



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

**A LEVEL (NEW)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 3
1700U30-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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.

GCE A LEVEL (NEW)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 3: Language Change Over Time

SUMMER 2017 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**.

- 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.
- The mark-scheme offers two sources of marking guidance and support for each Section:
 - **'Notes' on the material which may be offered in candidate responses**
 - **Assessment grid, offering band descriptors and weightings for each assessment objective.**
- Be positive in your approach: look for details to reward in the candidate's response rather than faults to penalise.
- As you read the candidate's response, annotate using details from the Assessment Grid/Notes/Overview as appropriate. Tick points you reward and indicate inaccuracy or irrelevance where it appears.
- Decide which band **best fits** the performance of the candidate **for each assessment objective** in response to the question set. Give a mark for each relevant AO and then add each AO mark together to give a total mark for each question or part question.
- Explain your mark with an assessment of the quality of the response 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 decisions made 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, 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

The following guidelines contain an overview, notes, suggestions about possible approaches candidates may use in their response, and an assessment grid.

The mark scheme, however, should not be regarded as a checklist.

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 parts of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

Language Change Over Time

PREFACES IN DICTIONARIES

	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4
Question 1 (a) – (d)	20 marks	-	-	-
Question 2	-	20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

General Notes

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

1. (a) **Identify the word class and archaic spelling patterns of the following words using appropriate terminology.** [4]

Award **one** mark for the correct identification of the word class (up to a maximum of 2 marks) and **one** mark for an appropriate description of the variation (up to a maximum of 2 marks).

EXAMPLE	WORD CLASS	ARCHAIC SPELLING PATTERN
<i>pouder</i> (Text A, l.11)	verb (lexical) (dynamic)	substituted vowel <i>-ou</i> for <i>-ow</i> (both pronounced /aʊ/) French influence
<i>Fourthlie</i> (Text A, l.21)	adverb	<i>-ie</i> for <i>-y</i> in suffix

- (b) **What does the spelling of the examples below tell us about language change? Make two points and refer to the examples using appropriate terminology.** [4]

Award **one** mark for the correct identification of the word class (up to a maximum of 2 marks) and **one** mark for a valid comment about language change (up to a maximum of 2 marks).

EXAMPLE	WORD CLASS	DESCRIPTION OF VARIATION	LANGUAGE CHANGE CONCEPTS
<i>doe/Do</i> (Text A, ll.5/13)	verb (lexical, l.5) (auxiliary, l.13)	inconsistent use of additional final -e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> spelling inconsistency reference to 1755 dictionary
<i>middest</i> (Text A, l.27)	noun <i>mid</i> (adj) + <i>-est</i> (suffix) functioning as noun	no longer used—replaced by 'middle'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reference to standardisation words become obsolete

- (c) **Describe the form and the archaic grammatical features of the following examples using appropriate terminology.** [4]

Award **one** mark for the correct identification of the form (up to a maximum of 2 marks) and **one** mark for a valid description of the archaic grammatical feature (up to a maximum of 2 marks).

EXAMPLE	FORM	ARCHAIC GRAMMATICAL FEATURES
<i>standeth</i> (Text A, l.12)	3 rd person (singular) present tense verb (phrase)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3rd person verb inflection obsolete by the end of EME period 3rd person standard southern inflection replaced by northern dialect -s inflection
<i>thou</i> (Text A, l.24)	second person (subject) pronoun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increasingly restricted to 'affective' use creating positive relationship with reader helps to develop intimate tenor (reinforced by following noun phrase, <i>gentle Reader</i>)

- (d) Analyse features of the grammatical structure and punctuation that are typical of Early Modern English in the extract from Text A below. Make four points and select an appropriate example to support each point. [8]

Four points required—award **one** mark for each point (up to a maximum of 4 marks) and **one** mark for each appropriate example (up to a maximum of 4 marks).

EXAMPLE	ARCHAIC GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE/ PUNCTUATION FEATURE	UNACCEPTABLE ANSWERS
<i>Preachers Clerks English Kings English</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> random capitalisation of common nouns (linked to job/position) standard use of capitalisation for adjectival (l.8) and noun (ll.6/9) forms of countries/nations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> comments on archaic spelling and lexis
<i>mothers language Kings English mans mind</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> possessive not marked with apostrophe 	
<i>&</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of ampersand/ligature of Latin <i>et</i> as a shorthand 	
<i>standeth it not BUT Do we not speak? Doth ... think ...?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inconsistency in use of dummy auxiliary 'do' (periphrastic) dummy auxiliary not used for negative dummy auxiliary used in interrogatives with inversion of subject and verb 	
<i>were not able</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of subjunctive after conditional <i>if</i> clause (hypothetical) cf PDE modal 'would' 	
<i>were not is not</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no elision (contracted forms) of negative primary auxiliary verbs (typical of formal tone) 	
ACIs: <i>as haue so as is ... receiued so that if ... were</i> NCIs: <i>what they say that wit resteth</i> NFCIs: <i>to speake ordering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> frequent use of subordination 	
ll. 1-6 = 15 clauses with subordinating (e.g. <i>as, that, so as</i>) and coordinating (e.g. <i>but, and, &</i>) conjunctions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> long sentences with many clauses (all compound-complex) 	
<i>to bee admonished is ... receiued is ... giuen</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of the passive (typical of formal tone) 	

Award other valid responses where they are accompanied by an appropriate example.

2. **Analyse and evaluate what Texts A, B and C show about the changing nature of prefaces in dictionaries.** [60]

In your response you must also:

- explore connections across the texts
- consider relevant contextual factors and language features associated with the construction of meaning
- demonstrate understanding of relevant language concepts and issues.

Overview

This section is focused on the language of the three texts, which are all prefaces from dictionaries.

Reward comparisons between the texts, and analysis, understanding and evaluation of the effectiveness of the writers' use of language. In addition, look out for sensible awareness and comment on the content and tenor of the extracts, the differing styles of writing, and the influence of contextual factors. Responses should also include knowledge and analysis of differences in language over time.

What distinguishes the best answers from the merely competent is usually the ability:

- to compare the texts effectively
- to engage with evaluation of the language
- to show understanding of the style and conventions of the specific genre (introductions in dictionaries)
- to make a large number of points and to group them, rather than plod through line by line
- to choose the most appropriate illustrations
- to discuss and explain language features accurately and interestingly.

Notes:

The main focus is on the exploration of language in specific contexts from different periods, and on similarities and differences in the use of language in dictionary prefaces. There are a lot of points that could be made, and the following notes are intended merely to suggest possibilities of approach. They are by no means exhaustive, and it is important to have an open mind. Be prepared to accept other points, if they are sensible, based on the language of the texts, and display an ability to apply knowledge and to use analytical methods.

Text A

(Robert Cawdery, *Table Alphabeticall*, 1604)

Overview: Cawdrey's preface provides an introduction to his book of hard words, but also offers an opportunity for him to voice his opinions about the state of the language. He is critical of the lexical choices people make, emphasising the importance of plainness as a desirable quality—rather than the ostentation of 'inkhorn terms'. Foreign loan words are seen as corrupting the purity of English, and defiling *the Kings English*. His attitude is clearly prescriptive, and the terms he chooses are loaded (*learned vs rude, Court vs Country-speech*). The modals of obligation (*must/should*) emphasise the moral duty of speakers to choose the 'right' kind of language. The importance of meaningful communication is a running theme with verbs such as *vnderstand, meaneth* and *perceiue* repeated. There is an advisory tone in his recommendations about the words we use, and his preface becomes explicitly instructive in telling readers how to use his *Table*. The style is formal and rhetorical.

Linguistic features of interest that could be analysed and discussed:

Identification of significant people: *Preachers, Clearks* (people who use language in public contexts—focus on formal role); *gentle Reader* (vocative – polite epithet)

Abstract nouns: *speech, wits, language, tongue, words, Rhetorique, signification* (all in the semantic field of ‘language’)

Adjectives: *strange, outlandish, far iournied, forraine, ouer-sea* (evaluative—critical of lexical borrowings); *ignorant/wise, learned/rude; fine* (ironic); *affected* (criticism of superficial linguistic display); *wholsome, apt* (qualities to aim for)

Adverbs: *especially, neuer* (emphatic); *publicuely, commonly; properly, rightly, readily, perfectly* (evaluative); *Againe, Thirdly, Fourthlie, Nowe, then* (time—sense of process, developing argument)

Noun phrases (head in bold): mostly short e.g. *their wits, this Table* (simple); *any strange ynckhorne termes, these fine English Clearks* (pre-modified); surprisingly few with embedded subordinate clauses given the age of the text (perhaps indicative of Cawdrey’s principles in action?) e.g. *one manner of language* (post-modifying PrepP), *the tongue wherein we speake* (post-modifying RelCI), *the word, which thou art desirous to finde* (post-modifying RelCI + NFCI); the opening NP is more typical of the period (**Svch** as by ... as *haue occasion to speak ... before ...*)

Adjective phrase complements (head in bold): emphatic position—*ouer fine or curious* (negative qualities in contemporary speech); **proper, plaine, apt and meete** (qualities speakers should aim for)

Tensed verb phrases: dominated by **present** (describing contemporary language use) e.g. *haue/labour/stand* (3rd person plural) and *resteth/standeth/art* (3rd person singular)

Modal verb phrases: reflecting advisory tone e.g. *must make ... & say, must ... banish ... and vse, should be, must learne*; assertion e.g. *will say*; certainty e.g. *will powder*

Passive verb phrases: *to bee admonished* (Svch ... = object of active sentence foregrounded); *is... receiued* (subject reference not important); *is ... giuen*, (object *the tongue* foregrounded—implicit religious reference perhaps implied by ‘giuen’?); *... be obserued* (eliminates need for self-reference—typical of formal style)

Subjunctive: hypothetical examples e.g. *if some of their mothers were ... they were not able ...*, *if the word ... begin ...*; expressions of desirability e.g. *they be* (l.20)

Grammatical mood: mainly declarative (describing/commenting on the state of English); interrogative (rhetorical) e.g. *Doth ... think that ...*, *or els standeth it not ..?*, *Do we not speak ...?*, *or is not ...*; imperative (instructive) e.g. *looke*

Syntax: there is only one simple sentence (ll.18-19)—marks the end of the discussion and the beginning of the instructive section; the following three advisory sentences are complex, but not long (ll.19-21); others are compound-complex with sequences of clauses e.g. (verbs in bold and conjunctions underlined) *Some men seek* (MCI) *... that ... forget ... so that if ... were ... were not able to tell, or vnderstand what they say, and yet these fine English Clearks, will say* (MCI) *Ø ... speak ...; but ... might ... charge* (MCI) *...* (carrying the weight of the argument)

Patterning: sense of balance/logical approach e.g. **parallel** structures (*ouer fine or curious; some is learned English, & othersome is rude; to vnderstand, and to profit; looke ... looke ...*); e.g. **foregrounded adverbs** re. argument/advice/instruction (*Therefore, Thirdly, Nowe*); e.g. **repetition** emphasising the importance of meaningful communication (*vnderstand ll.4/8, to vnderstand ll.13-14/24*)

Rhetorical style typical of the persuasive tone: **rhetorical questions** (ll.11-14); **figurative language** (*to beautifie ... as precious stones ...*); **analogy** (*forraine apparell/ouer-sea language*)

Semantic change: *curious; rude* (‘uncultured’, ‘uneducated’); *outlandish* (‘foreign’, beginning to have connotations of ‘bizarre’); *gentle* (well-bred, noble, courteous)

Period words/expressions alien to 21st century reader: *Svch* (pronoun + post-modifying as clause—‘the kind of people’); *apparrell* (clothes); *powder their talke* (figurative, ‘season’, obs.); reflect preface’s context

Contextual factors: *strange ynckhorne termes; Kings English*; reference to *Court talke; this Table* (deictic reference to dictionary); lack of literacy (reference to learning alphabet)

Text B

(Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 1755)

Overview: In this extract from Johnson's preface, he outlines the scale of the task that faced him as a lexicographer, and some of the reasons for the complexity of English spelling. His account is formal, but the use of first person pronouns and a comment clause (*I suppose*) gives us a stronger sense of the writer than in Cawdrey's preface—although there is little evidence of direct engagement with the reader here. The viewpoint emerges clearly in the lexical choice, but Johnson seems less derogatory: his focus is on the language, rather than on the users (other than one derisive comment about *later writers*). While critical of the *irregularities* and *imperfections* in English spelling, he also recognises the energy and variety of the language. This does not, however, mean that his approach is any less prescriptive—his dictionary is associated with the process of standardisation which had begun in the 15th century, and his focus here is on the concept of fixing the language by bringing order to what he sees as its chaotic orthography.

Linguistic features of interest that could be analysed and discussed:

Subject specific language: *modes of expression, ORTHOGRAPHY, tongue, language, lexicographer, alphabet, letters, dialects, spelling, analogy, formations*

Semantic fields: linked to correction e.g. *disentangled, regulated, registered, ascertained, to correct, proscribe*; linked to writing e.g. *writers, written, words, alphabet, penman, writing, letters*; linked to speech e.g. *oral, spoken, sounds, utter, to pronounce, pronunciation*

Loaded words: *purity, ignorance, negligence, barbarous jargon, vitiate*

Abstract nouns: *perplexity, confusion, adulterations, irregularities, ignorance, negligence, imperfections, improprieties, absurdities* (criticisms of language); *rules, principle, test, suffrages, authority, duty* (prescriptive); *choice, variety, modes, diversity* (range of language)

Pronouns: 1st person singular (*I*); 1st person plural (*we* l.17)—generic rather than inclusive

Adjectives: *copious, energetick, boundless*, (evaluative—linguistic potential); *unsettled, unfixed, wild, barbarous, uncertain, arbitrary* (evaluative—language as uncontrolled)

Adverbs: *now, already, always, never, afterward* (time); *imperfectly, negligently* (evaluative)

Noun phrases (head in bold): some simple e.g. **choice**, **its beginning**; some pre-modified e.g. *this wild and barbarous jargon*, *this uncertain pronunciation*; many long with post-modifying clauses e.g. **ORTHOGRAPHY** *which has been ...* (RelCI), **its anomalies**, *which ... must be tolerated ... and which require ... to be registred, that ... may not be increased, and Ø ascertained, that ... may not be confounded* (2 x RelCIs + 2 x NFCIs + 2 x ACIs)

Adjective phrase complements (head in bold): emphatic position—**copious without order/energetick without rules** (disorderly qualities of contemporary speech); **unsettled, fortuitous/inherent in our tongue** (qualities of contemporary spelling); **merely oral** (reductive view of speech); **unfixed by any visible signs/vague and unsettled** (imprecise link between letters and sounds); **fewer, and less different** (the inevitable process of standardisation)

Tensed verb phrases: **past** e.g. process of creating the dictionary (*took, found*) and describing origins of language (*was/were*); **present** e.g. describing state of contemporary language (*has*, l.9) and exploring language change (*arise, proceeds, destroys*)

Passive verb phrases: frequent use (typical of formal style; often the subject cannot be clearly defined i.e. broad references to language users) e.g. *was to be made, were to be detected, were spoken*

Modal verb phrases: wide range e.g. obligation (*must be tolerated*); permission (*may not be increased*); deduction (*must have been spoken*); predictable behaviour (*would exhibit*); assertion (*will ... be observed*); possibility (*can never be afterward dismissed*)

Syntax: all but one of the sentences are compound-complex with many subordinate clauses—typical of the formal tone of eighteenth century informative writing e.g. ll.9-13 = 11 clauses: main (*has/has*), relative (*which ... must be tolerated, which require, which ... is*), adverbial (*that ... may not be increased ... may not be confounded*), and non-finite (*to be registred ... Ø ascertained ... to correct or Ø proscribe*)

Patterning: creates a sense of balance/logic e.g. *copious without order ... energetick without rules; choice ... adulterations ... modes of expression ...; in the Saxon remains ... in the first books ...*

Juxtaposition: emphasises the importance of making the right choices e.g. *irregularities ... inherent in our tongue/others which the ignorance or negligence of later writers ...; anomalies ... must be tolerated/improprieties and absurdities ... to correct or proscribe; various dialects ... grow fewer, and less different*

Word order: foregrounded adverbials e.g. *When I took ..., In adjusting ..., As language was ..., When this ..., From this ...*; inverted subject/verb e.g. *arise ... the various dialects ...*

Period words/expressions alien to 21st century reader: *suffrages* (obsolete in plural form); *penman* (historical); *vitiate* (still used, but meaning now wider)

Contextual factors: prescriptive approach e.g. the need to 'fix' and control language (*registred*), Johnson's attitudes; the power of print (*books*) to standardise language.

Text C

(Aaron Peckham, *Urban Dictionary*, 2005)

Overview: As is typical of a twenty-first century text, the tenor is informal and there is a strong sense of personal voice. Language is indicative of the contemporary context with obvious Americanisms (*dorm*), neologisms (*twentysomethings*, *chillax*), and colloquialisms (*kids*, *smart-ass*). In spite of a light-hearted style, the grammatical structure is quite formal, reflecting the context (an e-book version of an online dictionary). The preface offers readers an understanding of the origins, content and contributors to Urban Dictionary (UD), and explains the current selection. There is direct engagement with the reader and a clear sense of Peckham's love of language—his attitude is descriptive, emphasising the ability of language users to change language creatively to reflect the way they see the world.

Linguistic features of interest that could be analysed and discussed:

Subject specific language: *regional slang, definitions, words, linguistic generation*

Semantic fields: language users e.g. *my dorm friends, creatively rebellious teenagers, hip twentysomethings and thirtysomethings, kids, serious students of the English language from all over the world*; language change e.g. *ever-evolving, change, emerging, changes*

Abstract nouns: *expressions, definitions, content, submissions* (dictionary); *insights, generation, diversity, opinion, culture* (linked to the reflective nature of the preface)

Pronouns: 1st person (*I*) for Peckham's thoughts/opinions; 2nd person (*you*)—direct address

Adjectives: frequent use expressing writer opinion e.g. *new, existing, serious* (defining); *hip, unique, funny, intelligent, hilarious* (evaluative); 250,000, *one million* (enumerators); *more accurate, funny, and insightful* (comparatives); *funniest, wittiest, truest, best* (superlatives)

Adverbs: *only* (limiting); *just, only* l.14 (hedging—informal); *creatively, openly* (evaluative); *Today, daily* (time)

Noun phrases (head in bold): few are simple e.g. *These **definitions***; most are long and modified, carrying a lot of information e.g. *the true, funny, wry ... **smart-ass voices** of today* (pre-and post-modified); *the urban illiterate **newbie** who confuses ...* (RelCI); *a hip **hangout** for a whole community, where people get ... to explain ... how they use and change ... to express ...* (PrepP, RelCI + NFCI + NCI + NFCI)

Adjective phrase complements (head in bold): emphatic position—***funny** to some, **offensive** to others* (attitudes to language); *so popular* (attitude to UD); ***hilarious*** (Peckham's attitude)

Tensed verb phrases: dominated by **present** e.g. discussing UD and current language users (*get, deserves*); **past** e.g. describing origins of dictionary (*started out, tracked*);

perfective e.g. past events with current relevance/ongoing success of UD (*has turned, has become*)

Modal verb phrases: e.g. possibility (*might be*); ability (*can't take, can ... say*)

Grammatical mood: all declarative except for two humorous imperatives (*step off, chillax*)

Syntax: there are more sentences in this text and a wider range of sentence types—typical of the informal tenor and the explicit engagement with the reader e.g. simple (l.3, 10-11), compound (ll.23-24), complex (e.g. ll.1-3) and compound-complex (e.g. ll.15-16); sentences tend to be short (e.g. l.22), which is typical of the more straightforward style of PDE texts; the longest sentence has fewer subordinate clauses than in Text B e.g. ll.6-10 = 6 clauses: main (*range*), relative (*who write ... who want*), and non-finite (*to know ... referring*), noun (*why ... keep*)

Patterning: parallelism—range of attitudes e.g. *funny to some ... offensive to others*; humour e.g. *step off and chillax*; importance of meaningful communication (link to Text A) e.g. *to understand and be understood*; **tripling**—Peckham's evaluation of UD e.g. *more accurate, funny, and insightful; funniest, wittiest, and truest*; **listing**: range of language users e.g. *from creatively rebellious teenagers ... to hip twentysomethings and thirtysomethings ... to not quite so hip 'rents and teachers ... to serious students ...*, adjectives l.17 (asyndetic); range of reasons for word selection e.g. *because they reveal ... because they live ... and ... because they're hilarious ...* (syndetic)

Word order: emphasis on key element e.g. **foregrounded adverbials** *Today ..., As of this writing ...* (timescale); *Of UD's one million definitions...* (scale of UD); **foregrounded indirect object** *To those who can't take ...* (humour); **initial position conjunction** *So ...* (conversational style); **foregrounded post-modifying prepositional phrases** e.g. *(a good book) for all of you who ... for the urban illiterate newbie who ... and for the slang speaker who ...* (direct address to potential readers)

Disrupted collocations: *the irreverent calling card, the nature of the urban beast, can't take the linguistic heat*

21st century words/expressions: *twentysomethings* (compound); *'rents* (clipping); *hella bootsy, chillax, skank, shank, keep ... game tight* (slang—typical of entries in *UD*); *hip, smart-ass, newbie* (colloquial); *pop, hip-hop, online* (cultural)

Contextual factors: descriptive approach e.g. the emphasis on ordinary language users (rather than people in positions of authority e.g. lexicographers, writers), the power of users to change language, the creativity of language change; elision reflects less formal tenor.

Please reward any other valid points: those above are only illustrative of what might be explored.

Assessment Grid: Unit 3, Question 2

BAND	A02	A03	A04
	Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use 20 marks	Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning 20 marks	Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods 20 marks
5	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed critical understanding of concepts (e.g. genre; writer's relationship with text) Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to language; relationship with reader) Confident and concise selection of textual support 	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confident analysis of contextual factors Productive discussion of the construction of meaning Perceptive evaluation 	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insightful connections established between texts Sophisticated overview Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure understanding of concepts (e.g. genre; writer's relationship with text) Some intelligent discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to language; relationship with reader) Consistent selection of apt textual support 	13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective analysis of contextual factors Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning Purposeful evaluation 	13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purposeful connections established between texts Detailed overview Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound understanding of concepts (e.g. genre) Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to language; awareness of reader) Generally appropriate selection of textual support 	9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible analysis of contextual factors Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning Relevant evaluation 	9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible connections established between texts Competent overview Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some understanding of concepts (e.g. genre) Basic discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes) Some points supported by textual reference 	5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some valid analysis of contextual factors Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning Inconsistent evaluation 	5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes some basic connections between texts Rather a broad overview Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few simple points made about concepts (e.g. genre) Limited discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes) Little use of textual support 	1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some basic awareness of context Little sense of how meaning is constructed Limited evaluation 	1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited connections between texts Vague overview Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks: Response not credit worthy or not attempted		