GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

A LEVEL
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1
A700U10-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 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.

EDUQAS GCE A LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE

COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

General Advice

Examiners are asked to read and digest thoroughly all the information set out in the document *Instructions for Examiners* sent as part of the stationery pack. It is essential for the smooth running of the examination that these instructions are adhered to by **all**.

Particular attention should be paid to the following instructions regarding marking:

- Make sure that you are familiar with the assessment objectives (**AO**s) that are relevant to the questions that you are marking, and the respective **weighting** of each AO. The advice on weighting appears in the Assessment Grids at the end.

- Familiarise yourself with the questions, and each part of the marking guidelines.

- Be positive in your approach: look for details to reward in the candidate's response rather than faults to penalise.

- As you read each candidate's response, annotate using wording from the assessment criteria as appropriate. Tick points you reward and indicate inaccuracy or irrelevance where it appears.

- Explain your mark with summative comments at the end of each answer. Your comments should indicate both the positive and negative points as appropriate.

- Use your professional judgement, in the light of standards set at the marking conference, to fine-tune the mark you give.

- It is important that the **full range of marks** is used. Full marks should not be reserved for perfection. Similarly, there is a need to use the marks at the lower end of the scale.

- No allowance can be given for incomplete answers other than what candidates actually achieve.

- Consistency in marking is of the highest importance. If you have to adjust after the initial sample of scripts has been returned to you, it is particularly important that you make the adjustment without losing your consistency.

- Please do not use personal abbreviations or comments, as they can be misleading or puzzling to a second reader. You may, however, find the following symbols useful:

E	expression
I	irrelevance
e.g. ?	lack of an example
X	wrong
(✓)	possible
?	doubtful
R	repetition

General Instructions – Applying the Mark Scheme

Where banded levels of response are given, it is presumed that candidates attaining Band 2 and above will have achieved the criteria listed in the previous band(s).

Examiners must firstly decide the band for each tested AO that most closely describes the quality of the work being marked. Having determined the appropriate band, fine tuning of the mark within a band will be made on the basis of a 'best fit' procedure, weaknesses in some areas being compensated for by strengths in others.

- Where the candidate's work convincingly meets the statement, the highest mark should be awarded.

- Where the candidate's work adequately meets the statement, the most appropriate mark in the middle range should be awarded.

- Where the candidate's work just meets the statement, the lowest mark should be awarded.

Examiners should use the full range of marks available to them and award full marks in any band for work that meets that descriptor. The marks on either side of the middle mark(s) for 'adequately met' should be used where the standard is lower or higher than 'adequate' but not the highest or lowest mark in the band. Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions. The awarding of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria.

This mark scheme instructs examiners to look for and reward valid alternatives where indicative content is suggested for an answer. Indicative content outlines some areas of the text candidates may explore in their responses. **This is not a checklist for expected content in an answer, or set out as a 'model answer'**, as responses must be marked in the banded levels of response provided for each question. Where a candidate provides a response that contains aspects or approaches not included in the indicative content, examiners should use their professional judgement as English specialists to determine the validity of the statement/interpretation in light of the task and reward as directed by the banded levels of response.

Candidates are free to choose any approach that can be supported by evidence, and they should be rewarded for all valid interpretations of the texts. Candidates can (and will most likely) discuss features of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

SECTION A: ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

AO1	AO2	AO4
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

General Notes

In making judgements, look carefully at the separate sheet with the marking grid, and at the Overview and Notes which follow. We may expect candidates to select some of the suggested approaches, but it is equally possible that they will select entirely different approaches. Look for and reward valid, well-supported ideas which demonstrate independent thinking.

Section A: Conversational Interviews on *Desert Island Discs*

In your response to the question, you must:
- draw on your knowledge of the different language levels
- consider concepts and issues relevant to the study of spoken language
- explore connections between the transcripts.

1. Analyse the spoken language of these interviews. You should compare the interactions between the speakers and the identities of the guests. [60]

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, and to explore meaningful connections across texts that demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant concepts and issues.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:
- clear understanding of spoken language concepts evident e.g. the turn-taking structure with the interviewers' strategies to prompt revealing responses
- insightful discussion of points of comparison that explore language use e.g. the contrasting discourses of Brand and Carr
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the way in which both Brand and Carr seek to project a particular self-image
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument e.g. the evidence of the interviewers converging with the discourse of their guests
- assured evaluation providing details on implications, consistently and purposefully tied to the meaning of the text
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the transcripts in light of the question set.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- a focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language, e.g. broad statements about genre
- a lack of focus on what is being asked by the question e.g. limited close analysis of the transcripts
- descriptions of some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- only a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- some demonstration of some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- a lack of engagement with the detail of the texts and providing, instead, a somewhat superficial view of the transcripts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content
- a limited number of comparative points across the texts, mostly rudimentary but some of which may be sensible.

Notes

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

Text A: Russell Brand on *Desert Island Discs*

Nouns and noun phrases: list of three used by Young to establish Brand's identity as an important cultural figure rather than just a comedian (*actor (.) comic writer (.) compelling cultural phenomenon*); surprisingly critical noun phrases (*reckless acts of self-destruction* and *a degree of chaos*) to suggest an uncontrolled element of Brand, a split in his personality later acknowledged by his use of *that aspect of myself*; mixed register used by Young to mirror Brand's own discourse in the metaphorical use of *his chirpy chums* and *life's winding path*; her alliterative reference to *belts… bangles… beads* to emphasise Brand's striking but unconventional appearance; her reference to his group as *your human blankets* implying his reliance on others which he challenges by using the informal phrase *my mates*; Brand's use of *heritage* to indicate his awareness of the history and cultural importance of the programme

Proper nouns: Brand's repeated use (four times) of *Kirsty* as a vocative indicating pseudo-intimacy and seeking to establish a rapport with Young; in contrast, her use of the proper noun phrase *Russell Brand* which possibly creates a greater sense of distance

Verbs: Young's initial turn establishes Brand's rapid emergence (*plucked* and *rocketed*) and his commendably self-conscious skill in pushing boundaries (*specialises*); his later use of the past participle *progressed* implies that he has changed and matured over time; the metaphorical use of the past participle *lacquered* (*in celebrity*) asserts his intelligence through the sophistication of his discourse but also suggests that celebrity is somehow superficial with the past tense *embraced* possibly indicating his previous enthusiasm for the celebrity lifestyle; Young's reference to *comfort* implies an insecurity on Brand's part which he subsequently rejects with the use of the verb *blanch*

Adjectives and adjective phrases: again, surprising language to reflect Young's complex response with *athletic* to suggest the speed of Brand's humour and *reckless* to point to an element of wildness as well as further evidence of Young's high register mimicking Brand's discourse in the adjective phrase *beguilingly florid*; the use of *splendid* by Young as face-work to praise Brand's appearance and his desire to be *confident* in this situation, possibly suggesting some nervousness on his part; contrast in Brand's register with informal adjectives *comfy* and *pyjamary* used alongside extremely elaborate lexical choices *sedentary* and *shamanic*

Adverbs: Young's gently mocking use of *even* and *regularly* to imply that washing his hair is an achievement; Brand's use of *increasingly* and *anymore* towards the end of the extract suggesting that he has changed; the adverb of time *now* in Young's interrogative *so where are you now with life?* to acknowledge this change

Determiners: Young's use of the possessive form *my* in the formulaic opening clause *my castaway this week is Russell Brand* makes the exchange appear more personal from the start; Brand's use of *the* rather than *my* in the noun phrase *the infatuation with fame* distances him from the attitudes of his former self's obsessive interest in celebrity

Interjection: Brand's exclamatory utterance *God* indicating his frustration with his former self

Prepositional phrases: contrast between Brand's past (*from a life of drugs and petty crime*) and his present (*into the snugly carcinogenic glare of celebrity*) with the oxymoronic adjective phrase *snugly carcinogenic* and the abstract noun *glare* implying the dangerous nature of the world of celebrity; Brand's use of *in recovery* stresses his change and development

Asyndetic listing: Brand's vision of himself implied by the adjectives *chaotic mayhem-inducing shamanic libido-lizard*, the last of which is especially inventive and used adjectivally

Turn-taking and latch-ons: the two examples of latch-ons indicate the care with which both speakers are listening to each other, revealing the co-operative nature of the exchange; distinction between the introductory remarks of Young and the conversational exchange; the co-operative nature of that exchange with no overlaps, characteristic of the radio context

Prosodic features: Brand's use of stress on the pronoun *that* to indicate his distaste for the presentation of his younger self and on the adverb *now* to show how he has changed; informal pronunciation of /sɔːtə/ and /kɒs/ by both speakers revealing their attempt to make their conversation seem comfortable, despite the fact that it is performed with an audience in mind.

Text B: Alan Carr on *Desert Island Discs*

Nouns and noun phrases: Laverne's focus on the normality and ordinariness of Carr's persona seen in his comedy's focus on *the ordinary stuff of life*; her reference to *the joys* in her interrogative *how do the joys of each compare* to indicate that he must enjoy his performances; Carr's use of the noun phrase *an Alan Carr show* which distances him from his act which he subsequently describes as *a bit of silliness*, downplaying any broader significance to his comedy; her face-work in describing him as *a camp icon*, implying a broader cultural significance to his act; his reference to *a wonderful British tradition* to place his act in an historical context

Verbs: Laverne's use of *revels* to suggest the joyful enthusiasm of Carr; Carr's repetition of *love* to underline his enjoyment of both TV and stand up; his ironic use of *crushed* to mock the claims of political comedy; his use of *bothered* in the negated verb phrase *can't be bothered* and the past participle *stuck* in the clause *stuck with this voice* to point to his apparent lack of regard for his own act

Adjectives and adjective phrases: Laverne's use of the compound adjective *best-loved* to emphasise Carr's popularity; tripling of adjectives *sharp saucy* and adjective phrase *gloriously silly* to stress the lighthearted nature of Carr's comedy, reinforced by the reference to *traditional*; her use of *winning* to point to the likeable and appealing nature of Carr; Carr's response by saying *interesting* to imply that he values Laverne's questioning and is engaged in the spontaneous conversation; his use of the adjective phrase *so freeing* to point to the liberating nature of stand-up; his use of *shocking* in a self-deprecating way to describe his lack of political interest; Laverne's use of the adjective phrase *absolutely wicked* to imply that Carr's presentation of his own comedy is itself not entirely serious

Adverbs: *back then* used by Laverne to emphasise the progress that Carr has made with his career; Laverne's use of *avowedly*, a rare example of more low-frequency lexis; Carr's repetition of *just* before the imperative clause *just have some fun* and the mitigated directive *let's just have a laugh* to indicate the lighthearted nature of his act

Determiners: Laverne's use of the possessive form *my* to affirm her role (as Young did with Brand) in the first line followed by the more inclusive *our* in the noun phrase *our listeners* later on; Carr's self-deprecating use of the demonstrative form *this* in the noun phrase *this voice* to indicate his dissatisfaction with the way in which he speaks

Interjections: Carr's use of *aah* to emphasise his gratitude for Laverne's praise; his overlapping with *oh please* to indicate his modest discomfort with it; his use of *ooh* to suggest his engagement in the interview

Prepositional phrases: Laverne's use of *for over /twenʔi/ years now* to underline how well established Carr is as a successful comedian; Carr's slightly surprising use of the metaphor *like another muscle* indicating the range of his comic abilities

Syndetic listing: Laverne's focus on the range of Carr's achievement in the tripartite structure *three stadium tours two books and long-running TV shows*

Parallel phrasing: repetition of the adjective *camp* in the clauses *telly's camp Strictly's camp X Factor's* camp to indicate the centrality of the concept to British entertainment

Deixis: Carr's use of the demonstrative pronoun *this* in the clause *what started all of this* to indicate his success, possibly including his appearance on the programme

Turn-taking and overlapping: a co-operative exchange with clearly defined turn transition points and the overlapping by Carr indicating his desire to be supportive and build rapport with Laverne; more interactive exchange than Young and Brand's

Prosodic features: emphatic stress on the adverb of time *now* to indicate Carr's awareness of ageing; both speakers' adoption of informal pronunciation such as */twenʔi/* and */fɔrʔi/* at points to lower the formality of the exchange; Carr's slowing of his speech in the clause *ooh that's interesting yeah* indicating that he is thinking carefully about his reply.

This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/approaches where they are based on the language of the text, display relevant knowledge, and use appropriate analytical methods.

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section A Question 1

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression [20 marks]	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use [20 marks]	AO4 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods [20 marks]
5	**17-20 marks** • Sophisticated methods of analysis • Confident use of a wide range of terminology (including spoken) • Perceptive discussion of texts • Coherent, academic style.	**17-20 marks** • Detailed critical understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Confident and concise selection of textual support.	**17-20 marks** • Insightful connections established between texts • Sophisticated overview • Effective use of linguistic knowledge.
4	**13-16 marks** • Effective methods of analysis • Secure use of a range of terminology (including spoken) • Thorough discussion of texts • Expression generally accurate and clear.	**13-16 marks** • Secure understanding of concepts • Some intelligent discussion of issues • Consistent selection of apt textual support.	**13-16 marks** • Purposeful connections established between texts • Detailed overview • Relevant use of linguistic knowledge.
3	**9-12 marks** • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology (including spoken) • Competent discussion of texts • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses.	**9-12 marks** • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate selection of textual support.	**9-12 marks** • Sensible connections established between texts • Competent overview • Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge.
2	**5-8 marks** • Basic methods of analysis • Using some terminology with some accuracy (including spoken) • Uneven discussion of texts • Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy.	**5-8 marks** • Some understanding of concepts • Basic discussion of issues • Some points supported by textual references.	**5-8 marks** • Makes some basic connections between texts • Rather a broad overview • Some valid use of linguistic knowledge.
1	**1-4 marks** • Limited methods of analysis • Some grasp of basic terminology (including spoken) • Undeveloped discussion of texts • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity.	**1-4 marks** • A few simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Little use of textual support.	**1-4 marks** • Limited connections between texts • Vague overview • Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors.
0	**0 marks:** Response not credit worthy		

SECTION B: LANGUAGE ISSUES

AO1	AO2	AO3
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

Overview

Responses in this section, regardless of which option is chosen, test the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect linguistic choices, to demonstrate evidence of wider reading and an awareness of the social implications of language use, and to use linguistic knowledge appropriately. Responses should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Notes

Characteristics of a successful response may include:
- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- well-informed analysis
- effective use of the prompt material at the start before effectively moving on to the candidate's own material
- critical engagement with key concepts and issues e.g. the way in which discourse seeks to establish particular power relationships
- well-chosen references, including possibly the research of specific linguists, which support the points made concisely and precisely e.g. the assumptions behind Chomsky's critique of Skinner's theories on CLA
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures e.g. the nature of code-switching in different contexts
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the relative importance of adult input in children's acquisition of language
- productive explorations of the implications of contextual factors e.g. the way in which audience alters speakers' use of language
- consistently and purposefully reference to the contextual factors and how meaning is created e.g. the way in which persuasive power is conveyed by particular lexical choices
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the set topics making effective use of examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources e.g. exploration of how power and status are negotiated in a political interview.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:
- loss of focus on what is being asked by the question e.g. broader analysis not directly relevant to the question
- description of some relevant linguistic concepts without linking them to the question
- the investigation of concepts tending to be implicit and difficult to follow
- a limited number of points which are appropriately and accurately supported with references
- demonstration of some rather limited linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- a lack of engagement with a somewhat superficial overview of issues/concepts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content.

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

Language and Power: persuading others

2.   Read the following extract.

Source: 'Introduction' in *Linguistic Evidence* by William M. O'Barr (Academic Press, 1982)

Two examples show the importance of language strategies in allowing writers or speakers to achieve their goals:

1.   A minister is disturbed by the fact that the public continue to use the church car park while shopping nearby. As a consequence, there are not usually enough parking spaces for those attending church meetings on weekdays. His efforts fail until he comes up with a sign that reads: THOU SHALT NOT PARK.
2.   At an informal meeting, the Head of Department says to another member of the university, "John **I've** got a problem – that is, **we've** got a problem and I think you can help solve it"

The language choices here are significant in establishing persuasive power.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which either speakers or writers use language to achieve their goals by persuading others.   **[60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:
- identification of characteristic features through which speakers seek to assert control in spoken language (e.g. use of vocatives or face threatening acts) and/or written language (e.g. use of persuasive language)
- detailed exploration of particular domestic situations (possibly drawn from the candidate's own experience) such as family arguments or discussions between friends or partners
- the language of politics or of political speeches where the speaker or writer seeks to persuade others of their opinion
- the effectiveness of the language of charity appeals in encouraging people to donate money
- consideration of a range of non-spoken contexts where persuasion is central such as print advertising or marketing, with a sense of how the receiver is positioned by the discourse in a particular way
- the nature of classroom discourse and exchanges between teachers and students, especially where one speaker is attempting to persuade others
- the relationships between users in electronic media, again exploring how language is used to persuade
- the nature of legal discourse, including the way in which barristers interrogate witnesses or summarise their case to a jury
- some (brief) reference to theorists (e.g. Norman Fairclough's notion of synthetic personalisation; Deborah Tannen's concept of genderlects; Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom discourse analysis; Giles' Accommodation Theory).

This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/ approaches.

Child Language Acquisition: interaction with adults

3.   Read the following data.

Source: 'Introduction' in *Child Language: A Resource Book for Students* by Jean Stilwell Peccei (Routledge, 2006).

> Child: Want other one spoon, Daddy
> Parent: You mean you want the other spoon
> Child: Yes, I want other one spoon, please Daddy
> Parent: Can you say "the other spoon"?
> Child: Other one spoon
> Parent: Say "other"
> Child: Other
> Parent: Say "spoon"
> Child: Spoon
> Parent: "Other spoon"
> Child: Other spoon (pause) now give me other one spoon

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate how important interaction with adults is for children's acquisition of language.   **[60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:
- the specific features of Child Directed Speech (CDS) in relation to lexical, grammatical and phonological development
- the arguments about the role of CDS in children's development (possibly quoting areas such as some speakers in Papua New Guinea where it does not play a role)
- Chomsky's critique of Skinner's focus on the centrality of input to language development and the significance of overextension
- the significance of case studies such as such as Genie or Jim, the son of deaf parents (research by Bard and Sachs) which highlight the importance of interaction with adults
- research such as Berko Gleason's "Wug Test" or Brown's work on the order in which inflections are learned and their implications for the way in which children acquire the patterns of language, irrespective of input
- a (brief) account of the stages of development, noting the significance of the set order in which children acquire language for a more biological account of the process
- the contrast between other theorists such as the Cognitive model (Piaget) and the Interactionist model (Vygotsky or Bruner),
- the centrality of the role of the caregiver in the Interactionist model
- specific examples of child language that are relevant to the debate about the role of adult input.

This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/ approaches.

Or,

Language and Situation: contextual variation

4.   Read the following extract.

Source: Chapter 7, 'Communication Accommodation Theory' in *Attitudes to Language* by Peter Garrett (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

> The basic notions of accommodation theory are 'convergence' and 'divergence'. Convergence refers to the strategy of reducing dissimilarities used with communication partners and divergence refers to accentuating differences. The motivation for changing one's language in different situations can be identified as a desire to increase the efficiency of the communication or to gain social approval or to maintain their social identity.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which speakers might alter their language to gain social approval or maintain their social identity.   [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:
- a clear account of Giles' ideas about convergence and divergence and the significance in particular contexts (see below)
- interviews of different forms such as political discussions or chat shows, where speakers establish their persona or social identity through their discourse and attempt to win the approval of the audience
- classroom exchanges between students and teachers, where the speakers' language seeks to present a particular identity and, in the case of some students, win the approval of their teacher
- domestic exchanges where members of a family alter their discourse to win approval
- work situations such as job interviews or discussions between bosses and their staff where convergence is used to win approval
- service exchanges such as discussions in shops with the speaker's discourse reflecting her or his desire to support the other's face
- doctor and patient conversations, possibly where doctors use language to establish their expertise
- use of language in friendship groups to assert the speaker's class or ethnic identity and underline their identification with the group
- reference to theorists exploring face (Goffman, Brown and Levinson) or politeness (Lakoff, Leech), supported by specific examples of exchanges
- exploration of the use of standard and/or non-standard forms in particular contexts, possibly referencing linguists such as Labov or Trudgill and writers such as Johns.

This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/ approaches.

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B

BAND	AO1 **Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression [20 marks]**	AO2 **Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language us [20 marks]**	AO3 **Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning [20 marks]**
5	**17-20 marks** • Sophisticated methods of analysis • Confident use of a wide range of terminology • Perceptive discussion of topic • Coherent, academic style.	**17-20 marks** • Detailed critical understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Confident and concise selection of supporting examples.	**17-20 marks** • Confident analysis and evaluation of a range of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication.
4	**13-16 marks** • Effective methods of analysis • Secure use of a range of terminology • Thorough discussion of topic • Expression generally accurate and clear.	**13-16 marks** • Secure understanding of concepts • Some intelligent discussion of issues • Consistent selection of apt supporting examples.	**13-16 marks** • Effective analysis and evaluation of contextual factors • Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication.
3	**9-12 marks** • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology • Competent discussion of topic • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses.	**9-12 marks** • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples.	**9-12 marks** • Sensible analysis and evaluation of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication.
2	**5-8 marks** • Basic methods of analysis • Using some terminology with some accuracy • Uneven discussion of topic • Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy.	**5-8 marks** • Some understanding of concepts • Basic discussion of issues • Some points supported by examples.	**5-8 marks** • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning • Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication.
1	**1-4 marks** • Limited methods of analysis • Some grasp of basic terminology • Undeveloped discussion of topic • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity.	**1-4 marks** • A few simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Few examples cited.	**1-4 marks** • Some basic awareness of context • Little sense of how meaning is constructed • Limited evaluation of effectiveness of communication.
0	**0 marks:** Response not credit worthy		