
A-LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

7707/2 Paper 2 Exploring Conflict
Report on the Examination

7707/2
June 2023

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2023 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.

Exploring Conflict: general comment

As ever, this paper was enjoyable to mark, with students demonstrating their creativity in Section A and their engagement with their chosen drama text in Section B.

The demands of Paper 2 are high on students as they must demonstrate a variety of skills and address all five Assessment Objectives. Most students understood that in this paper they needed to:

- offer an account by a named character, using the given extract as a springboard for their creative choices and addressing the bullet points
- comment analytically on their own text, drawing connections with their base text
- respond to a question on their set drama text, using the given extract as a starting point and drawing upon other areas of the play to explore how language and contextual factors also add to meaning and authorial crafting.

However, when students did not engage with the actual question in front of them, this led to less successful responses. For Section A, this often meant overlooking who the intended account receiver was in the recreative writing task, and only discussing the base text anecdotally without reference to language - often only referring to content or highlighting contextual points. For Section B, there was sometimes leakage from the question not chosen ie the starting extract was used as another text choice from the play, but this was rarely a successful selection for the question chosen.

Timing appeared an issue for some students this year. Examiners saw some brief and undeveloped responses to Section B and ones that barely covered more than the starting extract. There were also many quite descriptive responses, with retelling of the events in the play rather than an analysis of the playwright's crafting. As a reminder, there is a rubric infringement on Section B; where either only the extract or different parts of the play are discussed, then AO2 is capped at the top of Level 2. Sometimes the timing issues for Section B appeared the result of overly long commentaries in Section A. Whilst there are no rubric infringements for Section A, with the word counts only being advisory, a brief recreative task and overly long commentary could have also implications on overall achievement.

Students occasionally chose to do the paper in different orders. Most chose to complete it in a linear order by question and section, whilst others chose to tackle the Section B Dramatic encounters question first. There was no one right way to do it, although the few that did their recreative writing, then their drama response and finally the critical commentary were not allowing themselves the best opportunity to focus on the task in hand – decoupling the Writing about Society tasks is not advised.

Section A: Writing about society

Into the Wild responses tended to be successful, with students responding well to the tragic circumstances surrounding Sam's visit to Walt and Billie. *The Kite Runner* also showed some good responses, with many students evoking a clear sense of the tournament and the relationship between Amir and Hassan as part of a wider social/political attitude towards Hazaras. *The Great Gatsby*, whilst most popular, was mixed in terms of response; there were some strong responses with students demonstrating that they understood the significance of Klipspringer as a minor character in the base text whose shallow behaviours reflected those willing to take advantage of Gatsby. There were also well many more straightforward and derivative responses to the task. This variability was perhaps understandable given the numbers of students choosing this text option. As

ever, the recreative writing and critical commentary are assessed separately and this meant that students could write a successful analysis of their writing, even if the account itself had been judged as less imaginative or original. However, those who considered some of the subtleties of their own recreative choices such as characters' attitudes to Hazaras in Afghanistan, the nuances of telling a parent about the death of a child or how characters' attitudes to wealth in 1920s American society could be encoded in language choices could score highly.

The most popular text was *The Great Gatsby* with 70% of students choosing this option. However, examiners much enjoyed the many characterisations of Klipspringer, finding him on tennis courts, in libraries, in Gatsby's garden, in bars, at new host's houses and in many imaginative but thoughtful settings that showed a sound understanding of his characterisation in the base text. *The Kite Runner* was the next most popular, followed by *Into the Wild* and *The Suspicions of Mr Whicher*.

Recreative writing

The following marks are awarded for assessment objectives:

AO5 (25 marks) – Demonstrate expertise and creativity in their use of English to communicate in different ways.

In this transformation task, expertise and creativity is being assessed through three different strands.

- flair and originality.
- sustained use of style.
- convincing use of base text.

The generic nature of the task asks students to recast the base text into an 'account', allowing students freedom to make representational decisions about the use of dialogue, speech and thought, narrative modes and genre. Indeed, it is the quality and execution of these choices that determines whether 'flair and originality' is demonstrated - a requirement to get into Levels 4 and 5.

Many took these creative opportunities to shape their narratives by constructing effective dialogue that aided characterisation, successful use of the base text that made the accounts more interesting. Accounts that relied on dialogue alone, however, often failed to sustain interest. Some also represented thought confidently, using it to add to the characterisation. Some used thought presentation to meet some of the considerations required in the bullet points, some used it to allow the reader to know that the characters were thinking about their memories and some used it just to add irony as the character's thoughts contradicted their expressed views in dialogue. Monologues were a popular choice this year (mainly for *The Great Gatsby*) but this could leave students without any representation of an account receiver, which meant that they had not met the brief. Those students who used the monologue form more securely understood the language devices that could be used to signal that someone was listening to the monologue.

As a reminder, the task is not meant to be a pastiche of the original writer's style. This was most often seen with students trying to adopt, what they often called in their commentaries, Fitzgerald's 'poetic style', but without considering whether this was an appropriate choice for the character depicted. In terms of style and register, success is measured in the decisions students make in the creation of voice for the characters presented, in addition to the language choices they make throughout their account.

Use of the base text was a discriminator in awarding marks. Much of the ‘flair and originality’ of the first strand of the mark scheme can also come from the selection of details from the base text and how students use these to highlight their knowledge and understanding of the text they have studied. Obviously, students do not know in advance whether the character they will be depicting is a major or minor included participant (a character explicitly mentioned in the base text) or an excluded participant (a character not explicitly mentioned but whose existence can be assumed). However, students should be encouraged to realise that this task is assessing their study of the base text, as well as their creativity, and that this is also an open book exam where they have the opportunity to check their knowledge, although time constraints still rely on them knowing their text well in order to locate key sections.

As a general overview, the most successful responses:

- chose their form wisely and understood how it functioned in terms of presenting and developing characters. (This meant understanding that a monologue could reveal much about the depicted character, that dialogue allowed for characterisation of both account giver and account receiver and that choosing either a first-person or third-person perspective had narratorial affordances and constraints).
- used setting to enhance the narrative and to show a secure understanding of the base text
- adopted sensible genres for the characters to use, given the base text and the character being presented.
- focused on the characterisation, using carefully selected information from the base text, and developing the character beyond this, giving them convincing motivations and views
- thought about the way that the character would use language, crafting a convincing idiolect for them in dialogue or in the monologue.
- addressed all the bullet points, understanding that these are an integral part of the question
- controlled the narrative from the beginning to the end.

As a general overview, less successful responses:

- selected less appropriate settings for the account, for example choosing a café for telling Walt and Billie that their son was dead.
- selected less appropriate genres, for example a letter from Saifo to another shopkeeper without consideration of Saifo’s blindness and whether this shopkeeper would be literate.
- did not control the tense of the account, shifting illogically between past and present.
- tried too hard to copy the original writer’s style, rather than selecting more judiciously some of the base text’s writer’s language and narrative choices.
- gave literal retellings of the events in the springboard extract, adding little additional to the changed point of view.
- showed a lack of knowledge of the base text, confusing, omitting or making errors about key details.

Q1: *Into the Wild*

Students had clearly engaged with the characterisations of Walt, Billie and Chris, and their relationships with Sam afforded interesting scope for exploration.

Successful responses:

- thought carefully about when to begin their narrative, eg pulling up to the house, in media res.
- thought carefully about narrative perspective, with many adopting a homodiegetic narrative that allowed them to explore Sam’s interactions with Walt and Billie as well as his thoughts.
- balanced speech and thought effectively, allowing space for the news to be broken to Walt and Billie but also allowing for reflection on Chris’ character.

- drew on the base text successfully, reflecting on the given passage but also on wider aspects of the text, eg Sam's relationship with Walt, Chris' previous adventures, the last time he was seen by his family at his graduation etc.
- shaped their writing effectively, using metaphor or pathetic fallacy to present emotions.
- sustained the voice/style successfully.

Less successful responses:

- relied quite heavily on the given passage.
- focused more on Billie or Walt than on Sam's account.
- offered a monologue focusing on Sam's inner thoughts, without any sense of account receiver.
- focused too much on Sam and Michele's journey to Walt and Billie's house and the build up to the news of Chris's death, leaving little time to convey this.
- did not present a particularly convincing style, eg delivering the news very bluntly 'Chris is dead', ignoring how sensitive and devastating this news would be.

Q3: *The Suspicions of Mr Whicher*

Unfortunately, as there were relatively few responses to this question, it is difficult to comment in detail on the strengths and weaknesses of the accounts. Examiners commented that most of the accounts seen were retellings of the given extract and that little attention was given to characterisation of the prison warders to add to the information offered in the base text.

Q5: *The Great Gatsby*

There were some interesting characterisations of Klipspringer: for example, as a spy, a journalist, a bootlegger, an ex-soldier. Of note, were the very different genres selected, including letters, monologues, interviews, as well as more conventional narratives with Klipspringer in conversation with another guest.

Successful responses:

- presented Klipspringer's character well, variously as admiring of Gatsby or envious or self-absorbed or a close friend.
- thought carefully about when the narrative would be located, with some of the more successful ones reflecting on Gatsby and his parties after his death.
- focused on Klipspringer's reaction to and feelings about Gatsby, his feelings about the parties or his death, reflecting on why he was rarely seen at his parties or gazed at the green light etc.
- thought carefully about the account receiver, as someone who had also attended but who wanted more information about Gatsby from Klipspringer, as someone who should know him well having 'boarded' at his home.
- used information from the base text about other party goers wisely and sometimes choosing from these for the account-receiver, often when making the account retrospective and sharing memories.
- balanced speech and thought effectively, sometimes showing an interesting juxtaposition between what was said in an effort to protect Gatsby from idle gossip and inner thoughts about his elusiveness etc.
- showed good knowledge of the text, extending beyond the given passage, eg not attending the funeral, liver exercises, playing the piano, leaving his tennis shoes behind etc.
- shaped writing effectively, using some figurative language and varied sentence types to shape the narrative without falling into the trap of attempting to mirror Fitzgerald's style too closely.

Less successful responses:

- drew on the given passage very closely, sometimes simply listing the guests from Nick's narrative.

- had no sense of account receiver, offering a monologue or narrative that featured only Klipspringer.
- showed limited knowledge of the text beyond the given passage, eg assuming that Klipspringer had never actually spoken to Gatsby.
- focused solely on the parties and guests, reminiscent of an earlier question, rather than focusing on Klipspringer or Gatsby.
- offered very little content, spending a lot of time on dialogue, or offering only very brief responses so that the recast felt very thin.
- unsuccessful genre choices, eg transcripts or interviews which did not allow for imaginative detail.

Q7: *The Kite Runner*

The presentation of a minor participant such as Saifo provided scope for some to use the information that Hosseini provides about kite running imaginatively, and many considered the implications that Saifo's blindness would have on his account. One of the challenges for this text is how to talk about 'Baba' when not from Amir's perspective and this caused problems for some students.

Successful responses:

- thought quite carefully about how they might use their narrative to explore wider themes/issues from the novel, eg Pashtun/Hazara relationships. Some students presented Saifo as critical of Baba's kind treatment of Hassan, some students presented him as more tolerant and open about this, some focused on the account receiver (other shopkeeper) as holding prejudiced ideas.
- evoked an imaginative description of the tournament, both as it was at the time of the narrative but also in Saifo's past. Some even reflected on the tournament at different times of political upheaval, eg offering a release and freedom now that the days of Russian rule was over.
- showed Saifo reflecting on his career as kite-maker but also his days as a kite runner in his youth.
- noted Saifo's keen observation of the relationship between Amir and Hassan, or Amir's attempts to impress his father.
- showed good understanding of the different characters in the novel.
- extended beyond the given passage to reflect on wider themes and character relationships.
- incorporated some interesting figurative language – similes, metaphor, motifs, pathetic fallacy to present ideas.

Less successful responses:

- students focused on a narrow part of the task requirements, eg Saifo as a kite runner, or spent a long time exchanging pleasantries between the two shopkeepers so that there was limited content.
- got bogged down in imaginative detail and made very little reference to the base text.
- struggled to sustain style, frequently switching between past and present tense.
- showed little knowledge of the text beyond the given passage.

Critical Commentary

These were much more detailed than in previous years and seemed less formulaic with students able to select the more interesting aspects of their own writing and making more thoughtful connections to the base text.

The following marks are awarded for the three assessment objectives:

AO2 (15 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses two distinct strands: identification of language features used and analysis and evaluation of decisions made to shape the text.

Examiners noted that:

- students commented effectively on the meanings they had intended to create, reflecting on narratorial choices – 1st/3rd person including flashbacks etc., character decisions, decisions about speech/dialogue etc.
- some students reflected on specific language features precisely and explicitly; some students made only brief reference to a few, not very useful, features.
- commentaries that had no language content were rare, but some were overly descriptive of their own choices. Although AO1 is not assessed explicitly, it is implied through the level descriptors for both AO2 and AO4 and students should be aware of this.

AO4 (10 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses one strand: making connections (similarities and differences) between their own decisions as writers and the decisions and effects achieved by the writers of the base text.

Examiners noted:

- an overreliance on discussing social and historical contextual factors for *The Great Gatsby* such as the Jazz Age, capitalism and the American Dream at the expense of exploring language or narrative connections; this resulted in lower marks for AO4, despite their being connections made.
- much stronger reflection on the base text than in previous years, with students often reflecting on the writer's style and considering how their own writing drew or deviated from these stylistic elements and commenting on the effects of these decisions.
- that some focused solely on content with little understanding of writers' stylistic choices.
- some students relied perhaps too heavily on the base text, offering a mini-analysis of the given passage rather than a discussion of their own writing.
- some made very little reference to the base text, instead focusing solely on their own writing.

AO5 (5 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses two distinct strands: organisation of the commentary and accuracy of writing.

Examiners noted that:

- most students were aware of this Assessment Objective and paragraphed their commentaries, organising their analysis into key topics.
- spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors seemed greater this year and meant that full marks were not often awarded. Some errors were avoidable, such as the misspelling of characters' names, given the open book nature of this examination.

As a general overview, the most successful responses:

- understood that the task was assessing their ability to select carefully narratorial and language choices relevant to the brief given and explore these choices analytically.
- developed their discussion, rather than listed features without comment and analysis.
- showed their detailed knowledge of the base text and the stylistic choices made by writers in order to achieve certain effects.

- confidently discussed similarities and differences with the base text based on the changed point of view to their character.
- structured their commentaries around the assessment objectives.
- wrote accurately and organised commentaries around key topics.

As a general overview, less successful responses:

- did not always label the language features they were using, selecting quotations only to support their point which made comments more general.
- were unable to comment on point of view beyond identifying if they had used a first-person or third-person pronoun.
- did not analyse any specific language features used by the base text writer, commenting only on content or context.
- went through decision-making paragraph by paragraph, leading to repetition and the selection of less interesting features.
- focused only on how they had copied aspects of the base text's writer's style.
- did not check their spelling, grammar and punctuation.

Section B: Dramatic encounters

A Streetcar Named Desire was by far the most popular text with 75% of the total number of entries choosing this option, followed by *Othello*. Some responses covered *All My Sons* but only a few were seen for *The Herd*.

The following marks are awarded for the three Assessment Objectives

AO1 (15 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses three distinct strands:

- use of concepts, methods and terminology.
- selection of and analysis at different/appropriate language levels.
- expression and presentation of ideas.

Examiners noted that:

- there was a tendency for some responses to focus on identifying repetitively a pattern of a language features such as declaratives, perhaps thinking that this would guarantee level 4. Identifying a pattern in itself is not something that is valued on this specification, rather in how patterns can lead to meaning being created.
- gender theories were still being used by some students but these rare added anything to the response and they are not a requirement of the specification.
- some students misunderstood the meanings of positive and negative face. In terms of applying concepts, there is no specific checklist or hierarchy of features or concepts that need including so students should be encouraged to identify features and concepts that both they feel confident with and that further their analytical point.
- there is still some use of terms such as high or low frequency lexis (with high modality and low modality appearing too), which has been discouraged in all previous exam reports.
- assertions were made about characters (predominantly Stanley) using monosyllabic lexis and then quoting examples that used more than one syllable, perhaps mistaking short words for lacking syllables.

- students referred to ‘verbal phrases’ instead of verb phrases, perhaps confusing terms used for verb processes rather than grammatical features.
- labelled noun phrases, verb phrases etc. but then quoted whole sentences and clauses.
- some students, in an attempt to apply terms precisely, wrote themselves out of creditworthy points by mislabelling features.

AO2 (20 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses three distinct strands:

- an ability to interpret and evaluate the question focus.
- selecting appropriate detail.
- analysis of authorial craft.

Examiners noted that:

- there was not always careful reading of the actual question wording, resulting in misinterpretation and less appropriate selection from the text.
- some students only gave a cursory focus on different parts of the play, not allowing them to offer different interpretations of the question focus and move up the levels of achievement.
- some students wanted to turn questions into a focus on power and used this word repetitively in responses instead of using the actual question wording.
- some students were still overlooking the playwright’s decision-making and crafting.

AO3 (10 marks)

The mark scheme shows that this assesses two distinct strands:

- generic conventions of drama (specific dramatic conventions and the affordances of the stage such as soliloquy, asides, use of theatrical space, stage directions).
- the influence of contextual factors on the negotiation and shaping of meaning (these include the social, historical, political, and literary influences on the production and reception of the play).

Examiners noted that:

- the use of quotations from literary criticism was more evident and when used relevantly these allowed for evaluation of the question focus.
- students’ understanding of historical contexts sometimes led to more general assertions and inaccurate comments eg that domestic violence against women was to be an expected behaviour from men in the 1940s and that *A Streetcar Named Desire* was set just after the Civil War.
- some students still do not recognise the dramatic genre as important to comment on, despite this being one clear element of the AO3 mark scheme; some simply referred to stage directions as the only examples of genre conventions.
- there were many references to critical reception and more recent stagings of *A Streetcar Named Desire*, eg Young Vic version. Their relative success depended on the point that they were making; simply saying that the stage version did this or that did not add to the critical interpretation, whereas those who placed this against Williams’s dramatic crafting could make more insightful points.

As a general overview, the most successful responses:

- applied speech acts, face theory and maxims successfully and used these to explore the presentation of the question focus

- offered detailed response to the question themes, making texts choices from throughout the text and exploring these analytically
- signposted different parts chosen from the play clearly, demonstrating their link to the interpretation offered
- applied a range of terminology from different language levels accurately and meaningfully for the question
- selected contextual factors that added to the interpretative point and/or question focus. This was often used in opening/concluding paragraphs, as well as integrated throughout the essay.
- demonstrated their understanding of the playwright's uses of dramatic genre conventions for deliberate effects in line with the question focus
- showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the play studied.

As a general overview, less successful responses:

- made only brief reference to the given passage, offering little by way of focus on language features.
- made quite general references to the rest of the play, often descriptively and without analytical focus on language.
- focused primarily on the given passage with few references to wider aspects of the play.
- made broad references to the rest of the play.
- did not apply linguistic terms, or used terms very generally.
- referred to face-threatening acts in quite a general way, without clear exemplification to explain how/why.
- used context as the starting point rather than considering the question focus and linguistic detail to explore/analyse.
- foregrounded language detail for the given passage, with less detail for scenes from the wider play.
- did not always focus on the question, instead examining dramatic conflict more generally, or examining dynamics between different characters.
- made minimal reference to genre or contextual factors.

Othello

Question 9 was far more popular than Question 10, probably as the focus on 'masculinity' appeared more straightforward.

Successful responses:

- responded well to the given passage, comparing Cassio's military identity and respectful attitude towards Desdemona with Iago's more vulgar masculinity (Q9).
- considered different characters in light of different types of masculinity: Brabantio as a father/respected Venetian; Othello as a moor to diminish his masculinity; Iago's toxic masculinity; Cassio as defined by his military role (Q9).
- considered Iago's reference to 'real men' and what this means for the characters on stage, the Jacobean audience etc. (Q9).
- considered language features closely, eg metaphor, prose, song, exclamatories, derogatory language, specific word classes with some precision (Q9).
- selected wider scenes carefully, eg comparison of Othello's masculinity from Act I to Act 5, male characters in their interactions with female characters, Othello's loss of masculinity in his epileptic fit, Othello's attempts to regain his masculinity in killing Desdemona, cuckolding references to illustrate women taking masculinity away from men. Some focused on the willow scene to show femininity in stark contrast to the male dominated scenes, especially the given scene (Q9).

- offered contrasting negotiations with others, exploring relationships between different characters such as Iago and Roderigo, Iago and Emilia (Q10).
- addressed context thoughtfully and in detail, reflecting on genre, aspects of Aristotelian tragedy, Jacobean attitudes towards men/women/sexuality/cuckolding, critical reception.

Less successful responses:

- moved away from the essay question, focusing on Iago and his motives throughout the play, or on questions about his 'honesty' (Q9).
- focused only on 'masculinity' in reference to the treatment of women in the play (Q9).
- struggled to interpret what 'negotiations' mean and therefore did not make relevant text selections (Q10).

All My Sons

Question 11 proved far more popular than question 12. Q12 was less successfully addressed than Q11.

Successful responses:

- focused closely on the given passage, exploring Kate's role in detail, and considering her refusal to let go with ref. to specific language examples (Q11).
- successfully selected wider scenes from the play to discuss, considering Larry's refusal to let go of his principles, Sue's refusal to let go of her ambitions, George's refusal to let go of his pursuit of the truth (Q11).
- explored Larry's and Ann's relationship, his proposal and how this demonstrated their uncertainty (Q12).
- selected successfully from the play Kate's uncertainty about Ann, Larry's uncertainty about his future (Q12).
- addressed specific language detail for both questions, considering imperatives, modals verbs, fragmented speech, Larry's listing, pronoun use etc. – overall quite wide ranging and showing some precise labelling.
- addressed contextual factors in depth, addressing the American Dream, post-war context, and some detailed discussion of genre and stagecraft.

A Streetcar Named Desire

This was by far the most popular text, with students answering both Q13 and Q14. Q14 was slightly more popular.

Successful responses:

- explored Blanche's different methods to deceive others; Blanche's self-deceptions, eg about Shep Huntleigh; Stanley uncovering her various deceptions; Mitch's response to the truth; Stella's deception about her baby; Stella's deception about Blanche's fate (Q13).
- interrogated different strategies Blanche uses to impress others – her looks/sexuality, language/mannerisms, social class; Stanley's need to impress Stella to regain power in his household; Stanley's need to impress Blanche with his knowledge; Mitch's attempts and failure at impressing Blanche (Q14).
- selected scenes well to discuss question themes. There was often an overlap with scene selection for both questions – Blanche's arrival; her date with Mitch; Mitch ripping paper lantern from the light; rape scene; final scene.
- detailed reference to stage directions, both from given scenes and from the wider play, sometimes effectively linked to plastic theatre and/or ideas about expressionism/naturalism.

- used references helpfully to Williams’ personal circumstances: sexuality, alcoholism, sister, parents.
- made relevant references to Old South/new America to support their interpretations.

Less successful responses:

- misunderstood deception, often interpreting this as ‘depiction’ or ‘perception’ and thus offering a discussion of how characters viewed each other in the play (Q13).
- made reference to maxims/face theory with unclear examples or vague discussion, especially when addressing Blanche’s flouting of quality/manner.
- limited focus on language features, or confused references, eg confusing personification with zoomorphism.
- mentioned tragedy, tragic figures, hubris etc. or plastic theatre without discussion, simply dropping the term with no further comment.
- focused on a limited range of features: exclamatives (when they meant exclamatories), imperatives, adverbs, dashes to indicate hesitation/pauses.

The Herd

Of the few responses to this text, most chose Question 15.

Successful responses:

- discussed Carol’s unhappiness with Ian in some detail.
- considered the question theme with reference to Ian’s unhappiness with the situation; Carol’s unhappiness at Claire’s pregnancy; Carol’s unhappiness with Murat as symptomatic of wider unhappiness with the healthcare provision; Claire’s unhappiness with Ian; Brian’s chat with Ian.
- selected wider scenes carefully and thoughtfully.
- made reference to a good range of language features: questioning; incomplete utterances; repetition/listing; expletives; pronouns.
- some reference to maxims but less than for other texts.
- made reference to Kinnear’s own circumstances – his sister, the Covid impact on his sister and other people with disabilities, impact on families who live with people with serious disabilities (eg sidelining of Claire), ideas about healthcare and cuts to funding.
- some comment about domestic tragedy but less of this, although a couple of students did comment on inspiration from *A Day in the Death of Joe Egg*.

Less successful responses:

- focused primarily on Carol and her various unhappiness with all other characters in the play.
- made minimal reference to language detail, describing key scenes.
- made minimal or no reference to contextual factors.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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