



GCSE English Language

8700/2

Report on the Examination

June 2025

Version: 1.0

Contents

The below table is interactive. You can press the control button click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Contents	Page
Summary	3
Assessment objectives	5
Further support	15

Summary

Overall performance compared to last year

The overall performance of students saw further improvements across the Reading and Writing sections of the paper. Overall, the mean mark rose from 36.6 in June 2024 to 40.5 in June 2025 which is a significant improvement in performance across the assessment as a whole. The mean marks for the Reading section rose in most cases, which suggests an increased confidence amongst students as they approach the assessment and indicates that a more secure foundation of skills has been established. The mean marks for Writing have also increased for both AO5 and AO6, representing progress in this area.

This confirms the value of documents such as this to provide insight and detailed feedback, offering a focus for centres as they prepare students for assessment in 2026.

Question paper and source texts

The source texts used in this series focused on the natural world and the lives and habitats of some of our native British wildlife. Whilst Source B depicted a very traditional Victorian, romanticised view of a pastoral idyll, Source A portrayed an unexpected view of the peregrine falcon and its recent colonisation of our city centres. Thus, the two sources neatly played into the experiences of students from both rural and urban backgrounds, ensuring they were familiar with at least one of the natural environments explored in the texts.

In 'The Accidental Countryside', Stephen Moss provides an account of the recent history of the peregrine falcon, detailing its near demise in the years following the second world war and its need to migrate north to rockier, harder climes to find the habitat it required to flourish. He describes in detail how the arrival of the peregrine in the city of London represents an extraordinary comeback for a bird of prey, and characterises the resilience of nature in the face of human intervention. He draws on ideas about environmental change, human interaction and the interconnectedness of nature as a whole. In contrast, Richard Jefferies offers a far more traditional view of the English countryside amid scenes of bucolic joy and happiness. The brook, the meadow, the hedgerow and the orchard are all portrayed as havens for wildlife in a vision which appears to a modern reader as nostalgic and romanticised in tone. However, students responded with some enthusiasm to the idealised vision of nature and were often able to identify connections between the texts such as the environment prior to the changes of the Industrial Revolution; for example, of human interference, but also of the potential for harmony and inter-dependence between species. Both texts succeeded in engaging students and offering a richness of interpretation to support their responses.

The questions and text extracts represented a high level of familiarity for students, being very much in line with the tasks and source material selected for previous series. There were no surprises in the wording or phrasing of the questions which followed a similar pattern in addressing the same Assessment Objectives across the paper. The source material was accessible to students of all ability levels, although there were some occasional

misinterpretations, as is inevitable with a very large, mixed cohort. In Source A, a number of students misread the description of the peregrine as living 'in this neck of the woods' seeing a literal rather than idiomatic meaning to the phrase. Others struggled with some of the more specific references to nature in Source B, uncertain as to whether the brook was a person called Brook or whether the nettle-creeper, hawthorn and thrush were plants or birds. These quite specific misunderstandings did not detract from the general understanding of the texts as a whole.

Assessment objectives

AO	Common student errors
AO1 Identify and interpret explicit and implicit information and ideas. Select and synthesise evidence from different texts.	Focusing on the birds rather than their habitat and not explaining what they understood about their habitats
AO2 Explain, comment on, and analyse how writers use language and structure to achieve effects and influence readers, using relevant subject terminology to support their views.	Selecting examples of language use which include vocabulary they are unfamiliar with
AO3 Compare writers' ideas and perspectives, as well as how these are conveyed, across two or more texts.	Comparing the two writers' perspectives and omitting to comment on the methods they use to convey their views
AO5 Communicate clearly, effectively, and imaginatively, selecting and adapting tone, style and register for different forms, purposes, and audiences. Organise information and ideas, using structural and grammatical features to support coherence and cohesion of texts.	Focus was often distracted away from the topic to discuss other issues/themes rather than green spaces in school
AO6 Students must use a range of vocabulary and sentence structures for clarity, purpose, and effect, with accurate spelling and punctuation.	Punctuation often used in a way which suggests a checklist rather than meaningful deployment

Question 1

Q1 provides an accessible start to the assessment and offers students a confidence-building approach to the tasks which follow. The narrow focus on the first ten lines of Source A gives even the weakest students an opportunity for a successful start. Students found the task relatively very straightforward this series and the mean mark for Q1 was 3.6 marks. This is a small increase in the mean in June 2025 with 93% of students scoring either three or four marks, which indicates a high level of understanding.

There was a combination of explicit information and implicit ideas in the designated section of text in Source A which was based on the peregrine falcon's existence in the centre of London. The writer uses some figurative language in their evocation of the city, and this resulted in some cases to students misunderstanding the meaning, and consequently selecting the incorrect statement. Whilst this type of language can be challenging for some students, Q1 is still a reading assessment, and it is important to ensure that distinctions are made at the top

of the ability level as well as lower down.

Common strengths in responses

The students who scored full marks were able to identify the information accurately; made effective inferences regarding the narrator's experience and were able to track the information in the eight statements chronologically through the given extract. They were able to interpret the idiomatic or figurative phrasing the writer uses and demonstrate their understanding accordingly. This was an appropriate test of reading comprehension which successfully discriminated between students.

Common misunderstandings

The most frequently selected 'incorrect' choice was Statement C where students misunderstood the reference to the birds living 'in this neck of the woods' and selected in error – 'All peregrine falcons live in the woods'. Other students misunderstood that the 'heart of London' meant the centre of the city, an impression compounded perhaps by the reference to the 'corner of the city' suggesting that Tate Modern wasn't in the centre. This led some students to select Statement D in error – 'Tate Modern is on the edge of London'. The third significant error arose when students misunderstood the final sentence of the given lines: 'With a flick of his wings the falcon is gone' and thus failed to select Statement 8 as correct – 'The peregrine falcon rises quickly and easily from its perch'. As an assessment of English Language reading skills, it is important to understand the connotations of a word such as 'flick' and of idiomatic phrases such as 'the heart of' making this task a valid discriminator of reading skill.

Students should be encouraged to read through all the statements before selecting any as true and then read the short passage again. The statements are in chronological order and should be read through and matched against the text extract in order before selecting any of them. The lines indicated are very short and should therefore not take much time to re-read. After the four statements have been selected as 'true,' they should be read again to check that they are correct.

Question 2

The question focused on the habitats where the birds in both texts lived and the differences between them. Students were asked to select relevant details from each text related to these places, interpret this information and infer meaning from these ideas. In addition, they were expected to synthesise the ideas and information, interpreting the differences (and any similarities) between the texts.

The focus for Q2 is designed to avoid overlap with the focus for Q4. The focus on the birds' habitats provided the opportunity to write about the places rather than the writers' perspectives. Students were invited to comment on whether the habitat was natural or constructed by humans; whether it was in a rural or an urban environment; whether the habitat was open or concealed and what features each habitat offered by way of resources. It was pleasing to see how many students responded to this question in an appropriate way which focused on the habitats rather than the writers' attitudes towards those places.

There was plenty of relevant material to draw on regarding the different habitats. In Source A, the habitat was urban, constructed by humans, characterised by huge skyscrapers and other architectural monuments, inhabited by large numbers of people, most of whom were unaware of the birds living amongst them and in an atmosphere of constant activity, noise, pollution, and busyness. By contrast, the habitat in Source B was peaceful, quiet, uninterrupted by humans other than a few local people, isolated from civilisation, characterised by numerous species of birds, animals and plants, creating a mellow atmosphere of tranquil harmony. These ideas provided a rich pool of material for students to synthesise and interpret.

Performance on this question was very similar to performance in 2023 and 2024, with a mean mark of 3.5. This means that the average student was able to make some attempt to infer and identify some differences, indicating achievement at the top of Level 2. A similar number of students were awarded L4 as in 2024, with just under 3% of students awarded marks in the highest level. This is the lowest proportion of Level 4 marks on any question and may be due to the demands of this question so early on in the paper and demanding a knowledge of both texts in full. It remains an area where students could make significant gains given appropriate targeted support.

Common strengths in responses

The best responses were those where students focused very clearly on the places described in the two texts. To achieve Level 3, students were able to identify 'like for like' differences in the habitats – the level of threat from predators for example – and to interpret from this that whereas the city was a safe place for the peregrine to live, with no natural predators to threaten them and kindly humans to protect them, the smaller birds in Source B were far more vulnerable and had to take precautions to ensure their nests and eggs were kept safe from potential predators.

To achieve the highest level, students need firstly to be clear in their interpretations and then to provide additional detail about their ideas and extend their understanding to include concepts such as the level of human intervention in the birds' habitat, with humans taking on the role of scrutinising the peregrines' nests every hour of the day, suggesting an obsessive need to protect and preserve a species humans had previously been happy to shoot or poison into extinction and demonstrating a stark change in public attitudes. This is in contrast to the birds in Source B who enjoy a habitat far more distant in history when humans and nature were more in tune and lived in happy co-existence - humans, plants and birds all relying equally on the life-giving source of water they shared without the need for humans to deliberately intervene in the lives of the birds or animals – a perfect vision of diversity thriving in a natural ecosystem.

Common misunderstandings

The weaker responses were often characterised by a lack of development in their answers. Students were able to identify, for example, that the city was busy and the countryside was peaceful, but were unable to interpret from that what it meant for the individual birds or

creatures living in those habitats. As such, these 'attempts to infer' were judged to be incomplete and unexplained, rewarded at Level 2. To move beyond Level 2, students needed to explain how the tranquillity of the brookside habitat indicated a harmonious relationship between the different species, where birds and plants live alongside each other in peace or that the busyness of the city indicates that the falcons have been forced to adapt to the constant noise and bustle of people below. It is the development of their understanding which is rewarded at Level 3 as a 'clear' inference.

Many students simply paraphrased the information given in the texts, recounting the history of the falcon, for example, or the proximity of the meadow to the banks of the brook. Paraphrase offers nothing in addition to the information provided in the text; it is explicit understanding and is therefore rewarded at the lowest level (Level 1). To move beyond Level 1, students should begin to offer their own understanding of the text, using words such as 'because...but...so' to help them extend their thinking about the ideas and information they have encountered. The falcon lives in the roof of the skyscraper indeed, but he does so 'because' he needs to watch out for prey, or to protect his nest, or to show he's in control, or to build up speed as he dives to catch pigeons. There are numerous possible inferences to make if students can begin to offer some inferential understanding.

Question 3

The task in Q3 was to identify interesting uses of language and comment on the effects they create in relation to the focus of the question which was the description of the peregrine falcon attacking the unfortunate pigeon. The selected passage in Source A provided a wealth of linguistic devices and evocative vocabulary for students to comment on. Students tended to use the same few examples of language use: in this series, students often chose to comment on the similes comparing the peregrine to a 'guided missile'; comparing his talons to 'switchblades' and comparing the crunching bones of the pigeon to the 'crack of a rodeo whip.' Even though nearly 600,000 students chose these language devices to write about, each individual student was encountering the imagery and exploring the effects for themselves in an entirely fresh way and was rewarded accordingly.

Performance on this question was very similar to June 2024 with a mean mark of 6. There was also a similar number of Level 4 responses (over 7%), which continues an encouraging trend. This is likely to be the consequence of a well-judged selection of linguistic features as well as the nature of the devices found in the text. The image of the missile, for example, opened up a semantic field of warfare, which was often explored further by students, picking up on words such as 'switchblade' 'explosive' 'target' etc to confirm the visual comparison being made by the writer's choice of language.

Common strengths in responses

In Level 3, students were typically able to explain that the 'missile' suggested the falcon was aerodynamic in shape and/or destructive in purpose. They were able to highlight and explore the connections between the two images included in the simile – the missile on one hand and the peregrine on the other and to explain the common elements: their shape, their size, their

speed, their purpose, their effectiveness etc. Thinking carefully about what the two images have in common is key to elucidating the effects of the image chosen.

The very best responses extended their analysis of the 'missile' exploring the connotations of 'guided' to suggest the bird was programmed to destroy, as if at the behest of a greater power. It was this suggestion of power which dominated many of the top-level responses, as some students explored the repetition of 'higher and higher' to indicate a superior being and emphasise the omnipotence of the peregrine in deciding which pigeon lives or dies. Other responses rewarded in Level 4 focused on the use of 'powers' as a verb in the opening sentence of the given lines, exploring how this action emphasises the dominance and authority of the falcon over the fundamental elements such as the air itself, the soft, gentle onomatopoeia in 'ruffle' highlighting how little impact the wind has on him as he flies.

Common misunderstandings

Some students picked out the image of the missile, the talons or the rodeo whip and were able to identify that these suggested the violence of the peregrine or how dangerous it was. Where students have demonstrated some understanding of the language such as this, they are rewarded with marks in Level 2 for an 'attempt to comment on effect'. It is not enough to identify the effect without explaining how the language works to create that effect. It is the 'how' and 'why' which move students from Level 2 to Level 3. **Why** has the writer chosen to compare the falcon to a missile and not a cannon or a firework? **How** does the image of a missile help us to visualise the falcon moving through the sky? This was particularly evident in comments on the 'rodeo whip' and the 'switchblades' in that few students appeared confident in exploring the connotations. Whilst some were able to comment on a whip being 'fast' there was limited explanation of how that described the grabbing of the pigeon. Likewise, some students at Level 2 could identify the 'switchblades' as being 'sharp' or 'cruel' but few explained that this particular knife flicks open suddenly to surprise the victim with an unexpected blade, just as the bird's talons extrude on impact to attack the pigeon.

Only 10% of students were awarded marks in Level 1 and 50% of students were awarded marks in Level 3 and Level 4 which continues the improvements seen in June 24 and suggests that messages continue to be heard by students and teachers about focusing on the effects of language rather than depending on feature spotting.

Question 4

The task in Q4 was to compare the writers' feelings and perspectives on their attitudes towards nature, allowing students to consider the text extracts as a whole. The task required students to engage with Moss' and Jefferies' individual points of view and the methods they use to convey their perspectives, as well as to compare the similarities and differences between their points of view across the two extracts. There was certainly no shortage of points of contrast between the two with students at all levels able to access the comparative nature of this task. Performance was very similar to June 2024 with a mean mark of 6.8 and just under 6% achieving marks in Level 4.

The focus on similarities in the task should not have come as a surprise to students or centres as it has always been made clear since the start of the specification that either similarities or differences could be the focus of the task. Indeed, similarities has been used as a focus in both Q2 and Q4 on numerous occasions since 2017. Furthermore, it has been made clear in reports such as these, and in feedback sessions for centres, that similarities and differences are rewarded equally by examiners as they both demonstrate the same skill of comparison. As in previous series, the texts lent themselves to a discussion of both similarities and differences which meant that students were able to explore both freely and that was certainly the impression of examiners – students offered comparative comments which addressed a diverse range of connections between them.

There were many different perspectives on nature for students to identify and comment on: Moss demonstrated an awe and respect for nature through his description of the peregrine and an incredulity about the adaptability and resilience of the species to thrive in the heart of cities rather than their natural habitat. He explores the impact of human carelessness and cruelty in decimating populations of these birds in the past and nods to future demands and tensions in the relationship between humans and nature. Similarly, Jefferies demonstrates a sense of awe and wonder in the timelessness and interconnectivity of the brook and the rural ecosystem he describes so nostalgically, from his youth, we assume. He also acknowledges the idea of nature's independence from human interference, celebrating the fact that the apple tree blossoms for its own sake and not for the admiration of mere humans.

Common strengths in responses

Students at level 3 were able to comment on the admiration Moss felt for the peregrine and explain how this was shown through the language he uses to describe the bird as an 'emperor' for example, and compare this to the admiration Jefferies similarly felt for nature's diversity and co-existence, using the image of 'life-giving' brook to suggest that nature's resources are provided and shared by all. This 'like for like' comparison based on their admiration for nature's power and provision meets the criteria for Level 3 comparison as the same aspect in both sources is identified – their admiration. Students demonstrating all three key skills for this question – understanding, methods and comparison - were likely to be in the upper half of the level.

The very best responses in Level 4 were able to offer a more subtle or more developed response, with some students, for example, pursuing a comparison between the levels of human interaction. The peregrines in Source A were dependent on the protection of volunteers to scrutinise their nests 24 hours a day, suggesting a sad indictment of popular attitudes where birds of prey are at risk from those intent on stealing their eggs; whereas the apple tree in Source B is viewed by the writer as eschewing the admiration or protection of humans and needing nothing other than light and water to display its glory, for no benefit other than the swallows who fly above. Students at Level 4 were characterised by their understanding of the more philosophical musings of the writer regarding the final words – 'we bring the thought to the tree' which provided a useful discriminator for examiners at the upper end of the ability range.

Common misunderstandings

Some students working at a lower level identified the writers' perspectives, such as respecting nature or finding it beautiful, but did not provide an explanation to substantiate and secure their understanding. How do we know that Moss respects nature? How do we know that Jefferies finds the meadow beautiful? An appropriate quotation helps to illustrate the point, but students need to demonstrate their own understanding to move from Level 2 to Level 3. An examiner wants to see that a student is able to explain that when Moss describes the peregrine as an 'emperor' the simile demonstrates how superior he feels the bird to be. Too many students were able to provide the partial understanding of identifying his respect for nature but did not follow through with an explanation.

Weaker responses tended to show some comparison of the two perspectives but again lacked the clarity of explanation to secure a Level 3 mark. Their comparisons were more likely to be mismatched, comparing one aspect of one source with a different aspect of the other, such as an admiration for the beauty of nature in one source with a sympathy for the fate of the pigeon in the other. To be awarded at Level 3, students are required to make 'like for like' comparisons, comparing the similar ways in which Moss and Jefferies address the concept of human interaction with other species for example. It can be helpful for a student to begin a paragraph with the overarching comparison to ensure they are comparing 'like for like' before going on to explain how this is shown in each of the two texts.

There were still too many students who failed to incorporate some mention of methods in their answers to Q4. Central to this task is the expectation that students will write about how the writers convey their perspectives and feelings. If this key skill is not addressed, examiners can only award marks in the lower half of the level, which has a clear impact on the overall mark. This was most frequently reported in students working at Level 2 but also affected some students in Level 3. There was a wide range of methods for students to comment on beyond the inevitable list of language devices. Students could write about the use of first person narrative and the positioning of the narrator within the text; about the literary style they both adopt to express their love for nature; the switch in verb tense between past and present to provide a flashback in both texts; and of course the tone, which in both cases was in awe, but perhaps more nostalgic in Source B and more factual in Source A.

Question 5

The task in Q5 invited students to consider the proposal for schools and colleges to provide green spaces for students and staff to connect with the natural world for the benefit of their health and wellbeing. The question offered universal appeal with its focus on school or college and its audience as the school or college website. It was a familiar topic with students clearly confident and comfortable with the purpose, the audience and the content of this task. There were very few instances of any misunderstanding.

Students had plenty to say about the topic but in many cases developed their argument in an additional direction based on the main premise of the statement. Students tended to focus on three other main themes – mental health, climate change or social media. These were not unrelated to the idea of nature as the source of wellbeing, and most students were able to

weave their thoughts about these other topics into their main argument, with greater or lesser success depending on their skill and ability.

Many students chose to focus on the phrase 'health and wellbeing' and wrote about the rise in mental health difficulties with numerous accounts of the pressure of exams and the constraints of prison-like schools on the sanity of young people. Others took off in a different direction and explored the risks of environmental damage across the globe and argued how a green space in school could educate young people about the need to protect our planet and teach them the beauty of nature for themselves. A third group of students adopted an argument based on technology and wrote at length about social media, and screentime in general, as an evil distraction prohibiting students from pursuing more natural interests in the outside world. It was felt by many examiners that students were helped in constructing their arguments by work they had completed in preparation for the exam on these other topics which served as relevant material to bolster their ideas about outdoor spaces in school.

Examiners commented widely on the unnecessary length of some of the responses to Q5, with articles of five, six, and even seven or eight sides long reported. It is evident that the student often achieves their optimum performance by the end of the second or third side of writing. Continuing to write at greater length poses serious challenges in maintaining the tone, style and quality of writing and takes time which could far more usefully be spent crafting and editing a shorter piece of writing. Writing to a specific length/brief is a skill required in work but also in further and higher education. Writing without any constraint on length risks producing rambling and incoherent arguments. Centres would be well-advised to focus students on writing briefer and more crafted responses, with even some practise of writing to a specific word count recommended.

Of continued concern is the use of prepared lists of vocabulary in the students' responses. Centres may recognise that this is a point made previously in this report but as it continues to be a significant problem, it bears repetition. Words such as 'pulchritudinous, heinous, indignant, paradoxical' etc are unlikely to match the audience or the style and tone of the rest of the writing as they suggest a far more formal or literary register. As such, ironically, the use of this vocabulary brings down the quality of the writing rather than enhancing it and students are more likely to receive a mark in Level 2 or Level 3 at the highest, depending on the other qualities demonstrated.

Performance, in terms of the mean mark, saw marginal increases since 2024 for both AO5 or AO6. The mean mark for AO5 was at the top of Level 2 (12 marks) whilst the mean mark for Technical Accuracy (AO6) was also high in Level 2 (8.3 marks). Almost half of students (47% and 49% for AO5 and AO6 respectively) were awarded marks in Level 3 and Level 4 for writing which confirms the experience of examiners who report seeing many examples of clearly expressed arguments.

Common strengths

The best responses were those where the student presented a coherent response to the statement which took a general view on nature as a source of wellbeing and then drilled down to explore the implications of that perspective using a range of specific examples to illustrate and develop their points. Students at Level 3 were able to provide clear connected ideas

related to the proposal to create outdoor spaces in schools and colleges and were able to offer defined ideas about how this could be managed, such as with the addition of a butterfly courtyard, for spiritual enlightenment; an outdoor classroom with tented walls and ceiling for inclement weather or even a small petting zoo to encourage students to take responsibility for the care of animals. It is specific examples such as these which provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate the development of their ideas.

The highest performing students were often able to develop an original voice in presenting their argument and adopt a specific tone or approach which was either convincing or compelling, or both. These arguments were often developed beyond clear (Level 3) to become more complex (Level 4). Arguments in these cases were often educational, political, philosophical or psychological and were often build on a foundation which included the environment, mental health or technology. A typical point of view would be where a student argued that the irresistible characteristics of social media, created by powerful tech companies, had deliberately caused a generation of post-covid students to become addicted to the company of their mobile phones to the exclusion of their familiarity with the world outside their bedrooms and to the huge detriment of their relationship with the natural world. It is the diverse strands of this argument which create the complexity which examiners are looking to reward at Level 4.

Technically, successful students were reportedly using a wide variety of punctuation to support more complex grammatical structures and shaping sentences created specifically for effect. Technical skills were deployed deliberately to create effects and to enhance the content of their arguments. Vocabulary at Levels 3 and 4 was increasingly sophisticated or ambitious, used precisely and accurately, and in keeping with the tone and style of their response.

Common misunderstandings

There were weaker responses which failed to meet the criteria for Level 2, often characterised by a lack of focus or a paucity of ideas. These responses tended to be very simple in their approach and offered a limited variety of ideas about nature's benefits, often resorting to simple assertions that it's good for you. Responses at Level 1 typically lacked any structural features, such as paragraphs, to organise their ideas about how schools should incorporate these outdoor spaces, with a limited and pedestrian vocabulary characterised by familiar, everyday words.

At Level 2, many students limited themselves to writing in very general terms about the importance of nature for our wellbeing and indulging in unrealistic fantasies about which animals they could have roaming around school as 'comfort animals.' It was not uncommon to see hamsters and guinea pigs proposed as part of a petting zoo on the school grounds, but there were also examples of dogs, cats, monkeys and even zebras being mooted on the school site.

More concerning is the continued dependence at this level on spurious statistics. Much has been said previously about the inadequacy of these statistics as rhetorical devices and they continue to disappoint whenever they arise. It is simply not helpful or plausible to tell the reader that spending 15 minutes 'in nature' results in a 56% increase in productivity or that

students who spend their lunch break listening to birds chirping get 25% higher grades than those cloistered in classrooms. Statistics detract from the argument and very rarely enhance the student's own point of view. On the other hand, expert opinions seemed to be used more effectively in this context, with professors of psychology sounding more credible when they recommended spending time in nature as a treatment for depression or anxiety. Students need to be warned that systematic use of rhetorical devices (DAFOREST) is unhelpful unless deployed sparsely and with care.

In terms of technical accuracy, many weaker, longer responses demonstrated a lack of variety in the sentence structures attempted, and a subsequent absence of a range of punctuation. Lack of control of agreement was frequently evident in these responses as students struggled to maintain secure syntax over a number of pages. Again, writing at length risks the possibility of students increasing the number of errors they make. A shorter, more carefully crafted and accurately proofread response encourages students to think more precisely about how to deploy their technical armoury and ensure that they have demonstrated the widest possible range of sentence forms, for example, or punctuation marks. It is incontrovertible that shorter, more considered, more concise responses lead to more reliable, more accurate writing and thus will secure higher marks.

Further support

Mark ranges and award of grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [results statistics](#) page of our website.

Enhanced Results Analysis (ERA)

Use our exam results analysis tool to create and customise as many different reports for comparison as you like.

Professional development

Attend one of our feedback [courses](#) where you can review example responses from students and commentaries from our examiners. This does not apply to this component.

Contact us

Our friendly team will be happy to support you between 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 0161 957 7504

Email (GCSE): english-gcse@aqa.org.uk

Email (AS and A-level): english-gce@aqa.org.uk