



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AS/Advanced**

JANUARY 2010

Statistical Information

This booklet contains summary details for each unit: number entered; maximum mark available; mean mark achieved; grade ranges. *N.B. These refer to 'raw marks' used in the initial assessment, rather than to the uniform marks reported when results are issued.*

Annual Statistical Report

The annual *Statistical Report* (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
LG1: Introduction to the Language of Texts	1
LG4: Analysing and Evaluating Language Modes and Contexts	6

ENGLISH LANGUAGE
General Certificate of Education
January 2010
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

LG1: Introduction to the Language of Texts

Principal Examiner: Sally Melhuish

Unit Statistics

The following statistics include all candidates entered for the unit, whether or not they 'cashed in' for an award. The attention of centres is drawn to the fact that the statistics listed should be viewed strictly within the context of this unit and that differences will undoubtedly occur between one year and the next and also between subjects in the same year.

Unit	Entry	Max Mark	Mean Mark
LG1	1764	60	27.8

Grade Ranges

A	44
B	36
C	29
D	22
E	15

N.B. The marks given above are raw marks and not uniform marks.

LG1: Introduction to the Language of Texts

General Comments

It was felt that candidates were generally well-prepared for this examination and had a better understanding of the requirements of the paper. Candidates seemed to use the time well and successful responses clearly thought through their ideas and organised their thoughts with a meaningful plan.

The majority of candidates, by two thirds to one third, opted to re-sit this unit from last summer. While the majority of candidates were presumably trying to improve on low or middling grades, there were clearly some who were trying to improve on already high grades, and overall there was a good spread of marks.

There were still some uneven responses in both sections A and B: some candidates focused on linguistic knowledge and did not engage with meaning/context/focus while others did the reverse. We would reiterate the advice given in recent reports, that while it is important to have an understanding and overview of each text, this paper requires candidates to analyse the texts, and in order to do this, it is vital to display linguistic knowledge and to use appropriate terminology. In both sections, there were still a significant number of responses which showed very vague or limited knowledge of the key constituents of language. Approaching either section with a comprehension style response, which is very broad in nature, is not going to score highly. Such responses may struggle to score above Band 1 and therefore carry the risk of being ungraded.

Section A: The Language of Texts

Candidates had little difficulty in engaging with the texts in Section A: a newspaper report and an eye witness account about the assassination and death of President Abraham Lincoln. On the whole, AO2 and AO3 were covered with reasonable success. Many appreciated the concepts associated with the production of these texts and the context in which they were written. There were some problems where candidates had a limited understanding of concepts and contexts. Most notable was a very general understanding of the newspaper form: candidates seemed to feel that all news articles are to entertain and, coupled with a narrow understanding of some lexical choices ('excitement' and 'excited'), some candidates wrote that the general public were glad to hear news of Lincoln's assassination.

Most candidates seemed to have a reasonable overview of the texts, but there was a tendency among some to concentrate on discussing their overview rather than on actually analysing the language. There must always be a balance, but in this paper we do expect candidates to demonstrate actual knowledge about language, and to use a range of terminology to make precise points. The analysis and discussion must of course be closely related to the overall meaning of the text.

While there is appreciation of the fact that some candidates need to 'bed-in' their answer and will often look to the formula of audience, purpose and context, this is an area that candidates need to be very careful over if they are to avoid sweeping statements and offer ideas which cannot be substantiated. Such comments often related to the social class of the readership of the newspaper. There was also some grave misreading of the information relating to Text B, the eye witness account. Since it was published on a website in 1999, some candidates did not appreciate that it was still written in 1865 and therefore made a number of erroneous assumptions about the audience for the text.

It is an important point for candidates to take on board that when they are presented with a text which is not contemporary on LG1, the material must not be used as data to support a discussion of language change. This was the case in several centres where groups of candidates set out to prove that the language of the texts was archaic and dwelt on this without affording much attention to the actual meaning of the texts and the writers' use of the key constituents in reinforcing their message. Explanations of the effects of language choices have to be detailed and concise. There were many generic and basic explanations of effect without giving due consideration to the actual meaning of words – the 'making it flow' syndrome.

A poor technique, noticed in several answers, was repeatedly to quote a phrase or clause and then follow it with 'This is/shows...'. The technique was not only very tedious for the examiner, but also very limiting for the candidate. At best, it can lead to a feature spotting exercise which demonstrates little understanding of the effects of language use and would score low on AO1. Similarly, attempting to sum up the sentence type of a text is unhelpful and shows very little insight when such generalisations are made.

It is worth repeating from previous reports that the primary focus of this unit is to provide opportunities for candidates to analyse texts closely and thoroughly, to organise their ideas clearly and concisely whilst demonstrating their knowledge of the key constituents using appropriate terminology and to explore the effect of the linguistic choices utilised by the writers. It is important to note that this unit tests candidates' ability to analyse and use correct terminology. To score well, candidates need to make a range of points, showing precise knowledge and understanding.

Section A – a selection of characteristics of good responses:

- Identification of the feature used followed by a well chosen example and detailed but succinct explanation. For example: *“Text A includes dynamic verbs to add to the fast pace of the text, ‘dashed’, ‘rushed’. The use of these dynamic verbs highlights the speed of the assassin’s actions, and perhaps contrast to the slow death of the President, which is conveyed using adverbs ‘The President is slowly dying’, ‘The brain is slowly oozing ...’ The repetition of the adverb ‘slowly’ contrasts to the fast pace of the text and therefore depicts the sadness and devastation caused by this shooting.”*
- Precise and accurate identification of word classes. For example, abstract nouns *‘excitement’, ‘tragedy’ and ‘gloom’.*
- Responses which were concise, accurate and perceptive and did not dwell on superficial or obvious elements. For example, *“The 7th dispatch uses many simple sentences, e.g. ‘No hopes are entertained for his recovery.’ This gives an impression of solemnity and seriousness. The simile, ‘a feeling of gloom like a pall’ sums up the dispatch, almost like the ending of a memorial. The verbs in this dispatch are far more relaxed than those in dispatch 6 – ‘entered’, ‘shot’ and ‘lying’ are far less dynamic and theatrical and give a sense of stillness.”*
- There was some admirable and thoughtful grouping together of points. For example, one candidate observed a semantic field of degeneration in text B and quote several examples from within the text – *“the present participles ‘expiring’ and ‘wasting’, the adjectives ‘discoloured’ and noun phrase ‘closing moments’...”*
- Many candidates commented with great insight on the use of tense, the active and passive voice.

- Structural devices were discussed well and were linked to typical features of the genres of the discourse, particularly when exploring the sense of chronology through frequent time adverbials.
- In addressing AO3, a large number of candidates showed awareness of the cultural/contextual references to Lincoln and his involvement with the abolition of the slave trade movement and the emancipation of slaves.

Section A – weaker responses were characterised by some of the following:

- A preoccupation with the social class of the readership. One candidate stated that *“If the sentences were more simple, then it may appeal to the lower classes.”*
- Excessive vagueness
- A lack of linguistic knowledge and/or a tendency to feature spot
- Superficial discussion of graphology or narrative responses
- Inaccuracy: declaring the headline ‘HIGHLY IMPORTANT’ as an oxymoron; referring to all adjectives, no matter where their position is in a sentence, as pre or post modifiers and not distinguishing between the two; suggesting that any use of an exclamation mark therefore means that the sentence mood must therefore be exclamatory.
- Spending at least half of a response to Text A discussing the headlines
- Seeing the texts as an opportunity to write solely about language change
- Referring to plurals as collective nouns or pronouns and confusing proper nouns and pronouns
- Paraphrasing
- Narration
- Few examples – imprecision
- Some responses were far too long and unfocussed.
- Limited range of analysis – every feature exists ‘to make the reader read on’ or ‘to make it flow’.
- Spelling/grammar points: comparative, similie, exclamitory, fullfill/fulfill, humerous, imagary, peice, accross, definatly, devestated, assasination, accommodate, confusing its and it’s, token place, ellision, reffers, exitment/excitement, repition, sentance, seperate are just a few.

Section B: Language Focus

Candidates seemed to engage better with the question this session. Indeed, there was a great deal of information within the text on the ‘Ewok Village’ which could be made relevant to the question through careful structuring of a response. The text was accessible and candidates understood the gist of the text.

While there were fewer examples of totally irrelevant responses, there was a significant number of students who used this as an opportunity to unload all of the knowledge they have and discuss any feature they observed regardless of the requirements of the question. In essence, this is the fatal flaw in responding to this section. Such irrelevant analytical points often related to audience, purpose and context without a close link to the focus. Other faults included not providing a range of linguistic features which focused on the attitude of the writer or highlighting a feature used by the writer, such as the humour, but then did not link to the focus. As the title of this section of the paper is '**Language Focus**'; candidates who do not link every point they make to this, are in danger of producing an irrelevant response. This does, of course, have implications for candidates to practise the essay writing craft and to actually use the words of the question in each paragraph.

The best responses engaged immediately with the sense of enthusiasm exuded by the writer and were focused in every way. They avoided a discussion of audience and purpose and did not focus disproportionately on the reader but looked in close detail at the intentions of the writer.

Weaker responses had a tendency to relate the details of the book the text was taken from. They tended to approach the analysis in the same way as they did for Section A and therefore did not select a useful linguistic approach. They often struggled to focus as a result and were often too concerned with audience and purpose. Some more specific weaknesses include:

- The general assumption that all questions are rhetorical
- Confusion over basic terminology – word classes, similes and metaphors
- A general lack of terminology
- Responses at this end of the spectrum were also frequently displaying lapses in expression and inaccuracy in use of spelling and punctuation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE
General Certificate of Education
January 2010
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

LG4: Analysing and Evaluating Language Modes and Contexts

Principal Examiner: David Lewis

Unit Statistics

The following statistics include all candidates entered for the unit, whether or not they 'cashed in' for an award. The attention of centres is drawn to the fact that the statistics listed should be viewed strictly within the context of this unit and that differences will undoubtedly occur between one year and the next and also between subjects in the same year.

Unit	Entry	Max Mark	Mean Mark
LG4	526	80	41.2

Grade Ranges

A	60
B	50
C	40
D	31
E	22

N.B. The marks given above are raw marks and not uniform marks.

LG4: Analysing and Evaluating Language Modes and Contexts

We had had some misgivings about offering this paper in the January session, but we need not have worried, as most candidates were well prepared, and coped adequately with the texts and the demands of the questions. There were few weak answers, but there were weaknesses in answers, which this report will seek to explain.

Section A: Spoken Language: Analysis of Domestic Conversations

The texts were very accessible, though the series of extracts in Text B made this more difficult to interpret. Most candidates were well informed about conversational discourse. Some, however, had only a limited overview of the texts, and some failed to explore the main differences between them. Several did not take notice of the information on the question paper that the couples in both texts were husband and wife, and claimed that the couple in B were business or work colleagues, and that this conversation was work-related. This led to some very distorted interpretations, such as that *presentation* and *pitch* were examples of work-related lexis, referring to Richard's company. Some made exaggerated claims that Fiona in B and Bill in A were nervous.

Most candidates also had some theoretical knowledge about male-female conversations, but while some applied this with good sense and judgement, some tended to generalise too much from a single fleeting example. Many exaggerated a *battle for power* or a *battle for the floor* in Text A, as they also did the concept of males always trying to dominate mixed gender conversations, and applying this equally to the two men in these texts. Many clearly thought that every conversation had to be viewed as a contest or struggle, and the concept of co-operation between men and women was totally foreign to some.

Several candidates tended to offer generalisations about Text A based entirely on the first half, or they ignored the second half altogether. Some claimed, for example, that Bill's interruption in line 13 supported the gender theory that men interrupt more than women, and then conveniently ignored the fact that Sally interrupted more or less equally after this.

Slavish adherence to Grice's Maxims proved a pitfall for many. These should be seen as applying to spoken language very broadly, and 'breaking' them, which is probably very frequent indeed, should not be seen as a terrible crime. Many attempted to apply the maxims to virtually every line, and this led to some exaggerated claims. For example, some claimed that Sally's very first line (*Bill have you seen the box (.) that Harry's inner tube came in from Halford's last week?*) broke the maxim of relevance because she said more than was necessary. They then criticised Bill's minimal response reply to this question (*no*) as breaking the maxim of quantity, claiming that he should have said a lot more. Had he done so (e.g. *no I haven't seen it anywhere around the house*) some would no doubt have criticised him also for breaking the maxim of quantity by saying more than was necessary. Sally was frequently taken to task for 'flouting' various maxims. This kind of detailed line by line application of Grice's Maxims can lead not only to distorted claims, but also to a failure to see the bigger picture in the text as a whole. It can be helpful to refer to Grice, but we would advise that candidates should be sparing in their use of the maxims.

Some answers showed a worrying lack of knowledge of some very basic aspects of the spoken mode. Several thought that pauses and overlaps were examples of non-fluency, and large numbers thought that latch-ons were the same thing as interruptions. Several did not know the difference between overlaps and interruptions, and some thought that all 'interruptions' in Text B were rude, when in fact most were overlaps and were examples of appreciative interaction or back-channelling. Very few were able to explain that several of the interruptions came at points of possible completion by the previous speaker, which is typical of turn-taking in conversations, and that these were best seen as examples of co-operation rather than as rude or examples of struggles for power or domination.

A few candidates did little more than go through the key, giving examples of the features listed there, and quite a number merely listed examples of emphatic stress, or of overlaps or pauses, which was not very enlightening or productive.

'Sarcasm' was used wrongly by a majority of candidates to describe Bill's suggestion of buying Harry a car, and for other uses of humour in Text A. We would advise extreme caution in using the term. It involves taunting and attempting to hurt or deflate the listener, and clearly Sally is not deflated by Bill's humour, for she enjoys the joke and adds another of her own. Virtually all candidates did not understand her joke, as they did not recognise the term 'dinky car' (clearly a generational issue). We were very tolerant and accepted any sensible attempt to explain the significance of 'dinky'. The majority saw it as a colloquial diminutive modifying adjective and some likened it to 'wee' in Scots dialect.

There was too much speculation in some answers about the nature of the relationships between husband and wife, amounting to extended pieces of creative writing in some cases. Bill, for example, was heavily criticised for being too lazy to take any interest in looking after Harry, or in anything that Sally had to say. Their marriage was described as *female dominated*, on the grounds that Sally was the dominant speaker. Some discussed at length in Text B the possibility that the speakers were a co-habiting couple, and speculated about their interests outside the text, as well as their social status and levels of education.

Good answers concentrated on the actual language used and found plenty to explore, such as the degree of normal non-fluency (very little in A but a lot in B), colloquialisms and markers of informality, the lexis and grammatical structures, the monitoring and interaction features, the use of inexplicitness and ellipsis, the use of pronouns, the kinds of verbs, the turn-taking, the co-operative techniques, the questions and answers, etc. To score high marks it was necessary to make precise points, to use appropriate terminology and to illustrate points with actual quotations, rather than just using line references.

Some problems with terms included:

- Dialect: there were many claims that in Text A both speakers used a Northern dialect (they were in fact from the South): the only evidence offered was the use of universal colloquialisms such as *yeah* and *cos*. Candidates are advised to look for hard evidence of regional dialect before using the term. A few confused dialect with tenor, and referred to 'informal dialect'.
- Discourse marker: there were several examples, but some candidates used the term far too freely.
- Elision and ellipsis: these were frequently confused, and 'elision' was almost universally misspelt.

- False start: we would advise that the term should be applied only when a speaker changes the initial structure of an utterance (e.g. in B: *I was just wondering if I should send (2.0) if I should phone up...*) and not when there is merely repetition (e.g. *it's (.) it's* in A). The latter could be termed repetition or hesitation. Interestingly, several answers quoted *I can't (.) he hasn't...* in A as an example of a false start, but *I can't* is in fact a complete sentence, and *he hasn't* begins a new one.
- Filler: some of the sounds of interaction or back-channelling (e.g. *mm, aah*) were wrongly seen as fillers. (Some described *em* and *aah* as phatic utterances.)
- Latinate: a greatly over-used term. It is not synonymous with polysyllabic or low-frequency or elevated or educated or any similar term. At least one answer claimed that Text A was mostly *latinate* – and this was based on Sally's use of the verb *parcelling*.
- Rhetorical Question: this was grossly over-used, some describing every question as rhetorical. One or two arguably were, but most were genuine questions hoping for an answer (e.g. *have you asked him?* or *where are they from?*)
- Vocative: In A the first word *Bill* is a vocative, as the proper noun is addressed directly to him, but the later use of *Harry* is not, as he is not present at all, and there is no question of addressing him directly.

Other faults and weaknesses in answers included:

- Misunderstanding the references to expensive cars in A, and claiming that this illustrated the extreme wealth of Bill and Sally. (Fortunately most saw the humour in the references.)
- Claiming that *em* (the filler) was non-standard English for 'them'.
- Describing Bill's minimal response of *no* as rude.
- Over-generalising: e.g. claiming that the texts as a whole were examples of phatic speech (in fact there are not any real examples of phatic speech anywhere in the texts) or that there were constant interruptions throughout both texts, or that both texts consisted of nothing but adjacency pairs of questions and answers.
- Making wild assertions: e.g. *There are no examples of colloquial language in Text B.*
- Quoting Sally's use of her husband's first name, Bill, as an example of shared knowledge.
- Asserting that the speakers in B were less well educated than those in A. Some based this claim on the lack of concord in *these time share thing* and the repetition of *which which which* in B, and others on the assertion that A was much more formal than B because it used lexis like *ought* and *shall*, which proved that the speakers in A were much more educated.
- Describing *which which which* as a stutter.
- Describing the use of 'rubbish' in A as colloquial, when it clearly refers to household rubbish thrown away in a bin.

- Not realising that in transcripts what may at first appear to be a speech turn of a few words at the beginning of a line may be a completion of a previous line. This proved to be a problem for many in A when Bill finishes one turn with the words *want it is he*, which complete the clause *he's not gonna*. Several saw these words as totally incoherent.
- Inability to spell 'deictic' – usually as 'dietic' or 'diectic'.

Section B: Analysis of Written Language Over Time: Books On Cookery

The focus in this section is on the analysis of texts that are linked – in this case generically – and of which at least one was written in an earlier age. The texts should be analysed as texts in their own right, but of course any aspects of language use that are different from modern practice will need to be explored, described, and, as far as possible, explained. The section is not intended merely to provide data for an essay on language change. There was a worrying tendency in a significant number of cases to come perilously close to this approach. Many incorporated mini essays on language change (and even on word formation in English) into their answers, and clearly felt a necessity to unburden themselves of all the knowledge they had acquired about the history of the English language, whether it was relevant to the three recipes or not.

Many candidates were well informed historically, and most were able to describe Text A as Early Modern English, and to give the correct dates for Caxton's introduction of printing and Dr. Johnson's dictionary. Only a few described Text A, and even fewer Text B, as Middle English. Some were excessively cautious, such as one who stated that Text A was written *after the Norman invasion*. Some, however, had a very garbled view of the history of the language. An extreme example was a candidate who claimed that the Romans invaded England in 430 A.D., followed by the Anglo-Saxons twenty years later, and then by the Vikings in 490 A.D., all bringing with them different aspects of the Germanic language. Compared with this, some other errors could be seen more as slips of the pen: for example, references to King Alfred's Bible of 1611, or to the King James Dictionary, or statements such as *Text A was published in 1594, just over a year after the printing press was brought to London by Caxton in 1476*. Several stated that Text B was from the Industrial Age: while this is not entirely inaccurate, it is misleading.

Large numbers of candidates made claims about the influence of the Great Vowel Shift on the archaic spellings in Texts A and B. In fact the Great Vowel Shift had virtually no influence on English spelling, which was already fixed, but it can be used to show a mismatch between spelling and pronunciation in many English words. Centres are advised in future to warn candidates against using the term for this exam, as it is unlikely ever to be relevant.

Identifying archaic lexis is often difficult. Some candidates played safe and quoted only the examples given in the gloss on Text A (*Maces, Marie and Uergious*). Some seemed completely unaware of comparatively common words in present day English, and claimed that *broth, Ueale* (veal), *Capon*, and *earthen* (still common in 'earthenware') were all archaic. Better answers were able to identify genuine archaisms, such as *thereto*, and *middest*, and were able to focus on lexis in context, exploring semantic change in words such as *mistres, seeth, filthinesse*, and *wring*, in Text A, and *Flesh, sweet-meat* and *coffins* in Text B. Many saw the change in *coffins* as an example of 'pejoration', when 'narrowing' would have been more accurate. Some asserted that beginning a sentence with 'and' was archaic: this was an over-simplification. What was stylistically archaic in Text A was the sheer number of clauses beginning with 'and'. Some referred to archaic syntax (e.g. *what your fancie is*) when 'archaic expression' would have been more acceptable.

Texts A and B were clearly aimed at female audiences, and C at a non-gender specific one. Some brief reflection on the position of women and brief consideration of what sort of women would have been sufficiently educated to read the first two texts was perfectly valid, and many wrote well on this. Some candidates, however, wrote at excessive length about the social position of women in the past. Some, indeed, became irate and heated in their fervour to denounce what they perceived as injustices to women in past centuries, making often rather wild claims such as *Women were viewed as slaves in the period of Text A*. A common view was that Texts A and B came from a period when women were chained to the kitchen sink, while their husbands went out to work and came back wanting a meal on the table on their return. Candidates must focus in this Section of the exam on analysing and discussing the language of the texts provided, and should not see it as providing opportunities to write mini-essays or to indulge in sociological discussion or speculation totally divorced from the actual texts, however passionate they may feel. By the way, it was not entirely clear whether Texts A and B were written by men or women (within books published by men), and we accepted any reasonable suggestions either way.

There was a frequent tendency to over-generalise. A majority of answers claimed that Text A was written in complex sentences, whereas what was striking about the text was the degree of compounding: most sentences were in fact compound or compound-complex. Comments about punctuation were also often falsely generalised. Some asserted that there were no full stops in Text A, only commas, which was simply untrue. In discussing degrees of formality there was also a great amount of generalisation. Many stated that Text A was formal throughout, whereas it was quite colloquial at times, with direct address of the audience using second person pronouns. The level of formality in Text B tended to be overstated as well. Several candidates believed that in the late 16th century there were no rules at all about the use of language in writing.

Most candidates were well informed about spelling, and distinguished clearly the different patterns in Text A. Some found Text B more difficult, and there were some strange explanations of the apostrophe plus 'd' spellings (which indicated the absence of an extra syllable in the pronunciation of the final '-ed'). Some exaggerated the degree of phonetic spelling, though of course there was a strong element of this in Text A.

A large number of candidates used the terms 'prescriptivist' and 'descriptivist' to refer to the different historical periods. This tended to produce rather formulaic responses, with candidates making unfounded or distorted assertions about language use, especially when the terms were confused, and Text A was described as 'prescriptivist'. The terms can be useful when related to attitudes to language use, but can prove to be a minefield when applied rigidly to whole centuries of the past.

Good answers wrote perceptively about what was common to the style of recipes, such as the frequent use of imperatives and references to ingredients, and about the striking differences between them. They noted the extraordinary vagueness in A about amounts and timings, as well as the lack of personal opinion, but very clear sense of audience. A few were able to explain the syntax, which seems very strange to modern readers. In Text B they distinguished between the first half with its personal opinion, sense of spoken voice, and clear purpose of informing the audience, and the actual recipe in the second half, still with a lack of precise amounts and weights. Very few noted the concern with different forms of presentation of marmalade, which implied a very affluent middle or upper class readership. Good answers wrote well about Text C, which most candidates struggled to analyse adequately. They noted the style of the personality chef, seeking to impress and in this case to dazzle the reader with the appeal of luxury, elegance and sophistication. Some ventured to be critical of the writing and accused the writer of snobbery. Provided this was supported from the text, this was fully accepted. Interestingly, few candidates noted that the ingredients (which included butter and 4 tablespoons of double cream, to serve just two) indicated a period before concerns with dieting and calorie counting had taken hold.

Faults and weaknesses in answers included:

- Failing to make any distinction between grammar, spelling and punctuation (appearing to regard the terms as synonymous), so that it was common, for example, for differences in spelling and punctuation (e.g. the capitalisation of non-proper nouns) to be described as 'grammatical differences'.
- Describing *THERE* as a demonstrative pronoun.
- Being too concerned about the accent of the writers, which is difficult to establish from a written text.
- Describing imperatives as 'discourse markers' (a term used far too widely: essentially discourse markers operate outside normal clause and sentence structures, and are commoner in the spoken than the written mode).
- Going too far in an over-enthusiastic pursuit of examples of pejoration: e.g. '*boyle*' (*boil*) *nowadays has pejorative connotations of pain, unattractiveness and illness*: this was to ignore the word in context, and to ignore the fact that it is still widely used exactly as in Text A.
- Referring to orthography as *orthology*.
- Describing 'we' and 'us' as second or third person pronouns (surprisingly common).
- Confusing phrases and clauses (usually quoting a clause and calling it a phrase).
- Describing adverbs as post-modifying: e.g. as in *seeth softly*, which consists of two phrases; modifiers (pre- and post-) operate within a single phrase.
- Describing the frequent use of imperatives in the recipes as 'interrogatives' or 'declaratives'.
- Failing to distinguish patterning from listing, and over-using the terms syndetic and asyndetic listing: some saw the use of more than one comma in a sentence as being a marker of listing (e.g. lines 8-11 of Text B, and much of Text A, where a series of compounded clauses fronted with 'and' were seen as a list); a pattern of three is not the same as a list.
- Claiming that Text A was aimed at housemaids.
- Making wildly inaccurate statements (e.g. that *little punctuation is shown in Text A*; or the word '*boyle*' shows the language to be undeveloped).
- Referring to the 'incorrect' spelling of *Orenge*s, without noting that the word was also spelt as *Orange*s in the text.
- Assuming that every word in the language relating to food was introduced in 1066 by the Normans. Many claimed that 'sugar' was one such, whereas the word was first introduced into Middle English. Candidates are not expected to know this of course, but they need to exercise caution before making wild claims.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk