



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

**AS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 2
2700U20-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

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

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

WJEC GCE ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 2

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

UNIT 2: LANGUAGE ISSUES AND ORIGINAL AND CRITICAL WRITING

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.

Question 1(a): Spoken control and dominance (Language and Power)

| | A01 | A02 | A03 | A05 |
|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Question 1 (a) | 20 marks | 10 marks | 10 marks | |
| Question 1 (b) | | | | 20 marks |
| Question 1 (c) | | 10 marks | 10 marks | |

1. The text below is an extract from *The Anatomy of Power* written by a political journalist. It is a non-fiction account about British Prime Ministers. In the extract, Prime Minister Clement Attlee sacks a minister in his team he has known well for twenty years.

- (a) Using the extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate how spoken language is used to control and dominate others. You must refer to other examples of spoken control and dominance in your response. **[40]**

In your answer to the question that follows, you should consider:

- the lexical and grammatical choices
- the relationship between participants
- contextual factors relevant to this text and other spoken examples.

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, to evaluate how the contextual factors have shaped meaning, and to demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant concepts and issues. The candidate's ability to organise their response logically with clear topic sentences and a developing argument is also tested.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- confident analysis of the extract as a starting point before developing the argument to encompass a range of appropriate, carefully analysed wider examples
- explicit demonstration of language knowledge
- critical application of relevant issues, concepts and theories
- comprehensive evaluation of the effect of contextual factors
- clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question
- focused discussion of key concepts
- focused discussion of key issues
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion
- the importance of context i.e. situation, purpose, genre, register etc. e.g. how the setting of the interaction may reinforce the dominance of the powerful speaker
- the relationship between speakers e.g. levels of social distance, asymmetry, relative status.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- limited/non-specific discussion of the extract as a starting point
- limited provision of wider examples
- response focusing exclusively on the extract
- inaccurate use of terminology applied to demonstrate language knowledge
- lack of specific focus on the question e.g. discussing subordinate participant/s, rather than those whose power allows them to control and/or dominate
- general discussion of concepts/issues not used to explore extract/candidate's own examples
- lack of specific examples selected to support all points
- context discussed in general terms.

There are several theories that candidates could use:

- Instrumental Power - Wareing
- Accommodation theory - Giles
- Face - Goffman/Brown and Levinson
- Politeness - Lakoff/Leach
- Gender - O'Barr and Atkins.

This is not a checklist. Credit other valid interpretations where they display relevant knowledge and use appropriate analytical methods.

Notes

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

Candidates should analyse and evaluate how, in the extract, the powerful speaker (Attlee) dominates and controls the subordinate (the minister) through various strategies, before moving on to a wider consideration of spoken dominance and control.

Candidates **must** also analyse different examples of spoken dominance and control from their own knowledge/experience. Examples may include (but need not be limited to):

- classroom interactions
- job interviews
- media interviews
- parent/child interactions
- legal proceedings
- mixed gender interactions.

Medium

- spoken mode

Tenor

- how different levels of formality might be used to dominate/control
- the use of positive/critical and/or emotive language
- terms of address/vocatives
- different grammatical moods, particularly imperatives and directive declaratives/interrogatives
- use of tag questions assuming agreement
- prosodic features
- rhetorical devices
- tone.

This is not a checklist. Look for and reward valid alternatives.

| BAND | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 |
|------|--|--|--|
| | 20 marks | 10 marks | 10 marks |
| 5 | 17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophisticated methods of analysis Confident use of a wide range of terminology Perceptive discussion of topic Coherent, academic style | 9-10 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed critical understanding of concepts Perceptive discussion of issues Confident and concise selection of supporting examples | 9-10 marks <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 | 13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective methods of analysis Secure use of a range of terminology Thorough discussion of topic Expression generally accurate and clear | 7-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure understanding of concepts Some intelligent discussion of issues Consistent selection of apt supporting examples | 7-8 marks <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 | 9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible methods of analysis Generally sound use of terminology Competent discussion of topic Mostly accurate expression with some lapses | 5-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound understanding of concepts Sensible discussion of issues Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples | 5-6 marks <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 | 5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic methods of analysis Using some terminology with some accuracy Uneven discussion of topic Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy | 3-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some understanding of concepts Basic discussion of issues Some points supported by examples | 3-4 marks <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 | 1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited methods of analysis Some grasp of basic terminology Undeveloped discussion of topic Errors in expression and lapses in clarity | 1-2 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few simple points made about concepts Limited discussion of issues Few examples cited | 1-2 marks <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 | | |

(b) Write a newspaper report about the sacking of a high-profile figure. [20]

In planning your response, you should consider:

- the key features of newspaper reports
- the relationship with the target audience and purpose of writing
- the lexical and grammatical features appropriate to the genre.

Aim to write approximately 350 words.

This question tests the candidate's ability to use English to communicate in different ways, to demonstrate expertise in shaping, crafting and developing ideas, and to show creativity in engaging an audience.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- an appropriate form
- sophisticated sense of genre
- clear awareness of the needs of the audience (e.g. stylistic variation according to sub-genre of newspaper chosen)
- focused, thoughtful content e.g. techniques and effects
- effective stylistic choices e.g. journalese/sensationalism (tabloid) versus more sophisticated and apparently objective (quality)
- appropriate and engaging written expression.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- limited awareness of form and genre
- less awareness of different audiences for different sub-genres of newspaper
- less awareness of appropriate style, tone, content
- issues with clarity and accuracy.

This is not a checklist. Credit other valid interpretations.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 1(b)

| BAND | AO5 Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English in different ways [20 marks] | Guidance |
|------|---|---|
| 5 | <p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of creativity with some flair • Confident and original expression • Skilful engagement with audience • Form and structure linked intelligently to content | <p>High (19-20): Demonstrates expertise and self-assurance, flair and originality with language consciously and creatively manipulated for effect. Intelligent and engaging writing. Skilful engagement with audience.</p> <p>Low (17-18): Very good understanding of task. Genre and style understanding underpins choices made about form/structure. Polished style. Voice confident in places, with some confident engagement with audience.</p> |
| 4 | <p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thoughtful creativity • Well-crafted and controlled expression • Effective engagement with audience • Form and structure purposefully linked to content | <p>High (15-16): Strong sense of the writer as an individual. Thoughtful creativity. Some assured linguistic choices. Response shaped by an understanding of target audience. Explicit focus on task genre. Carefully controlled and sustained expression.</p> <p>Low (13-14): Response consciously crafted for effect in places. Some purposeful language choices. Secure understanding of audience. Effective structure.</p> |
| 3 | <p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable creativity • Sound expression • Clear attempt to engage audience • Form and structure sensibly linked to content | <p>High (11-12): Clear personal voice. Creative linguistic choices. Clear engagement with target audience. Organises material for effect. Expression generally sound and style controlled.</p> <p>Low (9-10): Expression mostly sound. Clear organisation. Focuses on demands of task and attempts to engage with audience. Good sense of shaping the writing. Some understanding of link between form, content and structure.</p> |
| 2 | <p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Some attempt to match form and structure to content | <p>High (7-8): Straightforward expression. Some creative engagement with task. Sense of structure. Clear signs that knowledge of genre underpins some lexical choices. Some awareness of audience.</p> <p>Low (5-6): Technical errors but they will not affect understanding. Some basic awareness of genre and audience in places. Some stylistic inconsistency.</p> |
| 1 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Limited attempt to link form and structure to content | <p>High (3-4): Technical inaccuracy and lack of fluency in expression. Some limited awareness of audience. Some evidence of occasional attempt to choose words for effect.</p> <p>Low (1-2): Expression often awkward and frequent technical errors. Little explicit evidence of organisation. cursory awareness of demands of task. Response may be very brief or incomplete.</p> |
| 0 | 0 marks: Response not credit worthy | |

(c) Write a commentary for the text you have produced, analysing and evaluating your language use. [20]

Comment particularly on your language choices and their effectiveness in relation to the context given in part (b).

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 concepts and issues, and should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 1(c)

| BAND | AO2 | AO3 |
|------|--|--|
| | 10 marks | 10 marks |
| 5 | <p>9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confident interpretation of the task Confident understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confident analysis of contextual factors Productive discussion of the construction of meaning Perceptive evaluation |
| 4 | <p>7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective awareness of the task Secure understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 3 | <p>5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible awareness of the task Sound understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 2 | <p>3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic awareness of the task Reasonable understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 1 | <p>1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some general awareness of the task Some understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some general awareness of context Limited sense of how meaning is constructed Limited evaluation |
| 0 | 0 marks: Response not credit worthy | |

Question 2 (a): Experts' Language (Language and Situation)

| | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 | AO5 |
|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Question 1 (a) | 20 marks | 10 marks | 10 marks | |
| Question 1 (b) | | | | 20 marks |
| Question 1 (c) | | 10 marks | 10 marks | |

2. The transcript below is an extract from a conversation between a doctor and a patient.

- (a) Using the extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate how experts use language in different situations. You must refer to other examples of how experts use language in your response. **[40]**

In your answer, you should consider:

- the lexical and grammatical choices
- the relationship between participants
- contextual factors relevant to this text and other spoken and/or written examples.

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, to evaluate how the contextual factors have shaped meaning, and to demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant concepts and issues. The candidate's ability to organise their response logically with clear topic sentences and a developing argument is also tested.

Overview**Characteristics of a successful response may include:**

- confident analysis of the extract as a starting point before developing the argument to encompass a range of appropriate, carefully analysed wider examples
- explicit demonstration of language knowledge
- critical application of relevant of issues, concepts and theories
- comprehensive evaluation of the effect of contextual factors
- clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question
- focused discussion of key concepts
- focused discussion of key issues
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- limited/non-specific discussion of the extract as a starting point
- limited provision of wider examples/response focusing entirely on the extract
- inaccurate use of terminology applied to demonstrate language knowledge
- lack of specific focus on the question e.g. discussing those spoken or written to experts, rather than the language of the experts themselves
- general discussion of concepts/issues not used to explore candidate's own examples
- lack of specific examples selected to support all points
- context discussed in general terms.

There are several theories that candidates could use:

- Accommodation theory - Giles
- Personal power (occupational) - Wareing
- Critical Discourse Analysis - Fairclough

This is not a checklist. Credit other valid interpretations where they display relevant knowledge and use appropriate analytical methods.

Notes

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

Candidates should analyse and evaluate how, in the extract, the doctor uses some subject specific language and spoken strategies to comfort, reassure and achieve compliance from the patient, before moving on to a wider consideration of experts' language in both spoken or written modes. Candidates **must** also analyse different examples of experts' language use from their own knowledge/experience. Examples may include (but need not be limited to):

- other medical settings
- educational interactions
- legal briefings
- textbooks
- manuals
- sports reporting etc.

Medium

- spoken and/or written modes - possibility for discussion of how experts' language is used differently depending on mode

Tenor

- level of formality, technical registers/avoidance of specialist language for novice audience
- jargon/field-specific/specialised lexis or avoidance of this through use of less technical synonyms
- levels of fluency in spoken language/grammatical complexity in written mode
- sentence/utterance types/moods
- how clarity is achieved
- purpose
- discourse features.

This is not a checklist. Look for and reward valid alternatives.

| BAND | A01 | A02 | A03 |
|------|---|---|---|
| | 20 marks | 10 marks | 10 marks |
| 5 | <p>17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophisticated methods of analysis Confident use of a wide range of terminology Perceptive discussion of topic Coherent, academic style | <p>9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed critical understanding of concepts Perceptive discussion of issues Confident and concise selection of supporting examples | <p>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>13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective methods of analysis Secure use of a range of terminology Thorough discussion of topic Expression generally accurate and clear | <p>7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure understanding of concepts Some intelligent discussion of issues Consistent selection of apt supporting examples | <p>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>9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible methods of analysis Generally sound use of terminology Competent discussion of topic Mostly accurate expression with some lapses | <p>5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound understanding of concepts Sensible discussion of issues Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples | <p>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>5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic methods of analysis Using some terminology with some accuracy Uneven discussion of topic Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy | <p>3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some understanding of concepts Basic discussion of issues Some points supported by examples | <p>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>1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited methods of analysis Some grasp of basic terminology Undeveloped discussion of topic Errors in expression and lapses in clarity | <p>1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few simple points made about concepts Limited discussion of issues Few examples cited | <p>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 | | |

(b) As an expert on your local area, you have been asked to write the script for an audio guide for tourists. [20]

While this is a text written to be spoken, it should not be presented as a transcript.

In planning your response, you should consider:

- which details of the area to include
- ways to engage your audience
- the lexical and grammatical features appropriate to the purpose and genre.

This question tests the candidate's ability to use English to communicate in different ways, to demonstrate expertise in shaping, crafting and developing ideas, and to show creativity in engaging an audience.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- an appropriate form
- sophisticated sense of genre
- clear awareness of the needs of the audience (immediate engagement through direct address, rhetorical devices etc.)
- focused, thoughtful content e.g. knowledge of the local area, landmarks etc.
- effective stylistic choices e.g. establishing appropriate tone and sense of voice
- appropriate and engaging written expression.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- lack of engagement with audience
- lack of awareness of task e.g. stating basic facts about the area with no sense of audience or purpose
- lack of appropriate linguistic features suitable to the genre
- issues with clarity and/or accuracy.

This is not a checklist. Credit other valid interpretations.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 2(b)

| BAND | AO5 Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English in different ways [20 marks] | Guidance |
|------|--|--|
| 5 | 17-20 marks | High (19-20): Demonstrates expertise and self-assurance, flair and originality with language consciously and creatively manipulated for effect. Intelligent and engaging writing. Skilful engagement with audience. Low (17-18): Very good understanding of task. Genre and style understanding underpins choices made about form/structure. Polished style. Voice confident in places, with some confident engagement with audience. |
| 4 | 13-16 marks | High (15-16): Strong sense of the writer as an individual. Thoughtful creativity. Some assured linguistic choices. Response shaped by an understanding of target audience. Explicit focus on task genre. Carefully controlled and sustained expression. Low (13-14): Response consciously crafted for effect in places. Some purposeful language choices. Secure understanding of audience. Effective structure. |
| 3 | 9-12 marks | High (11-12): Clear personal voice. Creative linguistic choices. Clear engagement with target audience. Organises material for effect. Expression generally sound and style controlled. Low (9-10): Expression mostly sound. Clear organisation. Focuses on demands of task and attempts to engage with audience. Good sense of shaping the writing. Some understanding of link between form, content and structure. |
| 2 | 5-8 marks | High (7-8): Straightforward expression. Some creative engagement with task. Sense of structure. Clear signs that knowledge of genre underpins some lexical choices. Some awareness of audience. Low (5-6): Technical errors but they will not affect understanding. Some basic awareness of genre and audience in places. Some stylistic inconsistency. |
| 1 | 1-4 marks | High (3-4): Technical inaccuracy and lack of fluency in expression. Some limited awareness of audience. Some evidence of occasional attempt to choose words for effect. Low (1-2): Expression often awkward and frequent technical errors. Little explicit evidence of organisation. cursory awareness of demands of task. Response may be very brief or incomplete. |
| 0 | 0 marks: Response not credit worthy | |

(c) Write a commentary for the text you have produced, analysing and evaluating your language use. [20]

Comment particularly on your language choices and their effectiveness in relation to the context given in part (b).

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 concepts and issues, and be organised logically with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 2(c)

| BAND | AO2 | AO3 |
|------|---|--|
| | 10 marks | 10 marks |
| 5 | <p>9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confident interpretation of the task, Confident understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>9-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confident analysis of contextual factors Productive discussion of the construction of meaning Perceptive evaluation |
| 4 | <p>7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective awareness of the task, Secure understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 3 | <p>5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible awareness of the task, Sound understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 2 | <p>3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic awareness of the task, Reasonable understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>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 |
| 1 | <p>1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some general awareness of the task, Some understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use | <p>1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some general awareness of context Limited sense of how meaning is constructed Limited evaluation |
| 0 | 0 marks: Response not credit worthy | |