



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**AUTUMN 2021**

**A LEVEL  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1  
A700U10-1**

## INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2021 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: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

### AUTUMN 2021 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 (**AOs**) that are relevant to the questions that you are marking, and the respective **weighting** of each AO. The advice on 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 Grid/Notes/Overview 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 example
X	wrong
(✓)	possible
?	doubtful
R	repetition

## General Instructions - Applying the Mark Scheme

Where banded level 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, and all responses must be marked according to the banded levels provided for each question.

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

<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO4</b>
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: Television Quiz Shows

In your response, 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 texts as examples of interviews with talk shows. [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 differing nature of the turn-taking in the two transcripts with the overlapping and low mean length of utterance (MLU) in Text A reflecting its more contentious nature and the higher MLU and consistent face work in Text B underlining its more co-operative approach
- insightful discussion of points of contrast that explore language use, e.g. Kyle's informal language at points (such as the verb *knocked*) as opposed to Winfrey's more elevated lexis (the noun *epitome*)
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions drawn, e.g. noting the different purposes of the exchanges with the promotion of the book and identification of Obama as a role model contrasting with Kyle's attack on Lisa and his focus on her inadequacies as a mother-to-be
- productive explorations of the issues stemming from pertinent spoken language concepts, e.g. the difference in status between Lisa and Obama which is reflected in their treatment by the hosts
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument, e.g. Kyle's use of the noun phrases *that kid's life* and *HIS DAUGHTER* to emphasise the importance of the unborn child's life to Shaun or Winfrey's introduction of Obama with the full proper noun phrase to emphasise her significance as a celebrity
- 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. vague assertions about talk shows without analysing the transcripts
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis of the transcripts
- some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- 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: *The Jeremy Kyle Show*

**Nouns:** Kyle's use of possessive noun *kid's* to sound informal; his use of the abstract noun *proof* (lines 18 and 20) to suggest his authority while Lisa's repetition of it (line 23) contends that she has evidence for Shaun's poor character; Lisa's repetition of the abstract noun *stuff* (line 25) suggests a lack of precise details for her case

**Verbs:** informal use of verbs by Kyle (*nicked* replaced by the more formal *steal* later on and the present participle *slating*) to underline his persona as an ordinary person; Lisa's non standard use of the auxiliary verb *don't* (line 16); Lisa's use of *deserve* (line 16) and *manipulate* (line 19) to attack Shaun; repetition of the verb *prove* (line 28) to show Kyle's support for Shaun

**Adjectives:** Kyle's use of *good* (line 36) to show his satisfaction with the outcome which is reinforced by the paralinguistic feature of shaking her hand

**Pronouns:** Kyle's varied use of first person plural pronouns with *we* (line 9) and *us* (line 22) suggesting the people on stage while *us* (line 15) and *we* (line 33) refer to the programme makers and possibly the audience both indicating collective responsibility; his use of singular form *I* (lines 20, 22 and 32) highlighting his own personal involvement; repetition of second person pronoun *you* (line 31) to pressurise Lisa into agreeing

**Interjection:** use of interjections as turn yielding cues (Kyle's *yeah* on line 7, *no* on line 15 and Lisa's *OK* on line 23) suggesting ordinary conversation; Kyle's final turn with *yes* (line 36) revealing his sense of his own success in changing Lisa's mind

**Noun phrases:** Kyle's more elevated legalistic lexis when commenting on the lie detector test (*the ring in question* on line 11) in contrast to more informal noun phrases elsewhere such as *the time of day* (line 21); his use of *this show* to suggest the power of the programme to intervene in others' lives; the reference to *his rights* directing the sympathy towards Shaun; use of *his daughter* (line 29) to emphasise these rights

**Prepositional phrases:** Kyle's support for Shaun prior to opening the lie detector test shown by *for no reason* (line 9); use of *on camera* (line 6) to assert the reliability of Kyle's assertion

**Parallel phrasing/antithesis:** Kyle's use of *it's not about your girlfriend....it's about the baby* (lines 31-33) to imply that Lisa is being selfish

**Imperative clause:** Kyle's use of *look at me* (line 31) to assert his power and *give us a chance* (line 33) to appeal directly to Lisa

**Deictic expressions:** use of adverb of place *here* (lines 9, 24, 26 and 27) to refer to the programme; use of demonstrative determiner *that* in the noun phrase *that kid's life* (line 22) to underline the importance of the unborn child

**Overlapping and latch ons:** amount of overlapping (lines 18, 19, 24 and 26) points to the conflict at this point with Lisa's points being overridden by Kyle with repetition of the interrogative on line 26 asserting his role as topic manager

**Non-fluency features:** some unintentional repetition such *I'm I'm* (on line 33); incomplete utterance (line 15) with the repair using pronoun *us* and adverb *together* to point to a more collaborative answer

**Prosodic features:** upward intonation on the politeness feature *please* (line 34) to put pressure on Lisa to change her mind; emphatic stress on the verb *do* (line 2) by Lisa to assert the genuine nature of her view and pronoun *him* (line 17) by Kyle to show his support for Shaun; raised volume by Kyle (lines 20, 28 and 29) to assert his authority and convey his anger at Lisa's attitudes; Kyle's use of informal pronunciation in elision such as /gʌnə/ to converge with other speakers.

### **Text B: *The Oprah Winfrey Show***

**Nouns and noun phrases:** high register in formal opening seen in abstract noun *epitome* (line 1); contrast drawn between proper noun phrase *First Lady* (lines 1 and 2) and the post-modified noun phrase *a girl from the South Side of Chicago* which emphasises her authenticity and normality; extended proper noun phrase in greeting on line 6 making Obama seem more significant; proper noun phrase *a Oprah's Book Club* indicates the book's importance, especially with the (possibly unintentional) omission of an abstract noun such as *choice*; Obama's metaphorical use of *journey* (repeated in line 29) to suggest her vision of life as an ongoing adventure

**Verbs:** Winfrey's use of *served* (line 1) stressing Obama's achievement in conventional terms; the dynamic verb *love* (line 21) underlining her passionate appreciation of Obama's book; her metaphorical use of the repeated verb *landed* pointing to the skill involved in writing the book while the repetition of *struck* (lines 17 and 18) indicating the strength of her response; Obama's use of the informal phrasal verb *figure...out* (line 38) to help her identify better with young people and sound more approachable

**Present participles:** both speakers mirror the use of present participles to underline the idea of ongoing growth such as *evolving* (O: line 25; M: line 29), *becoming* (O: line 25; M: line 43) and *growing* (M: line 32)

**Adjectives and adjective phrases:** Winfrey's set of positive evaluative adjectives (*extraordinary, tender, compelling, powerful, beautiful* on lines 14 -17) presenting the book's strengths in very personal terms; their connection emphasised by the adjective phrase *so proud* as if Winfrey were Obama's mother; Obama's optimistic vision of life reflected in her use of *amazing* (line 40) which Winfrey supports by her use of the comparative adjective *better* (line 41)

**Adverbs and adverb phrases:** Obama's tautological repetition of adverbs *always continually* (line 29) emphasising her point about life being a process; Winfrey's adverb phrases *so much* (line 21) similarly underlining her point about her regard for the book; different uses of the adverb of time *still*, first by Winfrey to suggest that Obama has not changed (line 3) and then by Obama to suggest that she continues to change (line 43)

**Personal pronouns:** Winfrey's inclusive use of first person plural *us* in the clause *she's really just like all of us* suggesting the normality of Obama; Winfrey's consistent use of first person singular forms (*I* and *me*) making the interview more personal while also asserting her own importance; emphatic stress on second person *you* allows Winfrey to redirect the topic back to Obama with its use in the greeting (line 9) underlining their friendship

**Determiners:** Winfrey's emphatic stress on predeterminer *all* (line 22) emphasising her desire for the book to be read by everyone

**Interjections:** the informal interjection *hey* in Obama's opening sequence followed by the vocative *guys* (line 10) showing her desire to connect directly with her young audience; her use of *je!* (line 19) also informal, showing her excitement at Winfrey's choice of the book for her Book Club;

**Prepositional phrase:** Winfrey's use of *in the preface* emphasising how quickly she realised the brilliance of the book; Obama's *at a thing* (line 30) is slightly vague use of language, possibly suggesting the spontaneity of her speech;

**Parallel phrasing:** the use of the simple utterances *the book is tender (.) it is compelling (.) it is powerful (.) it is raw* (line 16) making the judgements seem more convincing with the use of the adjective *raw* at the end of the list suggesting the book's emotional power

**Overlapping:** little overlapping with the only example (line 41) a co-operative one despite the fact that Winfrey only uses one interrogative throughout (line 24) and does not immediately yield the turn there

**Non-fluency features:** few non-fluency features with Obama's repetition of the determiner *a* (line 27) or the verb *is* (line 39) and her use of the filler *erm* (line 28) being rare examples of the spontaneity of the speech

**Prosodic features:** Obama's elision in /duɪn/ (line 11) delivered to the young audience, suggesting a desire to be friendly; Winfrey's slowing of her speech and elongated vowel on the verb *sa::y* (line 12) to emphasise the considered nature of her judgement.

**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	A01 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression	A02 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	A04 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods
	20 marks	20 marks	20 marks
5	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated methods of analysis</li> <li>Confident use of a wide range of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>Perceptive discussion of texts</li> <li>Coherent, academic style</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed critical understanding of concepts</li> <li>Perceptive discussion of issues</li> <li>Confident and concise selection of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insightful connections established between texts</li> <li>Sophisticated overview</li> <li>Effective use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
4	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective methods of analysis</li> <li>Secure use of a range of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>Thorough discussion of texts</li> <li>Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure understanding of concepts</li> <li>Some intelligent discussion of issues</li> <li>Consistent selection of apt textual support</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purposeful connections established between texts</li> <li>Detailed overview</li> <li>Relevant use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
3	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensible methods of analysis</li> <li>Generally sound use of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>Competent discussion of texts</li> <li>Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound understanding of concepts</li> <li>Sensible discussion of issues</li> <li>Generally appropriate selection of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensible connections established between texts</li> <li>Competent overview</li> <li>Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
2	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>Using some terminology with some accuracy (including spoken)</li> <li>Uneven discussion of texts</li> <li>Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some understanding of concepts</li> <li>Basic discussion of issues</li> <li>Some points supported by textual references</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes some basic connections between texts</li> <li>Rather a broad overview</li> <li>Some valid use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
1	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>Some grasp of basic terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>Undeveloped discussion of texts</li> <li>Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A few simple points made about concepts</li> <li>Limited discussion of issues</li> <li>Little use of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited connections between texts</li> <li>Vague overview</li> <li>Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors</li> </ul>
0	<b>0 marks:</b> 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.*

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 social role played by Standard English and Non Standard English
- well-chosen references, including possibly either the research of specific linguists, which support the points made concisely and precisely, e.g. Wareing's notion of influential and instrumental power
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures, e.g. the variation in persuasive strategies depending on the situation
- intelligent conclusions drawn, e.g. the inadequacy of a prescriptivist view of SE given its change over time
- productive explorations of the implications of context factors, e.g. the way in which classroom discourse helps to establish power relations between speakers
- consistently and purposefully tied to the contextual factors and how meaning is created, e.g. the way in which Non-Standard forms can assert covert prestige
- 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 response may include:

- losing sight of what is being asked by the question, e.g. lack of focus on close analysis
- some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- linguistic knowledge demonstrated, but not always accurate
- some overview of appropriate points of similarity/difference
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- 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

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

### Standard and Non-Standard Language: social significance

2. **Read the following extract from *An Introduction to Language and Society* by Martin Montgomery.**

Differences still exist between standard and non-standard dialects in the form and construction of utterances, of which the following are fairly typical examples:

Non-standard dialect	Standard dialect
Being on <b>me</b> own had never gone through <b>me</b> head	Being on <b>my</b> own had never gone through <b>my</b> head
We <b>was</b> forever having arguments	We <b>were</b> forever having arguments
Anyway they <b>done</b> it for me	Anyway they <b>did</b> it for me
I hadn't got <b>nothing</b> to fall back on	I had got nothing to fall back on

Socially engendered reactions of approval or disapproval are at stake rather than the inherent linguistic "rightness" of the forms. These features are of little consequence in terms of mutual intelligibility. Their real importance lies in their capacity to become charged with social significance.

Chapter 3: Language and Regional Variation: Accent and Dialect (Routledge, 1995)

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which standard and non-standard forms are socially significant.** [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- some brief historical context on the emergence of standard forms and the process of standardisation
- the distinction between prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches (possibly referencing writers such as Crystal and Johns who argue for different sides) and their conflicting attitudes to how society should judge NSE
- the frequent difference between attitudes to lexical variation (e.g. Scottish use of the adjective "wee") and the more heavily stigmatized grammatical variation (e.g. regularising of verbs such as "they was")
- specific examples of particular regional dialects as opposed to standard forms and the attitudes held by people
- some consideration of particular contexts (with examples) where standard forms are especially valued (for instance, the idea of its "gatekeeping" function in education)
- the notion of covert prestige as referenced in the work of linguists such as Labov, Cheshire or Milroy
- the relationship between NSE and class as explored in linguists such as Trudgill, Petyt or Labov
- examples of dialectal variation and the judgements made about them (such as multiple negation, unmarked adverbs or zero marked plurals)
- recent developments in dialects in Britain, including some discussion of dialect levelling or the changes to marked RP, noting how this reflects social changes over the last fifty years
- the attitudes towards Multi-Cultural London English (MLE) and the social judgements involved in them
- examples from candidates' own experience of attitudes towards their use of standard and non-standard forms.

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

### Language and Power: asymmetrical exchanges

3. Read the following extract from *Language and Discrimination* by Celia Roberts, Evelyn Davies and Tom Jupp.

<b>Manager:</b>	Now, I'm sick of it. You're either going to do the job properly or you're going to get out.
<b>Employee:</b>	I'm sorry. Next time=
<b>Manager:</b>	= there won't be a next time
<b>Employee:</b>	I (pause) am sorry. Next time do it properly.
<b>Manager:</b>	Yes. Well, the next time that girl complains to me about your bad work, I shall sack you. Is that clear?
<b>Employee:</b>	Yes, I (pause) English=
<b>Manager:</b>	You understand. You know what I'm going to do?
<b>Employee:</b>	Next time, sir.
<b>Manager:</b>	There won't be a next time
<b>Employee:</b>	I am sorry, I am sorry.
<b>Manager:</b>	It's not good you standing there like that saying you're sorry, you're sorry. You just keep on making bad work. Now I'm telling you the next time you make bad work like that, you're finished.

Chapter 1: Discrimination and Language Learning (Routledge 1992)

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which language is used in exchanges where one speaker is more powerful than others.**

**[60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- identification of specific strategies in spoken discourse (with examples) whereby speakers assert their power (e.g. overlapping, topic management, prosodic features such as raised volume, face threatening acts, tag questions) or lose power (e.g. hedges, fillers, use of vocatives, low Mean Length of Utterance)
- consideration of the specific strategies used by speakers in other asymmetrical exchange such as the courtroom or doctor/patient exchanges
- comments on linguists such as Fairclough or Wareing with identification of specific features of power (e.g. instrumental and influential)
- exploration of a specific speech situation such as student/teacher exchanges in the classroom (possibly referencing Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model)
- distinction between power and status, commenting on specific examples where those with higher status are challenged by speakers with lower such as members of the public challenging politicians
- analysis of domestic exchanges such as within a family, possibly drawing on their own experience
- exploration of power in debate (possibly political) where one speaker dominates a discussion.

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

Or,

**Language and Situation: persuasive language**

**4. Read the following extract from a persuasive leaflet entitled *Save the Bees*.**

Save the Bees

Bees are having a hard time, but we can all do our bit to help save the bees. You do not need to become a beekeeper. Indeed, many other pollinators (not just honey bees) are in serious decline too.

For example, in the USA, the rusty-patched bumblebee (*Bombus affinis*) – a once common species – is now on the brink of extinction, and has been declared endangered, with populations having plummeted by 90 %. Seven species of Hawaiian yellow-faced bees have to receive protection under the Endangered Species Act. In the UK, some bumblebee species have gone extinct already.

However, we can all do our bit to help the bees – and making a difference starts with each one of us – if not you and I, who else?

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which language is used to persuade others in different situations. [60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- identification of features that are characteristic of charity appeals such as emotive lexis and direct address to influence the audience's views
- analysis of how advertising uses language to win the support (possibly referencing Fairclough's notion of synthetic personalisation)
- consideration of persuasive speeches, especially those that are seeking to win the support of the audience such as those in a political context with focus on features such as tripling or the use of abstract nouns
- exploration of how speakers may seek to win support for personal goals in a domestic situation such as children persuading their parents to take a particular action (or vice versa)
- analysis of the language of the law with focus on the persuasive techniques used by barristers such as rhetorical interrogatives or hypophora
- commentary on the research into gender such as Tannen's theory of genderlects, with female and male use of features such as mitigated and aggravated directives.

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

## Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B-Questions2-4

<b>BAND</b>	<b>AO1</b> <b>Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO2</b> <b>Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language us</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO3</b> <b>Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning</b>  <b>20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated methods of analysis</li> <li>Confident use of a wide range of terminology</li> <li>Perceptive discussion of topic</li> <li>Coherent, academic style</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed critical understanding of concepts</li> <li>Perceptive discussion of issues Confident and concise selection of supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confident analysis and evaluation of a range of contextual factors</li> <li>Productive discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective methods of analysis</li> <li>Secure use of a range of terminology</li> <li>Thorough discussion of topic</li> <li>Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure understanding of concepts</li> <li>Some intelligent discussion of issues</li> <li>Consistent selection of apt supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective analysis and evaluation of contextual factors</li> <li>Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>3</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 topic</li> <li>Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound understanding of concepts</li> <li>Sensible discussion of issues</li> <li>Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensible analysis and evaluation of contextual factors</li> <li>Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>Using some terminology with some accuracy</li> <li>Uneven discussion of topic</li> <li>Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some understanding of concepts</li> <li>Basic discussion of issues</li> <li>Some points supported by examples</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some valid analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>Some grasp of basic terminology</li> <li>Undeveloped discussion of topic</li> <li>Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A few simple points made about concepts</li> <li>Limited discussion of issues</li> <li>Few examples cited</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some basic awareness of context</li> <li>Little sense of how meaning is constructed</li> <li>Limited evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<b>0 marks:</b> Response not credit worthy		