



...day June 20XX – Morning/Afternoon

A Level English Language

H470/01 Exploring language

**SAMPLE MARK SCHEME**

**Duration:** 2 hours 30 minutes

**MAXIMUM MARK      80**

This document consists of 24 pages

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING****SCORIS**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *scoris assessor Online Training; OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to Scoris and mark the [insert number] practice responses (“scripts”) and the [insert number] standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the Scoris 50% and 100% deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, by email or via the Scoris messaging system.
5. Work crossed out:
  - a. where a candidate crosses out an answer and provides an alternative response, the crossed out response is not marked and gains no marks
  - b. if a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question and makes no second attempt, and if the inclusion of the answer does not cause a rubric infringement, the assessor should attempt to mark the crossed out answer and award marks appropriately.

H470/01

**Mark Scheme****June 20XX**

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
  7. There is a NR (No Response) option.
  8. Award NR (No Response)
    - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
    - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
    - OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the question.
- Note: award 0 marks - for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).
9. The Scoris **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**  
If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the Scoris messaging system or e-mail.
  10. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to your Team Leader (Supervisor) by the end of the marking period. The Assistant Examiner's Report Form (AERF) can be found on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support. Your report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

H470/01

**Mark Scheme****June 20XX****11. Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning

**INTRODUCTION**

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the texts which candidates have studied
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

These are the **Assessment Objectives** for the English Language specification as a whole.

<b>AO1</b>	Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression.
<b>AO2</b>	Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use.
<b>AO3</b>	Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning.
<b>AO4</b>	Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods.
<b>AO5</b>	Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English to communicate in different ways.

### WEIGHTING OF ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

The relationship between the units and the assessment objectives of the scheme of assessment is shown in the following table:

<b>Component</b>	<b>% of A level</b>					
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>AO4</b>	<b>AO5</b>	<b>Total</b>
Exploring language H470/01	11%	6%	11%	6%	6%	40%
Dimensions of linguistic variation H470/02	11%	11%	12%	6%	0%	40%
Independent language research H470/03	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%	20%
	27%	22%	28%	12%	11%	100%

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

Study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question Papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide ‘correct’ answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide ‘best guesses’ about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners’ Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates’ responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates’ responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme. Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected. In your marking, you will encounter valid responses which are not covered by the Mark Scheme: these responses must be credited. You will encounter answers which fall outside the ‘target range’ of levels for the paper which you are marking. Please mark these answers according to the marking criteria.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**PAPER-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: H470/01 Exploring language**

Candidates answer all the questions on the paper. The paper addresses all of the assessment objectives:

Assessment Objectives AO1 and AO3 are addressed in question 1.

Assessment Objectives AO2 and AO5 are addressed in question 2.

Assessment Objectives AO1, AO3 and AO4 are addressed in question 3.

In each question, the assessment objectives are given equal weighting.

THE INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR EACH TASK provides an indication of what candidates are likely to cover. The notes are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive: candidates should be rewarded for any relevant response which appropriately addresses the Assessment Objectives.

THE LEVEL DESCRIPTORS FOR EACH QUESTION FOLLOW THE INDICATIVE CONTENT.

**SUBJECT-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

- Each level descriptor covers the relevant assessment objectives.
- Where the assessment objectives appear in separate columns, marks should be allocated for each assessment objective independently of one another. There is no requirement for responses to be allocated marks from within the same level across each assessment objective.
- An answer does not have to meet all the requirements of a level descriptor before being placed in that level. The extent to which it meets all of the requirements of a level descriptor will determine its placement within that level.
- The extent to which the statements within the level have been achieved should be the only criteria used when deciding the mark within a level.
- Indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. Any valid response should be rewarded.

**Indicative Content - Please note:** indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
1	<p><b>Text A</b> is an extract from a column in the <i>Guardian</i> newspaper written by Charlie Brooker. He writes a humorous opinion piece every week on a subject of his choice. The article was published on 20 December 2010.</p> <p><b>Giving careful consideration to the context of the text:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>identify and analyse uses of lexis in this text</b></li> <li>(b) <b>identify and analyse the way sentences are constructed in this text.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</i></p> <p>General contextual points (AO3): Context can be understood in different ways. In this text there is the context of the text's genre: a column in a broadsheet newspaper. These columns come in a range of forms, but will offer a personal opinion on an issue that concerns the journalist. The piece will be developed over 800 or more words and will have a structure which differs from the main articles in the paper; it will not simply tell a story in an impartial way, starting with a summary paragraph and followed by a mixture of facts and quotations from key individuals. In columns opinion is required and the journalist's position will often, but not always, reflect the paper's own political and social stance. Equally important is the social, cultural and historical context that surrounds the text.</p>	20	<p>In each of the bullet points below, AO1 is covered at the start of the point and AO3 at the end.</p> <p class="list-item-l1">(a) <b>identify and analyse uses of lexis in this text.</b> <b>Possible features could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of swear words, deliberately breaking taboos in its context, for humour (e.g. 'shitloads' as punch line) and to shock, helping to reinforce the point made</li> <li>• mixed register: some low frequency, French/Latinate vocabulary (e.g. 'consequences', 'condemned') to suit demands of educated audience, but plenty of higher frequency lexis ('lots', 'bits', etc.) to suit expectations of genre of article</li> <li>• choice of modifiers in noun phrases used to provide humour ('special quiz music', 'most exciting bits')</li> <li>• single modifiers used as epithets to provide humour ('past mountain').</li> </ul> <p class="list-item-l1">(b) <b>identify and analyse the way sentences are constructed in this text.</b> <b>Possible aspects could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• verb mood: mostly declarative, stating opinion, which is expected of a columnist, but with use of hedged imperatives (cohortative mood) like 'Let's' – rhetorical to engage audience in his satirical proposal; more forceful imperatives (e.g. 'take history'), to signal, structurally, a change in direction; rhetorical question as structural device in last paragraph, again part of the discourse structure of the piece</li> </ul>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme****June 20XX**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Guidance</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Text features</b>
<b>1</b>	<p>Here there is the current issue of tuition fees, which Brooker is objecting to.</p> <p>There is also the history of satirical protest writing. Candidates may, possibly, know a little of this or perhaps be able to refer to satire on TV, with shows like Mock the Week and Have I Got News for You.</p>	<b>20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dynamic vs stative: pattern of stative verbs early on (e.g. ‘it’s shitloads’) – opinion, to engage readers’ outrage; dynamic verbs used for proposed responses to high fees ('smash', 'whittled') add colour to the idea, which accentuates its sense of absurdity and hence makes irony clearer</li> <li>• sentence types: variety of sentence types used to maintain interest (e.g. opening simple sentence), suiting the agenda of providing entertainment</li> <li>• minor sentences retain colloquial quality (e.g. ‘Whittled down.’) and, again, work to reinforce message at key moments (e.g. minor sentence ‘Especially if your course only lasts seven days.’ is as punchy as it is outrageous and silly).</li> </ul>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

There are a total of 20 marks available for **Question 1**.

10 marks can be awarded for part **(a)** and 10 marks for part **(b)**. There is one mark per level for each AO. This table should be used twice – firstly to mark part **(a)** and allocate a mark out of 10, and then again to mark part **(b)** and allocate a mark out of 10. Parts **(a)** and **(b)** focus on different language levels, and therefore each part could achieve different levels. Each part should be marked completely separately – there is no need to look for consistency in allocating marks if the responses demonstrate different levels of competency.

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO1 and AO3</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates clearly identify patterns of language use in precise relation to the linguistic level specified in the task and can closely analyse incisively chosen evidence, with application of appropriate terminology; the writing is in a secure academic register. (AO1)</li> <li>With a precise hold on the language feature specified in the task, candidates perceptively evaluate the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received and understood by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates can single out and analyse relevant examples of language use related to the linguistic level specified in the task, with application of appropriate terminology and coherent written expression. (AO1)</li> <li>Focusing on the language feature specified in the task, candidates can convincingly weigh up some possible effects of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and the way it is received and understood by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some clear points about language use which relate to the specified language level and are supported with relevant evidence; use of terminology is mostly appropriate, although likely to be less densely packed than the level above and written expression is clear but likely not to be economical. (AO1)</li> <li>Having a reasonable sense of the language feature specified, candidates come to some clear conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates attempt to make their writing relevant to the feature and language level specified in the task, pulling out the occasional piece of evidence and using terminology which is partially appropriate; written expression has some errors but the meaning is nonetheless apparent. (AO1)</li> <li>Having some sense of the language feature specified, candidates come to some fairly loose conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some link to the specified feature and language level and some terms are used, appropriately; evidence, if there, is likely to be barely relevant or only loosely defined (not actually quoted, for example) and writing may at times obscure meaning. (AO1)</li> <li>Conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced and is received by the audience will be somewhat indistinct. There may be a vague sense of the text's purpose. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>

**Indicative Content - Please note:** indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
2	<p><b>'Technology is spoiling the English language.'</b></p> <p>Taking the above statement into account, write a short editorial for a student newspaper expressing your views about how language has been affected by technology. It should be no more than 500 words long.</p> <p>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</p> <p><b>AO5</b></p> <p>Editorials are, in essence, pieces of discursive writing which contain an opinion or opinions. It is not the same as a formal persuasive speech, which might work with rhetorical flourishes to win over an audience to a particular position which they may not hold, but it can have a persuasive element to it. If candidates adopt the kind of relentless rhetoric of a speech or campaign letter they can still do reasonably well, if the register is right for the candidate audience, but look closely to ensure the piece remains appropriate for the specified form.</p> <p>A good model is the kind of editorial found in newspapers opposite the letters pages, where the editor will add a fresh angle on two or three stories found elsewhere in the paper. One of these editorials is often lighter in tone and this would suit this topic.</p>	24	<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>The task can be approached from either perspective, although to pull off a position which simply agrees with the statement in the task is not likely to be engaging <i>critically</i> with the concept of technology and its effects on language.</p> <p>There is a huge range of technologies that might be covered: phone, radio, T.V., online communication in chat rooms and forums and via instant messaging; blogging of all kinds, including microblogging sites like Tumblr and Twitter; texting; even the book. In a piece of this length, candidates are not expected to cover them all. Full marks could easily be reached with a focus on instant messaging and texting, for example. That said, candidates who avoid tackling textspeak and instead, perhaps, want to prove that language is simply evolving rather than disintegrating, for example through the hyperlinked world of the internet, could well find themselves with a piece which does indeed show 'assured knowledge and understanding'.</p>

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
2	<p>Equally the piece might be reasonably personal – the kind you find in a magazine or in the <i>i</i> newspaper with a photograph of the editor above it. It is not necessary to imagine that they are referring to an article elsewhere in the paper, although this might help give authenticity to the piece.</p> <p>The piece should have a recognisable structure. A typical approach is to take one side of the argument into account, such as to cite all the ways in which many commentators blame technology for falling standards of literacy, before delivering the opposing view, perhaps celebrating the vast range of modes of discourse open to people now and the creativity this fosters. Candidates might round things off there (probably with a flourish – see below), making clear their position on the issue, or leave a door open at the end so that the reader is left to decide.</p> <p>It is also possible to maintain a clear line through the piece, bringing in opposing arguments and picking them off as you go, but too much seesawing between positions tends to break down any sense of cohesion and will not be counted as ‘expertly constructed’.</p> <p>To demonstrate flair, there will almost certainly need to be some kind of hook at the start. A student reader would not want something completely dry. One way to achieve this is through an anecdote of some kind, possibly personal, or possibly drawn from the news itself. A quotation or a lively piece of data might work too. Candidates will want to leave the reader on a strong final note, too.</p>	24	<p><b>Below are some areas that could be covered:</b></p> <p>Mode, in particular the mixed mode of online/phone communication. Are users adopting particular non-standard modes and registers or somehow picking up bad habits?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homophonic representation: playing with language or desecrating it?</li> <li>• Uses of expressive punctuation and non-standard punctuation: sloppy grammar or creativity? Prescriptivist debates – could cite someone like Aitchison (viral quality of language decay; the crumbling castle; damp spoon) but would need to engage with these opinions for high marks.</li> <li>• The work of David Crystal (for example Txtng: The Gr8 Db8 for example), Naomi S Baron (Always on: Language in an Online and Mobile World) and others.</li> <li>• Language change, including all types of neologisms (clipping, semantic change, conversion, eponyms, affixation and so on).</li> <li>• The particular discourse structures of the new media (for example the 140 character constraint of the tweet or the hyperlinked pages of websites) and what they offer as well as what they limit.</li> <li>• Representation: the notion of the online persona.</li> </ul> <p>Again, to show assured knowledge and understanding, depth in particular areas – an editorial just focusing on neologisms that might be spawned by technology, for example – could be more effective than ranging widely across language and technology in some kind of loose list.</p>

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
2	<p>Indeed, the sense of the piece building to a definite finish is a mark of a candidate being in control of their material.</p> <p>Of course this task is actually a form of transformation for candidates, where they are taking what they have learnt about the specified concept and re-presenting it for a non-specialist audience. For this student audience, the higher levels require carefully modulated formality levels. Some challenging vocabulary is bound to make it in, therefore, but any jargon such as 'homophonic representation' or 'synchronous discourse', while appropriate for the study of technology, is not going to be welcome in an article of this kind. The piece will have some colloquial touches, including uses of idiom and contractions ('don't, etc.) and perhaps the occasional minor sentence used <i>deliberately</i> (easy to spot this kind of purposeful rule-breaking if the rest of the article uses accurate standard punctuation!) but will not be too chatty. It is easy to see how, with a topic like this, candidates could play with neologisms to provoke a reaction from the reader ('LOL', etc.). Again, examiners will be able to distinguish between this kind of deliberate manipulation and writing which is not being fully controlled.</p> <p><b>Synthesising AO2 and AO5</b></p> <p>It is important that candidates do not simply 'rant'. All good discursive writing has to be supported with evidence and this evidence must be engaged with critically for high marks.</p>	24	

H470/01

**Mark Scheme****June 20XX**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Guidance</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Text features</b>
<b>2</b>	Candidates will need to have learnt some facts, some quotes, some names and statistics to prepare for this exam and have a few personal anecdotes up their sleeve. This will be a place to show their knowledge and to put any wider reading about English Language to good use.	<b>24</b>	

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

There are a total of 24 marks available for **Question 2**.

Decide on a mark for AO2 out of 12, and then a separate mark for AO5 out of 12. Add the two marks together to reach a total out of 24 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different levels for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO5</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show an assured knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>Candidates engage critically with the specified concept and issue.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An expertly-constructed text showing, perhaps surprising, originality in making the piece appropriate to the form specified in the task.</li> <li>The use of appropriately chosen linguistic features shows flair and the writing precisely suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show a good knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>In their piece, candidates show that they can take a critical angle on the specified concept and issue.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A well-constructed text, which is appropriate to the form specified in the task.</li> <li>The use of appropriately chosen linguistic features shows skill and their writing suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show an essentially sound level of knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>Candidates show that they have some ability to think and write critically about the concept/issue.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A deliberately constructed text, which contains most of the main elements of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>There is clear use of appropriate linguistic features and the writing has been modulated to take account of the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Their knowledge and understanding of the chosen language concept or issue is mostly accurate, although is likely to lack the depth needed to be convincing.</li> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates have addressed the specified language concept/issue, although not critically.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A text which is attempting to match the task's purpose and which is at least recognisable as an example of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>There are some appropriate language features employed and some attempts have been made to take account of the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates' knowledge and understanding of the concept/issue is likely to have inaccuracies or be muddled.</li> <li>The language concept/issue is present in the piece although somewhat indistinct or confused.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A text which has some sense of the form specified in the task, but which leaves out key elements.</li> <li>There are some attempts to use appropriate language features, although probably not employing a register which suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme****June 20XX**

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO5</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates do not appear to understand the concept or issue but it is possible to see one or two points relating to it.</li> <li>The language concept or issue will be just barely detectable in the piece.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates produce writing which has little sense of the specified task, although there may be one or two superficial features of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>One or two appropriate language features may be present; the audience is not understood or addressed.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

**Indicative Content - Please note:** indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Mark	Text features									
3	<p><b>Using appropriate linguistic concepts and methods, analyse the ways in which language is used in these two texts. In your answer you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explore connections and variations between the texts</li> <li>• consider how contextual factors contribute to the construction of meaning.</li> </ul> <p><b>A03</b></p> <p>Clear contrast between what seems to be genuinely spontaneous elements to conversation in Text A, within basic adjacency pair format, and continuous piece of discursive writing which is at times quite highbrow, but has some spoken touches ('don't', 'won't' etc) Audience for Text A programme is mainstream, hence humour, shorter turns, little depth to responses, whereas Text B has an audience that is prepared to accept some challenging lexis.</p> <p><b>A04</b></p> <p>Direct references to concept of the nerd in both pieces suggest that the Pegg/Ross conversation has some of the same degree of planning as the</p>	36	<p><i>Phonetics, phonology and prosodics</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Text B</th> <th>Text C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elision of words and emphatic stress (e.g. li'wbi') governed by needs of comedy – fast delivery.</li> <li>• Ross and Pegg both use glottal stop ('we were talkin', suggesting that convergence/accommodation a rapport between them and possibly a general air of informality.</li> </ul> </td><td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard English with no attempt at phonetic spellings.</li> </ul> </td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Lexis and semantics</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Text B</th> <th>Text C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little low frequency Latinate lexis: 'socially inept' breaks pattern, following slang phrase 'spekky idiot' – arguably shows Ross attempting to diverge from the established register for comic effect.</li> <li>• Empty modifiers ('incredibly talented', 'brilliant') typical of talk show discourse/register.</li> <li>• Fields enhance comedy (e.g. 'spekky idiot', 'nerdy', 'nerd trap').</li> <li>• Figurative language used playfully (e.g. 'nerd trap'; 'quicksand').</li> </ul> </td><td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed register in terms of vocabulary, with some low frequency Latinate lexis condensed in certain sequences, sometimes also used as a contrast: e.g. 'space-based nerd fest' is followed by 'portentous', 'virulent', 'populace' – suggests a well-educated readership; register shift creates comic effect.</li> <li>• More colloquial modifiers used at times which make no attempt to disguise opinion (e.g. 'Rubbish films').</li> <li>• Figurative language mostly common idioms (e.g. 'slip through the net'; 'the holy grail') lowers formality and increases colloquial quality.</li> </ul> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Text B	Text C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elision of words and emphatic stress (e.g. li'wbi') governed by needs of comedy – fast delivery.</li> <li>• Ross and Pegg both use glottal stop ('we were talkin', suggesting that convergence/accommodation a rapport between them and possibly a general air of informality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard English with no attempt at phonetic spellings.</li> </ul>	Text B	Text C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little low frequency Latinate lexis: 'socially inept' breaks pattern, following slang phrase 'spekky idiot' – arguably shows Ross attempting to diverge from the established register for comic effect.</li> <li>• Empty modifiers ('incredibly talented', 'brilliant') typical of talk show discourse/register.</li> <li>• Fields enhance comedy (e.g. 'spekky idiot', 'nerdy', 'nerd trap').</li> <li>• Figurative language used playfully (e.g. 'nerd trap'; 'quicksand').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed register in terms of vocabulary, with some low frequency Latinate lexis condensed in certain sequences, sometimes also used as a contrast: e.g. 'space-based nerd fest' is followed by 'portentous', 'virulent', 'populace' – suggests a well-educated readership; register shift creates comic effect.</li> <li>• More colloquial modifiers used at times which make no attempt to disguise opinion (e.g. 'Rubbish films').</li> <li>• Figurative language mostly common idioms (e.g. 'slip through the net'; 'the holy grail') lowers formality and increases colloquial quality.</li> </ul>
Text B	Text C											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elision of words and emphatic stress (e.g. li'wbi') governed by needs of comedy – fast delivery.</li> <li>• Ross and Pegg both use glottal stop ('we were talkin', suggesting that convergence/accommodation a rapport between them and possibly a general air of informality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard English with no attempt at phonetic spellings.</li> </ul>											
Text B	Text C											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little low frequency Latinate lexis: 'socially inept' breaks pattern, following slang phrase 'spekky idiot' – arguably shows Ross attempting to diverge from the established register for comic effect.</li> <li>• Empty modifiers ('incredibly talented', 'brilliant') typical of talk show discourse/register.</li> <li>• Fields enhance comedy (e.g. 'spekky idiot', 'nerdy', 'nerd trap').</li> <li>• Figurative language used playfully (e.g. 'nerd trap'; 'quicksand').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed register in terms of vocabulary, with some low frequency Latinate lexis condensed in certain sequences, sometimes also used as a contrast: e.g. 'space-based nerd fest' is followed by 'portentous', 'virulent', 'populace' – suggests a well-educated readership; register shift creates comic effect.</li> <li>• More colloquial modifiers used at times which make no attempt to disguise opinion (e.g. 'Rubbish films').</li> <li>• Figurative language mostly common idioms (e.g. 'slip through the net'; 'the holy grail') lowers formality and increases colloquial quality.</li> </ul>											

Question	Guidance	Mark	Text features			
3	<p>biography. However, Ross is perhaps taking Pegg off his prepared material in order to get a level of entertainment, although it may be a prepared routine to an extent, whereas any biographical writing like this is carefully worked through (despite the apparent ease of the register at times). Ross interrupts Pegg, as befits his role as the interviewer. The written text allows the writer to keep total control at all times.</p>	36	<p><i>Grammar and morphology</i></p>			
			<p><b>Text B</b></p>		<p><b>Text C</b></p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More coordinate clauses – higher than subordinate clauses indicates both that this is speech and also the aim to make the register accessible.</li> <li>Interrogative mood used by Ross – part of schema of this kind of discourse.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roughly every other sentence contains some subordination – can be done in writing and chimes in with other features; suggests fewer allowances are being made for a mainstream audience.</li> <li>Declarative throughout, suits informative purpose of biography.</li> </ul>	
			<p><i>Discourse</i></p>			
			<p><b>Text B</b></p>		<p><b>Text C</b></p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interview-guest format. P and R both with equal length turns, suggesting equality of status. Ross is also entertainer.</li> <li>R frames questions in adjacency pair Q and A format but the roles are sometimes reversed.</li> <li>Topics controlled by R – agenda setter (e.g. ‘are you genuinely nerdy’ is a clear shift of topic).</li> <li>Generally cooperative dialogue, suggests that both participants are comfortable with each other.</li> <li>High number of non-fluency features, including fillers and plenty of false starts suggests <i>genuine interchange here</i> (exception is ‘geek’/‘nerd’ definition).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of a chapter. Discourse structure is done by paragraphing, with some sense of chronology, but mostly divided into topics (marketing; independent films and similarities with Star Wars; effect on Pegg as a boy).</li> <li>Declarative mood, with adverbials as discourse markers typical of the essay or piece of discursive writing (‘Nevertheless’, ‘Generally, though’), indicate the twists and turns of his discussion.</li> <li>Continuous stream of writing, typical of this form/genre.</li> <li>Reader is implied at certain points (‘Strange to think’) which adds to levels of engagement.</li> <li>Written mode – polished prose but with spoken feel.</li> </ul>	

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

There are a total of 36 marks available for Question 3.

Decide on a mark for AO1 out of 12, and then a separate mark for AO3 out of 12, and a separate mark for AO4 out of 12. Add the three marks together to reach a total out of 36 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different levels for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO4</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply a range of appropriate methods in an assured and systematic way, using appropriate terminology and writing in a secure academic register.</li> <li>They deftly establish and explore patterns of language use and can closely analyse incisively chosen evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make discerning points about the possible effect of contextual factors on particular features of language, both in terms of production and reception.</li> <li>They perceptively evaluate their points, suggesting alternatives for how context might account for variations in language use.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates selectively and methodically apply confident knowledge of appropriate linguistic concepts across both texts.</li> <li>Candidates compare particular linguistic features in the two texts, making illuminating connections between them which clearly establish some of the varied ways that language is used.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply a range of appropriate methods to the texts in a systematic way, using appropriate terminology and coherent written expression.</li> <li>They establish patterns of language use and can analyse well-chosen evidence in some depth.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make strong and helpful points about relevant contextual factors, showing how context might affect language use, both in terms of production and reception.</li> <li>They show that they can weigh up how contextual factors might account for variations in language use.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates methodically apply sound knowledge of appropriate linguistic concepts across both texts.</li> <li>Candidates compare linguistic features in the two texts, making helpful connections between them which show some of the ways that language varies.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO4</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply some appropriate methods in a sound way, using mostly appropriate terminology and coherent if uneconomical writing.</li> <li>Analysis is characterised by either a fairly limited number of well-developed points, with relevant evidence, or a larger number of valid supported points that lack depth.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some valid points about context, showing how contextual factors can affect language production and reception</li> <li>They come to some sound conclusions about how contextual factors could cause variations in language.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply accurate knowledge of linguistic concepts to language features in a way that is mostly appropriate, across both texts.</li> <li>They make some comparisons of linguistic features in the two texts, making some connections between them which show ways in which language use varies.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates attempt to apply linguistic methods with some success, and terminology is at times appropriate; written expression contains some errors.</li> <li>Analysis is uneven and is characterised by either scattered points that are supported with evidence or points which may have validity but are unsupported.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make a few successful attempts at showing how basic contextual factors affect the way language is produced and received.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn tend to be assertive and simplistic rather than weighed in the balance and are sometimes unconvincing; there may be an elementary sense of how context affects language variation.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates have a loose grasp of linguistic concepts and attempt to apply them to both texts, although sometimes unconvincingly.</li> <li>They will make more general connections and will attempt to compare particular features but with only partial success.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

June 20XX

<b>Level</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO4</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make a vague attempt to apply linguistic methods to the texts and some terms are used, with occasional appropriateness; writing is likely to contain errors which sometimes obscure meaning.</li> <li>One or two simple points are made, with little or tenuous evidence; assertive rather than analytical.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates can comment on context, although this is unlikely to be show proper grasp of production and reception and so is of very limited use.</li> <li>Evaluation of points is not happening in this level because there is no real exploration of language, but there may be one or two generalisations made about the effects of context on the language.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where linguistic concepts are in evidence for each text, understanding is shallow and knowledge of them is likely to be muddled.</li> <li>Some loose connections between the texts are established in one or two places in the answer. These connections are likely to be simple matching or contrasting of features with very little demonstration of how language varies.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates struggle to apply the linguistic methods; terminology, if present, is inappropriate and accuracy of written expression is very limited.</li> <li>There may be the odd point made but there is no analysis with evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or at the most two references are made to the context with no link to language production or reception.</li> <li>Little or no attempt to draw conclusions about the effect of context on different uses of language.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any knowledge of linguistic concepts is likely to be mostly inaccurate with perhaps a very vague sense of understanding both texts being present.</li> <li>The notion of comparison is essentially lost in this level. There may be one or two connections here and there but these do not help with notions of the varieties of language use.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>

**APPENDIX 1**

Assessment Objective weightings are given as percentages.

**Assessment Objectives Grid**

Question	AO1%	AO2%	AO3%	AO4%	AO5%	Total%
1	5	0	5	0	0	10
2	0	6	0	0	6	12
3	6	0	6	6	0	18
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>40%</b>

## Summary of updates

---

Date	Version	Change
September 2020	1.2	Updated copyright acknowledgements in Resource Booklet.

H470/01

**Mark Scheme**

**June 20XX**

**BLANK PAGE**