



GCSE

English Language

8700/2

Report on the Examination

June 2024

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	4
Individual questions	5
Further support	14

Summary

Overall performance compared to last year

The overall performance of students saw modest increases across the Reading questions and established a consistent standard of achievement in the Writing task. Overall, the mean mark increased in comparison to June 2023 which signified improvement in performance across the assessment as a whole. The mean mark for all Section A tasks (with the exception of Question 1) improved, indicating a continued incremental rise in mean marks since the disruption of 2020 and 2021. This demonstrates an increased confidence amongst students as they approach the assessment and suggests that a more secure foundation of skills has been established. The mean marks for Writing have remained stable and represent continuity rather than progress in this area, which might indicate a focus for centres as they prepare students for assessment in 2025.

Question paper and source texts

The source texts used in this series focused on the world of medicine and the experience of two medical practitioners. Whilst students were unlikely to have direct experience of working in a hospital, most would have had some interaction with a doctor or nurse and therefore this represented a fairly universal experience for this cohort.

Adam Kay's autobiographical account of his journey from student to junior doctor was immediately appealing to students as they followed the trajectory of his career from college and university admissions through to the first shifts on the hospital ward. They responded with enthusiasm to his glee and delight in qualifying; engaged closely with the anticlimax and disappointment as the reality of his experience appeared to see his dreams shattered in a nightmare scenario on the night shift, but ultimately empathised with his confident self-assertion of his own position as a fully qualified doctor. In contrast, students were often already familiar with Mary Seacole, either through the KS3 History curriculum or through the poetry in the anthology for Literature. They responded with an equivalent enthusiasm to her selfless compassion and commitment to her patients, regardless of the privations and basic conditions of the field hospital on the wharf.

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. A few students thought Adam Kay was loving the night shift as he compared it to 'Disneyland' and others misunderstood the context for Seacole's voluntary role, but in the vast majority of cases, students grasped both the main content and action of the texts and absorbed much of the more nuanced ideas they contained.

Assessment objectives

AO	Common student errors
<p>A01 Identify and interpret explicit and implicit information and ideas. Select and synthesise evidence from different texts.</p>	<p>Focusing on how the writers felt about the workplace rather than the workplace per se</p>
<p>A02 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.</p>	<p>Failing to explain the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the language features used by writers</p>
<p>A03 Compare writers’ ideas and perspectives, as well as how these are conveyed, across two or more texts.</p>	<p>Making assumptions about class, race and gender which were not supported by the text</p>
<p>A05 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.</p>	<p>Ideas in response to the task were often generalised and students did not provide specific examples to substantiate their view</p>
<p>A06 Students must use a range of vocabulary and sentence structures for clarity, purpose and effect, with accurate spelling and punctuation. (This requirement must constitute 20% of the marks for each specification as a whole).</p>	<p>More sophisticated vocabulary not deployed precisely and often spelt inaccurately</p>

Individual questions

Question 1

The first task provides an accessibly ‘way in’ to reading the first of the two texts and provides students with a confidence-building approach to the tasks which follow. The mean mark for Question 1 in June 2024 increased compared to June 2023 and more than 85% of students scored 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 Kay’s experience of moving from school to university. The text adopts a humorous and sarcastic tone from the start and it helped for students to identify this and recognise that the writer’s meanings were often hyperbolic or figurative rather than factual and literal. Understanding tone is an important part of reading and one or two statements required some understanding of this to correctly identify them as true or false. This is used to ensure that comprehension is assessed and distinctions are made at the top of the ability level as well as lower down.

Common strengths in responses

The students who achieved 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 tone and ideas of the opening paragraphs to understand Adam Kay’s excitement at the prospect of becoming a doctor and to appreciate that the mention of ‘six long years’ meant that time passed slowly. This was an appropriate test of reading comprehension which successfully discriminated between students.

Common misunderstandings

The most frequently selected ‘incorrect’ choices were those where students misunderstood the year when the writer finished medical school and incorrectly assumed that Kay believed changing his name would make him a criminal. Statements 4 and 7 were most commonly selected as true. The first of these errors would likely have been the result of misunderstanding the timeline of his training and that when he packed his bags he was finishing rather than just starting his medical journey. The second of the errors was likely a consequence of judging the facetious comment about changing his name to be literal rather than a vivid allusion. These are critical reading skills and are an appropriate foundation for the assessment of AO1 skills in this question.

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 workplaces where the nurse and the doctor were based and the differences between them. Students were asked to select relevant details from each text related to the 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 Question 2 is designed to avoid overlap with the focus for Question 4. The focus on where the writers were working gave opportunity for students to write about not only the physical characteristics of the place – a modern British hospital and a makeshift field hospital on a wharf in a foreign country – but also allowed students to write about the conditions of the workplace: the challenge, the commitment, the colleagues, the level of organisation, the equipment available to them, the wider resources etc. Students need to put to one side how the writers feel about these conditions in order to write about the workplace itself and interpret the differences between the two workplaces. In too many cases, students leaped to respond to this question in a way which better suited a response to Question 4 and as a result, could not be rewarded with clear or detailed focus on the task.

There was plenty of relevant material to draw on regarding the different workplaces. In Source A, the hospital was modern, technologically advanced, large, permanent, purpose-built, with different departments, well-staffed (at times) and with considerable expertise on hand. By contrast, the workplace Seacole encountered was temporary, under-staffed, poorly resourced, transitory, disorganised and with limited expertise to draw on. 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, 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 Level 4 as in 2023, with just over 3% of students awarded marks in the highest level. This is the lowest proportion of Level 4 marks on any question, which serves as a reminder of the challenges inherent in this task. It remains an area where students could make significant gains given appropriate targeted support.

Common strengths in responses

The strongest responses were those where students focused very clearly on the places described in the two texts. Rather than allow themselves to be sidetracked by the writers' perspectives on their work, these students focused exclusively on the place itself and the concrete details of their working environment as well as the conditions of their employment there. Typical of these students' responses was a continual reference explicitly to the task in order to maintain the clarity of their focus.

To achieve Level 3, students were able to identify 'like for like' differences in the workplaces – the level of organisation for example – and to interpret from this that whereas the hospital had procedures and 'ward rounds' which gave it the air of a controlled and calm environment, the wharf was a chaotic sprawl of ships and injured soldiers where there appeared to be no order, no procedure, and no organisation which left patients without proper care.

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 autonomy both writers' experienced, with the mayhem of the workplace allowing Seacole to act independently and without scrutiny whereas Kay was subject to considerable supervision in the hospital, treated like a 'hypnotised duckling' and given very limited autonomy despite his extensive training, adding to his frustration at the working conditions, but contributing to Seacole's sense of fulfilment and satisfaction on the wharf.

Common misunderstandings

The weaker responses were often characterised by a poor focus on the task. Many students were distracted by the writers' experiences of their work and failed to focus sufficiently on the different places in the source texts. Inferences relating to the writers' experiences in the hospital or on the wharf or their feelings about the care they were offering were rewarded therefore as 'attempts' (Level 2). Writers' perspectives are central to the focus of the Question 4 task, and no reference to these can be rewarded at Level 3 or Level 4 in Question 2 because the Assessment Objectives are very different. To achieve Level 3 or higher, responses must address the correct focus. There were instances where students using a keyboard to type their responses simply copied and pasted their response to Question 2 to use it again for Question 4, which exemplifies the misjudgement of believing that the tasks are rewarding the same skills.

Many students simply wrote about feelings and attitudes and ignored the focus on the place entirely. Students need to identify relevant and appropriate details from the two texts, such as the fact that Seacole can only treat the soldier by easing his dressings and has nothing else to offer him except a cup of tea, whereas Kay can offer his patients treatment by referring them for scans and tests in other departments in the hospital. They need to link these directly to the focus of the task – the workplace. Students should then ask themselves what this tells us about the two workplaces – that one has more resources than the other and is likely to offer better results for patients, perhaps. It is the development and explanation of straight-forward points such as these which will lift responses from Level 2 to Level 3.

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 Adam Kay's night shift. 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, which demonstrated a better selection than in recent series where some responses have been hindered by poor choices. In this series, students invariably chose to comment on the simile comparing the nightshift which 'made Hell look like Disneyland;' the metaphor of the enormous ship which was on fire and nobody had taught him how to sail; and the repetitive list of 'ward after ward...' It is worth remembering that despite the fact that a large volume of students have chosen these language devices to write about, every single individual student was encountering the imagery and exploring the effects for themselves in an entirely fresh way.

Performance on this question improved from 2023 with an increase in the mean mark to 6 marks. There was also a significant increase in the number of Level 4 responses which rose to nearly 8%, which is a very 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 ship, for example, is an extended metaphor and where students were able to extend their own comment and accumulate a number of effects as they addressed the different parts of the extended metaphor – that it was 'enormous' and 'on fire' – they inevitably provided more detail which is likely to lead to greater clarity.

Common strengths in responses

In Level 3, students were typically able to explain that the night shifts were torturous and gruesome as the writer described them as making Hell look like Disneyland. There was a certain logic to this image, which required students to understand that the night shifts were so hellish that in comparison the real Hell looked as enticing as Disneyland. Students were often able to draw out the connotations of these places and bring them together to explain just how awful the night shifts were. Many students, even those who struggled with the more complex imagery of the Hell simile and the ship metaphor were successful in commenting on the list of ‘emergency after emergency,’ explaining that the effect of this list was to highlight the endless repetitive demands placed on Kay’s shoulders. This was a very effective way of moving into Level 3 for a significant number of students.

The most successful responses extended the idea of Hell and Disneyland even further and were able to write about Hell as a symbol of religious punishment and that Kay was experiencing a moral punishment for the sins of arrogance and complacency. Or they developed the image of Hell by using the tagged-on image of the ‘unrelenting nightmare’ and explored how Kay experienced the night shift as a place of torment from which he could not wake or escape, a ritualised torment of surreal images and unbearable responsibility which he suffered alone, every night, like the horror of a recurring nightmare.

Common misunderstandings

Some students misunderstood the image of Hell and Disneyland, concluding that this was a description of how much fun the night shift turned out to be as it was being compared to a place of so much joy and innocence. Where students have demonstrated some understanding, they are rewarded with marks in Level 2 for an ‘attempt to comment on effect’, despite arriving at the opposite conclusion of the correct one.

There still appears to be amongst some students a belief that the identification of language devices – feature spotting – is sufficient to gain marks in response to Question 3. However, it is always and only the quality of the comment on effect which attracts marks. The use of subject terms enhances the response but cannot determine the level awarded. The text contained a wide variety of language features to choose from. There were a number of students who wanted to identify some of the language devices in the source text as personification, despite the absence of personification from the passage entirely. This led students to try and explain how the paging device was personified, for example, and drew them away from a more fruitful focus on the list of bleeps which would have been more fertile territory. The naming of language features and the use of subject terminology is not treated as an equivalent skill; only the comments on the effect of language can move a response into a higher level, not the ability to correctly identify specific features.

Only just over 10% of students were awarded marks in Level 1 and 50% of students were awarded marks in Level 3 and Level 4 which suggests that messages are being heard by students and they are responding well. This is a solid foundation for future series and for these students, prepared them well for writing about methods in Question 4.

Question 4

The task in Question 4 was to compare the writers' feelings and perspectives on their attitudes towards providing medical care, allowing students to consider the text extracts as a whole. The task required students to engage with Adam Kay's and Mary Seacole's individual points of view and the methods they use to convey their perspectives, as well as to compare the differences and similarities 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.

Most students appeared to find that Question 4 enabled them to write more freely and to show their understanding of the ideas and perspectives in the two texts. There were many different perspectives to medical care for students to identify and comment on: Kay's attitudes shifted from an early complacency and scepticism about the application to medical school to an arrogance about his knowledge and a childish glee about changing his name; from a contemptuous disdain about his lack of autonomy as a 'glorified personal assistant' to a horror at the huge responsibility he was expected to bear on the night shift; and finally to a resilient sense of pride in his achievement. Seacole offered an equally diverse range of attitudes, from compassion, modesty, independence, initiative, pity, pride, despair and determination.

The mean mark for this question rose in 2024, compared to 2023. This reflects anecdotal evidence from examiners who reported high levels of both engagement and clarity in the understanding of students. There was an equivalent rise in the number of students awarded marks in Level 4, with just under 5% achieving Level 4 in 2023 and just over 6% achieving Level 4 this summer.

Common strengths in responses

Level 3 responses were able, firstly, to identify aspects of Kay's attitudes to medical care and to explain their understanding. They did not simply assert that he was excited to be a doctor (as responses at Level 2 often did) but were able to explain that his comments on changing his name demonstrated his excitement and anticipation, selecting relevant textual detail such as 'like a superhero' to support their understanding. Responses at Level 3 were then able to explain that this simile showed how childish his excitement was and that his motivation was about his own prestige rather than about helping other people. This, of course, led students to make a direct 'like for like' comparison with Seacole, explaining that she focuses instead on her patients, demonstrating her commitment to providing medical care, in contrast to Kay's selfish approach. 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 most successful responses in Level 4 were able to offer a more subtle or more developed response to each of the key skills, with some students, for example, building on a similar clear point to that in the previous paragraph, to explore how Kay's concern with status and changing his name indicated a self-obsessed superiority complex resulting in a contempt and disregard for the patients he is intended to serve. They conceptualised the effect of the simile 'like a superhero' to demonstrate the almost God-like status of the doctor in society, as if they are capable of superpowers and are above mere mortals. This was compared to the self-sacrificial modesty of Seacole, whose focus on her patients as individuals presents a profound contrast and creates an impression of her modesty and almost angelic nature, exploring how her selflessness reinforced the idea of medicine as a truly noble and selfless profession.

Common misunderstandings

Some students working at a lower level identified the writers' perspectives using an adjective, such as excited or caring, but did not provide an explanation to substantiate and secure their understanding. How do we know that Adam Kay is excited about the prospect of becoming a doctor? How do we know that Mary Seacole is a caring nurse? 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 Kay states that his 'spring couldn't have been coiled any tighter' this shows how desperate he is to spring into action after all his training. Too many students were able to provide the partial understanding of identifying his excitement 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 the busyness of the night shift with the lack of resources on the wharf or Kay's horror at being 'drenched in bodily fluids' with Seacole's admiration for the 'kind-hearted doctors' she worked with. For responses to be awarded at Level 3, students are required to make 'like for like' comparisons, contrasting the different ways in which Kay and Seacole are treated by their senior colleagues, for example, or the different ways they treat their patients. 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 responses to Question 4 which failed to incorporate some mention of methods. 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. Having seen such an improvement and such an impressive range of responses to Question 3, it is unfortunate to have seen so many responses to Question 4 where those skills in commenting on language (or structure) were not transferred and able to be rewarded.

Some students were keen to find an opportunity to write about race, class and gender in response to the writers' perspectives and this in itself is genuinely worth encouraging. However, the comments need to be rooted in the text and there is unfortunately very limited, if any, reference to race in either text. There is some potential for a discussion of class in the opening section of Source A, and there are clearly references to gender in Source B, where Seacole's womanly touch is commented upon by the sick patient. However, examiners reported a number of occasions where students speculated about race and gender in a way which felt 'bolted-on' rather than arising naturally from material contained in the text itself. Just as context is a strand in GCSE English Literature responses, which need to be founded on textual detail, not extraneous research, so do such comments in GCSE English Language in response to the unseen texts.

Question 5

The task in Question 5 proposed that young people should adopt careers that made a contribution to society as opposed to careers that prioritised wealth and status.

The question was an appropriate one for students at this particular juncture in their lives. The vast majority of the cohort are 16-year-olds, at the point of leaving statutory education and for the first time given some element of choice over the future direction of their lives. Post-16 students are equally at a critical point in their lives, making decisions about the possibilities of university applications, apprenticeships or other training or even full-time work. This gave students some genuine dilemmas to ponder and some real-world relevance to the argument. It is not easy to find topics which offer a universal appeal and a level playing field, but this task appeared to go some way towards achieving those characteristics.

Students had plenty to say about the topic and their views fell into four very broad groups: some argued forcefully for the freedom of choice, that nobody had the right to tell any individual student what they 'should' do and which careers they should choose; others were convinced that only ethical and moral career opportunities should be chosen if young people wanted to address the terrible state of society we see around us; yet others argued that, with the cost of living crisis, nobody could possibly deny another the right to feed their own family above all else and therefore it was appropriate to pursue wealth and influence; whilst a final group argued pragmatically that it was perfectly possible to achieve both aims by earning sufficient income from a job of your choice and contributing to society in your spare time.

Some students responded well to the form of an article in a school or college magazine with a clear sense of a young and impressionable audience in many of the writing responses. This was not always the case, however, with many students writing more generically and overlooking the need to think carefully about who the intended audience might be. In contrast to some more recent tasks, there was occasionally a sense of flatness about some of the responses which lacked the liveliness of the speech in 2023, for example. This was countered by some students by addressing their fellow students and engaging with some sensitivity to the choices and decisions laid out before them, using language which was well-suited to this age group.

Performance, in terms of the mean mark, was extremely stable with no change from 2023 for either AO5 or AO6. The mean mark for AO5 was at the top of Level 2 whilst the mean marks for Technical Accuracy (AO6) were also high in Level 2. Almost half of students were awarded marks in Level 3 and Level 4 for writing which confirms the experience of examiners who reported seeing many examples of clearly expressed arguments.

There continues to be even more widespread evidence of prescriptive approaches to the writing task. Examiners reported repeatedly seeing the phrase: 'Picture this...' or 'Imagine this...' in a huge proportion of students' responses. Also of concern were the same examples of 'so-called' ambitious vocabulary shoe-horned into the students' responses. Words such as 'jubilant, euphoric, lackadaisical, indignant, axiomatic' were all seen repeatedly in students' responses and very rarely were they used accurately. In almost all cases, the vocabulary does not match the audience or the style and tone of the rest of the writing and the words stand out as clumsy and imprecise. As such, ironically, they bring down the quality of the writing rather than enhancing it and responses are more likely to receive a mark in Level 2 or Level 3 at the highest, depending on the other qualities demonstrated. There appeared to be fewer pre-prepared responses, where students were primed with a generic argument about the ills of society where they were instructed to 'fill in the gaps' with the given topic. It is hoped that centres have understood the message that this type of approach reflects extremely poor practice and could be considered malpractice, depending on the level of scaffolding provided.

There continues to be a deterioration in the quality of handwriting. A significant number of students would have been better served by using a keyboard to write their responses to ensure that the quality of their work can be read, understood, appreciated and rewarded in full.

Common strengths

The most successful responses were those where the student presented a coherent response to the statement which took a general view on career options 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 necessity of making responsible employment choices, for example, and offering environmental science as one option which would open up opportunities for supporting a more sustainable society in the future. It is the specific examples which provide students with the chance 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 political, ethical, sociological, religious or economic in their thrust and were presented by a passionate exponent. Tone is a powerful element of any writing, particularly in the writing of non-fiction and is something which leaps off the page when it is executed effectively and confidently by students. Responses rewarded at the highest level rarely write in neutral terms; they engage with their readers intimately, leaving them in no doubt about their feelings on the topic. Typically, in response to this task, students adopted a tone, perhaps, of simmering rage at the state of the world left to young people by an older generation who have squandered and exploited earth's precious resources and hoarded great wealth but who have the audacity to propose that the younger generation should pick up the pieces by dedicating themselves selflessly to society. Reading a diverse range of non-fiction texts to explore and develop the idea of tone is a valuable route to improving marks for AO5 writing.

Technically, high performing students were reportedly using a wide variety of punctuation to support more complex grammatical structures and to shape sentences created specifically for effect. Technical skills were deployed deliberately to create effects and to enhance the content of their arguments.

Common misunderstandings

There were weaker responses which failed to meet the criteria for Level 2, often characterised by brevity or a lack of focus. These responses tended to be very simple in their approach and offered a limited variety of ideas about careers, mostly focusing on 'doing good things' for society. They often lacked any structural features, such as paragraphs, to organise their ideas about what direction young people should choose, with a limited and pedestrian vocabulary characterised by familiar, everyday words. It appeared in the responses of students working at Level 2 that students' had relatively limited experience of the workplace and few students were able to draw on their work experience placements or weekend jobs to inform their views on employment and future career opportunities. Many students limited themselves to writing in very general terms about the world of work and stuck to very conventional roles, such as doctor and teacher – influenced quite rightly by Source A – as those careers which contribute directly to society. Indeed, there was in some responses a sense that unless you were helping the homeless or working in a charity shop, you were pursuing a very selfish career path. The lack of specific examples was typical of responses rewarded at Level 2 and is an area ripe for future development.

A continued concern noted by examiners is the excessive length of some writing responses. Many students are submitting a response which is four, five or even six pages long. It is fair to say that most students have given a clear indication of the level at which they are working by the end of the first page

and have demonstrated the necessary skills by the end of the second or third page. To write at any greater length, in fact, does many students a disservice as they are often unable to control the cohesion of their argument or lose the consistency of their style or tone. The vast majority of students writing beyond three sides do no more than offer 'more of the same' and risk detracting from the skills they have evidenced earlier on. Clearly, the size of handwriting impacts on the number of pages a student uses, but on average, three or four sides is a useful guide for students. The ability to write accurately, coherently and concisely are real-world skills and students would be well-served by practising writing with a given word count, for example, to support the succinctness of their responses in the exam.

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 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 likely 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.

Contact us

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

Tel: [0161 953 7504](tel:01619537504)

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

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