

GCSE

**ENGLISH/ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

ENG1H Understanding and producing non-fiction texts

Report on the Examination

---

4700/4705

November 2015

---

Version: 0.1

---

---

Further copies of this Report are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2015 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

**English Unit 1 ENG1H      November 2015**

Examiners reported that the examination overall was accessible and that candidates had adequate time to complete all questions.

**Question 1**

The article concerned drug and cosmetics firms and the testing of their products. This was accessible to all candidates and most were able to understand the issues outlined in the text which related to vivisection, cost, time, reliability and the alternatives to testing on animals. The most successful answers offered a structured response which showed clear engagement with the article, enumerated the issues and offered considered interpretations of the facts. Less successful candidates reiterated sometimes random information from the article with less engagement and little or no interpretation. The least successful simply copied out parts of the text. A number of candidates offered their personal views on the topic, a strategy which was only successful when the comments related to the specific content of the article. Overall, the performance was successful with over 80% of candidates achieving a mark of 4 or better and nearly half achieving a mark of 5 or better.

**Question 2**

Candidates evidently found this article, concerning the behaviour of the panda, Ai Hin, and the accompanying photograph, engaging and intriguing. Many recognised the use of the pun with the words ‘pandering’ and ‘panda’, however few went beyond mentioning that this was a play on words. The phrase ‘bun fraud case’ produced, perhaps, better analysis with some candidates explaining the meaning and effect of the words ‘fraud’ and ‘case’ within the intended criminal context, and the humorous absurdity of applying this to a panda. There were some interesting interpretations of the image, such as that the panda was praying for forgiveness, hiding in the shadows to conceal her guilt, or displaying a cheeky grin to show how smug she felt, indeed how pleased she was to have hoodwinked her keepers. However, most of the effects proposed were ‘attempted’ rather than ‘clear’ and in many cases were ‘generalised’. Candidates’ responses to linking the elements of the headline and picture to the text, as required by the question, were perhaps more successful than their explanation of the effects. However, it was also the case here that the links were often arbitrary and not clearly contextualised or explained. A common error that many candidates continue to make is linking the headline and picture together, which may be a useful way to exemplify an effect but does not fulfil the ‘link’ aspect of the question. Others made simplistic comments about the colon in the headline and how this created a pause, or offered generic comments that could be applied to any text. Most candidates scored a mark of 4 for this question with only 23% attaining 5 or better.

**Question 3**

The account of Katherine Braun Mankin’s encounter with the gorillas was accessible and well received by candidates. Most candidates understood and were able to give some account of the main thoughts and feelings experienced by the writer, with 70% receiving a mark of 4 or better. Most candidates recognised Katherine’s surprise and pleasure at the beautiful scenery she enjoyed and the fact that she became anxious or scared when meeting the gorillas. Responses above Band 2 recognised that there was a certain complexity to her feelings and the reasons for them; that she was not just scared but thrilled and excited to be so close to the animals. Furthermore, that the range of feelings she had were precisely what she was seeking – including the tension, anxiety and fear. Less successful responses suggested that the encounter and associated feelings were just negative, frightening and better avoided – and that Katherine wanted to leave. Some candidates who did less well moved beyond the text by speculating rather than

interpreting or, identified thoughts and feelings but did not comment on them. Weaker responses concentrated on the scenery in the first few lines of the text but then produced a scant response to the remainder – often limited to the observation that Katherine was ‘scared’. As with previous years, some candidates failed to focus on the question and instead analysed language or the effect of the events on the reader, which gained them no marks.

#### **Question 4**

Just under 2% of candidates attained a mark in Band 3 or better for this question. Nearly half of the candidates were in Band 2 and the remainder below that. The majority of candidates failed to present any clear analysis of the effects of chosen language features and of those who showed some understanding of the effects of language, many offered only generalised comments. As with previous series, many candidates began by discussing purpose and audience before then focussing on genre, person and structure rather than analysing words, phrases or language features – an approach that was unhelpful in moving beyond the lowest mark band. A quite large number of candidates failed to select and quote any examples of words, phrases, or devices from the text on which to comment, meaning that effects could not possibly be discussed in a precise and contextualised way. Often, when a feature such as simile or metaphor was identified and quoted, no analysis of the effects of these language choices was offered.

#### **Question 5**

The task was accessible to all candidates – indeed a situation which was ‘exciting but also scary’ had been presented in Source 3. Candidates, generally, were able to produce a response which included both description and explanation. Over 70% of candidates were awarded a mark at or above Band 3 and so produced writing which was clear, engaging and more detailed and developed. There was a plethora of rollercoaster rides, football games and Halloween nights, first or last days of school and a number of examination-based experiences. More engaging responses included first dates or first kiss, stage-fright performances, or experiences which were unique to the writer and therefore special and unpredictable for the reader. A large majority of candidates attained the acceptable mark of 4 out of 6 for accuracy with but few able to show creativity in the use of sentences or accuracy in the spelling of words from an ambitious vocabulary.

#### **Question 6**

The candidates who produced the most successful arguments took some care to deal with the substance of the quotation, and some distinguished its elements – for example understanding and accepting the need for some animal testing in order to advance medical science whilst rejecting entertainment that resulted in animals being harmed. In this way, a clear, considered argument was formed. A number of candidates, whilst their writing may have been clear and their mark in, or just in, Band 3, produced an argument which owed much to specific material from Source 1, or was highly rhetorical, or employed spurious statistics and unconvincing experts. Less successful candidates – more than half were below Band 3 – made only some attempt at producing a clear and coherent, original argument of any substance, and a good number unleashed an invective against the right of the individual, or newspaper, to make the claim at all, instead of focusing on the issues. Over half of the candidates received 5 marks out of 8 for accuracy with a further 38% receiving 4 marks which suggests that, although sentence structure and spelling were not ambitious, they were generally accurate.

## **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.

## **Converting Marks into UMS marks**

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

[UMS conversion calculator](#)