



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2023

**AS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 1
2700U10-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 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.

WJEC GCE ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 1

UNIT 1: EXPLORING LANGUAGE

SUMMER 2023 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 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 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: Analysing language

	AO1	AO3	AO4
Section A	20 marks	15 marks	20 marks

1. Analyse and evaluate how the language used in each of these texts represents attitudes towards internet trolling.

In your answer, you should consider:

- how the writers' language portrays internet trolling
- the contexts and how they shape each text's point of view
- the similarities and/or differences between the texts.

[55]

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, to evaluate how the contextual factors have shaped meaning, and to explore meaningful connections across texts that demonstrate an understanding of how language is used.

Overview

Aspects of language study candidates are likely to explore include, but are not limited to:

- features of genre (audience; function; bias; content)
- tenor
- the effect of language choices (e.g. connotations of words, subject specific language, subordination to reflect conditionality)
- contextual factors (e.g. place of publication; form and structure)
- connections between the texts.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- purposeful selection and analysis of the representation of trolling as consequence of free speech versus social problem (Text A and Text B) or malicious and causing harm (Text C)
- perceptive understanding of how the texts' contexts shape meaning
- critical engagement with key concepts e.g. how the context of production (specialist technology website, UK broadsheet, international fashion magazine) affects the construction of attitudes
- assured evaluation providing details on findings and implications
- consistent and purposeful discussion tied to the meaning of texts
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the texts in light of the questions set.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- general points about the dangers of trolling without considering the sense of debate which Text B and to an extent Text A introduce
- demonstration of some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- lack of engagement with the detail of the texts, instead providing a somewhat superficial view
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance on describing and/or summarising content
- limited or unprofitable discussion of key concepts
- drawing some points of comparison across the texts, mostly rudimentary but some of which may be sensible
- a lack of close consideration of contexts when comparing and contrasting the attitudes expressed.

Notes

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

Genre

- an entry from the dictionary section of an online technology education website (Text A), an extract from the technology news section of a UK-based broadsheet newspaper (Text B) and an online article from the culture section from an international women's fashion magazine (Text C)
- function: to create a debate about the issue of trolling (Text B), to present an example of a prominent personality affected by trolling (Text C) and to define the term 'troll' and explain the phenomenon (Text A)
- the importance of engaging an audience (to entertain, inform and engage).

Content

- Text A: definition of the term 'troll' with brief summary of the phenomenon alongside some guidance on how to handle trolling
- Text B: broadsheet debate which presents a number of personal and professional perspectives on trolling
- Text C: news article which examines the impact of trolling on a high-profile public figure.

Register

- levels of formality: predominantly formal in all three texts, although some use of twenty-first century social media language e.g. *#megxit* (Text C) and *newbies* (Text A)
- use of direct speech e.g. to present personal experience and expert opinion (Text B)
- technological lexis e.g. *game developer* and *online* (Text B), *tweets* and *software* (Text C) and *the internet* (Text A)
- medical lexis e.g. *psychological torture* and *psychotherapist* (Text B)
- some 21st century English features e.g. *#mmtcd* (Text C).

Lexis and Semantics

- adjectives: evaluative to convey a judgement e.g. *notorious* and *abhorrent* (Text B); *unpleasant* (Text C); *undesirable* (Text A); evaluative to convey ideas about intent e.g. *ideological* (Text B); *threatening* (Text C) and *thought-provoking* (Text A); superlative to convey a sense of social disgrace e.g. *vilest* (Text B)
- complements: to convey emotional impact e.g. *I am afraid* (Text B); to convey the prevalence of the phenomenon e.g. *widespread* (Text A); to convey the need for regulation e.g. *proactive* (Text A); to convey the intentions of the trolls e.g. *confrontational* (Text B)
- adverbs: to convey the consensus of opinion e.g. *widely* (Text B); to convey the incessant and targeted nature of the trolling e.g. *repeatedly* and *specifically* (Text C) and *unnecessarily* (Text A)
- concrete nouns to convey ideas about online activities e.g. *blogger* and *developer* (Text B), *accounts* (Text C) and *users* and *comments* (Text A)
- abstract nouns: to describe communication e.g. *dialogue* and *speech* (Text B), *social media* (Text C) and *language* (Text A); to convey a sense of the difficulty of identifying trolls e.g. *alter ego* (Text B) and *anonymity* (Text A); to convey emotions e.g. *rage* and *fury* (Text B); to describe damage caused by trolling e.g. *anxiety* and *depression* (Text B)
- proper nouns: to introduce unashamed trolls e.g. *Andrew Auernheimer* and *Robert Ambridge* (Text B); to identify a high profile victim of trolling e.g. *Meghan Markle* (Text C); to introduce a medical expert e.g. *Dr Aaron Balick* (Text B); to introduce a campaign group e.g. *Hope Not Hate* (Text C); to introduce pseudonyms e.g. *Weew* and *Old Holborn* (Text B)

- pronouns: to convey the collective endeavours of internet trolls e.g. *they* (Text B); to describe the efforts of the authorities e.g. *they* (Text C)
- idiom to convey the tentative nature of initial trolling experiences e.g. *to put their foot in the water* (Text B); to convey anti-social nature of internet communication e.g. *name calling* (Text A); to convey the precarious nature of an online existence e.g. *walks a fine line* (Text A)
- colloquialism: to convey the innocence of many victims e.g. *newbies* (Text A)
- verbs: to convey threat e.g. *...to hurt or upset...* (Text B); *...to troll...* (Text C); to describe internet activity e.g. *posted* and *logged off* (Text B); *filter out* (Text C) and *posts* (Text A); to describe a sense of entrapment e.g. *to bait* and *lurking* (Text A); to convey the actions taken by authorities e.g. *shut down* (Text B), *to prevent* (Text C) and *blocking* (Text A)
- modal verbs: to convey long term effects of trolling e.g. *I will never feel the same* (Text B); to convey the categorical actions of authorities e.g. *will be blocked* (Text C) and *will be proactive in blocking* (Text A)
- modification: to introduce the dichotomous nature of the debate e.g. *free speech* and *pure sadism* (Text B) and *thought-provoking debate* (Text A); to convey brazen confidence e.g. *self-proclaimed troll* (Text B); to reflect slanderous behaviour e.g. *false account* (Text B), *unpleasant or racist anti-Meghan content* (Text C) and *offensive, divisive and controversial comments* and *inflammatory statements* (Text A)
- figurative language: metaphor to convey entrapment e.g. *bait* and *reeling* (Text B) and *lurking* (Text A); metaphor to describe a negative internet phenomenon e.g. *trolling* (Text A, B and C) and *troll* (Text A, B and C).

Form and Structure

- simple noun phrases: to introduce the concept e.g. *a troll* (Text A); to convey malicious motivation e.g. *the thrill* (Text B); to describe reactions to trolling e.g. *a statement* (Text C)
- longer noun phrases: to introduce perpetrators of online trolling e.g. *notorious internet troll Andrew Auernheimer* (Text B); to convey the impact of trolling e.g. *victims' mounting fury* and *sick jokes* (Text B); to describe the trolling of a high profile figure e.g. *offensive or threatening comments* (Text C) and *inflammatory statements* (Text A)
- simple sentence: to introduce a victim of trolling e.g. *In 2007...most visible women in technology* (Text B); to define the phenomenon e.g. *This is sometimes called trolling* (Text A); to describe the sadistic nature of trolling e.g. *Many just enjoy the thrill of psychological torture* (Text B)
- parenthesis: to introduce a troll's alter ego e.g. *better known by his screen name Weev* and *better known by his Twitter alter ego* (Text B); to define a hashtag e.g. *believed to mean "Meghan Markle, the Charlatan Duchess"* (Text C); to introduce contemporary terms e.g. *newbies* (Text A); to define types of inappropriate language e.g. *sexist, racist and so on* (Text A)
- marked themes: to emphasise the impact of trolling e.g. *But after...* (Text B)
- fronted adverbials: to report chronology e.g. *In 2007...* (Text B), *Earlier this month...* and *On 4 March...* (Text C) and *Often...* (Text A)
- passive voice: to reflect consensus of opinion e.g. *...is widely regarded...* (Text B); to describe the anonymity e.g. *The accounts were set up...* (Text C)
- mood: interrogative to raise awareness e.g. *What does Troll mean?* (Text A) and *Do psychologists agree?* (Text B); declarative to give factual accounts e.g. *70 per cent of anti-Meghan tweets...* (Text C)
- listing: asyndetic with bullet points to convey the pervasiveness of the phenomenon e.g. *internet chat rooms...* (Text A); syndetic to provide criticism of the phenomenon e.g. *offensive, divisive and controversial* (Text A); to list the hashtags used to insult Meghan Markle e.g. *...#megxit, # bumpgate, and #mmtcd...* (Text C).

Pragmatics

- Text A: a definition of and dispassionate perspective on the phenomenon
- Text B: a debate on the phenomenon of internet trolling, alternating perspectives
- Text C: informing of the impact of the phenomenon on high-profile figures from the royal establishment.

Possible Connections/Points of Comparison

- the sense of debate among the different perspectives
- high-profile versus ordinary status of the victims
- the intentions of the trolls
- the reactions of the authorities
- the pervasive nature of the phenomenon because of its social media platform.

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

Assessment Grid Unit 1: Section A

BAND	AO1	AO3	AO4
	20 marks	15 marks	20 marks
5	<p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligent methods of analysis • Confident use of terminology • Perceptive discussion of texts • Coherent and effective expression 	<p style="text-align: center;">13-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident analysis of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Intelligent evaluation 	<p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subtle connections established between texts • Perceptive overview • Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate methods of analysis • Secure use of terminology • Thorough discussion of texts • Expression generally accurate and clear 	<p style="text-align: center;">10-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure analysis of contextual factors • Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation 	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful connections between texts • Focused overview • Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology • Competent discussion of texts • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses 	<p style="text-align: center;">7-9 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation 	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible connections between texts • Competent overview • Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic methods of analysis • Some accurate terminology • Uneven discussion of texts • Adequate expression, with some accuracy 	<p style="text-align: center;">4-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Simple discussion of the construction of meaning • Some attempt to evaluate 	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some basic connections between texts • Broad overview • Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited methods of analysis • Limited use of terminology • Some discussion of texts • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity 	<p style="text-align: center;">1-3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some awareness of context • Limited sense of how meaning is constructed • Limited evaluation 	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some links made between texts • Vague overview • Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy		

Section B: Contemporary English

Online Discussion Forum Posts

	AO2	AO3
Section B	15 marks	10 marks

2. The following set of data is taken from an online discussion forum. The contributors are discussing the process of applying to study mental health nursing at university.

Read the data then answer the question below. You should use appropriate terminology and provide relevant supporting examples.

Using your knowledge of contemporary English, analyse and evaluate the ways in which the contributors use language in the discussion. [25]

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect linguistic choices and shape meaning. Responses should demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant twenty-first century language concepts and issues and be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Overview

Examples must be selected from the data provided.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- perceptive understanding of how the texts' contexts shape meaning
- an evaluation of contextual factors, such as success or failure in seeking university admission, and the status of contributors as either seekers of advice or givers of advice and expertise
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- well-informed analysis
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. discussing findings given the question focus
- assured evaluation providing details on findings and implications
- consistent and purposeful discussion tied to the meaning of the texts
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the data in light of the question set
- an exploration of the colloquial nature of online forum posts, which often include Non-Standard English.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- a focus on the surface evaluative features of the posts
- a lack of probing of how language conveys opinion
- superficial consideration of the role contextual factors play in the construction of attitudes and meaning
- demonstration of some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- lack of engagement with the detail of the texts; instead, providing a somewhat superficial view of the texts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- reliant largely on describing and/or summarising content
- limited or unprofitable discussion of key concepts.

Notes

Responses may explore some of the following points but there is no requirement to cover them all or to deal with all texts. Reward all valid discussion:

Medium

- online discussion forum posts instigated by a thread starter; subsequent posters interact with the thread starter to respond with relevant experience or expertise
- contributors are UK-based but from a range of educational and age backgrounds, including a contribution from a UCAS expert
- 'badges' as indicators of experience on the forum or of the quality of past contributions to similar discussions
- 'reps' as community endorsement for usefulness and expertise
- some initialisms: consistent with 21st century English e.g. *IDK* (Text 1); to refer to course certificates e.g. *hnc* (Text 5)
- some acronyms consistent with 21st century English e.g. *UCAS* (Text 1 and 6) and *LOL* (Text 5)
- non-standard orthography consistent with digital communication e.g. *u* (Text 3).

Current applicants (Texts 1, 2 and 3)

- ellipsis to reflect conversational nature of the medium and the earnest seeking of advice e.g. *Had an email...* (Text 1) *...got made unsuccessful for mental health...* (Text 2); to express common experience e.g. *must of been in same room as u...* (Text 3)
- non-standard orthography: intentional non-standard capitalisation of first person pronoun *i* (Text 1); intentional non-standard spelling *u* (Text 3); intentional non-standard capitalisation of institutions e.g. *ucas* (Text 1) and *uws* (Text 2); unintentional non-standard spelling of *being/been* homophone (Text 3) and *of/have* (Text 2)
- non-standard punctuation: to express emotions e.g. *??* (Text 2) and *!!..* (Text 3)
- passive voice e.g. *I got made unsuccessful...* (Text 2) versus active voice e.g. *my interview was unsuccessful* (Text 1) — both taking attention away from personal agency
- common feature of few badges and reps for Texts 1, 2 and 3 to indicate lack of community endorsement for posters
- conversational structure of posts between thread starter initiating discussion (Text 1) and another applicant responding to the thread starter (Text 2) and the thread starter continuing the conversation (Text 3).

Experienced applicants (Texts 4 and 5)

- use of Standard English in mature student (Text 4) versus Non-Standard English of the student re-applying a year later (Text 5) to reflect the generational gap between these two contributors
- use of first person *I* (Text 4 and 5) and past tense *ended up ...* (Text 4) to reflect personal experience
- complements: used to reflect immediate feelings after interview e.g. *fine* (Text 5) and *non-committal* (Text 4)
- imperative to give advice e.g. *don't give up...* (Text 4)
- educational jargon e.g. *clearing* (Text 4) and *hnc* (Text 5) which assumes shared interpretive understanding
- use of subordination to share experience of cause and effect e.g. *... which I would ...* (Text 4)
- ellipsis to convey irony e.g. *obviously not* (Text 5)
- interjection to convey emotion e.g. *gosh* (Text 4) and *LOL* (Text 5).

Expert (Texts 4 and 6)

- pronounced use of coherent standard English grammar and orthography to indicate generational difference (Text 4) or institutional authority (Text 6)
- parenthetical structure to add aspects of personal gender identity e.g. (*gosh ... etc*) (Text 4)
- noticeable lack of personal identifiers of expert in Text 6 to reinforce the authoritative nature of the advice
- high number of badges and reps to indicate reliability and community endorsement (Text 4 and 6)
- second person pronoun *You* (Text 6) to convey the directness of the feedback given
- imperative: for encouragement e.g. ... *don't give up ...* (Text 4); for dispassionate advice on next steps e.g. ... *contact ...* (Text 6)
- use of dummy auxiliary *do* for emphasis (Text 6)
- use of subordination to clarify focus e.g. *As far as ...* (Text 6) to clarify the shifting focus of the advice
- jargon to communicate personal experience of the process e.g. *clearing* (Text 4) or to outline the process e.g. *Track* (Text 6)
- abstract nouns: to refer to experience of the process e.g. *interview* (Text 4) and *process* (Text 6)
- suspension marks used intentionally (Text 4) to indicate a continuation of the process.

Assessment Grid Unit 1: Section B

BAND	AO2	AO3
	15 marks	10 marks
5	<p style="text-align: center;">13-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed critical understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Confident and concise selection of textual support/other examples 	<p style="text-align: center;">9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident analysis of a range of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication
4	<p style="text-align: center;">10-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure understanding of concepts • Some intelligent discussion of issues • Consistent selection of apt textual support/other examples 	<p style="text-align: center;">7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective analysis of contextual factors • Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication
3	<p style="text-align: center;">7-9 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate selection of textual support/other examples 	<p style="text-align: center;">5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication
2	<p style="text-align: center;">4-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some understanding of concepts • Basic discussion of issues • Some points supported by textual references/other examples 	<p style="text-align: center;">3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning • Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Little use of textual support/other examples 	<p style="text-align: center;">1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	