**Unit 4: Poetry and Prose**

**Principal Examiner’s comments on exemplar response**

**Section A/Question 1**

**AO1**

The response is well shaped with a competent overview at the start and a succinct conclusion which draws on observations made. The question is directly addressed throughout. Expression is accurate and coherent with little error. So far, the candidate is securely into band 4 but the range of terms used is quite narrow, more characteristic of band 3. The candidate identifies lists, sentence mood, parallelism and some verbs: the terms are accurately and purposefully used but narrow on lexis and lacking literary approaches (poetic form, imagery, phonology). **Band 4 10/15**

**AO2**

The introduction has accurate comments on tone and there is some acknowledgement of the genre of Text A. The explanation of the impact of listing in Text A is secure and relevant. Starting points for analysis are well chosen but the coverage of techniques is far from thorough. Reference to poetic form is missing and the candidate tends to explain Text B in terms of context rather than as a piece of literature. The texts are clearly understood but the range of analysis offered is quite narrow. There are some more developed points, such as the effect of the unintoned list in Clinton’s speech. **Band 4 11/15**

**AO4**

The comparative element of the task is competently addressed, with linking overviews in the introduction and conclusion. The discussion of time factors adds depth to the distinctions identified and is explored thoroughly towards the end of the essay. The response uses comparative links as an organising device which is a recommended approach. Differences in tone are well chosen as starting points, with suitable evidence to illustrate them. To achieve higher than a secure band 4, there needs to be a wider consideration of the impact of the genre of each text, along with some more obvious differences which have been overlooked, such as viewpoint. **Band 4 23/30**

**Question 1 44/60**

**Section B Question 3** (‘the main character’s relationships with other characters’)

**AO1**

There is little attempt at a general introduction and the conclusion is broad. The response covers six relationships, whereas more rigorous selection of three or four relationships would have allowed space for further development. Expression is accurate and coherent throughout but the range of terminology is narrow – nouns, verbs, pronouns and declaratives, recognition of irony. Again, the response is thin on literary terms and some obvious opportunities for linguistic analysis, such as the naming of Offred and the Commander, are overlooked. Organisation is basic and needed more thought but clear expression lifts this out of band 2. **Band 3 7/15**

**AO2**

There is a little developed comment on meaning, notably on the verb ‘shield’ (p.6) and some sensible literary reading, such as the significance of posture in the Serena Joy section, where the term ‘symbolism’ would have been helpful. Some attempts, such as the use of ‘declarative’ are less productive. The candidate has attempted too many relationships and although she does try to offer textual support, this has led to thin coverage of relevant material, for example in the section on Moira. The final section on the Commander is sensible but descriptive. **Band 3+ 9/15**

**AO3**

Although longer than the Section A response this is much less successful as it lacks a firm and steady focus on the dominant AO. The sketchy performance on AO3 is the weakest element. The introduction which could link the topic with key contextual factors is missing. There is one sensible reference to feminist movements in the first paragraph and one undeveloped comment suggesting awareness of theocracy on p.7. The candidate has failed to include any reference to the writer or her purposes, the dystopian genre, or any of the numerous historical, social and political influences which are relevant. **Band 1+ 5/30**

**Question 3 21/60**