranging and apt vocabulary and through detailed description. They were able to focus on the help given and what this shows us about the person rather than merely writing a description of the person's appearance.

Less successful responses were often pedestrian, undeveloped or unclear. They were often narratives or simple descriptions of how the person helped them. Some examiners commented that less successful responses sometimes had very exaggerated descriptions of the people, of the situations and of the settings which limited the effectiveness of the response.

Examiners commented that a number of candidates wrote narrative responses to this task which limited their achievement.

4EB1/01R

This was the most popular question.

AO4

Different interpretations of the title included Christmas, religious/cultural festivals, a season, birthdays or going on holiday.

Many responses were narrative and focused on what the candidates did or could do during their favourite time of the year rather than describing it. This limited their achievement.

Most candidates were able to communicate some description, real or imaginary. They showed some grasp of the purpose and offered a straightforward tone to describe their favourite time of year and feelings.

More successful candidates were able to give a perceptive insight into their favourite time of year, instead of simply narrating at length. Their tone was convincing by their clear focus and avoidance of repetition.

Less able candidates simply told a basic story and offered up very little description, often just a series of 'and then' events or what they did or ate.

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 Comments across Section C (Questions 9, 10 and 11)

4EB1/01

Most candidates were able to express and order information and ideas with some correctly spelt vocabulary, some control of punctuation and some accurate paragraphing. Most candidates were able to communicate successfully even if there were errors.

More able responses were accurate using a wide range of grammatical constructions, punctuation and vocabulary. They were able to shape their writing and used carefully crafted sentences very effectively.

Less able candidates communicated poorly. These candidates had numerous errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. They sometimes relied on basic sentence structures which became quite repetitive.

There was some 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. Examiners also commented on the use of over-ambitious vocabulary which was not effective or appropriate.

Common errors commented on by examiners were: missing basic sentence punctuation; comma splicing; missing or misused apostrophes; problems with homophones; misspelling of basic vocabulary; not capitalising 'I' for the personal pronoun; missing capital letters at the beginning of sentences; grammatical errors such as subject-verb agreement.

4EB1/01R

Most candidates were able to write in simple, compound and some complex sentences. Commas were used, but not always accurately. Word choices showed some adaptation to the topic being written about. Vocabulary was usually correct.

More successful candidates were able to use an extensive and convincing diction, choosing words to engage the reader. Punctuation was varied, developed and clarified meaning and was often completely accurate.

Less able candidates wrote in simple sentences, with some attempt to use basic punctuation and word choices to make meaning clear.

Similarly to 4EB1/01, there was some evidence of good spelling and reasonably accurate punctuation but there were 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.

Common errors were: grammar and tense errors that, at times, impeded meaning; lack of paragraphing to extend, develop or move events on; weak sentence structure and absence of variety in sentence starters and types of sentences to engage the reader.

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.

Summary – both papers

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
- were not able to select and adapt relevant information for Question 8
- did not write in an appropriate register in response to Question 8
- 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)
- did not demonstrate accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom