



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2024**

**GCSE English Language 2.0 1EN2 01**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 1EN2\_01\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Introduction

Examiners commented that the texts about work were accessible across the full range of abilities and candidates were able to engage with the tasks and respond appropriately. There was clear evidence that candidates had been prepared for this examination.

More successful candidates were able to engage fully with both texts and respond thoughtfully and articulately. Their writing responses were often engaging and effective and were well controlled and accurate. Less successful candidates sometimes struggled to understand the texts and the questions. Their writing was often pedestrian or lacked coherence and had weak language controls.

Some candidates were not clear about the focus of the reading questions eg they responded to the evaluation questions as language analysis and the language analysis question as evaluation.

Some examiners noted that some candidates found Text 1 harder to understand than Text 2. There was a common misconception that the first text was written by a male writer, despite the fact that the contextual information at the start of the text showed this not to be the case.

Examiners did comment on a number of blank responses especially to the reading questions, in particular Question 3 and Question 6. These are quite high tariff questions. There were some indications that candidates may have attempted the writing question (Section B) first and run out of time to complete the paper. Examiners mentioned that some handwriting was challenging although still legible – just.

The responses of candidates had positive features. Examiners were impressed by:

- evidence that the majority of candidates had understood the ideas in the texts
- the ability to make at least some comments on language and its effects for Question 3
- the inclusion of judgements at different levels for Questions 2, 5 and 6
- writing that showed a range of ideas and suitable tone, style and register for audience and purpose
- writing that used ambitious vocabulary and accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful responses:

- confused the texts, answering questions on Text One using Text Two and vice versa
- showed an insecure grasp of language with 'feature-spotting' or confusion of terms in response to Question 3
- failed to support points using appropriate textual evidence, or used textual evidence that did not support the point being made
- did not attempt to make judgements in response to Questions 2, 5 and 6 or based their responses to Questions 5 and 6 entirely on their own views with no reference to the text
- lacked organisation in their writing
- connected but did not develop ideas enough in their writing
- did not use a range of vocabulary and lacked accurate spelling and secure control of punctuation.

## Question 1

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

Many candidates were able to correctly identify four points the writer makes about when it is acceptable for women to work. All the bullet points in the mark scheme were seen by examiners. Many scored four marks usually by running together 'strong, healthy, sensible maidens'.

The most common cause of failure to be awarded a mark was to give 'career', 'nursing' and 'hospitals' as separate points when they were the same bullet point in the mark scheme. Other common incorrect responses were often unselective copying which missed the relevant information eg 'strain every nerve', 'earning money'. The 'provided it be given up on marriage' point caused some confusion with some candidates believing it meant women who have given up on the idea of marriage rather than giving up the job when they got married. There was also confusion with a number of candidates over the meaning of 'other pursuits open to my sex' with some thinking this referred to prostitution. Where candidates did not achieve any marks on this question, it was often because they had misread the question eg listing four reasons why women should not work.

## Question 2

This question requires the candidate to evaluate how successfully the writer persuades the reader that married women should not work.

There was clear evidence of preparation in the responses. Some examiners commented that there were some detailed responses to this question however most examiners commented that while it was clear that most candidates understood the text, a significant number of candidates had difficulty in developing evaluative comments.

Many candidates did (correctly) use examples from lines 1-9 but examiners observed that there were a significant number who selected evidence from outside the line references especially 'contemptible' and 'willing spirit but weak frame'. Some of these responses only used one or two examples from outside the given lines, but examiners came across a number of responses which focused solely on lines 10-15. Reasons and evidence from outside the given lines could not be credited.

Candidates chose to comment on the physical and psychological challenges which might be a barrier to women. Many candidates challenged this but not necessarily in a text-based way and unfortunately this sometimes resulted in candidates giving vent to personal opinions about sexism and women's rights. Many candidates referred to women being 'physically unfit' and 'mentally unequal' to show the writer's disapproval of women working. They demonstrated understanding of the harsh work environment that was daunting even to men with support such as 'fiercely striving' and 'long-continued strain'. Points were made about 'dust' and 'heat' and how successfully they presented an unsuitable working environment for women. Many candidates missed the reference to 'married women' in the question and referred only to women in their responses. A common misunderstanding observed by examiners was that candidates referred to the writer as male despite the italicised introduction (which is there to help candidates) clearly referencing the writer as a married woman.

Most candidates tried to find three reasons with evidence, as the question requested, but examiners commented that a significant number only gave two reasons which limited their achievement. Some examiners commented that candidates were able to offer a sufficiently clear evaluative opinion, linked to a clear explanation of the writer's ideas. However, other examiners noted that many candidates simply explained their chosen references rather than making a judgement about how effective they were in persuading the reader that married women should not work. Many responses recognised that the ideas the writer expressed were old-fashioned and of their time. Candidates had been taught evaluative vocabulary eg 'successfully', 'skilfully', 'clearly', which sometimes helped them to focus on the question.

More successful candidates carefully selected three points about the writer's ideas, opinions and viewpoints and supported them with examples from the text that were not too long, offering analysis and critical evaluation. They were fully focused on the task of evaluating how successfully the writer persuades the reader that married women should not work. These candidates understood that the text was from a female perspective and consistently evaluated throughout. They understood the nuances of the text regarding the difference between married and unmarried women. They pointed out the inconsistency of the women suddenly seeming less able once married, when they were acceptable workers as 'maidens'. Some considered how the writer deliberately juxtaposed the weakness of women who were 'physically unfit' with the strength of men who were 'fiercely striving' to successfully show that men were clearly better suited to working. Some of these responses examined the weakness in her argument with its very subjective point of view and lack of any evidence. Others also claimed that by contradicting herself with the exceptions, her argument was also weakened. Some candidates also looked at the context of the letter and how it linked to societal norms at the time.

Less successful candidates were sometimes able to find some relevant examples but were not able to provide a valid comment to justify the examples selected. They often gave no evaluative opinion and merely described what the writer said. Some less successful candidates paraphrased or retold the text, often with long quotations. Some listed three examples from the text with no comment. Other less successful responses did not reference much of the text and presented their own opinions on whether (modern) women should be working or at home.

This is a successful response to Question 2.

2 In lines 1-9, the writer tries to persuade the reader that married women should not work.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from lines 1-9.

- Plan (6)
1. Physically unfit / not adapted to the conditions  
*with 'men are fiercely strong'*
  2. ~~difficult~~ Just faced with 'men are fiercely strong' are already  
*notion that men are (who are fit + strong) are already 'strong' powerful men*
  3. mentally unequal to long continued strain. (unequal - strain - verb emphasis)

Answer

The writer successfully persuades the reader that married women should not work by firstly arguing that "women are physically unfit." They by inference cannot "plunge into the dust and heat of the arena." The use of the noun "unfit" gives the impression to the reader that women do not have the physiological characteristics suited to difficult working *environments*.

Secondly, the writer juxtaposes the inevitability of women working with the argument that it is already very difficult for fit men, "men are fiercely striving". This contrast suggests to the reader that even men, through the strong verb, "striving", are at the limits of their physical abilities, so how will women be able to cope?

Thirdly, the writer persuades the reader that women are, "mentally unequal to long continued strain." The word, 'unequal', is a continuation of her argument that women are not equal to men in physicality, and in this sentence, the verb, "strain", emphasises the effects work have on the worker. The reader is left with no doubt that women are not mentally able to deal with work demands.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a confident and succinct response, which demonstrates convincing analysis of the text. Language references are used to justify personal judgement, but this is clearly not a language response.

All Level 3 descriptors are met and a mark of 6 is achieved.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Note how the response is closely focused on evaluation and gives three convincing reasons with references that fully support the points being made.

Remember to include three reasons and always to give your opinion about the success of the text.

This is an example of a Level 2 response.

2 In lines 1–9, the writer tries to persuade the reader that married women should not work.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from lines 1–9.

(6)

I think the writer has been successful at this because he says how "women are physically ~~of~~ unfit". This would make people think what is the point of the women going to do the work as they wouldn't be able to achieve the job that needs doing.

The second reason I think the writer has been successful is because he says "they are also mentally unequal to long-continued strain." This shows again that although physically they couldn't keep up they couldn't mentally either, which

Could result in them giving up or not doing a good enough job.

The third reason I think he has been successful is because he says how it may be good for them but "provided it be given up on marriage". This shows that it will never be a long term thing as once married they are unable to work so could never make a career out of it.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response gives three appropriate references, but without developing explanations or opinions in any detail.

There is some opinion offered, but it is not evaluative.

Level 2 – 3 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Remember to focus on evaluating how successfully the writer presents their ideas.

### Question 3

This question asks the candidate how the writer uses language to interest and inform the reader across the whole text.

Some examiners commented positively on the responses they saw to this question, but many examiners noted that a significant number of candidates were not able to explain the effects of their chosen language features. Although there was some evidence of the use of relevant subject terminology, it was incorrectly identified by many candidates eg mixing up adjectives and adverbs. Some examiners thought that responses to this question were the weakest on the paper.

Most candidates were able to identify some words and language techniques the writer used although they often did not use subject terminology correctly eg 'fiercely is an adjective'. Most were able to offer an explanation of the text and comment on the writer's language. Most examiners commented that although candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the text and were able to identify key evidence such as 'plunge', 'fiercely' and 'striving', many candidates had difficulty in explaining the effect of their chosen words or phrases. When candidates did identify language features, their responses tended to be statements with little exploration. Popular points for comment were the adverb 'physically' and the list of three adjectives 'strong, sensible, healthy', but many did not really analyse how the language would impact on the reader. Some used evidence that was included in the glossary: 'maidens' and 'contemptible' which they then explained, leaning heavily on the wording from the glossary provided.

More successful responses were able to focus clearly on the language used to interest and inform the reader and correctly identify subject terminology. They unpicked the language and considered how it contributed to our understanding. They demonstrated an excellent understanding of the text and the way the writer manipulates the feelings of the readers. They explored language in detail and were able to select precise discriminating quotations to support their ideas. Word-level analysis was sometimes a feature of these responses. They discussed: the juxtaposition of the adjectives 'willing' and 'weak'; the metaphor of 'the dust and heat of the arena' which many cited as an example of the difficult and often violent work environment of the time; 'if you will allow' as if the author was asking permission to give her idea and suggests her humility; the contrast between women, 'unfit', and men, 'fierce'; 'old-fashioned' with agreement that her ideas are old-fashioned; the use of 'lets' which implies that men have to give women permission to work.

Less successful candidates did not focus on language and gave sometimes lengthy quotations and simply explained what they said. There was often limited, incorrect or no subject terminology or it was correctly identified, but used in a way that did not focus on effect: "The noun 'hospital' suggests that's where women should work.". Some just wrote about the content of the passage rather than the language. There were some who wrote about structure, in particular, paragraph length. These responses often made generic comments on the effects of their chosen features eg 'this would interest the reader' without any explanation of how it would interest the reader. Some examiners commented that there was also evidence of 'feature spotting' where candidates identify correctly (or incorrectly) particular language features in the text, but do not explain them.

Some candidates did not seem to understand the focus of the question and responded as if it was an evaluation rather than a language question, using evaluative language eg 'successfully' . Examiners commented that some responses to this question seemed like responses to Question 2 with little focus on language features.

There were a significant number of blank responses to this question.

Occasionally candidates wrote a response to Text Two. These were rewarded but were penalised for using the wrong text (not reading the instructions carefully).

This is an example of a successful response to Question 3.

3 How does the writer use language to **interest and inform the reader**?

You should include:

~~3 parts~~

- the writer's use of **language**
- the effect on the reader.

Use examples from the whole text and relevant **subject terminology**.

(8)

The writer uses language to interest ~~the reader~~ and inform the reader about their opinions on working married women by creating a controversial article. Beginning ~~the~~ <sup>the main body of the</sup> article with a statement about her own old-fashioned <sup>pre- war</sup> prejudice ~~prejudices~~ the reader that this article might frustrate them. Using the adjective 'old-fashioned' warns the reader about the writer's viewpoint already which not only informs one about what type of article it is, but also interests the reader to find out what exactly the writer needed to provide this disclaimer for.

Another way language is used to interest and inform the reader is by providing insight into what the working world is like. Having been prepared by the writer's ~~opening~~ opening statement, the reader ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> confronted by the working world being ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> idea that to work one has to 'plunge into the dust and heat of the arena'. Not only ~~is this~~ <sup>is this</sup> metaphor ~~now~~ harsh it also insinuates the working world is a battle. The noun 'arena' suggests there is a lot of competition in the working force and ~~is a~~ <sup>is a</sup> ~~arena~~ <sup>arena</sup> at the time fighting or any sport requiring an 'arena'.

would be considered masculine. This confronting image informs the reader of the environment of apply for jobs whilst ~~where~~ interesting the reader in a negative way as the reader is engaged at wants to read more, but only to find out why the writer describes the working world as harshly as she does.

Late on in the article the writer seems to counter her own point of view which interests the reader as they get to see a more varied viewpoint. This is seen when the writer talks about widows doing 'almost impossibilities for love's sake'. The fact it's for 'love's sake' displays this constant message that women are to love their husbands forever but because 'love' is an abstract noun it also hints at the 'almost impossibilities' being guided by their dead husbands. Additionally the fact 'almost' is used as a quantifier ~~once again~~ informs the reader that it isn't impossible for a woman to get a job, but nearly is.



The whole text is addressed. The selection of references is discriminating, and fully supports and clarifies the points made. There is a precise use of a range of terminology. It focuses successfully on key words such as 'arena', 'old-fashioned' and 'love's sake'.

This achieves a mark of 8 – Level 4.



Look at how the candidate uses correct subject terminology and focuses on exploring the writer's use of language and its effect on the reader. Think about why the writer chose to use particular words or phrases.

This is a less successful response to Question 3.

**3** How does the writer use language to interest and inform the reader?

You should include:

- the writer's use of language
- the effect on the reader.

Use examples from the whole text and relevant subject terminology.

(8)

The writer has used direct address to interest and inform the reader which makes it more relatable ~~for the~~ and engages the attention.

e.g. ~~I wonder if you~~ My own old-fashioned prejudice is against the 'idea'. This suggests that writer considers her ideas as old-fashioned though still acceptable by people in those times.

The narration starts with a rhetorical question 'I wonder if you will allow an old wife...'. This grabs the attention of the reader and curiosity to know more about it. The writer is aware of the thinking of people in ~~her~~ <sup>that</sup> place and time and knows what they want to hear and agree upon.

This has a huge impact on the reader because she knows who the audience is and what their needs are. They need strong and healthy maids who can cater to their household chores and at the same time consider them as meek and frail who cannot do physically challenging jobs.

The writer has used emotive language throughout the extract which engages the reader and urges them to take action.

e.g. 'An able-bodied man who lets his wife work is a contemptible being'

These lines make a huge impact on the opposite sex especially men, who will consider it shameful to let their women or the family work.



This response offers explanation of the text and the language used. References are valid and are generally used appropriately. Subject terminology is used to identify rhetorical questions and direct address.

It fulfils all Level 2 criteria with a mark of 4.



Try to use correct subject terminology. Remember that this question is about how the writer uses language to create effects. Try to focus on the writer's language choices and the effects on the reader.

## Question 4

### Question 4(a)

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

Many candidates achieved two marks on this question. The most common experiences identified were 'the darkness' and 'the silence', although all points in the mark scheme were seen. The most common reason for not achieving both marks was incorrect copying eg 'the noise above our heads grew' without the necessary addition of 'indistinct'. Some wrote that 'voices became more distinct' rather than 'indistinct'. Some used the same experience for both points 'darkness', 'pitch black' or/and 'not a ray of light' so were only able to achieve one mark.

A few candidates used the text given for 4(b) to answer this question. A few used material not within the line references or referred to the wrong text.

### Question 4(b)

This question requires candidates to understand implicit meaning and ideas in a text. Many candidates used quotations to answer this question and some of these were appropriate responses, but candidates should try to use their own words to show they have understood the implied information and ideas.

Most candidates were able to provide two reasons, commonly 'silence', 'darkness' or 'low pay'. Many quoted the phrase 'compelled to linger through their lives, in silence, solitude and darkness' to secure more than both marks. The most common reason for not obtaining the marks was either no attempt or those who did not use the text properly and wrote things like the single word 'abjectness' which did not answer the question. There was some confusion over the reptilian reference, with some candidates thinking there were actual reptiles roaming the tunnels in the mine.

## Question 5

This question required candidates to evaluate how successfully the writer shows that children were being mistreated in the coalmine.

Many examiners commented that candidates engaged enthusiastically with the text and candidates constructed a more secure response to this question compared to Question 2. However other examiners commented that many candidates struggled to be evaluative and did not move much beyond explaining or paraphrasing the text. Similarly to Question 2, a significant number of candidates did not give three reasons. Examiners noted that there were a quite a few blank responses and also those with very little written.

Most candidates were able to identify key points in the text that showed the children were being mistreated and were able to provide quotations to support their ideas, offer a general evaluative comment (usually at the start of the paragraph) and then explain the quotations. Most responses offered clear explanation of the text with some evaluation, although the explanations were often lacking in detail. Candidates engaged well with the description of the children's working conditions and wrote about their shock and disgust. The reasons most candidates chose were: 'They can serve 13 hours a day without perishing', 'inhumanely sacrificed', 'In the winter-time they never see day-light except on a Sunday', 'solitary confinement' and 'prison'. They were able to comment on how unfair these conditions were and also how unfit they were for a child. Some candidates seemed emotionally provoked by this, offering their personal opinions regarding it as 'awful' and 'no way to treat a child!'

More successful candidates were able to fully evaluate the extract, referring clearly to the question of the 'mistreatment' of the children, and were able to develop their responses analysing the writer's ideas and viewpoints and providing critical personal judgement on the success of the text. They were able to explore details, such as the children working six days a week, considering the full implications of this on their health and wellbeing. Some considered the effectiveness of 'solitary confinement' and often linked it to 'their prison' to support ideas that the children were trapped, unable to escape their miserable lives. Some responses explored the idea that children might have been experimented on to see how long they can work for 'without perishing' whereas others thought it meant children had in fact died in order for them to know the limit of 13 hours. There were references to the idea of the lack of humanity both in the description of the workers as 'some reptile' and the squalid conditions they worked in. Although this is not a language question, some of these responses did evaluate the effectiveness of particular word choices and techniques in conveying the mistreatment of the children. These more successful candidates had the confidence to go into a more developed evaluation and they often presented convincing ideas. They put forward strong opinions and the majority agreed with the statement using a range of evaluative language such as 'clearly', 'successfully', 'evidently' to add critical evaluation to their points.

Less successful responses just described the passage. Quotations were used but only to explain content, sometimes re-stating their chosen quotation eg “exhausted with watching and fatigue’ shows they were exhausted”. “In the winter-time they never see day-light except on a Sunday’ which shows they work every day except Sunday.” Some candidates misunderstood words such as ‘sacrificed’ and ‘perishing’ to mean that the children were being tortured and killed. Some included long quotations with little or no explanation or comment and, although they were valid, they were undeveloped or explained in very general terms eg ‘it was bad in the mines’. Some responses failed to consider the extract at all and gave a personal response to the question.

This is a successful response for Question 5.

5 Read this extract.

Few of the children thus inhumanly sacrificed were more than eight years old, and several were considerably less, and had barely strength sufficient to perform the office that was required from them. In the winter-time they never see day-light except on a Sunday, for it has been discovered that they can serve for 13 hours a day without perishing<sup>4</sup>, and they are pitilessly compelled to such a term of solitary confinement, with as little consideration for the injury that they suffer, as is felt for the hinges and pulleys of the doors at which they attend. As soon as they rise from their beds they descend down the pit, and they are not relieved from their prison till, exhausted with watching and fatigue, they return to their beds again.

In the extract, the writer tries to show that children were being mistreated in the coalmine.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from the extract.

(6)

The writer is rather successful in achieving this as they describe the children who are "inhumanly sacrificed". This shows that their lives are meaningless, allowing for this harsh mistreatment they endure. A modern reader will be shocked by this, as someone being "sacrificed" alludes to their death. It would be considered atrocious that a child no "more than eight years old" would be sacrificed.

The writer continues this success by claiming that the children

"serve 13 hours a day!" His language dehumanises them, furthering their mistreatment and proving how downtrodden they truly are. A modern reader will find this statistic horrifying as a child in today's society isn't allowed to work for nearly as long.

The writer ends the extract being very successful in proving their point after describing the children as working in a "prison." This choice of vocabulary suggests that they are trapped in the mine whilst they work, with no breaks. A reader will be astounded by this comparison as a business would never be allowed to have "prison" like working conditions in the modern world.



There is convincing analysis and developed critical evaluation with a range of points. There are apt and discriminating references which persuasively clarify the evaluation being made.

All Level 3 criteria are met and this is full marks – 6.



Note how this response is fully focused on evaluation. Remember to include three reasons and to give your opinion about the success of the text.

This is a Level 2 response.

5 Read this extract.

Few of the children thus inhumanly sacrificed were more than eight years old, and several were considerably less, and had barely strength sufficient to perform the office that was required from them. In the winter-time they never see day-light except on a Sunday, for it has been discovered that they can serve for 13 hours a day without perishing<sup>4</sup>, and they are pitilessly compelled to such a term of solitary confinement, with as little consideration for the injury that they suffer, as is felt for the hinges and pulleys of the doors at which they attend. As soon as they rise from their beds they descend down the pit, and they are not relieved from their prison till, exhausted with watching and fatigue, they return to their beds again.

In the extract, the writer tries to show that children were being mistreated in the coalmine.

Evaluate how successfully this is achieved.

Give **three** reasons for your opinion and use examples from the extract.

(6)

The ~~writie~~ writer successfully shows that children were completely mistreated in the coalmine by the fact in the winter they could only see daylight on a sudad, this is disgusting as the average age was eight and they should ~~have~~ have been outside playing like kids these days, and getting their vitamin D in the sun and, I bet that caused a lot of illness in them young ~~ethl~~ kids.

The writer also successfully shows that children were very mistreated by the quote "they serve for 13 hours a day without perishing"

this tells me as a reader that the children didn't get a break and they just had to do as they were told for 13 hours straight and it's sad because that was just a normal day for them, and daylight on a Sunday would be a treat to them.

The writer shows ~~etc~~ that children in 1835 were very mistreated and deserved so much more from life. Another point in the text that proves this is the quote "As soon as they rise from their beds they descend down the pit" this shows and tells me as a reader is all them young children done was work until they ~~we~~ couldn't work no more and ~~there~~ their bodies hurt them just to go to sleep and do it all over again when they woke up.

Another quote that proves this is "they're not allowed to leave their prison hill, exhausted with watching and fatigue". (Total for Question 5 = 6 marks)



Appropriate references are included and there is evidence of a personal response. There is clear explanation and clear evaluative opinion, but this is not developed into critical evaluation or convincing analysis.

Level 2 – 4 marks.



Try to give your judgment on how successful the text is and support it with relevant examples.

## Question 6

This question requires candidates to evaluate how successfully the text shows how bad working conditions were in coalmines.

Generally, candidates were able to engage with the text and examiners commented that the subject matter about children working in the coalmines was accessible to the candidates and many were able to see how challenging the conditions were. Some examiners commented that the responses to this question were better and more focused than in previous series. On the whole, candidates' responses were securely focused on the text. Examiners saw some convincing responses where candidates showed developed analysis of the writer's ideas and critically evaluated how successful the text was in showing how bad working conditions were in coalmines. Some examiners, however, commented that some candidates had difficulty with this question and offered brief or unfocused responses. There were also a number of blank responses, which may be a timing issue, although there seemed to be fewer than in previous series.

Most candidates were able to write with some confidence about the treatment of the children in the mine, often expressing strong feelings. They were able to select relevant points and support them with appropriate references from the whole text although examiners commented that they did not always explain how the writer was building a sustained argument against the working conditions in the mines. Some examiners commented that many candidates did not evaluate the text and only offered explanations of their chosen references. Popular choices for comment were: the description of the girls, the conditions being described as a 'character of a hell', the darkness, loneliness, silence and the age of the children.

More successful responses were able to analyse effectively and focused on the whole text. They offered informed evaluative opinion with appropriate references, using evaluative phrases such as 'I fully agree with...' or 'I partially agree...'. These responses covered the whole text and produced a range of evidence including analysis to give a convincing evaluation of the statement. They were able to organise their ideas well, focusing on the theme of darkness, treatment of the children and how the writer and their companion were affected by their experiences in the mines. Evaluations were supported with appropriate evidence eg the simile of the meteor and the lack of light symbolising the lack of hope in the working conditions often linking with 'the character of a hell'; the references to imprisonment and 'solitary confinement'; and the child resembling a reptile as a reflection of the terrible working conditions.

Candidates who disagreed with statement had varying degrees of success. Some seem to have been taught to find two points agreeing with the statement and a further one disagreeing and they sometimes struggled to find a clear reason for their disagreement. Those who used disagreements to evaluate the text and integrated these into their evaluation were more effective. Points identified to support their disagreement were: they were paid, were gaining work experience, had somewhere to sleep and had Sunday off. However, most examiners commented that the text presents overwhelmingly negative impressions of the coal mine and that candidates did not have to disagree with the statement.

Less successful responses were often undeveloped and wrote very little or used very lengthy quotations and then briefly explained their meaning, with little explanation or judgement or just described the conditions. Some responses did not use quotations to support their responses. A number of candidates only used material that was in the extract for Question 5 which meant they referred only to the children and not the working conditions across the whole text. Some less successful candidates gave their own opinions about the horrors of the mines, rather than evaluating the text. Some wrote about the conditions for workers in those days or a comparison with how times have changed now. They sometimes began with the text as a starting point but drifted away from it. However, examiners did comment that this was less prevalent than in previous series. There were some candidates who approached the task as a language analysis question and explored a range of devices used in the text, missing the focus of the question.

Occasionally candidates wrote a response to Text One. These were rewarded but were penalised for using the wrong text (not reading the instructions carefully).

This is a very successful response to Question 6.

6 For this question refer to the whole of Text 2.

'In my view, this text shows how bad working conditions were in coalmines.'

Based on your evaluation of the text, how far do you agree with this opinion?

Use examples from the text to support your evaluation.

(12)

Firstly, I agree with the statement because at the beginning of text 2, the writer describes to the reader how dangerous the coalmines were. They say "hands grasping the chain" which may suggest how precarious the descent to the mines were. The present progressive noun "grasping" could imply that the darkness also added to the dangerous atmosphere, and created a sense of apprehension for the workers. This may make the reader feel uneasy by the ~~high~~ risk associated with coalmines, and could evoke anxiety from the reader as they imagine the horror felt by workers every day "grasping the chain".

Moreover, the writer presents the working conditions as bad in the coalmines when they say "did not dispel the darkness". The lack of physical light in the coalmines might discern the reader, and make them feel concerned for the safety of the ~~workers~~ workers. The slight ~~repeat~~ <sup>alliteration</sup> of "dispel the darkness" could also imply that the darkness is what makes the job unsafe, and what causes the bad working conditions. This also highlights how ineffective working in the coalmines could be, because you're unable to see much "through the gloom".

Additionally, the "bad working conditions" are further shown when

the writer later on says the place has "the character of a Hell". The fact that the ~~the~~ <sup>coalmines</sup> are given the same characteristics of Hell, implies that the working conditions are beyond unfit for anyone, and could in fact be seen as a punishment for bad people, similar to how Hell is a place of punishment for sinners. The word "Hell" has connotations of darkness, gloom, solitude, misery and perishing." All of these words are also used to describe the coalmines, which highlights how significantly bad the poor working conditions for the workers actually are. This would horrify the reader as they realise how abysmal the conditions of the coalmines are, and how people work down there everyday, including children.

furthermore, I agree with the opinion when the writer says "the abjectness of its condition". The adjective "abjectness" is used to amplify how miserable the workers conditions are, and it shows how hopeless and dejected the workers feel, as if they are doomed to always be working in such terrible condition. This would make the reader question why anyone would ever work in the coalmines, and also question how ~~easy~~ <sup>easy</sup> it would be to give up coal, in order to help those who work in the mines. The "abjectness" is significant, as it highlights how unmotivated and lost all the workers feel, as they're stuck working in the dark abyss everyday.

finally, the writer also presents the "bad working conditions" when they describe the coalmines as a "prison". The writer

states that the workers "are not relieved from their prison..." This use of comparing the coalmines to prisons, creates a negative tone, and implies that the workers are imprisoned in the coalmines. This could also suggest that the conditions of the coalmines are also as poor as the conditions of 19th century prisons. This is significant to the reader because we associate prisons with punishment for convicts and bad people, however the ~~coalmines~~ <sup>coal mines</sup> are a place of work for many people (including children), which makes this comparison seem exaggerated, despite the fact that it's most likely ~~that~~ <sup>true</sup>. This could evoke a sense of pity from the reader, as you wouldn't wish anyone to be sent to a 19th century prison, therefore amplifying the sympathy the reader might feel for all the helpless children and workers who have to work in the coalmine every day.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a detailed and convincingly analytical response with a sustained and detached critical evaluation throughout.

All level 5 descriptors are met so full marks are achieved.

Level 5 – 12 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Look at how the candidate has used examples from across the whole text and has consistently focused on evaluation.

This is a less successful response to Question 6.

6 For this question refer to the whole of Text 2.

'In my view, this text shows how bad working conditions were in coalmines.'

Based on your evaluation of the text, how far do you agree with this opinion?

Use examples from the text to support your evaluation.

(12)

In my opinion, I agree that the working conditions were bad because children as young eight years old are being forced to work "13 hours a day". This is not healthy for them because are breathing in all the dust and chemicals all day, everyday.

As well as this, the writer states that in winter they only see light on Sunday because of their long work hours. This would slowly start to have an effect on their eyes because they are constantly in the dark.

Additionally, the writer describes ~~it~~ the place to have a "character from hell". This shows us that this clearly is not a healthy environment for children.

The writer has also described the children as a "misereble little wretch" which shows us that the children are clearly unhappy. The writer goes on to describe it as "some reptile" which also shows us that they are unwell.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is best described as straightforward, working through the text and choosing some valid references. However, the comments are not always secure – for example, in the first paragraph the evidence chosen refers to the length of the day, but the comment goes on to mention 'dust and chemicals'. The points made are slightly repetitive and rely on the unhealthy aspect of the mines. The lack of developed comment keeps this at the lower end of Level 2 with a mark of 3.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Remember this is a 12-mark question so allow yourself enough time to respond in sufficient detail. Keep a focus on evaluation and also try to develop your comments.

## Question 7

This question asked candidates to write a blog about how to choose the best job. This was the more popular choice. Many examiners commented positively about candidates' responses to this topic. There were a few blank responses.

### A05

Examiners commented that candidates obviously knew a lot about this subject and could relate to this topic and had plenty to write about. Many candidates used the opening in the question in their own writing and this seemed to give them some confidence and direction. Most candidates successfully used blog features with direct address and rhetorical questions being common, although some examiners felt that there was not much clear differentiation between the features of a blog compared with an article. They understood the purpose of the task and were able to communicate clearly and talk about different careers and what to think about and how to find different career paths. Most candidates addressed the reader directly and the most successful achieved an effective combination of practical advice and reassurance on how to navigate a difficult process in a young person's life. Examiners commented that it was impressive how much candidates actually knew about looking for jobs, many obviously informed by careers lessons. Some related their responses to actual experience with their own part-time jobs and were able to use their personal experience to inform their advice. Some made the important point that having a full-time job when studying could be counterproductive, as one could fail at one's studies due to exhaustion. Some examiners commented that it was pleasing to see responses that considered the satisfaction of employments that benefit the community rather than, primarily, oneself. Many candidates focused on the importance of following your dreams and choosing a career path that you feel passionate about and said that if you choose a job you like then 'you'll never work a day in your life'.

More successful candidates sustained a sense of purpose and audience throughout and organised their material into a clear and logical sequence of ideas. These responses were lively and clearly crafted, using paragraphs in an appropriate manner with varied sentences and structural devices. They had a strong register and related to their audience effectively. There were some passionate and convincing responses. They used a range of rhetorical devices and humour to get the ideas across. Their responses had a reassuring or friendly tone eg 'Did you worry about finding the right job when you left college? I did too...' or 'On the job and off the job training. Don't know the difference? Let me explain'. A common piece of advice given was: 'The internet is your friend!' There were many examples of websites to use and online tests to take to help you choose a job to suit your personality. Some recommended taking advice from friends and family but others suggested that it was not a good idea to be influenced by people close to you. Personal anecdotes were also used effectively in the more successful responses to persuade the audience of their arguments. For example, one wrote about an older brother going into law 'just for the money' and hating it. The advice was not to always chase the high pay because 'It was paying a lot but didn't pay for his happiness.'

Less successful responses had difficulty with developing their ideas and focusing on the task. They often struggled with the correct form, tone and register for a blog. Several less successful responses described personal experiences of job hunting rather than focusing on giving advice. Some wrote about the best job they had had or why they wanted to follow a particular career eg why they wanted to be a footballer/dancer/musician. Others wrote about why jobs are important and gave a general overview on the need to earn money, without focusing on the question. There were some who included too much information about being interviewed which did not focus on how to choose the best job. There were some responses that were brief and undeveloped with weak language controls which impeded meaning. Less successful responses wrote very little – some had clearly run out of time. There were a number of responses that wrote little beyond copying out the prompt on the question paper, however it was noted by some examiners that the prompt allowed some of the least successful candidates to write something on the ideas provided.

## **A06**

Most candidates were able to make some attempt to select vocabulary, sentence structures and punctuation to suit the task. They were able to express and order information and ideas with some correctly spelt vocabulary, some control of punctuation and some accurate paragraphing. Most candidates were able to communicate successfully even if there were errors. The use of a varied vocabulary showed some adaptation to the topic being written about.

Examiners commented that although vocabulary was often varied, there were spelling errors. Complex words were sometimes correct, but there were frequent careless errors which suggested a lack of proof reading. Nearly all examiners commented on weak punctuation with some responses using very few full stops or capital letters.

More successful candidates were selective with their word choices and used a range of appropriate linguistic techniques, eg rhetorical questions and direct address to communicate their ideas. They used a wide range of vocabulary that was well-chosen for the task they had selected. These candidates wrote fluently with a range of structural devices. They had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful candidates were often repetitive with their word choices and sentence structures. They often used very basic sentences or did not punctuate sentences. These candidates sometimes had limited vocabulary and poor grammar.

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

Some examiners remarked that informal contractions such as 'gonna' and 'wanna' appeared in some responses possibly in an attempt at register, but their use was not entirely appropriate.

This is an example of a response to Question 7.

Chosen question number: **Question 7**  **Question 8**

**Plan your answer to Section B here:**

- how to choose the best job?
- variety of jobs 1 para
- likes and dislikes 2 para
- relevant questions
- permanent or fulltime benefits 3 para
- skills qualification

**Write your answer to Section B here:**

How to choose the right job? a question that everyone has asked themselves <sup>at least</sup> once in a lifetime, well with an extremely excellent number of variety it sure is hard to decide, well there is not really a definitive best job as people have different wishes and desires, different goals and achievements. However, we can definitely get a solid strong understanding of what a person wishes for based on their personality.

Firstly, your best job depends heavily on your likes and dislikes am I right? For example, if you perhaps are very party and extroverted you might enjoy more of a outside communicating job, on the other hand if you are more of a introvert you might decide to work perhaps in an office, alone on your desk, in peace, and that's why personality has an extremely incredible influence in your pick. For example, say you are an extremely eager person to communicate to others maybe the solitary, slow and selective office job isn't for you.

Many people pick their jobs however ~~not~~ can't decide if they wish to work fulltime or part time, this is a subject that changes from person to person, the questions that might help in this selective section is

how much time do you have?

are you in college or sports that take away time?

do you have transport?

All these questions have a big play when it gets to deciding to work full time or part time. ~~Now the benefits of full time is that you earn more~~

However, there <sup>is</sup> benefits of both full and part time, full time you earn more, however, you ~~to~~ work more leading into ~~time~~ the fact that it's incredibly issued as time consuming. On the other hand, part time isn't as many hours this may

be better for the people who have sports or college going on. For example if you have college 9am till 3pm ~~and~~ Monday to Friday, you won't be able to do full time and ~~if~~ do you ~~to~~ really want to give up on college ~~to~~ for a job? well ~~it's~~ it's up to you.

Finally, the question that seems the most important of all the questions. How much will I earn? well depending on the job you pick, you will earn depending on your hours. However some jobs have courses inside jobs to do. ~~this~~ You might be thinking "why ~~do~~ should I do more courses inside my job?" well the more courses you do, the higher your pay will be.

In Conclusion, I hope you have learnt the fundamentals of picking the best job and understand that it differs ~~is~~ from person to person.



**A05** – There is a clear ability to communicate clearly, effectively and imaginatively. Material is selected to suit audience and purpose with appropriate structural devices used to make the meaning clear. Level 3 qualities are evident.

Level 3 – 13 marks.

**A06** – There is some accurate, varied vocabulary, but punctuation has some basic errors and there is a lack of range evident. There are some sound grammatical features used for clarity and effect.

On balance, the best fit mark for this is at the top of Level 2 – 7 marks.



To improve this response the candidate could have developed their ideas in more detail.

Proof reading and checking the response might have improved the accuracy.

## Question 8

This question asked candidates to write an article for an employment website aimed at young adults about how to succeed in interviews.

Examiners commented that candidates who chose this option seemed quite well-prepared and offered a range of sensible ideas in an appropriate format. An examiner said, 'It was great to see so many candidates with an excellent understanding of how to excel in this situation'. Some examiners felt that responses to this question were more secure than those to Question 7 although other examiners thought candidates performed better on Question 7. There were a few blank responses.

### A05

The majority of candidates approached this question with confidence and understood the key principles for succeeding at a job interview. It was clear that many candidates were using their real-life experience to inform their writing others were perhaps informed by advice given in careers lessons or from websites. Most candidates were able to use the bullet points to help structure their response, with the bullet points often used as sub-headings. Most candidates were able to understand what the requirements were for a successful interview and gave sound advice.

Advice included: what to wear and what is considered professional; researching an employer to demonstrate an understanding of the company; being polite (with some warning against using slang or swearing); asking questions but definitely not on pay/salary; practising with a friend or family member in a mock interview; and arriving with plenty of time before the interview. Suggestions about dress code was a particularly common area eg 'wear something that tells the interviewer that you will look this good every time you walk through the door.' Some listed exactly what to wear from top to toe, the best kind of hairstyle (always tied back). Others commented on personal hygiene eg smelling good and brushing your teeth.

There was a similarity of approach to most responses to this question. Advice on dress, punctuality, speaking, politeness etc. featured in nearly all. The main variation was in the tone of the advice; some responses made a real effort to create a website article, with a friendly and conversational style while others gave straightforward advice. It was common to wish the reader luck in their interview and end with a positive affirmation such as 'you can do this' or 'you've got this'.

More successful candidates used a range of rhetorical devices and humour to get the ideas across. The pieces were well structured and left the reader very knowledgeable and confident to ace their next interview. Use of imperatives was frequent and usually effective. These candidates employed an authentic advisory voice that was suitable for the intended audience of young adults, with a good mix of formal and informal language choices. There was a mixture of instruction and reassurance in the more successful responses with humour employed appropriately, as well as a range of language devices. These responses were introduced clearly and organised into clear paragraphs which took a logical approach to preparing for and conducting yourself in an interview. These responses were well-structured with a clear introduction, development and conclusion. Some of them explored not just how to make a good impression but why certain impressions were important: 'commitment and communication will make you a desirable employee.' Many conveyed very positive, motivational sentiments and ended with 'smash/ace that interview' or 'bag that dream job' or simply 'good luck'.

Less successful responses had problems organising and developing ideas in any detail. They had a basic structure and some points, which were repetitive, such as talking about smelling nice, shaking hands and not swearing or playing on their phones. They sometimes focused too much on the preparation before the interview rather than advising on what approaches might be useful in the interview itself. Some wrote about what they would personally do in an interview. Some of these less successful responses were very brief and others were a simply a list of points without further development.

## **AO6**

The comments from examiners were the same as those for Question 7.

Most candidates were able to make some attempt to select vocabulary, sentence structures and punctuation to suit the task. They were able to express and order information and ideas with some correctly spelt vocabulary, some control of punctuation and some accurate paragraphing. Most candidates were able to communicate successfully even if there were errors. The use of a varied vocabulary showed some adaptation to the topic being written about.

Examiners commented that although vocabulary was often varied, there were spelling errors. Complex words were sometimes correct but there were frequent careless errors which suggested a lack of proof reading. Nearly all examiners commented on weak punctuation with some responses using very few full stops or capital letters.

More successful candidates were selective with their word choices and used a range of appropriate linguistic techniques, eg rhetorical questions and direct address to communicate their ideas. They used a wide range of vocabulary that was well-chosen for the task they had selected. These candidates wrote fluently with a range of structural devices. They had full control of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Less successful candidates were often repetitive with their word choices and sentence structures. They often used very basic sentences or did not punctuate sentences. These candidates sometimes had limited vocabulary and poor grammar.

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

Some examiners remarked that informal contractions such as 'gonna' and 'wanna' appeared in some responses possibly in an attempt at register, but their use was not entirely appropriate.



reception door and give it your best shot, here are some pointers to remember.

Firstly, research your ~~reser~~ potential employer; find out everything you can about them. Read their website, do a Google search and look on Glassdoor.com. Nothing irritates an employer more than candidates who do not know anything about them. Show you care.

Secondly, consider how your skills and experience map onto their requirements. How can you make their life easier? How can you make a difference? This kind of reflection and consideration will make you stand out during the interview, as it shows potential employers that you have given the role serious thought and attention.

Thirdly, check for practical requirements of the interview. Find out the dress code - is it smart or casual? Tie or no tie? Will you be expected to do proficiency tests and workshop on an employer's site? Take a bottle of water!

Once you have found out what you can about your employer and done your homework you are ready for the interview, for the presentation. Some employers will give you an initial online, in-person call through Microsoft Teams or <sup>an</sup> other portal, before the main interview. But whether in person or not, you are still visible, still front and centre, so your presentation here is critical. So what should you do?

Firstly, sit up straight. Arms by your side or resting in your lap. Breathe deeply and smile. The interviewer will chair the process, will put you at ease and direct the questions. It is very important to be fully present in your interview, give the interviewer your full attention, listen attentively so you can actively answer the questions relevantly and with as few "Um"s and "Ah"s as possible.

Be personable, be friendly, but avoid bad language and slang which you will possibly upset and confuse your interviewer. Even if your interviewer swears, be cautious and polite, try to avoid being over-familiar with someone you do not know.

~~The~~ Do not criticise other previous employees as this is framed up. There are a few key things to avoid, <sup>behaviors</sup> things that definitely <sup>make</sup> the worst of impressions. Firstly, do not slouch, do not fold your arms and take on a defensive demeanour. Body language is as important in human communication as verb exchanges. So keep your body open, and your eyes on the interviewer.

The biggest no-no, is the mobile phone. Once you've successfully used Google to navigate you to your job interview, turn off your phone and put it out of sight. Checking your notifications and random pop-up adverts firing off during an interview will definitely give an employer the impression that they do not want to employ you.

Something that many employers <sup>all</sup> love is a proactive candidate. When they have asked their questions, and you have

elegantly and convincingly explained to them why you would be an effective employee - you will then get your chance to ask <sup>your</sup> questions. So it is definitely worth thinking carefully about the conditions of your employment, the scope of the role, holiday, prospects and training, and also ethics and climate: change readiness. Your question readiness, can help you find out if this employer is the right place for you too. What sort of ~~the~~ impressions do they make on you?

~~So you~~ So, you successfully applied for that dream job you wanted, you have been given an interview date, a location and it is your big opportunity. To make the right impression remember: preparation (do your homework), presentation (dress appropriately, be attentive) and participation (what do you want - what happens now?). And remember, smile! Be personable and engaging and people will remember you for all the right reasons.



**A05** – This is an impressive and highly sophisticated response which manipulates complex ideas and shapes audience response with sustained use of tone, style and register. There is a good balance between friendly and formal throughout. Full marks are well deserved!

Level 5 – 24 marks.

**A06** – This response employs a consistently high level of control, uses an extensive vocabulary and demonstrates a sophisticated holistic use of grammatical features.

Level 5 – 16 marks.



Note how the candidate directly addresses the reader engaging them in the topic. The response is fully-focused on the task and develops their ideas with sophistication.

The planning box has been used effectively to help the candidate organise and develop the ideas.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on the paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- For short-answer Questions 1 and 4(a), ensure that you are responding briefly and selecting information, not just writing out a section. Highlight the relevant lines in your extract booklet and read the question carefully. Ensure you answer on the correct text as well as correct lines. For Question 4(b), try to find ideas that are implied in the given text rather than just selecting phrases or quotations from the text.
- For Question 3, make sure you focus on language features eg alliteration, personification, simile, metaphor. Remember to focus on the effects of your chosen examples on the reader and not just explain their meaning. Try to use appropriate subject terminology.
- In Questions 3 and 6, where reference to the whole extract is needed, it is important to consider what references you will use and consider what examples are most significant for comment. Discriminating references are seen where you pick out specific examples across the extract that link to your points, not just where you comment on every feature seen.
- For your responses to Questions 2, 5 and 6, remember that you evaluate every day, and more so than ever with online feedback and posting of opinions and ideas online. Read the question carefully – what is it you are giving your opinion on? You do not need to comment on language and structure here unless this supports your evaluation. Remember always to link your evaluative points to the text.
- Remember to find three reasons for your opinion and support them with examples for your responses to Questions 2 and 5. Remember to give examples from the correct lines in response to Question 2.
- When you are writing, always think about your reader, what ideas you want them to understand and how you want them to react at different parts of your writing; then choose the most useful words, phrases or techniques available to you to achieve those effects.
- Plan your writing, even just briefly. You have been given a planning box to do this. Think carefully about how you will begin to write so that it is engaging for your reader from the very start. As you begin to write, know where you will end. This will help you to write in a cohesive and coherent way. If you start presenting an idea, make sure you are developing it.
- Take care throughout with accuracy: spelling, punctuation and grammar. Try to give yourself time to proof-read your writing.
- Focus on timing during the examination and use the number of marks available for each question as an indication of how long you should spend answering each question. Make sure you try to answer every question.

## **Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

