

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/11 Reading
--

Key messages

- Candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech / word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)**, the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their Directed Response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)**, candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2**, candidates need to comment on form, structure and language of a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing. They need to organise information in their answers and write using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. There were some brief responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words and, while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. Only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by language, style and structure to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was the opening to a memoir. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a letter (150–200 words) to the writer's father. Careful consideration of the target audience is required.

Candidates are expected to write clearly, accurately, with relevant content and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language.

In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text.

Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were asked to read the opening of memoir written by Ariana Neumann, about her Jewish father who survived the Holocaust. They were then required to write a letter as Ariana Neuman to her father asking him about a mysterious photograph and watch from her childhood.

The characteristic features and conventions of a letter were clearly, recognised by most candidates: they gave a salutation and a valediction, most wrote in a register appropriate to a father from his daughter and content showed unity, coherence and adequate development.

Most candidates had read the rubric carefully and understood the purpose of the letter: to request information about the 'mysterious photograph and watch'. Candidates understood their audience and, generally, employed an appropriate salutation ('Dear Father', 'Dear Papa' were usual) and an appropriate valediction ('Love, Ariana' – although some included a surname 'Neumann', which increased the formality). Some responses included an address and a date.

Candidates employed first person and direct address in setting the personal tone of their letters and several employed an appropriate modified formal register to suggest that the relationship between the two, although tender (given the childhood memories), was a little distant (given Neumann's shock in finding her father's name on the memorial wall and the reference to 'questions about my father had emerged long before'). One candidate opened their letter with a conventional enquiry about health ('I hope this letter finds you well?') and then went on to explain that their questions had been prompted by a visit to the Pinkas memorial. Most candidates employed a variety of moods, including declaratives for explaining the concerns about their findings and the exclamatory mood for posing questions. One candidate interpreted details from the text with regard to the '*father's collection*' and speculated about why this 'odd British watch' was so 'fiercely protected'. The most successful responses included a complimentary closure with one candidate employing a memorable pun: 'Awaiting your timely response.'

In summary, the most effective responses employed direct address, emotive language, and made good use of rhetorical questions. Some of these more successful responses repeated several questions to show their pure desperation in wanting to know more about their father's past, emphasising their clear state of confusion, linking to their past and even their identity. Whilst many successful responses were focused on questions about the mysterious photograph, followed by some reference to memories of the father's collection of watches, others were able to incorporate references to colourful memories of family life in Caracas: the wildlife, the watches, and the family

parties. These stronger candidates used sophisticated expression, which contributed towards the overall effect.

Weaker responses often offered a straightforward summary of the text, failing to ask Ariana's father questions about the photograph or the watch. Or, where these weaker responses did pose questions, they drifted beyond the focus of the task (for example why Ariana's father had left the family home), thus adversely affecting task purpose. Many of these responses showed difficulty referencing the attributes of the special watch in the candidate's own words and quite a few depended on lifting material from the text (for example *dizzying display*, *bold black question mark* and *'rendered in an easily tarnished silver'*, which interfered with the letter's tone. There was also some confusion about whether the photograph was at the memorial or in the Neumann household.

Furthermore, these weaker responses often contained errors in use of grammar and incorrect tenses, frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses quoted large amounts from the given text in their Directed Response, which was rarely justified.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was perhaps to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often, the most effective writing came at the end of responses when candidates freed themselves from 'checklisting' the text.

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

- (b) Candidates were asked to compare their letter with the memoir, analysing form, structure and language.

To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

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

Candidates compared the ways in which the conventions of letter writing and memoir writing were adhered to in the texts. They compared the purpose of each text: to explain and to request information; to record or to inform; to describe and to narrate; to entertain. Candidates considered the salutation and the valediction of their own pieces but were often unclear or unsure about what to say about the original extract; some made reference to the title of the memoir, located in the rubric. They compared how each audience was specified by the purpose of each piece: the letter being to an individual or parent; the memoir having a much wider audience. They compared how each was written in first person, with some noting that each text provides some 'insight' into the writer's thoughts. They commented on the register of each piece and how the audience of each piece dictated the register employed. They commented on the ways that they addressed their audience in second person to provide a 'personal' and/or 'confrontational' tone and the ways in which Neumann's tone is 'more neutral' because she is providing a detailed and informative account.

Points about structure were limited; largely, comprising basic comparisons of paragraph numbers and lengths with reference made to the conventions of opening and closing a letter. Some reference was made to long and short sentences. Some candidates noted that their letters only contained information and questions relevant to the task whilst the memoir contained more description and sensory detail.

Comparisons of language features were very limited. There was some comparison of adjectives where they were employed in the letter ('unfamiliar' photograph) and the sensory details of the text (*the songs of troupials*). The questioning tone of letter was compared to the sad or dark tone of the

memoir. Some reference was made to factual detail to provide some 'historical information'. One candidate noted that the letter directly asks questions whilst the Memoir 'infers' that there are unanswered questions.

Stronger responses showed a clear distinction between a letter and its conventions and the conventions of the memoir; these responses regarded the memoir and their own letter as of equal status and commented on both extensively. Such responses also offered a considerable amount of detail to illustrate points, showing a strong grasp of each feature and detail selected, and how each related to audience and shaped meaning. Whilst many of the more successful composed letters created a tone of confusion or even desperation, one candidate noted that their letter focussed on positive ideas, so as not to upset the father. This was a rare case of sensitivity to the circumstances and relationship. The very strongest commented on the question mark initiating mystery as a key theme, geographical settings changing to organise the memoir; the metaphor *lost in a sea of names* and the connotations of *dizzying*.

Limited responses were often brief, focused more – occasionally entirely – on the memoir than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, showing little awareness of how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of a memoir; some pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without reference to effect.

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

Many candidates who adopted a direct comparison approach often stated that a feature that was present in one text was absent in the other. It is advisable to comment only on the features that are present in a text. Furthermore, candidates would be well advised to note that 'comparative' is the most discriminating skill in terms of the Reading Paper and especially analysis – analysis that not only explains how a technique works generally, but also that specific effects that are created.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read an advertisement from the website of Royal Caribbean Cruises, for a cruise ship holiday beginning in Singapore. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

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

Responses to form were, generally, limited. Candidates understood some of the conventions of advertising. Most commented on the purpose: to persuade and inform. Responses were less clear about the audience of the piece, with many suggesting that the target audience was merely extremely wealthy people, given the reference to *billionaires* in the opening paragraph. Responses mainly commented on the convention of the title, strapline and subheadings 'to aid navigation' for the reader.

Candidates recognised some elements of positive and descriptive language and the appeals to an audience through direct address. A minority of candidates recognised the 'soft sell' strategy in that 'Royal Caribbean Cruises' attempts to tempt its audience by 'exploiting Singapore's attractions rather than the services offered by the cruise'. One candidate noted that the advert fulfils its purpose by 'addressing each notable attraction of Singapore.' Many candidates noted the use of direct address throughout, with the advert's employment of second person, a 'rhetorical' question, and implicit in the employment of imperative verbs such as *Cruise*.

Candidates identified that the advert is structured in sections comprising short paragraphs with summative subheadings. Some responses noted that some of the subheadings were in bold to 'draw attention' to these particular sections of the advert. A few commented that the advert concludes with a summative one-line paragraph 'to maintain the excitement built up' in the previous paragraphs. One response reflected that the idea of *adventure* mentioned in paragraph two connects with the sense of adventure in the final paragraph and creates a 'cyclical structure'.

There was much to discuss about the language features employed in this text. However, comments were, in general, fairly limited. For one candidate, the mention of *Gateway* in the title suggested the advert's 'grand introduction' to Singapore. Responses mostly commented on the friendly tone that, as one response noted, creates a 'sense of welcome'. For another, the 'persuasive and paternal tone indirectly influences' the audience. The reference to *new money and Cinderella stories* suggested a 'thriving nation'. Some responses explored the sensory details (for example *smell the complex fragrance*, *hear Bollywood music drifting lazily*, *bold, colorful Malay murals* and *delectable treats*) that, as one put it, 'build a level of expectation'. Reference was made to the positive language features, for example *fascinating*, *gorgeous*, *glitz and glam* and *relax in luxury*. Some candidates noted that the advert 'reiterates cultural diversity through repetition'. A few responses commented on metaphor, hyperbole (for example *every corner*) and alliteration (for example *gigantic gorgeous*) to emphasise particular features and to 'make the text fun to read', but reference to effects was sparse. Finally, one candidate noted the positive and appealing language in *five-star*.

Stronger responses were often characterised by greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. This was especially evident in responses commenting on frequent use of adjectives to make onshore attractions more interesting and even alluring, for example *eclectic neighbourhood*, *crispy duck*, *golden satay*, *gigantic*, *glowing supertrees*; these stronger responses also noted the use of verb-fronted sentences to impart sense of variety of experiences that customers can enjoy when visiting attractions within Singapore, for example *Shop along ... Head to ... Stroll along ... Order a feast ...*.

Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', with little further elaboration or definition. Similarly, a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as 'creating an interesting image' or 'stopping the reader from being bored'. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels.

Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower 'orders' of lexis and occasionally even 'register', where specific words were categorised as formal and informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the candidate's critical vocabulary (and the accuracy of use), the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

Some weaker responses confused details of aspects of Singapore (especially the range of cuisine available) with on-board cruise amenities, which are not addressed in the advertisement.

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

Basic responses offered generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text, generally at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/12 Reading
--

Key messages

- Candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech / word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)**, the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their Directed Response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)**, candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2**, candidates need to comment on form, structure and language of a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing. They need to organise information in their answers and write using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. However, there were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words and, while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of the response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. Only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by language, style and structure to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from a book about human migration. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a diary entry (150–200 words). Careful consideration of the target

audience is required. Candidates are expected to write clearly, accurately, with relevant content and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language.

In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text.

Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were asked to read an extract from the book *The Next Great Migration: The Beauty and Terror of Life on the Move*, by the investigative journalist Sonia Shah, about human migration. They were then required to write a diary entry about their impressions of Sonia and her reasons for coming to India.

The characteristic features and conventions of a diary were recognised by most candidates: they used first person and the past tense, sharing observations, thoughts and feelings that they wouldn't necessarily do face to face, wrote in chronological order with detailed description and at times used emotive language.

Most candidates understood the need to write from the taxi-driver's point of view and most began with a conventional salutation, 'Dear Diary', and dated their entries. They employed first and third person and, generally, employed past tense to record and document their impressions of Sonia and her reason for travelling to the area – 'to investigate migration' was usual. Some stronger responses created a highly entertaining persona of the taxi driver which was by turns bewildered, annoyed and exhausted. In these responses, the diary entry was usually perceived to be the latest in a series of entries rather than an occasional one. There was the appreciation that a taxi driver's job requires long hours that may prevent them from being with their family, especially in the evening. These responses usually inferred that the driver was familiar with the urban environment, though not the *alleys* in the foothills of the Himalayan mountains.

Stronger responses engaged with the rubric carefully and drew inferences from the text in forming their impressions of Sonia. These were either complimentary or scathing or a mixture of both. Inferences were drawn from Sonia's purpose in travelling to McLeodganj. In some responses, Sonia was 'bold', 'courageous', 'ambitious' or 'foolhardy'. Inferences were also drawn from the volume of her luggage. Thus, she was either 'well prepared for the trip' or she was 'over prepared', with some indicating that she 'had a surprise in store' for her, given the change in altitude and climate. Some responses drew inferences from the factual details of the text and the 12-hour taxi drive became the 'worst time of my life' because Sonia talked too much, 'going on and on about her previous adventures'. One response confided, 'I could not spend another second with her' and promptly 'dumped her off' together with 'her mountain of luggage'. Inferences were also drawn from the metaphor 'the town's heart-stopping panoramas'. Hence, the ride with Sonia was 'exhausting' as a result of her 'exaggerated gasps throughout the journey' due to her being awe-struck by the mountainous environment and its flora and fauna. Impressions about Sonia were interlaced with

the taxi-driver's general complaints about the state of 'my poor car', regrets about 'letting her into my car' in the first place, the length of the journey, the altitude and freezing temperatures, for which taxi-driver felt totally unprepared given his own attire. The strongest responses understood that Sonia was not travelling alone (*discharged us*), and drew inferences from the fact that she endlessly took notes and photographs during the journey and, given the content of the fourth paragraph, might have a background in physical geography. These responses appeared to put forward that the driver could not fathom her research project and so cast her in the role of an ignorant, unreasonably demanding (mostly Western) tourist.

These stronger responses also focused on Sonia's reasons for coming to India, as required by the task. Generally, her academic purpose to explore migration patterns in mountainous territory was deemed a laudable activity, especially in reference to Buddhist monks; otherwise, the taxi driver was suspicious of her perceived 'real' intentions, i.e. sightseeing, exploiting local inhabitants.

Many concluded their diary entries with a brief summative comment about the journey or employed an idiomatic phrase: 'never again' was a usual sign off. Some hoped for Sonia's well-being in coping 'with the change in climate'. Some concluded with a valediction.

Several candidates had not read the rubric carefully enough before undertaking this task. The least effective responses provided more than one diary entry, and some wrote as though they were accompanying Sonia Shah in all her activities on the following day. Some responses lost focus, spending too long setting out extraneous details about collecting Sonia from the airport in New Delhi and/or the taxi-driver's 'back story'.

These weaker responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses, frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses lifted large amounts from the given text in their Directed Response (for example, *latest (in) mountain gear, discharged ... in the middle of the village square*), which was rarely justified.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was perhaps to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often, the most effective writing came at the end of responses when candidates freed themselves from 'checklisting' the text.

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

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

To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

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

Candidates, generally, understood the conventions of investigative journalism, i.e. it generally reveals matters related to public interest and issues of serious concern that are usually unknown, the approach is usually systematic in collecting and verifying information and aims to present findings.

Successful responses generally compared the purpose of each text: either to record, to reflect, to comment or to provide opinion with regard to the diary entry; either to inform, to describe, to narrate and/or entertain with regard to the extract. They compared the point of view of each piece and noted that the diary entry was more opinionated and emotive than Shah's extract which, even though incorporating some opinion and emotion, was more informative with its references to facts and figures and historical and geographical details. The register of each piece was compared,

noting that whilst the register of the diary entry was informal and colloquial, the extract was modified formal (weaker responses simply stated that it was formal) – here there were comments on the contraction employed in the modal *wouldn't* and on idiomatic phrases such as *heart-stopping* and *huffed and puffed*. Many compared the first-person voice of the diary entry to the first-person voice of the extract, with the more successful noting the shifts to third person in the extract. The audience of each piece was compared, noting that the diary entry was personal and confidential whilst the extract was written for a general audience. A minority referred to the ways in which Shah fulfils the five Ws (who, what, where, when and why) in her writing; to be more effective, these candidates could have expanded on this by drawing comparisons.

Points about structure were often limited. Many candidates simply enumerated the amount of paragraphs in each piece and referred to the length of sentences and the amount of punctuation employed. Such responses, generally, noted the convention of providing a salutation at the beginning of their entries, but had nothing to compare this to in the extract from the book.

Clear and detailed responses compared aspects of chronology in both pieces and referred to how events are sequenced: the date of the diary entry ('to validate that it is a diary', as several responses noted) was compared to the 'time stamps' of the extract: *late that night; the following morning*. Stronger responses (who had followed the rubric) also noted that the diary entry was written after the events of a single day, whilst Shah's extract was written over a longer time frame, and that the focus changes in the extract from sequential events to specific and general observations. A few tried to compare how they 'set the scene' in their diaries with emotive language whilst Shah's opening paragraph is descriptive. Such comparisons were not, generally, sustained. A final feature involved a comparison of triadic structure and, where this was employed in the diary entry, it was compared to a triadic structure in the extract: *dizzied, cold, and fed up* was usual.

Comparisons of language features were often limited, with many responses simply comparing the specific content that they had utilised for their diary entry with that of the extract. Such 'comparisons' were descriptive and often initiated by the phrase 'I talk about ..., the extract talks about ...'. This reflective approach is not a requirement of Paper 1 and candidates would be well advised to take an analytical approach. There was some comparison of figurative language – metaphor and simile – where it was employed in responses. Personification rather than metaphor was identified in relation to the trees' migration *up the slopes*. Credit was given, however, for identifying the way in which the journalist gives 'life' to the trees, but there was little in the way of comparison here. The writer's use of 'jargon' in the triadic structure of *a nylon jacket coated in polyurethane, sturdy waterproof hiking boots, special sweat-wicking woolen socks* was sometimes identified and compared to the simple language of the diary, but such comparisons were quite vague. Some responses made reference to Shah's use of adjectival phrases (*precariously balanced, narrow waterfalls and frigid air*), pre-modification and contrast and compared such features to the more 'direct' or 'prosaic' or 'emotive' language of the diary. In some instances, mood was compared, especially where candidates had employed the exclamatory mood and rhetorical questions to express their opinions about Sonia.

Candidates identified that the extract from the book is declarative. The first-person past tense of the diary entry to reflect on the day's events was compared to Shah's use of first-person past tense to inform and entertain, with a very few developing their comments to explore the range of tenses in the extract.

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

Limited responses were often brief, focused more – occasionally entirely – on the given extract than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, showing little awareness of how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Some candidates mainly listed the conventions of a review; some referred to their own writing as an advert even though it was not. Some merely pointed out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without any reference to effect. Responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read a series of extracts from a speech given by the environmental activist Greta Thunberg to the British Parliament in 2019. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

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

Stronger responses were often characterised by the greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', with little further elaboration or definition. Similarly, a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as 'creating an interesting image' or 'stopping the reader from being bored'. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels; for example, 'stream of consciousness' and 'personification' were often used incorrectly. Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower 'orders' of lexis and occasionally even 'register', where specific words were categorised as formal and informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the candidates' critical vocabulary, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

The conventions of a speech were generally understood, though responses were not always clear about the audience. Those who provided clear and detailed responses usually took their cue about the audience from the rubric, which not only provided the context for the speech but outlined the primary audience of it. This, initial, careful reading made a significant difference in their analyses. Sophisticated and detailed responses developed their comments about audience, identifying both the secondary audience of the speech (implicitly referred to at the outset *I speak on behalf of future generations* and explicitly referred to in a later extract *we children*) and even a third, more global, audience, given the general references to *we*, in the latter part of the speech, and its controversial tenor.

Candidates recognised the conventional introduction. They identified that the speech was delivered, initially, in first-person singular and that Thunberg employed second person when directly addressing her primary audience. They identified the switch to first-person plural when referring to her secondary audience and also that she employs first person plural more generally: *we must lay the foundation ...*. Most candidates identified the primary purpose of the speech: to inform. More successful responses recognised the didactic element in Thunberg's need to instruct the British Parliament, reminding policy makers of *facts* and statistics. They recognised its entertainment value in the repetitive interjections about whether or not Thunberg's microphone was on. They recognised the persuasive elements in the rhetorical flourishes (*cathedral thinking* is required to address climate change and avoid breakdown) and they commented on 'the abundant rhetorical features', as one candidate put it. Most identified this speech as 'a call to action'.

The key points made about structure involved Thunberg's matter-of-fact introduction with its range of simple sentences in first person and present tense, providing both a sense of 'immediacy' and 'urgency'. For several candidates, this enabled Thunberg 'to make her speech personal'. The more successful responses explored structure in some detail. For one candidate, the order of Thunberg's introduction suggested that her 'identity is not as important as the topic'. For another, the introduction, with its triadic reference to her name, her age and her nationality, enabled Thunberg 'to take ownership of her words', even if 'only repeating the message of the united climate science'. Secondly, the interplay between first person and second person was seen as a structural feature because Thunberg, initially, wished to establish 'a division' between her views and those of her primary audience, the British Parliament. Candidates noted that Thunberg's use of direct address has a range of effects; in particular, when used to create pathos and to engage (*like many of your own children or grandchildren*) and then to create bathos and distance: candidates noted the latter in Thunberg's 'accusatory voice of disillusionment' and 'betrayal': *you lied to us. You gave us false hope*. These successful responses also noted that Thunberg's use of first-person plural changes: in one instance, to unite and engage her primary audience (*we must lay the foundation*); in another, to unite and engage her secondary audience (*we children*). Most candidates also commented on the repetition of Thunberg's 'sarcastic' interjections referring to her microphone. Sophisticated and detailed responses commented on the change in tone in the final declaratives, suggesting that the repetition of *I hope*, whilst suggesting a sense of cyclical structure, is actually less 'aggressive' than the previous references to be being heard and is more 'aspirational', coinciding with the previous clause: *we want our hopes and dreams back*. The most successful commented on Thunberg's use of prolepsis: *we will go back to school when you start listening ..., the moment we start behaving as if we were in an emergency ...*

Candidates were well versed in the rhetorical features of speeches. They commented on Thunberg's use of emotive language, with her repeated references to the hopes and dreams of children and referenced in the diminutive *little sister*. They commented on her changes in tone: at one moment, 'imploping' (*is that really too much to ask?*) or 'scolding' (*that future was sold*); at another, 'mocking' (*Is the microphone on? Because I'm beginning to wonder.*). Sophisticated and detailed responses commented on the several instances of irony in Thunberg's speech, including the verbal irony of the rhetorical questions (*Is my microphone on? Can you hear me?*); and including the situational irony of politicians being instructed in the 'lessons of science' by a 16-year-old girl who is, apparently, wasting valuable lesson time. A further situational irony was commented on in politicians clamouring to have a *selfie* taken with children. Here, candidates noted Thunberg's patronising tone in her use of the adverbial intensifier: *you really admire what we do*. These successful responses commented on Thunberg's barely veiled accusation of hypocrisy, suggested by the clichéd, idiomatic phrases about children's futures (*you said that the sky was the limit, and that you only live once*), such 'promises' being made in the knowledge that *that future was sold* to a minority for monetary gain. A further instance of hypocrisy/irony was noted in sending children to school for a future whilst 'impotent' politicians (adults) destroy the world. Most candidates commented on Thunberg's use of facts, statistical data and an authoritative body, which 'lends credibility' to her speech, with some candidates noting that the theme of time can be seen throughout. They commented on her many references to the future and her detailed reference to impending doom (*10 years 252 days*). Finally, candidates commented on Thunberg's use of metaphor, in particular her reference to *cathedral thinking*. Many candidates identified the religious connotations of this phrase and some suggested that this was a reference to the 'scale' of the task ahead. One candidate noted the symbolism of the phrase, given that the speech itself exemplified Thunberg's 'crusade' against climate change.

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

Basic responses offered generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text, generally at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/13 Reading
--

Key messages

- Candidates need to ensure that they read a wide range of material from a diverse range of sources such as advertisements, brochures, leaflets, editorials, news stories, articles, reviews, blogs, investigative journalism, letters, podcasts, (auto)biographies, travel writing, diaries, essays, scripted speech, narrative writing, and descriptive writing.
- Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the linguistic elements and features of texts such as parts of speech / word classes, vocabulary, figurative language, phonology, morphology, rhetorical devices, voice, aspect, tense, modality, narrative perspective, word ordering and sentence structure, paragraph and text-level structure, formality/informality of tone, pragmatics.
- Candidates should develop an intimate knowledge and understanding of the conventions and discourses associated with a diverse range of genres, styles and contexts, enabling them to respond reflectively, analytically, discursively and creatively, as is appropriate to the task or context.
- For **Question 1(a)**, the accompanying instructions and text provide the context and background information to guide the candidates as they produce their Directed Response. Candidates should use these to make carefully considered choices of appropriate lexis, register and tone to suit the task set and ensure they achieve the highest possible standards of accuracy and expression in their writing.
- For **Question 1(b)**, candidates need to ensure they compare the form, structure and language of the original text and their own, with a clear emphasis on selecting elements from both texts that may be analysed to demonstrate how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning.
- For **Question 2**, candidates need to comment on form, structure and language of a text. They are required to identify characteristic features of the text and relate them to the meaning, context and audience of the writing. They need to organise information in their answers and write using clear and appropriate language.
- A secure degree of technical accuracy – especially in the use of spelling, punctuation and tenses – is required at this level.

General comments

The rubric was generally understood with only a few candidates omitting either a part of a question or a full question. However, there were some overlong responses to **Question 1(a)**. Candidates are required to write between 150 and 200 words and, while there is no direct penalty for failing to adhere to this requirement, this is an aspect of a response's 'relevance to purpose'. As such, adherence to the word limit is assessed as part of the second bullet point of AO2. Candidates should remember that they are being marked for task focus and relevant content as well as expression and accuracy. Largely speaking, though, the paper was handled with understanding and competence. Only a few candidates lacked the necessary language skills for text analysis.

Question 1(a) is a Directed Response task. Candidates need to follow the instructions carefully to produce a written response informed by language, style and structure to fit a specific form, purpose and audience – in this session the original text was an extract from a travelogue. Their reworking (or recasting) of the original text should incorporate recognisable conventions of the text type identified in the instructions; in this session it was a report (150–200 words). Careful consideration of the target audience is required. Candidates are

expected to write clearly, accurately, with relevant content and effectively for the prescribed purpose and audience.

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

In **Question 2**, a sound knowledge of linguistics is again required as candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a text in terms of meaning, context and audience with reference to characteristic features and their ability to analyse form, structure and language.

In the case of most candidates, there was a clear understanding of the need to make precise connections between language features and their contribution to the full effect of the given text.

Less successful responses could often have been improved through more precise use of language to link evidence with explanatory comments; phrases such as 'the writer is trying to persuade the readers' and 'this helps the readers to imagine' cannot be considered useful text analysis.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were asked to read an extract from a travelogue by the writer Pankaj Mishra, about his travel experiences in some small towns in India in 1995. They were then required to write a report, for the Health and Safety Department of the ISBT, making recommendations about how to improve the bus terminal mentioned in the extract.

The characteristic features and conventions of a report were recognised by most candidates: the inclusion of a title/heading, a clear logical structure; the use of precise detail, relevancy, the need to be audience aware and the use of both information and guidance.

Many candidates created a matter-of-fact title (or RE: line) to succinctly introduce the topic; 'ISBT Health and Safety Report' was usual and reports were often dated and/or numbered. They adopted an appropriate matter-of-fact tone throughout their pieces, employing third person (and sometimes first), the more successful adopted a judicious range of tenses (past tense for reporting on their findings; present tense and modal auxiliary verbs for outlining their recommendations) and the passive voice to create a sense of objectivity (with the latter often referred to in **1(b)**). An overview of the report's contents was provided in opening statements by a minority of candidates; such candidates, generally, understood the need for a concluding comment to justify the findings and recommendations of their reports, and the more successful signed off with initial(s) and surname and suitable job title, i.e. 'Regional Inspector'.

The 'untenable' state of the bus terminal was referred to by one candidate; another candidate concluded that 'the recommendations stated above are solely to enhance the comfort and safety [of] our passengers'. Several candidates utilised sub-headings to organise their responses (such as 'The state of the bus terminal' and 'Recommendations to improve the bus terminal'). Some utilised ordinal adverbs and a concluding adverb ('Firstly'; 'Secondly'; 'Finally'). Most candidates clearly understood the position of the writer as an employee of the Health and Safety Department of the ISBT, writing for the attention of a line manager or person in authority, and adopted an appropriate formal register. One candidate concluded with an unctuous valediction that explicitly addressed the audience of the report: '[w]e thank the Board for their consideration.' Details from the source text were utilised to substantiate the recommendations of candidates' reports. These included concerns about the polluted air from *diesel smoke*; concerns about hygiene from the *unflushed toilets*, the *muddy floor* and general *detritus*; concerns about the noise pollution from *the roar of bus engines*, *cassette players blaring* and *bawling babies*; concerns about the oppressive and potentially violent atmosphere caused by *thuggish touts*, and *aggressive child-beggars*. Recommendations generally

took the form of a 'call to action' (again, referred to in **1(b)**) to address the 'insufficient infrastructure' as one candidate put it. This meant addressing staff shortages and staff training issues (for the toilets and muddy floor – and, 'the incompetency of those responsible for bus timetabling', as one candidate noted); addressing overcrowding issues on the platforms; addressing security issues to combat the touts and beggars; and addressing signage issues in an attempt to 'police' noise pollution and reduce 'the chaos'. One candidate endorsed their recommendations with testimonial statistics from travellers.

More successful responses usually addressed no more than three aspects of the terminal for improvement which were reasoned to be the most pressing ones, in each case succinctly explaining what the issue was and how it may be resolved in clearly delineated paragraphs and compound-complex sentences. One candidate plausibly had Mishra provide pithy quotations to complain about each problem that the persona of the report writer duly quoted (which created an enhanced sense of authenticity).

In the least successful responses, descriptive writing and summary of the original text predominated. Furthermore, these weaker responses often showed errors with use of grammar and incorrect tenses, frequently as a result of being over ambitious with language choices. Several of these weaker responses lifted phrases from the given text, which was rarely justified.

Getting the balance between showing understanding of the text and crafting an effective response is the key to this question and the tendency was perhaps to be a little too safe. It is important for candidates to be aware that understanding is not necessarily demonstrated by rearranging chunks of the text. Often, the most effective writing came at the end of responses when candidates freed themselves from 'checklisting' the text.

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

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

To do well in this task, candidates need to analyse form, structure and language and to directly compare different approaches and features in the two texts available to them, i.e. the text given and the one that they have just created. An integrated approach is more effective for this type of comparative task than dealing with each text separately. Where textual evidence is selected, candidates should remember to offer clear analysis of how the writer's choices of form, structure and language are related to audience and shape meaning.

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

With reference to form, successful responses compared the ways in which the conventions of report writing and travelogue writing were adhered to in the texts. They compared the purpose of each text: to inform, to discuss, to make recommendations; to narrate, to inform and to entertain. They compared the register of each piece noting the need for a high level of formality in report writing compared to the modified formality/informality of the travelogue, especially with its use of direct speech and indirect speech. Register was linked to the intended audience of each piece: the ISBT, on the one hand; a general or 'lay' audience on the other. Structure and language features were, generally, linked to the form and purpose of each piece. Most candidates compared the use of number and person of each text, with most identifying the use of third person as appropriate for report writing and the use of first person as generally appropriate for travelogue writing – though there were and are variations, it was noted. Several candidates, whilst employing the passive voice appropriately, missed the opportunity to compare the passive voice in their reports with the active voice in the travelogue. Detailed and sophisticated responses commented on the range of tenses used in their reports. They noted similarities and differences in the travelogue, identifying shifts from past continuous and past simple to present tense in the direct speech (as in the hortatory conjunction *Let's go*).

In terms of structure, successful responses compared the organisation of their reports into headings, subheadings and/or nominal discourse markers and paragraphs to the anecdotal paragraphs and interjectory phrases and quotations of the travelogue. Some also compared

changes in perspective as a structural feature, with one more successful candidate commenting on the single, third-person, objectified voice of the report and the changing, subjective first-person/second-person voices of the travelogue, referencing both the voice of Mr Chugh and the voice of the writer. Several candidates compared the sequential arguments of their reports with the sequential events of the travelogue together with its sense of chronology, though, for some, the piece lacked structure and was identified as 'rambling'. In the most successful responses, whilst both pieces 'set the scene' to some extent – the report in providing an overview and outlining findings and the travelogue responding to at least four of the five Vs (who, where, when, why and what) – the outcome of the report is 'prescriptive in its conclusions' whilst the travelogue is, largely, 'narrative and descriptive'.

In successful responses, candidates compared the factual, concrete language of their reports to the more figurative, abstract and sensory language of the travelogue. Where candidates had employed the acronym ISBT and employed statistics or evidence to endorse their findings and provide both an authoritative voice and credibility, they were able to compare this to the opinionated, uncertain (*I wasn't even aware of its existence*) and 'self-deprecating' voice of the extract (*a fellow sufferer*). The matter-of-fact tone of the report was compared to the humorous tone of the travelogue. Candidates also compared mood with a few candidates commenting on the indicative and imperative moods of the report as compared to the indicative and subjunctive moods of the travelogue – though understanding of these was not always clearly evidenced by examples. The strongest commented on the use of a lexical field associated with the mind in the final paragraph of the extract – *state, berserk, disturbing, delirium* and the effect of the simile, *like so much detritus*.

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

Limited responses were often brief, focused more – occasionally entirely – on the given text than on their own Directed Response, and tended to summarise content rather than to analyse comparatively, with few or no supporting examples from the texts. They were often very general, and needed to show more awareness of how writers' stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning. Weaker responses mainly listed the conventions of a travelogue. These weaker responses tended to merely point out the variety of sentence types or length of paragraphs without reference to effect. Responses could have explored in more detail the formality of each text type.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to read an extract from the diary of Dara MacAnulty, a teenage Irish writer and naturalist, after he and his family had moved to a new house in Northern Ireland. They were then required to analyse the text, focusing on form, structure and language.

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

Candidates noted the characteristic features and conventions of a diary: use of first person; the past tense; sharing observations, thoughts and feelings that wouldn't necessarily happen face to face; use of chronological order; with detailed description and at times emotive language.

With respect to form, candidates understood the conventions of the diary form and there were some sophisticated/detailed responses. Candidates commented on the date of the entry and the writer's purpose: to record a day in the life of the writer, Dara MacAnulty. Most candidates commented on the personal nature of the text with its employment of first-person singular and first-person plural. They commented on its reflective nature: in moving to a new house, the writer is seemingly leaving past troubles behind (*why should it be hard?*). They commented on its nostalgic tone (*remember that night*). Sophisticated and detailed responses noted the 'unconventional' nature of this diary; especially, given the writer's use of simple present and present continuous to provide a sense of immediacy in contrast to more conventional usages of past tense to 'set down observations and record events'. As such, candidates noted that, contextually, this diary entry was written 'with a view to' public consumption rather than merely private documentation. Accordingly, candidates commented on the evocative language features of this text.

Structure was, generally, addressed by candidates through 'time stamp' chronology, beginning with the immediacy of the walk in the present tense (with its sense of *in medias res* – often misspelled) and the fact that it is not yet dark. Aspects of chronology were noted not only in the adverbial phrases *I then* and *darkness comes in quick*, but also sequentially in reference to the mundane routine of dog walking leading to a seemingly 'life changing event', as one candidate noted, that brought the writer and his family together, *congregated in worship* of the natural world. Structure was also addressed through shifts in tone. Candidates commented on the initial 'light-hearted attitude' and humour of the writer in the opening paragraph with its images of the 'minutiae of life' in *hopping over the back fence* and of the family's obstinate pet coupled with the recollection of the writer's 'impotent' father *pleading for help* from his Mother who is *top dog*. *She-wolf*. Zoomorphism was not always clearly understood here; however, a noteworthy point recognised in a stronger response was that the theme of the natural world was established in the opening paragraph of the diary and 'fortifies the appreciation of wild nature' developed later in the text. Such more successful responses then commented on how the opening section of the diary contrasted with the writer's use of the verb *fester* in the second paragraph (with its 'connotations of decay and something left unaddressed') and the *promise not to let the bullies weigh me down* (with its connotations of 'internal battle') in paragraph three. The 'abrupt change' was discussed in paragraph four. Here, with the onset of *darkness*, a distinct change in pace was noted in the verbs *grabs*, *rush* and *pummels* whilst hinting at violence, for one candidate; for another, the use of these verbs suggested not only the intense excitement of the moment but also the writer's intense eagerness in viewing the flying shadows of bats in their habitual, nocturnal flight. An 'atmosphere of wonder' and a sense of 'rapture' was noted in the writer's admission that he *must have shouted but [didn't] remember doing it*. This epiphanic and climactic moment was further referenced by one candidate in the writer's use of parallel, triadic structure where the underlying 'tension of the previous paragraphs' is resolved: *I notice a new feeling, a buzzing ... a pulsation ...* This response also referred to the sense of calm that is established in the final paragraph with the passing of *the storm/a storm* which constitutes a 'cathartic release' – thus, fulfilling another convention of the form. A further feature of structure was noted in the writer's shifts in perspective and focus from the use of the extrospective first-person plural to the introspective use of first-person singular and back again in the closing paragraph to provide both a sense of 'unity and disunity' and a sense of 'circularity'.

The usual features of language that invited comment were the informal register of the text with the writer's use of contractions and his colloquial use of second person (... *if you hop over the back fence*, which was sometimes misunderstood). The 'chatty', 'confidential' and even 'philosophical' nature of the diary was referred to with the writer's use of the rhetorical question *why should it be hard?* For one candidate, this created 'an impression of despairing indecision and of a troubled soul'. Many commented on the instances of high frequency lexis and simple sentences that suggested a child-like, naivety and innocence: *I then go on to tell her about Jude next door, my new friend*. Much was made of the imagery of the text. Most candidates referred to the lexical fields of nature (there are *more birds here*, *more insects*), religion (*congregated in worship*) and cosmic forces (the triadic *Orion*, *Seven Sisters* and *the Plough*). A few referred to the ways in which elemental imagery is employed as a metaphor in the closing paragraph (the *fluttering stars calmed a storm in all of us*). The metaphor of the way in which the bats *mobilise from the trees*, with its 'military connotations', implied 'a sense of scale' and a 'moment of great importance to the author'. For one candidate, this, together with the references to the migration of the moths and the constellations, suggested that the writer was 'witnessing something ... of cosmic import'. The metaphor of *this origami take flight*, together with *the bat's nimble wings making strange angles* and the verb *etched*, in the final paragraph, inferred both the connection between nature, beauty, geometry and art and the 'long lasting impact' of the day. The triadic, *refilling, whirling and dancing* were referred to as being metonymic 'symbols of life'. In one response, the metaphoric synonyms of *the storm of flitting* and the *fluttering stars*, to describe the migration of the Y moths, suggested both 'a turbulent vortex' and a 'unified cycle of bliss'. A minority of candidates suggested a parallel between the migratory habits of the Y moths and the migration of the author in moving to a new home. The extended metaphor of the moths in *shimmering with starry dust* and becoming *silver stars*, suggested their 'otherworldliness' to some. The repetition of the first-person plural *us* in the closing paragraph implied, for several candidates, a sense of connectedness or unity with the family and with the reader too and is thus 'all the more potent' with its final note of resolution.

Stronger responses were often characterised by the greater clarity in the critical terminology employed in analysing form, structure and language. Conversely, weaker responses often described style, mood, and vocabulary as having 'positive connotations' or 'negative connotations', with little further elaboration or definition. Similarly, a range of precisely constructed language effects were sometimes summed up as 'creating an interesting image' or 'stopping the reader from being bored'. It is important that candidates use precise terminology to access the higher levels; for example, 'stream of consciousness' and 'personification' were often used incorrectly. Furthermore, lower and higher frequency lexis was often confused with higher and lower 'orders' of lexis and occasionally 'register', where specific words were categorised as formal and

informal and often referred to as tone. The wider the candidates' critical vocabulary, the more able they will be to describe the precise effects of how meaning is created.

Weaker responses appeared not to have engaged well with the content of the diary entry, especially the paragraph about moths; they held that *origami take flight* is personification and tended not to identify metaphors, sensory language or the lexical field associated with nature. Weaker responses also adopted a paragraph-by-paragraph approach, using the phrase 'in the ... paragraph' or adopted an approach to analysis which ranged haphazardly across the text. It would be helpful for candidates to be aware that the discriminator 'analysis is coherent and effectively structured' and similar descriptors are features of the higher levels; a whole-text approach can often provide sophisticated and coherent analysis. Another consequence of the line-by-line approach was the repetition of the same point, such as the author's use of alliteration. It is worth remembering that the same point cannot be rewarded twice.

Basic responses offered very generalised comments. These responses identified some language features but offered limited analysis. These weaker responses tended to summarise the contents of the text, generally at great length.

Selection of evidence by way of quotation was not always expertly used in these weaker responses, with some candidates quoting at too great a length, or merely referring to a range of lines. Quotation from the text should always be precise, as concise as possible and linked to explanatory comments.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/21 Writing
--

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B** or to satisfactorily complete the task.
- Candidates should be aware that relevant content in the correct form is a key aspect of the overall assessment of responses for **Question 1(a)** and **Section B** tasks. To ensure that candidates understand the key requirements, they should pay attention to key words within the question which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 3** the key instructions are to *write a story* and to *create a sense of drama and suspense*.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. It is imperative that candidates know and understand the basics of sentence construction if they are to succeed on this paper. Clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety is preferable to expression that does not flow, in long, rambling sentences. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates should be reminded of the need to write legibly and clearly to ensure communication is not impeded. Centres should make use of appropriate access arrangements for candidates who are unable to produce legible handwritten text.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the past.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

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

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger responses focused clearly on the question, writing the text for effective leaflets, successfully creating a sense of enthusiasm for the attraction. Weaker responses consisted of simple descriptions of the attraction, or described a visit to the attraction, without commenting on reasons for

visiting it. Candidates should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the task; the guidance of *no more than 400 words* means candidates are being guided to provide a purposeful, succinct response.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** maintained a close focus on linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker responses focused mostly, or entirely, on content and therefore only provided minimal analysis by indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

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

Weaker responses on **Section B** generally lacked focus on what the task required. For example, some responses to **Question 2** were simple recounts of the content of the comic magazine, with very little in the way of critique or personal opinion; some responses to **Question 3** lacked a sense of drama or suspense; and some **Question 4** responses lost focus on the formality required of the email and became repetitive, with the same points made several times rather than offering a selection of relevant points.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You recently visited a tourist attraction in your area that is very interesting but not well known. You have offered to help produce a leaflet in order to attract more tourists to visit.

- (a) Write the text for the leaflet, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the reasons for visiting the attraction, and create a sense of enthusiasm for it.**

Candidates wrote about a wide range of different attractions, from museums, festivals, water and wildlife parks to beautiful places such as beaches and natural springs. Many candidates wrote responses of an adequate length using a tone and register appropriate for an information leaflet, and there was some good use made of subheadings to clearly signpost the different aspects of the chosen attraction. The best responses were focused on a real or very well-imagined tourist attraction, which enabled candidates to use realistic detail to inform the text of their leaflet.

A noteworthy number of weaker responses were well below the 400-word limit and, although many such responses showed attempts to demonstrate enthusiasm, it did not feel sincere because the reasons to visit were missing. A great many candidates did not seem to understand the required form for the task and wrote a description or a first-person narrative of their recent visit; however, such answers generally did successfully convey a sense of enthusiasm. The weakest responses often did not name the attraction or explain what it was, referring to it throughout as 'the attraction', for example, and this was inevitably self-limiting. Other candidates, meanwhile, chose to write about an already well-known tourist attraction (Disneyland, for example), and therefore overlooked an important element of the question focus.

Stronger responses showed that the candidates had a clear idea of the specific tourist attraction they wished to publicise and named the attraction clearly. The focus was usually on either tranquillity or adventure and included effective descriptions and evaluative comments, using vocabulary with positive connotations. Most stronger responses covered three or four highlights of the tourist destination and developed each of them informatively and convincingly, integrating a range of persuasive techniques, including similes, metaphors, adjectives and alliteration, throughout the text. The better responses demonstrated an enthusiastic tone and were well structured, sometimes with sub-headings which helped to guide the reader through the text. One candidate wrote about a water park, including the following section: 'The view is not like anything you have seen before. Imagine a blue glacier, powdered with white snow, shining in the light of the sun.' Stronger responses were informative and clearly suggested reasons for visiting, as seen in this piece which explored Quilmes Green Zone in Buenos Aires, Argentina: 'The whole purpose of the place is to connect people with nature in a unique way. From the outside, it is an abandoned building, looking rusty and grey. However, when you enter it is a new utopic world. The intention of

the idea, created by Mark Hill, is to demonstrate how horrible the planet will be if we continue polluting it.'

Weaker responses were often about theme parks. Content centred around 'the thrill of the ride' and 'the family day out' with clichéd descriptions of 'big dippers' and 'mouth-watering hot dogs'. Such responses often came across as simplistic and did not fully address the audience. Many weaker responses lacked paragraphing and were underdeveloped. Quite a number of candidates wrote personal reviews of a visit to a tourist attraction or holiday destination and, although these often included an enthusiastic tone, the purpose and audience was often unclear. Others handled the conventions of a leaflet quite well, but either the basic language skills were absent, or the writing lacked clarity, such as in this example: 'As you slowly tremble into the deep forest in the heart of the island, you have been provided by Heaven with many opportunities that only appears on this island.'

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

One approach that worked well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. However, many responses were limited in detail and failed to provide evidence from their **Question 1(a)** response in their commentaries.

In many stronger responses, candidates approached this question in one of two ways, each of which proved to be successful: addressing form and structure, going through the leaflet's content and then concentrating on language; or going through the text, simultaneously analysing all language devices. Stronger responses included quite precise examples and attempted to analyse how the writer's stylistic choices relate to audience and shape meaning, although few candidates did this consistently and in detail. Quite a lot of candidates were able to select particular words and phrases they had used and to begin some analysis of their choices, but few got beyond the level of these two extracts from different candidates' responses: 'The leaflet keeps an enthusiastic tone throughout the whole passage to encourage the reader to attend this attraction. Using words and phrases such as "breath-taking", "perfect", "grabbing the clouds" and "friendly staff and thrilling rides" gives excitement to readers as they want to do all these things the writer is talking about'; 'I used the simile "like a shy animal" to describe the lake appearing through the trees. The simile helps to personify the lake and convey a feeling of the unknown, unexplored.'

Weaker responses sometimes demonstrated an ability to identify some basic language and structural features, but needed more in terms of analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis using general phrases such as, 'I wrote in paragraphs to break up the text and so the reader knew to expect a new topic.' They often wrote very short answers or very general answers, without adequate analysis of effects. Incorrect terminology was common. There were also many examples of candidates paraphrasing the text of their leaflets or focusing solely on structure, needing more in the way of language analysis.

Some weaker responses listed linguistic features that the candidate said they had used without any supporting evidence, for example: 'I used adjectives, metaphors and alliteration'. Quite a few candidates did not focus clearly on detailing and explaining the intended effects of their linguistic choices. Instead, many concentrated on describing the structure and format of their accounts with comments such as, 'I used long and short sentences,' and 'I created a calm atmosphere'. Some candidates did attempt to explain the effect of their linguistic choices but these were often vague, for example, 'I also use repetition in the third paragraph to get my point across,' and, 'I used sub-headings to break the leaflet up'. Other responses were extremely short, wrongly identified linguistic features, and/or had little or no comment on structure.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Review

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

Stronger reviews were appropriately written, with a suitable tone and register that discussed, for example, the graphics, the plot and even the durability of the paper used in the magazine's print run, effectively

balancing jargon with standard English. Stronger responses were successful in addressing the audience using appropriate language, for example, 'The artwork is insane.' One candidate offered some interesting insights on the incorporation of technology into comics. Stronger responses included an introductory paragraph which included some overview of the comic, including a sense of excitement for its long-awaited release. Headings were used to structure responses. All such candidates named the magazine they were reviewing, which varied from *Batman and Robin* to a new Japanese comic called *My Hero Academia*. One candidate reviewed all the Marvel comics.

Weaker responses simply summarised the comic's storyline, offering few evaluative comments. Others, meanwhile, wrote in great detail about the moral messages contained in the stories within the comic and would have done better to focus on relevant form and content. They often would have been improved with a higher level of structure and detail. Many did not provide the title of the comic they were reviewing.

Question 3 – Story

Write a story which begins with the following sentence: *When I was sure that nobody was looking, I picked up the bag.* In your writing, create a sense of drama and suspense. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates embraced the immediacy of the opening, beginning in media res; a few resisted its structure and rather awkwardly flashed back to a much longer preamble, one narrator even addressing the audience to insist that they should have started earlier. Candidates should pay attention to whether they are asked to write the opening to a story or a complete narrative, as some cliff-hangers are rather frustrating and felt like an admission that the candidate did not know where this was going. Some candidates opted to write very detailed fights or chases, and the reader could almost imagine a movie scene. Unfortunately, such detail was generally at the expense of a reasoned plot or a completed narrative.

Stronger stories were engaging with clear and reasoned plot lines that created drama and suspense. There were many imaginative responses in which successful candidates exploited various genres and the tropes of those types of writing, including some fine spy stories, thrillers, and even horror stories. Stronger stories often focused on the central character's dilemma in handling a bag with unknown contents, thus creating suspense and tension from the start. In many answers, the protagonist discovered lots of cash or expensive jewellery in the bag, while several found USB sticks with incriminating images or evidence of some sort. Unusually different finds included a cat and a notebook which, when opened, summoned the Night Stalker (resulting in a suitable horror story). An interesting setting was a mediaeval court, where the crown was stolen (in the bag) leading to a chase by a knight on horseback.

Weaker responses included frequent errors and weak expression, which hindered the overall response. Many struggled to maintain a consistently appropriate verb tense. In some cases, there was constant switching from past to present tenses and back again. Not only did this confuse the plot, but it sometimes negated from an otherwise reasonably fair style of writing, as in this example: 'I heard a dog walking around. I knew it was not mine. I lay down and place myself as hidden as I possibly can be. Maybe I can get away with this, this thought came to a halt as I heard the shed door creek open. Time frooze'

A few candidates did not really relate the given first sentence to their story, and wrote a narrative that featured the bag and/or its contents very little, if at all. Weaker responses had over-complicated narratives with a wide range of action. In one story, the narrator collected a bag from a local train station to be then chased across the whole country. The wide scope inhibited the candidate's ability to focus on creating drama and suspense as journey details dominated. Many weaker stories lacked narrative control, with little suspense, drama or plausibility, such as in this story ending: 'I quickly ran home but was stopped by my bully, Rachel. "Why are you so ugly?" I tried to get passed but only to be mocked and got the bag stolen again.'

Question 4 – Email

You recently read a newspaper article which said that learning online is preferable to learning in a classroom. You decide to write an email to the editor, in response to this article, giving your opinion. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Many candidates found the question focus here a relatable topic, drawing on first-hand experiences of online learning. The vast majority believed that, even though they acknowledged some advantages of online learning, being in the classroom was preferable, stating the importance of physical contact for young people as expressed by this candidate: 'When we attend school physically, such as chatting with classmates, this is

what makes the process of learning fun and bearable.’ Some spent too long recounting their own experiences, which tended to read more like a complaint about their school’s approach to online learning. Adopting a wider overview would have been more appropriate to form. Reasons to learn online included: saving money for the school, being more convenient as lessons can be accessed anywhere, and having fewer distractions. Reasons cited against online learning included: the ease of cheating online, lack of socialising, size of classes and issues with internet access or connectivity. Most grasped that an email to an editor is intended for publication and has a wider audience; some still focused solely on the editor’s experience (on occasions mistaking them for the author), making a more personalised and occasionally inappropriately aggressive attack.

Stronger responses showed awareness that a discursive answer works best with clear, logically arranged paragraphs and discourse markers. The best responses looked at the pros and cons of both online and classroom learning in a balanced argument. One candidate considered that the ideal situation would be for students to have a choice so that they could use the learning style that suited them best. One candidate adopted the role of a concerned parent who had watched her son’s mental health decline because of online learning. Some adopted the persona of an educational professional, adding empathetic detail to the maturity of tone required to pull off such a voice successfully. The best responses deployed rhetorical devices effectively as part of their argument, not as a bolt-on – for example, when discussing the fragility of connectivity: ‘If the teacher is absent, a replacement can be found. But how do we find a replacement for the internet?’

Weaker responses were not as comprehensive and sometimes lacked paragraphing. Reasons were often presented in a list-like form, with limited development of points. Many were poorly punctuated, such as in this example opening to an email: ‘On your latest take saying “learning online is preferable to learning in a classroom” I would have to disagree completely, I just believe this is an untrue statement, this due to the fact that many candidates still believe in socializing face to face instead of virtually, it is also easier for candidates to be taught in a classroom, finally there is more learning involved when it’s learning in a classroom.’

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/22 Writing
--

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B** or to satisfactorily complete the task.
- Candidates should be aware that relevant content in the correct form is a key aspect of the overall assessment of responses for **Question 1(a)** and **Section B** tasks. To ensure that candidates understand the key requirements, they should pay attention to key words within the question which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 2** the key instructions are to *write an essay* and to *give your opinion* on the topic.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. It is imperative that candidates know and understand the basics of sentence construction if they are to succeed on this paper. Clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety is preferable to expression that does not flow, in long, rambling sentences. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates should be reminded of the need to write legibly and clearly to ensure communication is not impeded. Centres should make use of appropriate access arrangements for candidates who are unable to produce legible handwritten text.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the past.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

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

Stronger responses to **Question 1(a)** focused clearly on the question, presenting some clear opinions. Weaker responses addressed the issue but tended to lose focus on explaining their reasons for disagreeing with the premise of the article. Candidates should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the task; the

guidance of *no more than 400 words* means candidates are being guided to provide a purposeful, succinct response.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** maintained a close focus on linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker responses focused entirely on content and therefore only provided minimal analysis, usually only indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

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

Weaker responses on **Section B** generally lacked focus on what the task required. For example, some essays in **Question 2** lacked specific examples of popular places and were disorganised; some responses to **Question 3** were mainly narrative rather than descriptive; while some **Question 4** responses were simple accounts of the event, with very little in the way of critique or personal opinion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

You recently read a newspaper article which said that young people have too much free time these days. You disagree, and decide to write an email to the editor of the newspaper about this.

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

Nearly all candidates clearly disagreed with the viewpoint, with many similar, reasonable ideas discussed, including time taken up with long school days, extra-curricular clubs, sports and hobbies, part-time jobs and household chores. The vast majority of responses were appropriately formal and some were quite deferential. Many candidates chose to include personal information or anecdotes as well as statistics to prove their points, although the figures used were sometimes unrealistic, for example: 'Seven in ten young people commit suicide due to overwork.'

Stronger responses were well organised and got straight to the point. While the majority spoke as a young person in school or at university, many chose to take on a persona which gave them a different viewpoint on the subject, for example a parent of teenagers, a youth worker or a school principal. This approach gave them more choice of material not just based on the candidate's own daily routine. For example, one candidate who took on the persona of a child psychologist wrote: 'While mainstream media glorifies work, work and more work, they rarely pull back the curtain and show the consequences of excessive labour: stress, anxiety and depression.'

Some convincing responses conveyed strong opinion, yet still managed a respectful tone. For example, one candidate wrote: 'I write to you to express my utter disappointment and vehement disagreement regarding the article "Today's Youth: Have they Lost Their Way?" that was published in last week's issue. I wish to convey my concerns about the ideas present being not only misleading but downright dangerous.' Discourse markers, such as 'furthermore', 'moreover' and 'additionally', were often used effectively to structure the email.

Weaker responses sometimes spent rather too long explaining that the writers were regular readers of the paper and greatly enjoyed it, and they often spent too much time on trivial details of their daily lives, rather than exploring the consequences of their different routines. Others simply listed the duties and responsibilities thrust upon young people without explaining their reasons for disagreeing with the article. Some weaker responses took an inappropriate tone, verging on rudeness or an overly informal register for the audience and purpose. Many weaker responses lacked paragraphs and other organisational devices and had frequent errors of various kinds, including lack of control of sentence structure. For example, one candidate wrote: 'Those attending school, spend at least 8 hours or more in classrooms. Attending to lectures, having in class tests and exercise. Which means less time to play around and more time to studying.'

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

One approach that continued to work well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. However, many responses were limited in detail and lacking in evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response.

Many stronger responses approached this question in one of two ways, each of which proved to be successful: addressing form and structure, going through the speech's content and then concentrating on language; or going through the text, simultaneously analysing all language devices. Stronger responses were focused throughout, exploring techniques and effects in tandem, for example: 'The author's repetitive use of the phrase, "There is no time", highlights how little free time young people have. By placing it in short, simple sentences, the author illustrates how miniscule the time is for the youth.'

The strongest answers gave very precise examples, considered language, structure and form in equal measure and integrated terminology with skill. For example, one candidate wrote: 'The last line of the first paragraph provides a hook with a compound sentence and sophisticated vocabulary ("misleading", "downright dangerous") to create an impression of a refined and learned disposition, so that the editor may be more inclined to consider my disagreement with an open mind. I have used similarly low frequency lexis throughout the email ("mechanical afterthought", "impressionable") to achieve an elevated semantic field and formal diction, as is expected of an email to a major newspaper editor.'

Weaker responses sometimes demonstrated an ability to identify some basic language and structural features but needed more in terms of analysis. Some candidates attempted analysis but used general phrases such as, 'The paragraphs make it clearer for the editor to understand'. They often wrote very short answers or very general answers, listing lots of features but without adequate analysis of their effects. Incorrect terminology was common. There were also many examples of candidates paraphrasing their speeches or focusing solely on structure, needing more in the way of language analysis.

Some weaker responses listed linguistic features that the candidate said they had used without any supporting evidence, for example, 'I used hyperboles, metaphors and verbs,' or, 'I used yours faithfully at the end of the email.' Quite a few candidates did not focus clearly on detailing and explaining the intended effects of their linguistic choices. Instead, many concentrated on describing the structure and format of their accounts with comments such as, 'I wrote my email to the editor using a formal tone as convention dictates.' Some candidates did attempt to explain the effect of their linguistic choices but these were often vague or somewhat meaningless, including phrases such as, 'I used repetition to encourage the reader to agree with my point,' or, 'I did a good job'.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Essay

In class, you have been discussing whether the number of tourists visiting very popular places should be limited. Your teacher has asked you to write an essay on the topic, giving your opinion. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Nearly all responses discussed both the advantages and the disadvantages of limiting tourist numbers in a reasoned fashion and generally included a personal opinion as a conclusion. The vast majority of candidates used an appropriately formal tone. Some candidates gave specific examples to give extra weight to their points.

Arguments for limiting tourist numbers included: they cause pollution, especially litter; tourism damages the overall environment; precious monuments can be damaged deliberately; an increase in petty crime like pick-pocketing; overcrowding at popular spots means a lack of enjoyment for tourists; too many tourists can annoy/disturb locals; too many tourists spread disease.

Arguments for not limiting tourist numbers included: there would be a loss of income/jobs for locals; there would be increased crime due to loss of income/jobs; there could be issues over how tourist numbers are

limited and this could cause discrimination problems; lots of tourists means increased revenue for an area, with associated benefits such as increased standards of living; tourists bring a multi-cultural element to countries; everyone should have the right to visit the places they want, when they want.

Stronger essays were clearly planned and written with logically arranged paragraphs and discourse markers. These candidates clearly stated their viewpoint in the opening of their writing, and then proceeded to outline its advantages and disadvantages, which were often mainly concerned with finances and conservation. There were some very sensible discussions on the balance needed between income generated through revenue from tourism and the potential damage to the environment from large numbers of visitors. There were concerns expressed genuinely around the impact on climate change of people travelling around the world, and the harm to wildlife as more and more infrastructure is put in place to support tourism. Stronger responses referred to specific destinations, for example Paris, Victoria Falls and the Taj Mahal. One strong response provided a good example and incorporated it into their argument: 'The Grand Mosque in Abu Dhabi UAE has set limits to the number of tourists who can visit. This has allowed thousands of Muslims to safeguard the sanctity of their mosque and allowed others to experience and witness the beauty of Islam.'

Some weaker essays were dry and vague and did not include an example of a tourist destination. Some did not enter into the argument, simply listing and describing certain tourist attractions around the world. They tended to repeat the phrases 'popular places' and 'limit the number of tourists'. Some listed pros and cons in a seemingly random order, rather than planning the order of points before starting to write. In others, the essay nature of the task was substituted for something more resembling an article, with a headline and subheadings. The occasional less confident candidate lost the thread of argument and counter-argument to contradict themselves until a final conclusion suddenly emerged in the last paragraph.

Question 3 – Descriptive piece

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

Most responses demonstrated some focus on sound, movement and light, but to varying degrees. Often, the more successful answers used a narrative framework as a structure, such as walking through the jungle, floating down a jungle river, or the progression from morning through to night. However, some candidates used this technique but slipped too far into a predominantly narrative style.

Stronger responses usually had some sort of structure, for example a narrative frame such as a walk or an expedition. One particularly striking description was from the perspective of a hawk, flying from one scene to another within the jungle. There were some novel approaches, including: likening the jungle to a king's (lion's) court; a guided meditation; a description from the viewpoint of a native tribesperson; and a battle ground with plants and animals fighting off human invaders. Several candidates opted instead for a reflective frame, considering the contribution a jungle may make to biodiversity, the global environmental balance and mankind's well-being. Both these reflections and narrative twists worked best when framing, not replacing, the sensory imaginative detail prompted by the question's focus on sound, movement and light, for example in this response: 'It has all been consumed, destroyed, desecrated, left derelict by the most destructive animal on earth. Man.' Stronger responses provided specific details of the jungle setting, for example: 'Between the leaves, writhed pinkish, brownish worms, inching their way between, over and below the leaves. To them, the vast darkness above them was what we humans think of as the vast expanse of space.'

There were some vivid and original descriptions of animal life in the jungle, with a strong focus on visual imagery, for example in this description of a toad: 'He sat like a king on the throne that was the pond, soaking in its murky shallow water. The dancing lights from above focused on him as he stared at me, extremely still, apart from his elastic neck that bulged with every rapid breath he took. Suddenly, without warning, his mouth became a blur of sap and pink and the crystal-like reflective wings of an unsuspecting fly poked out of his mouth. In the next second, he hopped away.'

In some weaker responses, candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote a story set in a jungle. Many candidates struggled to write in accurately constructed sentences, with many responses showing a proliferation of minor sentences or participle clauses, such as in this example: 'On a calm morning, with bright white clouds and sunny sun greeting everyone as they open their eyes. Loud chirps from the small brown birds that seem energetic. Owls howling in the background.' A significant number of candidates also had trouble with verb tenses, often flipping back and forth from present to past. Some weaker responses lacked original descriptions, merely listing a few things that could be encountered in the jungle and then bluntly stating a colour or two, accompanied by a sound that could be associated with the phenomenon, as

in this example: 'The birds are yellow, green or red. They chirp, and their wings flutter. The frogs are green or brown. They make a screeching sound.'

Some candidates used what appeared to be pre-prepared or well memorised descriptions of a forest in the autumn, many of which were adapted clumsily to describe a jungle. In such responses, content was not fully relevant and the task was not well achieved; candidates should be able to demonstrate the ability to use their writing skills to write effectively for a specific task, which cannot be achieved through applying previously prepared or memorised responses.

Question 4 – Review

You recently tried to buy something online, but you had some problems with the experience. You decide to write a review of this online shopping experience, which you will post on your blog. Write between 600 and 900 words.

There were some lively answers to this question, with most written using an appropriate tone and register for a blog. The structure was usually clear and judgements were made for it to read like a review. Most candidates included specific shopping experiences and real or fictional websites and products to illustrate the problems they encountered, along with detailed accounts of technical glitches, poor customer service, delayed delivery and shoddy products. A few candidates described a positive outcome, often with a refund; a great many others felt they had been scammed. Most answers concluded with a recommendation to avoid that particular site or online shopping altogether.

Websites were criticised for being too slow, unresponsive to payment, and possibly scam sites. Tracking orders was also a problem, as were delays in delivery and the quality of goods when received (not matching the pictures on the website, for example). Items purchased included, clothes, jewellery and IT equipment. One candidate wrote: 'Moreover, the website is universally accessible so I think it is the minimum to expect it to have a translation setting so people who know other languages can use it.'

In stronger responses, candidates managed to make what could be quite dull material into an interesting and sometimes humorous read. They demonstrated familiarity with professionally written reviews and exploited every generic feature thereof. They engaged with an imagined audience with whom they clearly had an ongoing relationship; their blogs included links to imagined past and future postings, suited to someone who had a clear following. There was a good use of humour by many candidates and many of the reviews, although somewhat exaggerated, seemed to reflect real-life experiences. They were often written in a lively style, for example: 'So that's where I am now, cozily cramped between 9000 boxes and writing an update on my blog. I'm contemplating whether or not to return all of them. I mean I could keep a couple of dozen and just gift them to family and friends for the next few years. After all, who would not want a Donut-Burger-Maker?'

Weaker reviews lacked important details such as the name of the website or the product being bought. Some got bogged down in quite tedious details about the website and delays to the order. Many neglected to address the audience reading the blog. Less convincing responses were littered with grammatical errors and often gave a long narrative account of the online shopping procedure, without actually reviewing the experience. Other weaker responses related a lengthy history of some online transaction that went awry, with no evaluation of the service.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/23 Writing
--

Key messages

- Candidates should manage their time carefully, allocating an equal amount of time for each section of the paper. Quite often the time spent on **Section A** seemed to have left candidates insufficient time to meet the required word count in **Section B** or to satisfactorily complete the task.
- Candidates should be aware that relevant content in the correct form is a key aspect of the overall assessment of responses for **Question 1(a)** and **Section B** tasks. To ensure that candidates understand the key requirements, they should pay attention to key words within the question which indicate the specified form, content, audience and purpose of the task. For example, in **Question 3** the key instructions are to *write an article*, focusing on ' and also to comment on *why it can be so good for their physical and mental health*.
- Candidates must understand the importance of writing in clear, properly punctuated English, with accurate sentence demarcation, to perform well in this exam. It is imperative that candidates know and understand the basics of sentence construction if they are to succeed on this paper. Clear expression in simple and compound sentences with less variety is preferable to expression that does not flow, in long, rambling sentences. Often, weaker candidates lose control of grammar when they attempt to write in long, complex sentences. One error that occurred regularly was that of separating sentences with commas rather than full stops; another common error was writing in sentence fragments. Sentence demarcation is key, followed by accurate use of commas, and then the accurate use of a wider range of punctuation.
- Candidates should be reminded of the need to write legibly and clearly to ensure communication is not impeded. Centres should make use of appropriate access arrangements for candidates who are unable to produce legible handwritten text.
- Candidates who have difficulty with tense selection should focus on writing in one tense, preferably either the present tense or the past.
- Candidates should be encouraged to proofread carefully, particularly for accurate sentence demarcation and for tense confusion/inconsistency. Such errors impede, sometimes seriously, the overall sense of fluency and cohesion.
- Candidates must be aware of the need for clear paragraphing in their responses, including paragraphing for direct speech. A secure focus on structure is crucial since it helps the reader to feel that the candidate is in control of their writing.
- Candidates should be exposed to a wide variety of different text types, as outlined in the syllabus, so that they become familiar with the conventions of a variety of writing forms and purposes. They should be taught key features of those text types, to enable them to replicate these in their own writing.

General comments

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

In responses to **Question 1(a)**, stronger responses focused clearly on the question, consisting of engaging news reports with clear comments on the impact on local people. Candidates with weaker responses tended

to write accounts of the incident but without appropriate form. Candidates should avoid lengthy preambles before addressing the task; the guidance of *no more than 400 words* means candidates are being guided to provide a purposeful, succinct response.

The strongest responses to **Question 1(b)** maintained a close focus on linguistic and stylistic choices, with the relationship between these features being explained and explored successfully. They used relevant terminology consistently and confidently, using language precisely and appropriately. Weaker responses focused entirely on content and therefore only provided minimal analysis, usually by indirectly outlining the structure of the piece.

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

Weaker responses on **Section B** generally lacked focus on what the task required. For example, some stories in **Question 2** lacked in sense of drama or mystery; some responses to **Question 3** did not adequately address the benefits of spending time outdoors; and some **Question 4** responses were simple recounts of a trip by plane, with very little in the way of critique or personal opinion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Shorter writing and reflective commentary

Question 1

Something very unusual happened near your home recently. You decide to write a news report about this event, which will be published in your local newspaper.

- (a) **Write the text for the news report, using no more than 400 words. In your writing, focus on the atmosphere of the event and the impact it has had on local people.**

Many features of a report were successfully integrated into the majority of these reports for a local newspaper. The focus of the news story was important: those more successful responses selected an engaging event; others selected a more mundane subject, which impacted on the opportunity to explore it in a meaningful way. Some lost focus on report form and became narrative, sometimes even a first-person recount. Most responses included a headline written to engage the reader and fulfil the *unusual* aspect of the question in terms of an event. Closing comments were also evident across most responses, indicating for example, 'further news to follow.'

Stronger responses were appropriately structured for a news report, using an inverted triangle structure, as it was referred to in many candidates' commentaries. Stronger responses used an effective headline were structured with sub-headings, clear topic sentences and other newspaper conventions. Humour was a feature of some stronger responses, as well as intrigue, which in some cases was immediately introduced in the headline and opening section of the report, for example: 'Grandma on the run: The elusive pet stealer' and 'Halloween Havoc'. One candidate structured the report around 'Aliens from Mars' featuring 'extra-terrestrials' who 'stole a cow, using their flying saucer after taking a wrong turn home.' This example, and more like it, were effective in terms of the precision of language used, employing both third and first person. Successful responses had a clear structure, noting the need to include both atmospheric details surrounding the event together with eyewitness accounts. Candidates made effective use of adverbs of time and pronouns in their reports.

Weaker responses often included quotations from neighbours or passers-by, but fell short of capturing atmosphere. Whilst direct speech is a feature of a report, the punctuation and layout of it was mostly poor. Weaker responses were usually paragraphed but were very brief, which impacted on the development and overall quality of the piece. A small number of candidates produced quite confused accounts which were purely narrative in terms of form.

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

One approach that worked well for candidates was to use a Point, Evidence, Explanation format to analyse the form, structure and language of their responses to **Question 1(a)**. However, many responses were limited in detail and lacking in evidence from the **Question 1(a)** response.

Stronger responses provided sustained analysis of language and also commented on the news report's structure by referring to the 'Four W's' and the 'Inverted Triangle'. Effective commentaries provided evidence of how discourse markers were used to signpost events, hence creating a logical structure. Some higher level commentaries specifically referenced the use of pronouns, as in this example: 'I used first person perspective, singular and plural form as it was about the town so, by using the possessive pronoun "our", makes the reader feel included in the event. Singular pronoun "I" was used to give my perspective as a journalist.' Rhetorical questions, listing, the rule of three, alliteration and assonance were also often referenced. As candidates were providing analysis of language used in a news report, there was some competent analysis of how reported speech had been used, as in this example: 'The use of reported speech helps to better transfer the feelings of the townsfolk, thus fulfilling genre requirements.' Other stronger responses detailed the pathos-logos-ethos sequence and included analysis of, for example, the use of hyperbole, use of reported speech, onomatopoeia and parallelism.

Weaker responses consisted of content-driven accounts. Many did not provide specific examples from the **1(a)** response to support points made. Some weaker responses included commentary on alliteration, listing and repetition, but would have been improved with analysis of how these features would affect the reader.

Section B: Extended writing

Question 2 – Story

Write a story which begins with the following sentence: *As he picked up the book, Max realised that an envelope had been hidden underneath it.* In your writing, create a sense of drama and mystery. Write between 600 and 900 words.

There were many engaging and well written responses to this question. The contents of the envelope provided a stimulus for hidden treasure stories, letters from long-lost relatives (often a parent wanting to be reunited with a child), espionage and voyages of discovery. Strong responses created a sense of voice for their main character, Max.

Stronger candidates engaged the reader from the outset by focusing on the envelope, creating a real sense of intrigue and suspense as to its contents, for example: 'Taking the CD out of the envelope, he inserted it into his PC, and what he saw next was truly shocking. An envelope had been hidden underneath it. Puzzled, he ran his fingers along its coarse edges, its yellowed surface.' For other candidates, minute details, including the texture of the envelope, the style of handwriting, even the weight, provided interest for the reader, as shown in this example: 'He turned it over in his hands. It was made of high-quality paper, stark-white. His father's name and address were scrawled on the front in cursive writing with dark green ink.'

Weaker responses tended to include too much dialogue, with flaws in punctuation that often made it unclear which character was speaking. Some weaker responses involved complex family dramas with little focus on creating drama and suspense. There was often confusion regarding point of view, together with a lack of control of tenses and little sense of purpose.

Question 3 – Article

In class, you have been discussing the fact that many teenagers spend a lot of time indoors these days. You decide to write an article for your school magazine. In your writing, focus on ways to encourage teenagers to spend time outdoors, and why it can be so good for their physical and mental health. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Many candidates approached this question from personal experience. There were a range of reasons given for young people remaining indoors, with a reliance on social media as the top issue. Most candidates had a secure understanding of the relevant form and audience. Candidates used direct address together with

listing and some highly charged emotive language. Mental health issues dominated most responses with sport seen as a solution to improve overall well-being.

Stronger responses were lively with some energetic writing, including an upbeat tone and a strong sense of voice, as seen at the close of this candidate's writing: 'We are a generation that has grown up surrounded by technology – it is ingrained into our everyday lives. We need to make positive changes which can be hard. By surrounding yourself with love and an improved lifestyle, we can live life to the full!' Strong responses combined personal anecdote with a more objective evaluation of the problems caused by being indoors. Some stronger responses showed awareness of form with the use of headlines, straplines and sub-headings, for example: 'The Great Outdoors: A Guide to Digital Detoxing'. Use of sub-headings such as 'New body. New mind. New you!' clarified structure and organisational focus. In focused responses, language was persuasive and tackled the topic of mental health particularly well.

Some responses were weaker where candidates had misinterpreted or lost focus on the question, which led them to advise on healthy eating or to strenuously defend the use of social media, instead of maintaining focus on encouraging the audience towards the great outdoors. Others did not engage the teenage audience, listing activities that teenagers could undertake; some provided lengthy anecdotes without clearly addressing the question.

Question 4 – Review

You recently flew to another country, using an airline you have not flown with before. Write a review of the airline, which will be published on an international travel website. Write between 600 and 900 words.

Most candidates adopted a methodical approach to the question, which led to some laborious but perfectly competent pieces of writing. Candidates were able to tap into their own experiences and either exaggerate them or speak truthfully about them. Responses covered all aspects of the flight, from experiences in the airport lounge to touch down. Flight attendants, food, and toilets were all reviewed, along with the comfort of the seats, including leg room.

Stronger responses showed excellent understanding of the features of a review, and, hence, there was often the adoption of a sophisticated voice and register that facilitated some sophisticated expression and some humorous touches appropriate to a travel website. Higher level responses structured the review so that ideas flowed through a logical sequence which tackled ticket purchase, ease of boarding, leg room, friendliness and efficiency of the flight attendants, in-flight entertainment, hospitality and baggage reclaim. What could have been a very dry subject was often made more readable by the injection of some gentle humour, for example: 'Punctuality is not a strong point of Gold Star and, as if to rub salt in the wound, we were treated to a panoramic view of planes taxiing in, boarding and leaving, all while ours was yet to make an appearance.' A sense of sarcasm was achieved by this candidate who, like many, also maintained an upbeat mood: 'While I was waiting (and waiting) to board, I could not help but notice how small everybody's check-in luggage was. Then I saw a sign saying, "No baggage over 5 kg." Were they serious? A criminally low weight for an international flight!' Upbeat, lively writing proved effective, as opposed to the 'listing' effect of things going wrong as seen in weaker responses.

Weaker responses tended to consist of personal accounts starting with facilities at the airport and other factors such as passport control, which were not within the control of the airline in question. Others merely listed the aspects of the flight that had gone wrong, while some indulged in writing about their own personal likes and dislikes in the way of food and beverages, in an uninteresting process of listing, showing little awareness that users of the website would like to know about the available range of seats, meals, in-flight entertainment and other amenities. Features of many weaker responses were lack of paragraphs and other organisational devices, and frequent errors of various kinds, including lack of control of sentence structure. For example, one candidate wrote: 'I've heard many people talk about Singapore Airlines and complementing it. So, even I decided to travel in that airlines to see what's all this hype about.'

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/31 Language Analysis
--

Key messages

9093 Paper 3 is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key topic areas: Language change and Child language acquisition. The question paper requires responses to use controlled expression in two sustained analytical essays and to support ideas with evidence of wider study of the language topics.

In November 2022, the demands and weighting of the four assessment objectives were observed well. It was clear that candidates had been keen to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of their wider study of the language topics. At times, evidence of this knowledge and understanding overshadowed that of engagement with the stimulus material. The strongest responses provided balanced work in which candidates had made effective or insightful analysis of the texts provided, reinforcing their findings with reference to relevant linguistic theories.

For the November 2022 series, the key message for Paper 3 is that there was a noticeable increase in confidence in responses to Section A. However, candidates need to observe the examination time carefully and divide it equally between the two Sections in order to maximise the number of marks awarded. Nonetheless, overall responses were sustained, demonstrating a clear, detailed and sometimes insightful level of analytical skill.

General comments

Overall, most responses were written using an appropriate register. Sequencing of ideas was generally evident and logical, although there were often lengthy introductions which were not fully relevant to the demands of the question. Moreover, there was a considerable number of responses in which ideas were sequenced but the analysis was presented without paragraph demarcation. This detracted from an otherwise clear or effective response.

There was some evidence of planning. In most cases this had been brief and meaningful which meant that candidates had included only useful points which were, in the main, incorporated into the full response as developed ideas. Such an approach led to keener focus on the question demands, more logical sequencing of ideas and increased relevance of theoretical citation than had been seen in previous series.

In general, responses demonstrated a clear level of engagement with the stimulus material and a clear control of expression.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

All but very few candidates had observed the requirement that responses should incorporate analysis of all three data sources. However, some responses demonstrated a reasonably thorough analysis of the data but had not made reference to any wider study of the language topic. On the other hand, some responses had provided long discussions of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but had made only passing reference to the data sources. Neither of these approaches enabled such responses to move forward through the levels of the mark scheme. Candidates should bear in mind that in **Question 1**, there are 15 marks available for their handling of data and that this should be their primary engagement; without

evidence of keen analytical skills, responses to this question can only remain as 'limited' whereas clear, effective or insightful work will incorporate thorough analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

In **Question 1**, there are five marks available in relation to Assessment Objective 2, which means that responses are expected to demonstrate controlled expression and structural organisation. At times, there was occasional repetitious work, but otherwise expression was mostly clear to effective.

Clear to effective responses maintained an appropriate register throughout, with paragraphs flowing neatly through a logical sequence of ideas pertaining to a succession of linguistic frameworks which included lexis, grammar, syntax, graphology, orthography, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not prescribed by the mark scheme, although there was evidence of its usefulness in terms of candidates' focus, which led to more thorough analysis.

Clear, effective or even sophisticated writing in the strongest responses maintained an elevated register which demonstrated a thorough understanding and ease of use of linguistic terminology. In such responses, a linguistic standpoint was established and maintained. However, at times there was evidence that a sociological rather than linguistic approach had been taken. In some basic or limited responses, long accounts of the history of the English language were provided, which led in some cases to irrelevant content. Even though as part of the analysis it can be useful to set the texts provided within a historical timeline (1774, in the case of Text A), a linguistic focus should be at the core of the response.

Candidates should be aware that clear, effective or even sophisticated crafting of responses will probably not be achieved if the structural organisation of the response is such that the three texts for **Question 1** are analysed separately in their order of appearance in the question paper. Generally, this will result in weak areas and underdevelopment of ideas. The requirement of the question paper is to take ideas from Text A and support the analysis with evidence from Texts B and C in order to achieve cohesion in the writing, and this requirement was not always met in the November 2022 series.

Conceptualisation

Basic or limited responses tended to attempt translation of any archaic grammatical or syntactical structures into contemporary English to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how the English language has changed over time, for example *If you have none, be filent*; from Text A. Although such attempts might offer some discussion on the general concept of language change, they are not analytical, nor are they supported by scholarship. Candidates should be aware that such an approach will only minimally meet the demands of Assessment Objective 4.

In weaker responses, reference was frequently made to Caxton's printing press, where the analytical findings indicated the ongoing process of standardisation. The Great Vowel Shift was also referenced in many responses, with some citing Jespersen. However, both of these were of limited use, with the first not linking to the correct time period in which Text A was written, and therefore ran the risk of becoming irrelevant. More useful was reference to Johnson's dictionary of 1755, although this was not as effective as citing theories such as Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Chen's S curve, Hockett's random fluctuation theory or Hallidayan functional linguistics, for example, could have been. These concepts, models or approaches were seen, although at times reference was speculative.

Responses tended to introduce sociological commentary on changes in attitudes in familial circumstances, contrasting levels of formality or politeness evident in Text A with those in the contemporary world. Sharon Goodman's Informalisation theory was frequently used for support in stronger responses. Evidence of such attitudes was overt in Text A, but it was only in the most carefully crafted responses that sociological comment remained plausible support to the analysis. Where it was used instead to form the basis of the analysis then the linguistic focus became blurred or even lost at times.

At times, there was evidence of a broader and deeper level of wider study than had been seen in previous series, with conceptualisation emerging across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated. Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts such as semantic or pragmatic shift may have been seen in all three texts and could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

Data handling

Most candidates were able to discuss the medial *j* and 'ct' ligature, as well as other differences in orthography in *fhew* for example, the change in hyphenation convention in *boarding-fchool* along with pragmatic change in use of nouns *intercourse* and *humour*. As in previous series, there was evidence of some confusion, however, on the use and positioning of the medial *j*. From Text A, *fhew* and *discompoje her features* were clear indications of its positioning – initially and medially but not used in any final position, although some responses still described its use as 'random'. Moreover, basic or limited responses indicated that the grapheme is pronounced as is the phoneme *j*, having referred to the IPA chart appended to the question paper. Not all responses attempted synthesis of Text A's *humour* as it was seen in Text B. One general error was in regarding 'advise' as a change in spelling from 'advice'.

Graphological and syntax frameworks explored in most responses. Discussion of punctuation, paragraph construction and sentence types was often generalised, however, instead of forming clear syntax analysis. Examination time could have been more productively spent on analysis of semantic or pragmatic change, or synthesising commentary arising from analysis of all three texts.

Whereas most candidates engaged well with Texts A and B, when scrutinising Text C, other than identification of the percentage scores shown on the y axis, analysis was weak. Some responses indicated *unbecoming* as now obsolete instead of more accurately describing the item as low frequency. Overall, candidates should be aware that even though lexical or grammatical items are unknown to them, they may not be obsolete.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of a conversation between Bailey, age 3 years, and her mother. The conversation was recorded at the home of the interlocutors.

Understanding

The ways in which the interlocutors interacted was evident in most responses, indicating clear understanding of the transcription and conventions used in conversation analysis. Furthermore, most responses selected a wide variety of features from the transcription, which were described using a range of linguistic terminology. In detailed or insightful responses, an increased range of technical descriptors were used with ease, indicating a deeper understanding of the language topic. Only a limited number of responses referred merely to the transcription key to aid in identifying features – such as pause in seconds, or upward or downward intonation as in *who are you calling?* – without further comment as to how they could be seen as characteristic.

An approach often taken was to discuss first the characteristic features of Bailey's utterances and then to discuss features demonstrated in those of her mother. Although this led to some in-depth analysis, the most sophisticated responses combined analytical findings from both interlocutors in order to establish cause and effect in the conversation.

The mother's questioning technique was explored in most responses, although limited responses tended to describe all her questions as 'tag questions' which was not the case. Turn-taking, topic shift and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly in confident responses, as were Bailey's virtuous errors, seen for example in *mine are little*. Less clear were responses which had taken a deficit approach, commenting mainly on features which were expected but absent from the transcription. Conversely, any commentary without analysis which described Bailey as in advance of any expected milestones in acquisition limited itself.

Conceptualisation

There was some effective or insightful commentary which did not reference the child's age as the determiner of her stage of acquisition but which instead analysed her utterances. This approach led to more accurate conclusions. The most effective, or indeed at times insightful, analysis of whether Bailey was in the telegraphic or post-telegraphic stage (or more accurately, emerging from one to the other) referred to linguistic models from Nelson, Crystal, Banduras or Aldridge, perhaps juxtaposed with that of Piaget.

With regard to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development, most responses placed Bailey at the preoperational stage, although there was confusion demonstrated by weaker candidates who indicated

without evidence that she remained at the sensorimotor stage or that she had progressed to the concrete operational stage, again without evidence.

Bailey's mother was seen in the role of Vygotsky's More Knowledgeable Other where she was seen to scaffold Bailey using a series of IRF exchanges. Developed responses also used Bailey's *and potato too* to analyse the extent to which the mother had assisted Bailey to reach a zone of proximal development.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription, most notably the imaginative function evident in Bailey's extended utterance *he just /peɪɪŋ/ at home and waiting for his mama to come and he daddy (.) his aunt is watching him right now*.

Clear reference was frequently made to Skinner, using 'somebody' to demonstrate Bailey's imitation of an adult making a telephone call and the mother's continuing positive reinforcement, for example in her utterance *oh my (.) that sounds good*. Less clear were long descriptions of Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device, not only because it was occasionally confused with Bruner's Language Acquisition Support System, but mainly because insufficient evidence from the text was used to support the inclusion of that theory.

Data handling

This series, there were commendable attempts to make phonological analysis, some of which were detailed if not insightful. The consonant cluster reduction in Bailey's *he just /peɪɪŋ/* was generally described accurately, although ease with linguistic labelling varied greatly between responses which attempted analysis of *on my /sʌm/*. Limited responses described Bailey's substitution of the unvoiced sibilant /s/ for the unvoiced fricative /θ/ in general terms, usually indicating /θ/ inaccurately as a consonant cluster.

Bailey's utterance *i didnt know how it did it (.) i didnt know how it comed out* offered the opportunity for in-depth analysis of her use of tense. Most responses identified *comed* as a virtuous error, with detailed or insightful responses using *did* in combination to demonstrate Bailey's emerging facility with tense. This particular utterance was also a useful opportunity to analyse her use of negation and contraction, the latter also being seen in *its bunnyhorse*.

Confident responses detailed these data in order to provide effective and sometimes insightful analyses of the ways in which the interlocutors used language to achieve an interactive, cooperative and free-flowing conversation. Further selections of data included: *bunnyhorse says hes got go to eat dinner*, in which Bailey reports speech but omits the particle 'to'; *it big ↗*, in which she omits the copular verb; and the mother's *just a little bigger*, in which she repeats her attempt to demonstrate size comparison with the *er* inflection, which could have been a new or emerging concept for Bailey.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/32 Language Analysis
--

Key messages

For the November 2022 series, the key message for Paper 32 is that there was a noticeable increase in confidence in responses to **Section A**. At times this was to the detriment of responses in **Section B**, which were rather too succinct on occasion. As in previous series, advice is to observe the examination time carefully and divide it equally between the two Sections in order to maximise the number of marks awarded.

The demands and weighting of the four assessment objectives were observed well in general. It was clear that candidates had been keen to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of their wider study of the language topics. At times, evidence of this knowledge and understanding overshadowed that of engagement with the stimulus material. The strongest responses provided balanced work in which candidates had made effective or insightful analysis of the texts provided, reinforcing their findings with reference to relevant linguistic theories.

General comments

Overall, responses tended to be sustained, with most responses using an appropriate register. Sequencing of ideas was generally logical, although at times there were lengthy introductions which were not fully relevant to the demands of the question. There were some brief or even very brief responses which could only be described as 'limited', with the limitation being due to their own brevity. Brief responses usually included fewer analytical findings, or any ideas concerning findings remained undeveloped.

There was some evidence of planning. In most cases this had been brief and meaningful, which meant that candidates had included only useful points which were, in the main, incorporated into the full response as developed ideas. Such an approach led to keener focus on the question demands, more logical sequencing of ideas and increased relevance of theoretical citation than had been seen in previous series.

In general, responses demonstrated a clear level of engagement with the stimulus material and a clear control of expression.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most responses met the requirement of the mark scheme to incorporate analysis of all three data sources. However, some responses demonstrated a reasonably thorough analysis of the data but had not made reference to any wider study of the language topic. On the other hand, some responses had provided long discussions of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but had made only passing reference to the data sources. Neither of these approaches enabled such responses to move forward through the levels of the mark scheme. Candidates should bear in mind that in **Question 1**, there are 15 marks available for their handling of data and that this should be their primary engagement; without evidence of keen analytical skills, responses to this question can only remain as 'limited' whereas clear, effective or insightful work will incorporate thorough analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

In **Question 1**, there are five marks available in relation to Assessment Objective 2, which means that responses are expected to demonstrate controlled expression and structural organisation. At times, there was loss of paragraph demarcation to separate ideas and some evidence of repetition in weaker responses.

Clear to effective responses maintained an appropriate register throughout, with paragraphs flowing neatly through a logical sequence of ideas pertaining to a succession of linguistic frameworks which included lexis, grammar, syntax, graphology, orthography, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not prescribed by the mark scheme although there was evidence of its usefulness in terms of candidate focus which led to more thorough analysis.

Clear, effective or even sophisticated writing in the strongest responses maintained an elevated register which demonstrated a thorough understanding and ease of use of linguistic terminology. In such responses, a linguistic standpoint was established and maintained. However, at times there was evidence that a sociological rather than linguistic approach had been taken. In some basic or limited responses, long accounts of the history of the English language were provided which led in some cases to irrelevant content. Even though as part of the analysis it can be useful to set the texts provided within a historical timeline (1831, in the case of Text A), a linguistic focus should be at the core of the response.

Candidates should be aware that clear, effective or even sophisticated crafting of responses will probably not be achieved if the structural organisation of the response is such that the three texts for **Question 1** are analysed separately in their order of appearance in the question paper. Generally this will result in weak areas and underdevelopment of ideas. The requirement of the question paper is to take ideas from Text A and support the analysis with evidence from Text B and C in order to achieve cohesion in the writing, and this requirement was not always met in the November 2022 series.

Conceptualisation

Basic or limited responses tended to attempt translation of any archaic grammatical or syntactical structures into contemporary English to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how the English language has changed over time, for example with *Had I a beloved daughter...* from Text A. Although such attempts might offer some discussion on the general concept of language change, they are not analytical, nor are they supported by scholarship. Candidates should be aware that such an approach will only minimally meet the demands of Assessment Objective 4.

Reference was frequently made to Caxton's printing press where the analytical findings indicated the ongoing process of standardisation. The Great Vowel Shift was also referenced in many responses. However, both of these methods or concepts were of limited use as they did not link to the correct time period in which Text A was written and therefore ran the risk of becoming irrelevant. Moreover, they were often used in support of weak findings from one of the texts. More useful was reference to Johnson's dictionary, although this was not as effective as citing theories such as Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Chen's S curve, Hockett's random fluctuation theory or Hallidayan functional linguistics, for example, could have been.

Responses tended to introduce sociological commentary on changes in attitudes – towards religious precepts on how children should treat their seniors, on children making presents for their parents, and especially on the current unacceptability of arranged marriage. Evidence of such attitudes was overt in Texts A and B but it was only in the most carefully crafted responses that sociological comment remained plausible support to the analysis. Where it was used instead to form the basis of the analysis then the linguistic focus became blurred or even lost at times.

However, at times, there was evidence of a broader and deeper level of wider study than had been seen in previous series, with conceptualisation emerging across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated. Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts, such as narrowing, etymology, backformation, compounding, broadening, pejoration, amelioration or abbreviation, as may have been seen in in all three texts, could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

Data handling

Analysis of the data in Text A included a general misunderstanding of *deference* indicating that it was an archaic spelling of 'difference'. *Seldom* and *apt* were often described as obsolete lexis in limited responses,

although there were more appropriate suggestions that although these lexical items may have become low frequency in the oral mode, they may still be found in written forms. Analysis of *want* demonstrated understanding of its use more usually in contemporary English as a verb. Other lexical items frequently scrutinised were *asperity*, *follies*, *aged*, *intercourse*, *manufacture*, *bestowed*, *unmixed*, *insure* and *anti-selfish*. In general, in terms of a lexical framework, analysis was sound and developed well.

A graphological framework was also explored. At times, analysis of graphological features became lengthy and was at the expense of analysis of other features. Discussion of paragraph construction and sentence types was often generalised, and examination time could have been more productively spent on analysis of semantic or pragmatic change, or synthesising commentary arising from analysis of all three texts.

Weaker responses frequently mistook the collocates in Text B for synonyms, indicating that *juvenile* had changed its meaning to *crime*, *court* or *offenders* for example. However, some responses discussed how *juvenile* had become the name for youth prison, known colloquially as 'juvy', 'juve' or 'juvie'. Stronger responses were able to develop this, to point to just how much change must have occurred, not only in the use of the word *juvenile* but in the way this reflected changes in attitudes to younger adults. Development included reference to the subsequent ideas of 'the teenager', unknown in Child's time, and the concurrent rise in the ideas of *delinquency*.

As in previous series, although most candidates engaged well with Texts A and B, when scrutinising Text C, other than identification the percentage scores shown on the y axis, analysis was weak. Clear or detailed responses made a close comparison over time of the use of *and c*, *et cetera*, its abbreviation to *etc.* and the compound *etcetera*. Analysis was supported by discussion on how technology continues to drive abbreviation forward. There was also some clear discussion on Latinate lexis, although at times *et cetera* was mistaken for French.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of a conversation between Carter, age 3 years, and his mother. The conversation was recorded at the home of the interlocutors.

Understanding

A clear understanding of the stimulus material and the ways in which the interlocutors interacted was evident in most responses. Furthermore, most responses selected a variety of features from the transcription and generally described them using linguistic terminology. Where a wide range of linguistic terminology was used with ease, a deeper understanding of the language topic was demonstrated overall.

Basic or limited responses referred only to the transcription key to aid in identifying features such as pause, or upward or downward intonation as in *you win?*, without further comment as to how they could be seen as characteristic, and often described in general terms. For example, basic responses concentrated on the ways in which intonation was used, whereas stronger responses noted not only intonation as a characteristic feature but also the possible pragmatic reasons Carter's mother raised or lowered pitch at the end of her utterances, as seen in her attempts to scaffold Carter.

An approach often taken was to discuss first the characteristic features of Carter's utterances and then to discuss features demonstrated in those of his mother. Although this led to some in-depth analysis, the most sophisticated responses combined analytical findings from both interlocutors in order to establish cause and effect in the conversation.

The mother's questioning technique was explored in most responses, although limited responses tended to describe all her questions as 'tag questions' which was not the case. Turn-taking and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly in confident responses, as were Carter's virtuous errors, seen for example in *he at a work*. Less clear were responses which had taken a deficit approach, commenting mainly on features which were expected but absent from the transcription, or any commentary which described Carter as 'behind' any expected milestones in acquisition.

Conceptualisation

As in previous series, all but effective or insightful responses referenced the child's age as the determiner of his stage of acquisition instead of analysis of his utterances provided in the transcription. The most effective,

or indeed at times insightful, analysis of whether Carter was in the telegraphic or post-telegraphic stage (or more accurately, emerging from one to the other) referred to linguistic models from Nelson, Crystal, Banduras or Aldridge, perhaps juxtaposed with that of Piaget.

With regard to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development, most responses placed Carter at the preoperational stage, although there was confusion demonstrated by some candidates who indicated without evidence that he remained at the sensorimotor stage or that he had progressed to the concrete operational stage, again without evidence.

The mother's utterances, with their evidence of a Brunerian approach, drew comment from most candidates with some strong development seen at times where discussion progressed to consideration of the effectiveness of initiation-response-feedback exchanges, where the mother was seen as Vygotsky's More Knowledgeable Other, scaffolding him into more complete constructions such as *as i want to watch a video*.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription. For example, Carter's *because i miss him* demonstrated personal function and his mother's *oh dont do that* provided an opportunity to discuss regulatory function as well as to discuss her negative reinforcement of his behaviour in terms of Skinner when throwing his toy spider. Although reference to Halliday was frequently seen, weaker responses described the seven functions as 'stages' and implied that children could only show linguistic competence in these one at a time and chronologically, which is incorrect.

It was clear that candidates were mindful of the need to address AO4, though some responses made undeveloped reference to approaches which included Chomsky and Skinner. Analysis can only remain undeveloped where insufficient evidence from the data source is provided. In some cases, very few data were provided, with the entire response comprising only a demonstration of a weak understanding of theories. On the other hand, some insightful reference was made to models from Bellugi, Berko and Brown, and Aitcheson, which were relevant to the data under scrutiny and which were woven into responses in a sophisticated manner.

Data handling

In the November 2022 series there were considerable attempts to make phonological analysis, some of which was detailed if not insightful. Overt in the transcription were Carter's omission of the rhotic phoneme in */tarseataps/* and the initial unvoiced sibilant in */paid/*, this latter utterance further demonstrating deletion of the whole final syllable. Ease with linguistic labelling varied greatly between responses; mainly it was clear, if a little generalised.

Carter's competence in using conjunctions was identified in *max and oliver and olivia*, as was his ease with personal pronouns *i* and *my*. Pronoun use was linked to his egotistical stage, although this was not always viewed as progression as it should have been, often being described as a flaw.

The utterance *like dan have* was frequently selected for analysis of subject-verb agreement where it was described reasonably fully, as was his *i go throw er (.) throw er (.) my /paid/*. However, this latter example also provided opportunity to discuss Carter's emerging competence in use of tense and some consonant clusters. His *um my friends come over my house* was the utterance most frequently used to consider tense. Confident responses provided detailed examples of these and further data in order to provide effective and sometimes insightful analyses of the ways in which the interlocutors used language to achieve a reasonably interactive and cooperative conversation, in spite of the child's natural conversational flow being directed many times by the mother's enthusiastic rate of topic shifts and his own occasional unruly behaviour.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/33 Language Analysis
--

Key messages

9093 Paper 3 is an opportunity for examination candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of two key topic areas: Language change and Child language acquisition. The question paper requires responses to use controlled expression in two sustained analytical essays and to support ideas with evidence of wider study of the language topics.

In November 2022, the demands and weighting of the four assessment objectives were observed well. It was clear that candidates had been keen to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of their wider study of the language topics. At times, evidence of this knowledge and understanding overshadowed that of engagement with the stimulus material. The strongest responses provided balanced work in which candidates had made effective or insightful analysis of the texts provided, reinforcing their findings with reference to relevant linguistic theories.

For the November 2022 series, the key message for Paper 3 is that there was a noticeable increase in confidence in responses to Section A. However, candidates need to observe the examination time carefully and divide it equally between the two Sections in order to maximise the number of marks awarded. Nonetheless, overall responses were sustained, demonstrating a clear, detailed and sometimes insightful level of analytical skill.

General comments

Overall, most responses were written using an appropriate register. Sequencing of ideas was generally evident and logical, although there were often lengthy introductions which were not fully relevant to the demands of the question. Moreover, there was a considerable number of responses in which ideas were sequenced but the analysis was presented without paragraph demarcation. This detracted from an otherwise clear or effective response.

There was some evidence of planning. In most cases this had been brief and meaningful which meant that candidates had included only useful points which were, in the main, incorporated into the full response as developed ideas. Such an approach led to keener focus on the question demands, more logical sequencing of ideas and increased relevance of theoretical citation than had been seen in previous series.

In general, responses demonstrated a clear level of engagement with the stimulus material and a clear control of expression.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

All but very few candidates had observed the requirement that responses should incorporate analysis of all three data sources. However, some responses demonstrated a reasonably thorough analysis of the data but had not made reference to any wider study of the language topic. On the other hand, some responses had provided long discussions of linguistic issues, concepts, methods and approaches but had made only passing reference to the data sources. Neither of these approaches enabled such responses to move forward through the levels of the mark scheme. Candidates should bear in mind that in **Question 1**, there are 15 marks available for their handling of data and that this should be their primary engagement; without

evidence of keen analytical skills, responses to this question can only remain as 'limited' whereas clear, effective or insightful work will incorporate thorough analysis supported by relevant scholarship in a detailed, sustained manner.

Writing

In **Question 1**, there are five marks available in relation to Assessment Objective 2, which means that responses are expected to demonstrate controlled expression and structural organisation. At times, there was occasional repetitious work, but otherwise expression was mostly clear to effective.

Clear to effective responses maintained an appropriate register throughout, with paragraphs flowing neatly through a logical sequence of ideas pertaining to a succession of linguistic frameworks which included lexis, grammar, syntax, graphology, orthography, semantics, pragmatics or morphology. This approach is not prescribed by the mark scheme, although there was evidence of its usefulness in terms of candidates' focus, which led to more thorough analysis.

Clear, effective or even sophisticated writing in the strongest responses maintained an elevated register which demonstrated a thorough understanding and ease of use of linguistic terminology. In such responses, a linguistic standpoint was established and maintained. However, at times there was evidence that a sociological rather than linguistic approach had been taken. In some basic or limited responses, long accounts of the history of the English language were provided, which led in some cases to irrelevant content. Even though as part of the analysis it can be useful to set the texts provided within a historical timeline (1774, in the case of Text A), a linguistic focus should be at the core of the response.

Candidates should be aware that clear, effective or even sophisticated crafting of responses will probably not be achieved if the structural organisation of the response is such that the three texts for **Question 1** are analysed separately in their order of appearance in the question paper. Generally, this will result in weak areas and underdevelopment of ideas. The requirement of the question paper is to take ideas from Text A and support the analysis with evidence from Texts B and C in order to achieve cohesion in the writing, and this requirement was not always met in the November 2022 series.

Conceptualisation

Basic or limited responses tended to attempt translation of any archaic grammatical or syntactical structures into contemporary English to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how the English language has changed over time, for example *If you have none, be filent*; from Text A. Although such attempts might offer some discussion on the general concept of language change, they are not analytical, nor are they supported by scholarship. Candidates should be aware that such an approach will only minimally meet the demands of Assessment Objective 4.

In weaker responses, reference was frequently made to Caxton's printing press, where the analytical findings indicated the ongoing process of standardisation. The Great Vowel Shift was also referenced in many responses, with some citing Jespersen. However, both of these were of limited use, with the first not linking to the correct time period in which Text A was written, and therefore ran the risk of becoming irrelevant. More useful was reference to Johnson's dictionary of 1755, although this was not as effective as citing theories such as Schmidt's wave model, Hartl and Clark's concept of cultural transmission, Chen's S curve, Hockett's random fluctuation theory or Hallidayan functional linguistics, for example, could have been. These concepts, models or approaches were seen, although at times reference was speculative.

Responses tended to introduce sociological commentary on changes in attitudes in familial circumstances, contrasting levels of formality or politeness evident in Text A with those in the contemporary world. Sharon Goodman's Informalisation theory was frequently used for support in stronger responses. Evidence of such attitudes was overt in Text A, but it was only in the most carefully crafted responses that sociological comment remained plausible support to the analysis. Where it was used instead to form the basis of the analysis then the linguistic focus became blurred or even lost at times.

At times, there was evidence of a broader and deeper level of wider study than had been seen in previous series, with conceptualisation emerging across the three sources, some of which was insightful and sophisticated. Clear, detailed or insightful work was seen in responses which detailed how and why linguistic issues or concepts such as semantic or pragmatic shift may have been seen in all three texts and could be relevantly supported by theoretical examples.

Data handling

Most candidates were able to discuss the medial *j* and 'ct' ligature, as well as other differences in orthography in *fhew* for example, the change in hyphenation convention in *boarding-fchool* along with pragmatic change in use of nouns *intercourse* and *humour*. As in previous series, there was evidence of some confusion, however, on the use and positioning of the medial *j*. From Text A, *fhew* and *difcompofe her features* were clear indications of its positioning – initially and medially but not used in any final position, although some responses still described its use as 'random'. Moreover, basic or limited responses indicated that the grapheme is pronounced as is the phoneme *j*, having referred to the IPA chart appended to the question paper. Not all responses attempted synthesis of Text A's *humour* as it was seen in Text B. One general error was in regarding 'advise' as a change in spelling from 'advice'.

Graphological and syntax frameworks explored in most responses. Discussion of punctuation, paragraph construction and sentence types was often generalised, however, instead of forming clear syntax analysis. Examination time could have been more productively spent on analysis of semantic or pragmatic change, or synthesising commentary arising from analysis of all three texts.

Whereas most candidates engaged well with Texts A and B, when scrutinising Text C, other than identification of the percentage scores shown on the y axis, analysis was weak. Some responses indicated *unbecoming* as now obsolete instead of more accurately describing the item as low frequency. Overall, candidates should be aware that even though lexical or grammatical items are unknown to them, they may not be obsolete.

Section B

Question 2

The data source for **Question 2** was a transcription of a conversation between Bailey, age 3 years, and her mother. The conversation was recorded at the home of the interlocutors.

Understanding

The ways in which the interlocutors interacted was evident in most responses, indicating clear understanding of the transcription and conventions used in conversation analysis. Furthermore, most responses selected a wide variety of features from the transcription, which were described using a range of linguistic terminology. In detailed or insightful responses, an increased range of technical descriptors were used with ease, indicating a deeper understanding of the language topic. Only a limited number of responses referred merely to the transcription key to aid in identifying features – such as pause in seconds, or upward or downward intonation as in *who are you calling?* – without further comment as to how they could be seen as characteristic.

An approach often taken was to discuss first the characteristic features of Bailey's utterances and then to discuss features demonstrated in those of her mother. Although this led to some in-depth analysis, the most sophisticated responses combined analytical findings from both interlocutors in order to establish cause and effect in the conversation.

The mother's questioning technique was explored in most responses, although limited responses tended to describe all her questions as 'tag questions' which was not the case. Turn-taking, topic shift and adjacency pairing were analysed clearly in confident responses, as were Bailey's virtuous errors, seen for example in *mine are little*. Less clear were responses which had taken a deficit approach, commenting mainly on features which were expected but absent from the transcription. Conversely, any commentary without analysis which described Bailey as in advance of any expected milestones in acquisition limited itself.

Conceptualisation

There was some effective or insightful commentary which did not reference the child's age as the determiner of her stage of acquisition but which instead analysed her utterances. This approach led to more accurate conclusions. The most effective, or indeed at times insightful, analysis of whether Bailey was in the telegraphic or post-telegraphic stage (or more accurately, emerging from one to the other) referred to linguistic models from Nelson, Crystal, Banduras or Aldridge, perhaps juxtaposed with that of Piaget.

With regard to the Piagetian stages of cognitive development, most responses placed Bailey at the preoperational stage, although there was confusion demonstrated by weaker candidates who indicated

without evidence that she remained at the sensorimotor stage or that she had progressed to the concrete operational stage, again without evidence.

Bailey's mother was seen in the role of Vygotsky's More Knowledgeable Other where she was seen to scaffold Bailey using a series of IRF exchanges. Developed responses also used Bailey's *and potato too* to analyse the extent to which the mother had assisted Bailey to reach a zone of proximal development.

Examples of a range of Hallidayan functions were evident in the transcription, most notably the imaginative function evident in Bailey's extended utterance *he just /peɪɪŋ/ at home and waiting for his mama to come and he daddy (.) his aunt is watching him right now*.

Clear reference was frequently made to Skinner, using 'somebody' to demonstrate Bailey's imitation of an adult making a telephone call and the mother's continuing positive reinforcement, for example in her utterance *oh my (.) that sounds good*. Less clear were long descriptions of Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device, not only because it was occasionally confused with Bruner's Language Acquisition Support System, but mainly because insufficient evidence from the text was used to support the inclusion of that theory.

Data handling

This series, there were commendable attempts to make phonological analysis, some of which were detailed if not insightful. The consonant cluster reduction in Bailey's *he just /peɪɪŋ/* was generally described accurately, although ease with linguistic labelling varied greatly between responses which attempted analysis of *on my /sʌm/*. Limited responses described Bailey's substitution of the unvoiced sibilant /s/ for the unvoiced fricative /θ/ in general terms, usually indicating /θ/ inaccurately as a consonant cluster.

Bailey's utterance *i didnt know how it did it (.) i didnt know how it comed out* offered the opportunity for in-depth analysis of her use of tense. Most responses identified *comed* as a virtuous error, with detailed or insightful responses using *did* in combination to demonstrate Bailey's emerging facility with tense. This particular utterance was also a useful opportunity to analyse her use of negation and contraction, the latter also being seen in *its bunnyhorse*.

Confident responses detailed these data in order to provide effective and sometimes insightful analyses of the ways in which the interlocutors used language to achieve an interactive, cooperative and free-flowing conversation. Further selections of data included: *bunnyhorse says hes got go to eat dinner*, in which Bailey reports speech but omits the particle 'to'; *it big ↗*, in which she omits the copular verb; and the mother's *just a little bigger*, in which she repeats her attempt to demonstrate size comparison with the *er* inflection, which could have been a new or emerging concept for Bailey.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/41 Language Topics
--

Key messages

On 9093 Paper 4, candidates are presented with the opportunity to respond to two compulsory questions on the key language topics, *English in the world* and *Language and the self*, as outlined in the 9093 syllabus, with two sustained, discursive essays. In this series, it was clear that candidates had observed the syllabus requirements which are that examination candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing logically sequenced and cohesive, discursive responses to the stimulus material. Essays were supported with evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory and overall, work was sustained and demonstrated clear control of expression.

In November 2022, careful crafting was seen in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. Therefore, generally responses appeared balanced in the way in which reference to theories and theorists supported the number of specific points made.

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

There was some evidence of the language of the texts having been analysed. This was evident in basic or limited responses to both questions, particularly in **Question 2**. In Paper 4, such an approach is not required and at times in November 2022 it led to part of some responses becoming irrelevant. The requirement is for candidates to provide discursive responses which explore ideas in – and not the language of – the stimulus material and is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093 Paper 3.

General comments

There was evidence of a sound engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Section A**, but less engagement with the specific points presented in the stimulus material, nor the particular focus of the question. Throughout each essay, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. However, in November 2022, it was mainly balanced views that were seen in clear, effective and even insightful responses to both questions. Such responses maintained focus on the texts provided throughout in relation to the particular demands of the questions.

In November 2022, succinct plans were seen which had clearly provided candidates with specific points for discussion in the main body of the response. Occasionally, there were more elaborate plans, which seemed to have taken up too much of the examination time therefore leaving insufficient time for the candidate to complete a full response. Although there were fewer brief responses in November 2022, these will generally limit themselves by lacking in development, even where the points raised are drawn from the texts provided. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins but plans do not need to be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay in any way.

In basic or limited responses there was loss of focus where long paragraphs had been used, usually as an introduction, which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4, even where control of expression was clear and historical, sociological or theoretical discussion was sustained.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In November 2022, the text provided in **Question 1** was an extract from an article posted on *The Conversation* website in 2020. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the varying use of English globally. They were further required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of English in the world.

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated at least a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to specific points made in the text. These included – but were not limited to – prescriptive or descriptive views on varieties of English, the concept of standard Englishes, the extent to which new varieties of English such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) might receive *negative attention*, be *hotly debated* or *denounced as grammatically incorrect*, the contention that new varieties are *not English, but rather the legacy of an English-based creole*, the contribution that new varieties are making through the world, and how research has demonstrated grammatical patterns relating to the varying use of English globally.

Confident responses made a careful selection from these and further examples in the texts to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the ways in which English is used in the world. At times, responses became impassioned in views on the reception of AAVE, particularly taking issue with the quote from the stimulus material indicating that children may have been *mocked and bullied* or that *Few dialects of English have garnered so much negative attention*. This approach led to imbalance of the overall response where a counterargument had not been presented and thus could not have been described as effective or insightful understanding, even where a considerable amount of detail had been provided.

The example of the *northern subject rule* and how *the standard English requirement that subject and verb agree in the third-person singular is actually relatively recent* were frequently explored with clear understanding of the grammatical items being described in the text. Whereas limited responses only discussed the view presented, clear, effective or insightful responses drew succinct comparisons with other historical precedents of other *linguistic features now denounced as grammatically incorrect* such as the concept of double negative.

Furthermore, clear, effective or insightful responses developed these ideas with full discussion of *The problem with ignoring the past*, demonstrating creative thinking around the ways in which the English language is constantly evolving globally.

Writing

Many responses were not structured clearly into logical, fluent sequences of developed ideas, even where the control of expression could otherwise have been described as sophisticated. This lack of structural organisation detracted from the clarity which was required in Assessment Objective 2.

At times, introductions incorporated very short statements appearing as soundbites from language theorists such as Crystal, which were disconnected from points made in the stimulus material. However, a far more meaningful approach had been taken in confident responses which plunged straight into discussion of the main thrust of the text provided. To maintain focus in Paper 4, introductions should be brief and discuss only what is required by the question, enabling the full body of the response to engage with the stimulus material and offer support from relevant theoretical examples. Moreover, conclusions which had merely reiterated arguments which had previously been stated instead of reinforcing ideas which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints were not effective.

In general, an appropriate register was maintained. Detailed or sophisticated crafting was seen in responses which used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside a logically sequenced structural framework of ideas.

Stylistically, the use of rhetorical questioning in an attempt to develop a response is not advised as it can only be successful where questions are followed by the candidate's own ideas. This approach can result in a loss of register and does not add to the discursive quality required as it becomes somewhat journalistic.

Conceptualisation

All responses provided knowledge and understanding of the ways in which the concept of new varieties of English (NVEs), as discussed in the stimulus material, are now present internationally. Clear responses introduced a number of different NVEs into the discussion, which led to relevant development.

Limited responses introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of clear understanding was demonstrated. It was the Kachru model which was most frequently cited in weaker responses, where at times focus was lost on the point it was trying to support in an effort to describe the model in more detail than was relevant.

However, there was some informed discussion including detailed and insightful reference to hybridisation and its linguistic value over time in countries such as Singapore. Detailing included knowledge and understanding of the timeline of progression from contact, dialect levelling, lingua franca, through to creolisation and standardisation. In insightful work, there was reference to Kerswill's notion of Koineisation and his 'The Speech of the Adult Migrant' which was neatly applied to the parallel of growth of AAVE.

Responses which maintained focus on the concept of the various ways in which English is being used in the world made clear to effective reference to theories from Trudgill, Cheshire, Aitchison and Rosewarne. On the other hand, clear but not always detailed reference was made to linguistic concepts, methods and approaches from Crystal, Diamond, or McCrum. However, overall in November 2022, a broad selection of conceptualisation was incorporated into responses by most candidates, their work generally found to be clear if not effective, and at times insightful and sophisticated.

Section B

Question 2

The stimulus material for **Question 2** was an extract from an article published on the *BBC News* website in 2020. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the ways in which language can shape and reflect personal and social identity. Candidates responded with some thoughtful and sustained discussion.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract. These included – but were not limited to – how some schools are urging candidates *to ditch slang words in lessons in order to teach them how to use formal English*, the introduction of *anti-slang posters and stickers, grammar police badges and word jails* in some schools, how and why *slang bans may actually cause more harm than good*, the tension between prescriptivist and descriptivist views that there is *no incorrect or correct way of using language*, that banning slang *may be a threat* to personal and social identity, the concepts of *linguistic impoverishment* and code-switching, and how young people *will police their own language*.

Basic or limited responses focused on examples from the text such as *peng* or *emosh*, or provided examples of their own which were in current use. Clear, effective or insightful responses used the title of the text to open discussion on the validity of the argument. Responses which took issue with the idea that schools were threatening the development of personal and social identity, and which only maintained their defensive standpoint, became imbalanced and did not demonstrate clear understanding of McGovern's counter-argument on functional illiteracy.

Responses were effective or insightful where the argument detailed how and why *under-employment, unemployment or destitution* may develop as a consequence in later years if schoolchildren have not received education which has aimed to progress literacy as fully as possible.

Writing

Some responses limited themselves by working through the ideas presented in the stimulus material in the order in which they appeared in the extract. This approach was not always fruitful as it led at times to some

lack of development. Thus, although this approach led to some clear work with a defined structural framework, a more effective or indeed sophisticated approach was to make a careful selection of specific points from the text and then provide full, balanced and developed discussion on each one.

Candidates should be aware that a full response should contain a series of succinct quotes from the text which neatly illustrate ideas; long quotes, however much they support the discussion, take up examination time unnecessarily. In November 2022, some limited responses sought only to paraphrase the content of the extract without any discussion or development from the candidate. At times also, some responses were based on wider knowledge or the language topic itself, with little or no reference to the stimulus material, which gave rise to some of the content of the response lacking in relevance.

Overall, however, clarity and control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was generally maintained, although – as was the case in **Question 1** – at times, structural organisation became unclear due to lack of paragraphing. Clear, detailed or sophisticated work used low frequency lexis and technical terminology. At times, a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology was seen. Where this was evident, there was an elevated register and enhancement of the linguistic point of view.

Conceptualisation

The concept of slang was overtly provided by the stimulus material. This was discussed in all responses, although levels of detailed understanding varied. As a development, effective responses detailed how slang can also form a cryptolect for use in certain discourse communities, and the ways in which cryptolect can gain covert prestige and privacy. In such responses, Halliday's notion of 'Anti-language' was frequently referenced, as was the emergence of Multicultural London English and its progression to Urban British English.

The ways in which personal and social identity might be gained and developed were effectively scrutinised by referencing theories from Tajfel, Fairclough, Labov, or Milroy and Milroy, with development exploring how the age of interlocutors might influence the reception of language created by certain younger discourse communities. Personal or social pride and esteem also formed part of such discussions.

Discussion on linguistic inclusivity was relevantly supported by reference to Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, although Grice's conversational maxims were not always referenced clearly. Furthermore, although focus on personal and social identity was lost at times, even in clear or detailed responses, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis was referenced frequently and developed by contrast and comparison with Lenneberg, Boas, or Fodor's Language of Thought Hypothesis. Where focus was maintained, there was some insightful discussion on how determinist, reflectionist or relativist views were relevant to ideas contained in the stimulus material. Further theories which might have been appropriate to discussions relating to personal and social identity were the Leaders and Loners study by Fagyal et al., or Eckert's observation of Jocks and Burnouts.

In November 2022, although some limited responses sought only to mention the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been represented in the stimulus material, where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed clearly, effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing with some insightful commentary.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/42 Language Topics
--

Key messages

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

There are 25 marks available in each section indicating that candidates should divide their writing time equally between the two questions. In November 2022, there was evidence that such technique had been employed and responses to the questions were generally sustained, with a clear engagement with the stimulus material.

Careful crafting was seen in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. Therefore, responses appeared balanced in the way in which referenced theories and theorists supported the number of specific points made.

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

There was some evidence of candidates having analysed the language of the texts provided in both questions, particularly in **Question 2**. In Paper 4, such an approach is not required and at times in November 2022 it led to part of some responses becoming irrelevant. The requirement is for candidates to provide discursive responses which explore ideas in, and not the language of, the stimulus material and is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093 Paper 3.

General comments

In November 2022, succinct plans were seen which had clearly provided candidates with specific points for discussion in the main body of the response. Occasionally, more elaborate plans were seen which seemed to have left insufficient time for the candidate to complete a full response. Brief responses will generally limit themselves by lacking in development, even where the points raised are drawn from the texts provided. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins, but plans do not need to be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay.

In some weaker responses, there was evidence that there had been a sound engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Section A**, but there was less engagement with the specific points presented in the stimulus, nor the particular focus of the question. Throughout each response, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. However, balanced views were seen in clear, effective and even insightful responses to both questions which maintained focus on the texts provided in relation to the particular demands of the questions.

Loss of focus was also evident in responses which provided long paragraphs, usually as an introduction, which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4, even where control of expression was clear.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In November 2022, two texts were provided for **Question 1**. Text A was an extract from the article, 'Behemoth, bully, thief: how the English language is taking over the planet', published on the website of the British newspaper *The Guardian* in 2018. Text B was an extract from the article, 'Why Are We So Quiet About Language Death?', published on the news website *Byline Times* in 2020. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the texts relating to the causes and effects of the expansion of English around the world.

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to specific points made in the text. These included – but were not limited to – the power and ubiquity of English, the notion of English being *a golden ticket* as a language of aspiration, the *inauspicious beginnings* of English and its growth internationally, *endangered* languages and the stages of language death, how language death may not be *restricted to the developing world*, the notion that languages might be seen as *the ultimate museums of culture*, and the breadth and depth of knowledge that disappears following language death.

Confident responses made a careful selection from these and further examples in the texts to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the causes and effects of the expansion of English. At times, responses became impassioned in views on language death and the resulting loss of cultures internationally. Although such strong opinions were a result of clear engagement with the stimulus material, they meant that the overall response became imbalanced and could not therefore be described as effective or insightful understanding, even though at times a considerable amount of detail had been provided.

Statistics were provided in Texts A and B which were interpreted well by most candidates who used that evidence to answer the author's question, *So why should we worry about languages dying?* along with effective commentary drawn from local knowledge. There was also clear understanding of *lingua franca* and the difference between native and *official* languages as they are used in the contemporary world.

Text A offered a further opportunity to discuss America's influence on the expansion of English in the world, but that was not always taken up. More frequently, responses explored the writer's view of English being a *parent's dream* in relation to the importance of the English language in international education, with some offering development by providing examples of personal experience.

Writing

Not all responses were structured clearly into logical, fluent sequences of developed ideas. Some weaker responses began with a long introduction about origins of English, together with extended commentary on colonisation. At times, these introductions also incorporated very short statements from language theorists, such as Crystal, which were disconnected from points made in the stimulus material. However, a far more meaningful approach was taken in confident responses which plunged straight into discussion of the main thrust of Texts A and B. Furthermore, weaker responses tended to provide lengthy conclusions which merely reiterated arguments which had previously been stated instead of reinforcing ideas which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints.

In general, an appropriate register was used, although weaker responses lapsed into colloquialism at times; on the other hand, stronger responses used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside a logically sequenced structural framework of ideas.

Stylistically, the approach taken to use rhetorical questioning in an attempt to develop the response is not advised as it can only be successful where questions are followed by the candidate's own ideas, results in loss register and does not add any discursive quality.

There was evidence of large parts of the texts being copied out and being presented as a final response. Candidates should be aware that this approach may result in the response not being creditable, or that it may attract very few marks where there is at least some of the candidates' own work.

Conceptualisation

The concept of language death was provided in the stimulus material and although evidence of the depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding of the concept was present at various levels, all responses provided relevant discussion. This was an opportunity, for example, to make reference to UNESCO's stages from endangerment to extinction and these were discussed effectively in stronger responses.

Text B's *Are we really impoverished if everyone speaks versions of English, Mandarin, Hindi or Spanish?* led to some informed discussion of varieties of English, including detailed and insightful reference to hybridisation and its value in countries such as Singapore. Using that particular example, responses quoted the Speak Good English campaign with some insightful reference to the way in which Singlish may more recently have become celebrated as a hybrid.

Responses which took a balanced view introduced the concept of language revitalisation with examples which included the New Zealand government's efforts to teach Maori in schools, and emerging bilingualism in Wales or Scotland.

Text A's *winner of the haves from the have-nots* enabled discussion of overt linguistic prestige. Although this concept was not always detailed, effective or insightful responses cited Fairclough, Labov or Goffman, which proved useful points of reference.

As in previous series, basic or limited responses introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of clear understanding was demonstrated.

However, overall, a clear but not always detailed variety of linguistic concepts, methods and approaches was discussed. These included reference to Crystal, Diamond's steamroller, McCrum's default position, Philipson's view on language imperialism, Modiano's circles, and the Kachru model. It was the Kachru model which was most frequently cited in weaker responses where at times focus was lost on the point it was trying to support in an effort to describe the model in more detail than was relevant. However, responses which retained focus on using conceptualisation to reinforce points made by referencing a variety of relevant concepts, models and approaches were found to be clear, effective or at times insightful and sophisticated.

Section B

Question 2

In November 2022, the stimulus material for **Question 2** was an extract from an article posted on the *Colorado Public Radio* website in 2019.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made by the extract provided. These included how and why in texting and social media, *punctuation is everything*, how *timing* and the use of emoji might add to nuances in the electronic mode, how *teens might be better at* communication in this way, the extent to which people of different ages might use language differently, the notion that young people are *writing now more than ever before*, the concept of code-switching in terms of levels of formality, and the idea that young people might be *kind of hiding from social life* and if so, how that may affect their personal and social identity.

Basic or limited responses focused on the various ways in which *Ok* could be interpreted, as indicated in the text or sought to explain short forms in popular use, such as 'lol' or 'imho' indicating that this latter example would generally be used only by older people. Clear, effective or insightful responses, however, used the title of the text: *Teens Are not Breaking Language, They're Adding To It* to provide balanced discussion on the ways in which personal or social identity is gained and maintained through use of language in text messaging or through social media.

The idea that language growth is *a participatory contribution* drew interesting discussion, with responses indicating that all discourse communities are valid and enable language to progress, wherever the social

situation may be. Responses were seen to be effective or insightful where the argument detailed how and why *teenagers are driving language change*, although there were some limited responses which had taken a defensive standpoint about the issue of teenagers not knowing how to use *standard language* and young people being viewed as *socially backward*.

Writing

There were some brief responses. Those which were more sustained at times limited themselves by working through the ideas presented in the stimulus material in the order in which they appeared in the extract. This approach was not always fruitful as it led at times to some lack of development. Thus, although this approach led to some clear work with a defined structural framework, a more effective or indeed sophisticated approach was to make a careful selection of specific points from the text and then provide full, developed discussion on each one.

In **Question 2**, as in **Question 1**, there was evidence that some candidates had copied long parts of the stimulus material and presented it as their own work, making the content of the response only minimally creditable. Candidates should be aware that a full response should contain a series of succinct quotes from the text which neatly illustrate ideas; long quotes, however much they support the discussion, take up examination time unnecessarily. Furthermore, basic or limited responses sought only to paraphrase the content of the extract without any discussion or development from the candidate. At times also, some responses were based on wider knowledge of the language topic itself with little or no reference to the stimulus material, which gave rise to some of the content of the response lacking in relevance.

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

Conceptualisation

Tajfel's theory of social identity from 1979 was frequently and relevantly referenced, although levels of detailed understanding varied. Effective referencing was developed in explorations of how the language of different age groups might create in-groups and out-groups, discussing how pride and self-esteem might be generated by covert or overt linguistic prestige. Further effectiveness or insightfulness linked ideas of Tajfel or Fairclough to the findings of Labov in New York or Milroy and Milroy's 'web of ties' in their Belfast study.

Although focus on personal and social identity was lost at times, even in clear or detailed responses, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis was referenced frequently and developed by contrast and comparison with Lenneberg, Boas or Fodor's Language of Thought Hypothesis. Where focus was maintained, there was some insightful discussion on how determinist, reflectionist or relativist views were relevant to ideas contained in the stimulus material. However, in limited responses, there was often a long and unnecessary explanation of the Sapir-Whorf study into the Hopi tribe rather than relevant application to the focus of the question. Candidates should be aware that theoretic citation should only be used where appropriate to the argument in hand.

Further theories which might have been appropriate to discussions relating to the stimulus material were the Leaders and Loners study by Fagyal et al., or Eckert's observation of Jocks and Burnouts. Nonetheless, responses overall presented knowledge and understanding of a wide variety of theoretical methods and approaches which included innatist, nativist and cognitivist models. It was clear that Chomsky, Piaget and Locke were understood to some extent. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics often drew only a soundbite, although there was some deeper understanding of cultural transmission and random fluctuation. Although some limited responses sought only to mention the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been represented in the stimulus material, where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed clearly, effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing with some insightful commentary.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Paper 9093/43 Language Topics
--

Key messages

On 9093 Paper 4, candidates are presented with the opportunity to respond to two compulsory questions on the key language topics, *English in the world* and *Language and the self*, as outlined in the 9093 syllabus, with two sustained, discursive essays. In this series, it was clear that candidates had observed the syllabus requirements which are that examination candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing logically sequenced and cohesive, discursive responses to the stimulus material. Essays were supported with evidence from the text and relevant reference to linguistic theory and overall, work was sustained and demonstrated clear control of expression.

In November 2022, careful crafting was seen in responses which observed the weighting of the assessment objectives: AO1 (understanding) – 10 marks; AO2 (writing) – 5 marks, and AO4 (conceptualisation) – 10 marks. Therefore, generally responses appeared balanced in the way in which reference to theories and theorists supported the number of specific points made.

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

There was some evidence of the language of the texts having been analysed. This was evident in basic or limited responses to both questions, particularly in **Question 2**. In Paper 4, such an approach is not required and at times in November 2022 it led to part of some responses becoming irrelevant. The requirement is for candidates to provide discursive responses which explore ideas in – and not the language of – the stimulus material and is therefore very different from the requirements of 9093 Paper 3.

General comments

There was evidence of a sound engagement with the language topic overall, particularly in **Section A**, but less engagement with the specific points presented in the stimulus material, nor the particular focus of the question. Throughout each essay, focus should be maintained on the question and the context provided; a demonstration of knowledge gained from wider reading is not sufficient to gain marks across all three assessment objectives. However, in November 2022, it was mainly balanced views that were seen in clear, effective and even insightful responses to both questions. Such responses maintained focus on the texts provided throughout in relation to the particular demands of the questions.

In November 2022, succinct plans were seen which had clearly provided candidates with specific points for discussion in the main body of the response. Occasionally, there were more elaborate plans, which seemed to have taken up too much of the examination time therefore leaving insufficient time for the candidate to complete a full response. Although there were fewer brief responses in November 2022, these will generally limit themselves by lacking in development, even where the points raised are drawn from the texts provided. It is always wise to sketch an outline of ideas before the essay writing begins but plans do not need to be so elaborate that they diminish the full essay in any way.

In basic or limited responses there was loss of focus where long paragraphs had been used, usually as an introduction, which demonstrated knowledge and understanding of historical or sociological events which were not tied into the context provided. Conversely, some responses made no reference to theoretical examples at all. Both of these approaches led to loss of marks either in AO1 or AO4, even where control of expression was clear and historical, sociological or theoretical discussion was sustained.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In November 2022, the text provided in **Question 1** was an extract from an article posted on *The Conversation* website in 2020. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the varying use of English globally. They were further required to refer to specific details from the text as well as to ideas and examples from their wider study of English in the world.

Understanding

Most responses to this question demonstrated at least a clear understanding of the linguistic issues put forward in the article, making clear reference to specific points made in the text. These included – but were not limited to – prescriptive or descriptive views on varieties of English, the concept of standard Englishes, the extent to which new varieties of English such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) might receive *negative attention*, be *hotly debated* or *denounced as grammatically incorrect*, the contention that new varieties are *not English, but rather the legacy of an English-based creole*, the contribution that new varieties are making through the world, and how research has demonstrated grammatical patterns relating to the varying use of English globally.

Confident responses made a careful selection from these and further examples in the texts to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the ways in which English is used in the world. At times, responses became impassioned in views on the reception of AAVE, particularly taking issue with the quote from the stimulus material indicating that children may have been *mocked and bullied* or that *Few dialects of English have garnered so much negative attention*. This approach led to imbalance of the overall response where a counterargument had not been presented and thus could not have been described as effective or insightful understanding, even where a considerable amount of detail had been provided.

The example of the *northern subject rule* and how *the standard English requirement that subject and verb agree in the third-person singular is actually relatively recent* were frequently explored with clear understanding of the grammatical items being described in the text. Whereas limited responses only discussed the view presented, clear, effective or insightful responses drew succinct comparisons with other historical precedents of other *linguistic features now denounced as grammatically incorrect* such as the concept of double negative.

Furthermore, clear, effective or insightful responses developed these ideas with full discussion of *The problem with ignoring the past*, demonstrating creative thinking around the ways in which the English language is constantly evolving globally.

Writing

Many responses were not structured clearly into logical, fluent sequences of developed ideas, even where the control of expression could otherwise have been described as sophisticated. This lack of structural organisation detracted from the clarity which was required in Assessment Objective 2.

At times, introductions incorporated very short statements appearing as soundbites from language theorists such as Crystal, which were disconnected from points made in the stimulus material. However, a far more meaningful approach had been taken in confident responses which plunged straight into discussion of the main thrust of the text provided. To maintain focus in Paper 4, introductions should be brief and discuss only what is required by the question, enabling the full body of the response to engage with the stimulus material and offer support from relevant theoretical examples. Moreover, conclusions which had merely reiterated arguments which had previously been stated instead of reinforcing ideas which confirmed strong linguistic standpoints were not effective.

In general, an appropriate register was maintained. Detailed or sophisticated crafting was seen in responses which used low frequency lexis, appropriate discourse markers and relevant linguistic terminology inside a logically sequenced structural framework of ideas.

Stylistically, the use of rhetorical questioning in an attempt to develop a response is not advised as it can only be successful where questions are followed by the candidate's own ideas. This approach can result in a loss of register and does not add to the discursive quality required as it becomes somewhat journalistic.

Conceptualisation

All responses provided knowledge and understanding of the ways in which the concept of new varieties of English (NVEs), as discussed in the stimulus material, are now present internationally. Clear responses introduced a number of different NVEs into the discussion, which led to relevant development.

Limited responses introduced linguistic concepts and approaches with, 'Some theorists believe ...' without acknowledging the source of their wider reading. Although this went some way to opening theoretical or conceptual discussion, lack of clear understanding was demonstrated. It was the Kachru model which was most frequently cited in weaker responses, where at times focus was lost on the point it was trying to support in an effort to describe the model in more detail than was relevant.

However, there was some informed discussion including detailed and insightful reference to hybridisation and its linguistic value over time in countries such as Singapore. Detailing included knowledge and understanding of the timeline of progression from contact, dialect levelling, lingua franca, through to creolisation and standardisation. In insightful work, there was reference to Kerswill's notion of Koineisation and his 'The Speech of the Adult Migrant' which was neatly applied to the parallel of growth of AAVE.

Responses which maintained focus on the concept of the various ways in which English is being used in the world made clear to effective reference to theories from Trudgill, Cheshire, Aitchison and Rosewarne. On the other hand, clear but not always detailed reference was made to linguistic concepts, methods and approaches from Crystal, Diamond, or McCrum. However, overall in November 2022, a broad selection of conceptualisation was incorporated into responses by most candidates, their work generally found to be clear if not effective, and at times insightful and sophisticated.

Section B

Question 2

The stimulus material for **Question 2** was an extract from an article published on the *BBC News* website in 2020. Candidates were required to discuss what they felt were the most important issues raised in the text relating to the ways in which language can shape and reflect personal and social identity. Candidates responded with some thoughtful and sustained discussion.

Understanding

Overall, responses demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the specific points made in the extract. These included – but were not limited to – how some schools are urging candidates *to ditch slang words in lessons in order to teach them how to use formal English*, the introduction of *anti-slang posters and stickers, grammar police badges and word jails* in some schools, how and why *slang bans may actually cause more harm than good*, the tension between prescriptivist and descriptivist views that there is *no incorrect or correct way of using language*, that banning slang *may be a threat* to personal and social identity, the concepts of *linguistic impoverishment* and code-switching, and how young people *will police their own language*.

Basic or limited responses focused on examples from the text such as *peng* or *emosh*, or provided examples of their own which were in current use. Clear, effective or insightful responses used the title of the text to open discussion on the validity of the argument. Responses which took issue with the idea that schools were threatening the development of personal and social identity, and which only maintained their defensive standpoint, became imbalanced and did not demonstrate clear understanding of McGovern's counter-argument on functional illiteracy.

Responses were effective or insightful where the argument detailed how and why *under-employment, unemployment or destitution* may develop as a consequence in later years if schoolchildren have not received education which has aimed to progress literacy as fully as possible.

Writing

Some responses limited themselves by working through the ideas presented in the stimulus material in the order in which they appeared in the extract. This approach was not always fruitful as it led at times to some

lack of development. Thus, although this approach led to some clear work with a defined structural framework, a more effective or indeed sophisticated approach was to make a careful selection of specific points from the text and then provide full, balanced and developed discussion on each one.

Candidates should be aware that a full response should contain a series of succinct quotes from the text which neatly illustrate ideas; long quotes, however much they support the discussion, take up examination time unnecessarily. In November 2022, some limited responses sought only to paraphrase the content of the extract without any discussion or development from the candidate. At times also, some responses were based on wider knowledge or the language topic itself, with little or no reference to the stimulus material, which gave rise to some of the content of the response lacking in relevance.

Overall, however, clarity and control of expression was clear or effective and an appropriate register was generally maintained, although – as was the case in **Question 1** – at times, structural organisation became unclear due to lack of paragraphing. Clear, detailed or sophisticated work used low frequency lexis and technical terminology. At times, a sophisticated level of linguistic terminology was seen. Where this was evident, there was an elevated register and enhancement of the linguistic point of view.

Conceptualisation

The concept of slang was overtly provided by the stimulus material. This was discussed in all responses, although levels of detailed understanding varied. As a development, effective responses detailed how slang can also form a cryptolect for use in certain discourse communities, and the ways in which cryptolect can gain covert prestige and privacy. In such responses, Halliday's notion of 'Anti-language' was frequently referenced, as was the emergence of Multicultural London English and its progression to Urban British English.

The ways in which personal and social identity might be gained and developed were effectively scrutinised by referencing theories from Tajfel, Fairclough, Labov, or Milroy and Milroy, with development exploring how the age of interlocutors might influence the reception of language created by certain younger discourse communities. Personal or social pride and esteem also formed part of such discussions.

Discussion on linguistic inclusivity was relevantly supported by reference to Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory, although Grice's conversational maxims were not always referenced clearly. Furthermore, although focus on personal and social identity was lost at times, even in clear or detailed responses, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis was referenced frequently and developed by contrast and comparison with Lenneberg, Boas, or Fodor's Language of Thought Hypothesis. Where focus was maintained, there was some insightful discussion on how determinist, reflectionist or relativist views were relevant to ideas contained in the stimulus material. Further theories which might have been appropriate to discussions relating to personal and social identity were the Leaders and Loners study by Fagyal et al., or Eckert's observation of Jocks and Burnouts.

In November 2022, although some limited responses sought only to mention the names of theorists without demonstration of the relevance of their work or how it might have been represented in the stimulus material, where linguistic issues, concepts and theoretical approaches were discussed clearly, effective referencing led to sustained and cohesive discursive essay-writing with some insightful commentary.