

# Commentary on candidate evidence

## Candidate 6

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for this course assessment component.

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

**Q15. “The aim for the writer — journalist, travel writer, diarist, commentator, biographer — is to encourage the reader to reflect, inquire and to be inspired.”**

**Discuss to what extent at least two non-fiction texts have succeeded in achieving one or more of these responses from the reader.**

‘Dreamboat’ Luke Mogelson/ ‘Sudan Slow and Cruel Starvation’ Hilary Anderson

### Knowledge and Understanding

The Hilary Anderson article is short and does not contain much in the way of any “literary” content, the Mogelson article is from the New York Times magazine and is a significantly more fruitful text at this level, but the knowledge and understanding of both articles is limited to a very basic statement of the general context of each article. The approach is limited to looking at what are unrewarding techniques for the candidate and there is just enough textual evidence but it is still limited.

### Analysis

The selection of “first person narrative”, “shocking word choice”, and “personal stories” as the techniques, are limited – the narrative is self-evident and does not go beyond a comment on “I’m”; and the word choice work is limited also with limited comment on “dark”, “prodded”, “some peeling skin”, “sickly anaemic look” and a couple of sentences describing the terrible experiences of those involved. The “personal stories” element is very limited indeed and merely states self-evident truths.

### Evaluation

The evaluation is limited and lacks relevance to the question, and does not go beyond the trite approach that these are bad experiences. The paucity of knowledge, understanding, textual evidence, analysis, and evaluation all contribute to the very low level evaluative comment.

### Technical Accuracy

The response meets minimum competence for technical accuracy. Every aspect of this response is limited so places this into the 9-6 band range; but the knowledge and understanding just touches upon this band range, as does the analysis and evaluation.

This response just meets the standard described and is awarded 6 marks.