

1. A significant number of candidates did not number their questions.
2. Many did not read the instructions carefully, e.g. in Question 1.1 they missed the plural in "memories" and "days".
3. Some candidates hijacked topics and wrote on what could be construed as a previous or private agenda. Links with topics were sometimes tenuous at best, and off the topic at worst. It is not for the examiner to make meaning on behalf of the candidate.
4. When a higher order question was set, such as 1.5, ("My pen is my weapon ..."), the response was usually excellent. Teachers are, therefore, strongly encouraged to advise able writers to choose challenging topics.
5. The visuals in this paper inspired no quality writing and should have been avoided.
6. In Section B there was a confusing instruction and too many candidates wrote dialogue script rather than interview in dialogue.
7. It was clear that there was considerable confusion about the difference between an obituary and a eulogy.
8. In 2.3 (Newspaper article) The instruction to respond to a letter caused confusion about the format. Teachers are strongly advised to clarify the differences in format between letters, newspaper articles and columns.
9. In the final question (3.3 Advertisement) the link between image and required text often proved to be vague at best.
10. Teachers are strongly advised to spend time teaching learners how to structure their responses and allocate time to the different sections of the writing paper. Many learners do not realise that process writing and examination responses require different skills.