



---

# AS MARKING SCHEME

---

**SUMMER 2016**

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
NEW AS – COMPONENT 1**

**B700U10-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2016 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## COMPONENT 1: Analysis of Texts in Context

### Section A: Spoken Language of the Media

	AO1	AO2	AO4
Section A	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

**1. Analyse and evaluate the spoken language used by the hosts and their guests in Text A and Text B. [50]**

In your response you should:

- consider how the hosts and guests interact
- explore the spoken language features which engage the audiences
- consider the ways in which the different topics shape language choices
- include some discussion of similarities and/or differences between the texts.

There will be a range of different approaches to this question, but discussion should focus on how the presenters interact with their guests and the kind of language they use. Responses should apply appropriate methods of language analysis, and should show critical understanding of spoken language concepts and of a television debate and a radio interview as distinct genres. Since AO4 is worth two fifths of the marks for this question, connections across the texts should be explored. Look for and reward all valid discussion.

#### Overview

Text A shows an interaction between host, David Dimbleby, and guests, Nigel Farage and Ed Miliband, which is confrontational in nature, within a formal context and setting. Text B, by contrast, offers a more humorous and chatty interaction between Graham Norton and his guest, Will Young, which also includes some mock confrontation between the two speakers. Provoked by Farage's attack on the composition and political leanings of the studio audience, David Dimbleby firmly asserts his role as chair of the debate with politeness and respect. Farage's non-fluency and the overlapping utterances of the different speakers in Text A reflect the varying reactions to Farage's unexpected faux pas. In contrast, Graham Norton's hosting style is effortless and tongue in cheek, and this ease reflects the rapport he clearly has with his guest, Will Young.

## Notes

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored, but it is important to reward all valid discussion.

### Genre

- the situation e.g. a televised political debate versus an informal Saturday morning radio chat show, and content e.g. electoral politics versus popular culture and personal interests
- the function of the hosts in either moderating the contribution of the other speaker(s) or engaging and drawing out personality of the guest
- turn-taking and the relationship between the participants
- the unexpected increase in incidence of non-fluency in Text A e.g. Farage's repetition in l.24, which is employed almost as a filler which gives him time to think whilst appearing undaunted by his earlier offensive comment about the audience
- the importance of engaging the audience(s) and understanding the different ways these audiences receive the contributions of the speakers
- the use of proper nouns e.g. people (*Nigel, Ed Miliband, Mimi, Tracey in Norfolk*) and organisations (*BBC, Labour Party*)

### Prosodics

- an awareness of similarities regarding rising intonation, i.e. to draw attention to key points or to create humour
- an awareness of the differences in pitch e.g. raised to show excitement/surprise/mock enthusiasm in Text B, and more monotone in Text A in order to maintain an appearance of statesmanship and decorum
- an awareness of the similarities/differences regarding emphatic stress e.g. to draw attention to key nouns, e.g. *demand*/adjectives, e.g. *remarkable*/adverbs, e.g. *directly* used more extensively by Farage in Text A in order to repair the damage caused by his comments
- changes in volume reflecting Graham Norton's good natured ironic humour in Text B
- David Dimbleby's use of emphatic stress to emphasise his polite insistence on fair broadcasting in Text A
- changes in pace e.g. increase in pace as part of Graham Norton's delivery style in Text B, and a more rhetorical style in Text A
- stretched vowels and non-verbal utterances to reflect the speakers' personalities in Text B, and to reflect Farage's momentary loss of control and attempt to recover dominance in Text A

### Register

- varying levels of formality in Text A and informality in Text B
- creation of a positive mood in Text B
- terms of address e.g. first names (*Ed* - personal/familiar abbreviation; *Nigel, Tracey* - assumed familiarity but not abbreviated); abstract noun attempting to sound ingratiating (*folks*); full names (*Margaret Griffiths*)
- relationships between hosts and their guests e.g. formal in Text A; informal in Text B
- relationship with audience e.g. formal in Text A; informal in Text B

## Lexis and semantics

- subject specific words linked to the focus of the event: abstract nouns linked to political and economic concepts e.g. Text A - *market, demand, crisis*
- unexpected concrete nouns in Text B e.g. *lettuces, potatoes, vegetables*
- adjectival modification e.g. Text A – *independent* (informative), *total* (emphatic); Text B - *lovely, stupid, favourite* (attitude)
- adverbs e.g. Text A - *carefully, actually, directly* (manner); Text B - *frankly* (attitude)
- informal language e.g. Text A - *hang on* (to assert dominance); Text B – *dude* (to establish rapport)
- imperative verbs and verb phrases e.g. Text A - *hang on, have a go* (confrontational); Text B - *go go; get out* (mock confrontational)
- use of pronouns e.g. Text A - second person plural *you* (to separate); Text B - first person plural *us; we* (to unite)
- figurative language e.g. Text A – *flicker* (litotes), *left wing* (cultural)

## Form and structure (typical of genre)

- incomplete utterances e.g. Text A - I.23 *it's never a gre.*, (interruption); I.28 *you cannot discuss* (non-fluency); Text B - I.29 *remain (.) be* (non-fluency)
- ellipsis, e.g. omission of subject and auxiliary verb in Text A - I.7 *be very interesting* (losing control), omission of subject and verb in I.33 *remarkable* (defiant); Text B - omission of subject, verb and determiner in I.5 *favourite question of the day* (ironic)
- extended and complex utterances featuring subordination typical of political discourse in Text A; shorter utterances in Text B
- grammatical mood e.g. imperative in Text A *hang on* (for control, asserting authority); *go on* (asserting authority); imperative in Text B *go go* (cut off/end interview in a humorous way)

## Pragmatics

- public personas of Nigel Farage, Graham Norton and Will Young
- shared knowledge e.g. *Mary McCartney* in Text B language and attitudes of hosts and guests; patronising e.g. *remarkable* in Text A; humorous and ironic e.g. *demographic* in Text B)

### Assessment Grid Component 1 Section A

BAND	<b>AO1</b> Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression.  15 marks	<b>AO2</b> Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use.  15 marks	<b>AO4</b> Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods  20 marks
<b>5</b>	<b>13-15 marks</b>	<b>13-15 marks</b>	<b>17-20 marks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intelligent methods of analysis</li> <li>• Confident use of terminology</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of texts</li> <li>• Coherent and effective expression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed understanding of concepts (e.g. turn-taking)</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. political vs cultural/personal)</li> <li>• Relevant and concise textual support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subtle connections established between texts</li> <li>• Perceptive overview</li> <li>• Effective use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>10-12 marks</b>	<b>10-12 marks</b>	<b>13-16 marks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate methods of analysis</li> <li>• Secure use of terminology</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of texts</li> <li>• Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure understanding of concepts (e.g. turn-taking)</li> <li>• Some focused discussion of issues (e.g. political vs cultural/personal)</li> <li>• Consistent apt textual support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful connections between texts</li> <li>• Focused overview</li> <li>• Relevant use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7-9 marks</b>	<b>7-9 marks</b>	<b>9-12 marks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible methods of analysis</li> <li>• Generally sound use of terminology</li> <li>• Competent discussion of texts</li> <li>• Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound understanding of concepts (e.g. turn-taking)</li> <li>• Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. public vs personal)</li> <li>• Generally appropriate textual support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible connections between texts</li> <li>• Competent overview</li> <li>• Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4-6 marks</b>	<b>4-6 marks</b>	<b>5-8 marks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>• Some accurate terminology</li> <li>• Uneven discussion of texts</li> <li>• Adequate expression, with some accuracy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of concepts (e.g. turn-taking)</li> <li>• Simple discussion of issues (e.g. public vs personal)</li> <li>• Some points supported by textual references</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some basic connections between texts</li> <li>• Broad overview</li> <li>• Some valid use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3 marks</b>	<b>1-3 marks</b>	<b>1-4 marks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>• Limited use of terminology</li> <li>• Some discussion of texts</li> <li>• Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two simple points made about concepts (e.g. turn-taking)</li> <li>• Limited discussion of issues (e.g. public vs personal)</li> <li>• Limited textual support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some links made between texts</li> <li>• Vague overview</li> <li>• Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<b>0 marks:</b> Response not credit worthy or not attempted		

## Section B: Written Language

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section B	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

**2. Analyse and evaluate how the appeal of 'Poldark' is conveyed in this review.**

**[50]**

In your response you should explore:

- how language is used to convey the writer's views
- the features that are typical of review writing.

There will be a range of different approaches to this question, but discussion should focus on the use of language to convey the appeal of the programme. Responses should apply appropriate methods of language analysis, and should show critical understanding of the linguistic concepts underpinning review writing. Since AO3 is worth two fifths of the marks for this question, the ways in which contextual factors and language features shape meaning should be addressed. Look for and reward all valid discussion.

### Overview

Typical of a broadsheet review of a popular programme, the text affects a tongue in cheek attitude to the subject matter, appearing to ironise it at the same time as appreciating its entertainment value. There are semantic fields associated with love, sexuality and sex appeal (e.g. *sweetheart, romantic Latin hero*), and with broadcast media and filming (e.g. *Spanish-dubbed, better techniques and bigger budgets*). The language is varied: geographical language (e.g. *coastline, Cornish tourism, Croatia*); the language of military history and fashion (e.g. *tricorn, breeches, swashbuckle*), and the language of car engineering (e.g. *speed, chassis*). It is designed to appeal to and engage the programme's varied audience whilst emphasising Aidan Turner's sexual appeal for female viewers. In the headline, the adjectives *rugged* and *gorgeous* immediately tap into the media buzz surrounding the programme and its star, whilst cleverly comparing Aidan Turner's charms to the Cornish coastline that figures prominently in the programme.

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored, but it is important to reward all valid discussion.

### Medium

- the use of headline to identify the programme and its appeal
- the use of the subheading to introduce a possible tone of condescension

### Content

- adjectives in the title introduce the central conceit of the merging of appreciation for Cornwall's appeal to tourists and Aidan Turner's appeal for his admirers e.g. *rugged, gorgeous*
- semantic field of tourism e.g. *coastline, Cornish tourism, Croatia*
- semantic field of love and sexuality e.g. *sweetheart, romantic Latin hero*
- a mix of facts e.g. *BBC1, original 1970s Poldark*; and opinion e.g. *better techniques, interesting re-invention*

### Register

- the tenor fluctuates from formal to informal; polysyllabic lexis e.g. *magnificently, reinvention*) is counterbalanced by conversational phrases and clauses e.g. *pretty much, did I mention*; elision e.g. *we'll, there'll, it's*; ellipsis e.g. *Trouble is...*; and interjections e.g. *oops, oh*
- relationship between reader and writer is informal with language features linked to spoken language e.g. use of hypophora e.g. *Could they have done...? Possibly*
- lexis used suggests a specific target audience, i.e. Guardian readers who are discovering the appeal of the story and its characters for the first time e.g. pre-modified noun phrase *Sunday evening family swahbuckle*

### Lexis and semantics

- proper nouns e.g. location (*Croatia, Cornwall, Afghanistan*); names of current television programmes (*Banished, Poldark*); actors (*Aidan Turner, Robin Ellis*)
- concrete nouns and noun phrases which create a sense of historical authenticity e.g. *breeches, tricorner hat, street urchin*); familial relations e.g. *father, cousin, ex, sweetheart*
- lexis associated with passion and sexuality, e.g. noun *passion*; noun phrases *tight breeches, tousled locks, (passion)*
- use of first person pronouns to establish a strong sense of voice e.g. *I, we*
- complements used to convey passion and sexuality e.g. *rekindled, pacier and racier*
- adjectives to compare the 1970s version with the 2015 version of the programme e.g. *old, new*
- evaluative adjectives e.g. *uncharismatic, rugged, gorgeous*
- present tense verbs associated with horsemanship e.g. *plods, gallops*
- adverbs e.g. *immediately (manner), magnificently (attitude), successfully (attitude)*

## Form and structure

- pre-modified noun phrases to shape opinion e.g. *tousled-haired Aidan Turner, uncharismatic local farmer, family caravan park, street urchin servant boy*
- simple sentences e.g. *The BBC has gone nuts for the 80s*; and minor sentences e.g. *The 1780s, Possibly*
- fronted coordinating conjunctions e.g. *And...* are used frequently to convey the conversational tone
- adverbials of time e.g. *On a Thursday, between now and July* and place e.g. *outside, inside*
- listing e.g. *syndetic sulks, does things with rocks, and gallops...* (mild condescension)
- parentheses e.g. *“crawlers”, they call them* (to mimic the authentic voice of the characters), *- also rugged and gorgeous* – (to establish a parallel between main actor and setting)
- rhetorical question e.g. *God it’s beautiful, who needs Croatia?* (shared cultural reference that would be understood by Guardian readers)
- ellipsis e.g. *Same triangular hat too, a kind of head-samosa, or tricorn, I believe it’s called* (mild condescension)
- subordination e.g. *And that’s something else that’s much better here than in the Spanish-dubbed 1970s, when, on the few times it does venture out of doors, it’s drab and grey* (to juxtapose the current version with its 1970s predecessor)

## Pragmatics

- review in *The Guardian*, i.e. target audience
- irony and mock condescension
- popular cultural reference associated with a cultural understanding of the 1970s and 2015 British broadcasting trends
- European coastal tourism

### Assessment Grid Component 1 Section B

<b>BAND</b>	<b>AO1</b> Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression.  <b>15 marks</b>	<b>AO2</b> Demonstrate critical understanding of language concepts and issues relevant to language use.  <b>15 marks</b>	<b>AO3</b> Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning.  <b>20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>13-15 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intelligent methods of analysis</li> <li>• Confident use of terminology</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of texts</li> <li>• Coherent and effective expression</li> </ul>	<b>13-15 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed understanding of concepts (e.g. review genre)</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. the wider underlying popular culture implications)</li> <li>• Relevant and concise textual support</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>• Productive discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Intelligent evaluation</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>10-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate methods of analysis</li> <li>• Secure use of terminology</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of texts</li> <li>• Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<b>10-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure understanding of concepts (e.g. review genre)</li> <li>• Some focused discussion of issues (e.g. the wider underlying popular culture implications)</li> <li>• Consistent apt textual support</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Purposeful evaluation</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7-9 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible methods of analysis</li> <li>• Generally sound use of terminology</li> <li>• Competent discussion of texts</li> <li>• Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<b>7-9 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound understanding of concepts (e.g. review genre)</li> <li>• Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. popular culture)</li> <li>• Generally appropriate textual support</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>• Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Relevant evaluation</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4-6 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>• Some accurate terminology</li> <li>• Uneven discussion of texts</li> <li>• Adequate expression, with some accuracy</li> </ul>	<b>4-6 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of concepts (e.g. review genre)</li> <li>• Simple discussion of issues (e.g. popular culture)</li> <li>• Some points supported by textual references</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>• Simple discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Some attempt to evaluate</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>• Limited use of terminology</li> <li>• Some discussion of texts</li> <li>• Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<b>1-3 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some simple points made about concepts (e.g. review genre)</li> <li>• Limited discussion of issues (e.g. popular culture)</li> <li>• Limited textual support</li> </ul>	<b>4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some awareness of context</li> <li>• Limited sense of how meaning is constructed</li> <li>• Limited evaluation</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<b>0 marks:</b> Response not credit worthy or not attempted		