



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

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

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

EDUQAS GCE A LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE
COMPONENT 1: Language Concepts and Issues
SUMMER 2024 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 criteria 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, and all responses must be marked according to the banded levels provided for each question.

This mark scheme instructs examiners to look for and reward valid alternatives where indicative content is suggested for an answer. Indicative content outlines some areas of the text candidates may explore in their responses. **This is not a checklist for expected content in an answer, nor is it set out as a 'model answer'**. Where a candidate provides a response that contains aspects or approaches not included in the indicative content, examiners should use their professional judgement as English specialists to determine the validity of the statement/interpretation in light of the task and reward as directed by the banded levels of response.

Candidates are free to choose any approach that can be supported by evidence, and they should be rewarded for all valid interpretations of the texts. Candidates can (and will most likely) discuss features of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

SECTION A: ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

AO1	AO2	AO4
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

General Notes

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

Section A: Exit Interviews for Television Competition Programmes

In your response to the question that follows, you must also:

- draw on your knowledge of the different language levels
- consider concepts and issues relevant to the study of spoken language
- explore connections between the transcripts.

1. Analyse the spoken language of these texts as examples of exit interviews with contestants in television competition programmes. [60]

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, and to explore meaningful connections across texts that demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant concepts and issues.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- clear understanding of spoken language concepts and resulting issues e.g. the differing nature of the turn-taking in the two transcripts, with the overlapping in Text A reflecting its more comedic nature, and the higher MLU and politeness in Text B underlining its more commiserative approach
- insightful discussion of points of contrast that explore language use e.g. Tom Allen's mock use of high register (such as the adjective */ɪndɪˈpiːd(ə)nt/*) to ironise in Text A, versus Rylan Clark Neal's colloquialisms (such as the noun *shocker*) in Text B to convey support and surprise
- well-chosen, concise textual references to support the points made
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. noting the different ways in which the exchanges between hosts and their guests entertain the audiences, e.g. comedic in Text A versus chat show style entertainment in Text B
- productive explorations of the issues stemming from pertinent spoken language concepts e.g. the different handling of politeness in both situations
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument e.g. Tom Allen's use of the noun phrase *the whole thing* as a description of the programme ironically underplays the significance of the competition, versus Rylan Clark Neal's use of the noun phrase *an absolute shocker* to his own, and by extension his audience's, emotional investment in the competition
- assured evaluation providing details on findings and implications
- a range of terminology, which is used consistently and purposefully
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the transcripts in light of the question set.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- a focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language e.g. vague assertions about exit interviews without analysing the transcripts
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis of the transcripts
- descriptions of some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- only a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- some linguistic knowledge, but not always accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- lack of engagement with the detail of the texts providing, instead, a somewhat superficial view of the transcripts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content
- a limited number of points across the texts, mostly rudimentary but some of which may be sensible.

Notes

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

Text A: *The Apprentice: You're Fired*

Lexical sets: of nouns associated with the programme (*interviews, advisors, task, final*) to reflect a shared frame of reference between interlocutors and the audience; of nouns and noun phrases relating to business, used by LA (*start-up, business plan, my idea*) to bring credibility and a real-world application to his involvement in the programme.

Nouns: L's use of the proper noun *Lord Sugar* to convey respect for the well-known businessman who fronts the programme; T's use of the concrete noun *chair* to inject comedic tone from the outset; L's use of abstract nouns *heart, soul and dream* to convey the significance of his own business aspirations, which reach out beyond the programme.

Pronouns: L's use of first-person singular pronoun *I* to offer a personal reflection on his journey on the programme; T's use of the first-person plural pronoun *we* to reflect a sense of communal viewership; T's use of *they* as a comedic reference to the target audience for L's perfume slogan, which was one of his failed tasks on the programme.

Adverbs: T's use of *definitely* to mock his own stature alongside L; L's use of *obviously* to downplay his personal ambitions to win the competition.

Noun phrases: L's use of the colloquial noun phrase *a long shot* to downplay his own chances of winning the competition; L's use of the colloquial noun phrase *pocket money* to underplay the significance of the financial gain he would achieve by winning the competition; T's use of antithesis *big pockets* to derive humour from L's underplaying of the winning sum; the ironic use by T of *mountain-climbing aspirations* and *↑lovely↑ perfume bottle label* to mock L's concept for the perfume he attempted to market in one of the programme's tasks; T's ironic reference to L's spelling error in his perfume branding *strong /Indipi:d(ə)nt/ women*.

Adjective phrases: T's politeness in the adjective phrase *pretty impressive* to praise L's achievements in the competition; L's deliberate underplaying of his own achievements with *quite proud*.

Verb phrases: L's use of ***messed up*** to honestly reflect on his own shortcomings; L's use of *get knocked out* to convey his realistic understanding of the experience he has just been through.

Tense of verbs: L's use of the present simple *it feels* to reflect a sense of his coming to terms with being knocked out of the programme, and the past simple tense *I wanted to*, to reflect his aspirations and intentions in the programmes; L's use of *hated* to convey his honest appraisal of a failed task; T's antithetical use of *loved* to convey how the audience responded to what L had hated.

Prepositional phrases: L's sense of dedication conveyed through his use of *into that*; T's use of politeness and flattery in the prepositional phrase *to the interviews*.

Passive voice: L's use of *get knocked out by everyone* to convey his resilience in the face of personal defeat.

Adverbials: for time, e.g. *up late every single night* and *weeks and weeks*, to convey L's dedication.

Complement: e.g. *a bit gutted* to reflect T's understanding of how the experience would have affected L.

Grammatical mood: L's use of interrogative mood *why are you [^]laughing* to address the studio audience directly; T's mocking tone in the declarative *it was a [^]lovely[^] perfume bottle label* to convey an ironic tone.

Simple utterances: T's use of *we [^]loved[^] it* to reflect the audience's enjoyment of the contestant's struggles; L's use of *it feels very [^]strange* to sum up the complexity of his emotional response at being knocked out of the programme.

Non-fluency features: T's sarcastic false start *oh right you just want. that's all you wanted* to humorously scorn LA's false modesty; L's use of unintentional repetition *obviously obviously* to respond to this scorn; L's repeated use of the filler *you know* to seek affirmation for his feelings and experiences.

Prosodic features: emphatic stress to introduce a sense of flattery from T, e.g. *pretty **impressive***, and from L ***I hated** that task*; T's phonemic pronunciation of /ɪndʒɪːd(ə)nt/ to mock L's spelling error in the task; raised pitch by T in *it [^]works[^]* to mock his own lack of stature; rising intonation in T's use of *that's all you wanted from the **whole** // [^]thing* to ironise L's understatement of his own ambitions.

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

Text B: *Strictly Come Dancing: It Takes Two*

Lexical sets: of nouns associated with the programme (*leaderboard, judges, dance-off, final*) to reflect a shared frame of reference between interlocutors and the audience; of nouns associated with competing, e.g. *competition, position, scores*.

Nouns: R's use of the proper nouns *Bruno* and *Shirley* to convey an easy familiarity with the personalities on the show; DG's use of the proper nouns *Alex* and *Michelle* to refer supportively to fellow competitors; R's use of the abstract noun *student* to reflect the developmental nature of celebrities' participation in the show; R's use of the abstract noun *credit* to engage in an act of politeness with his guests; R's use of technical jargon *cha-cha-cha* to reflect a sense of knowledge and expertise.

Pronouns: DG's use of first-person singular pronoun *I* to offer a personal reflection on his journey on the programme; DG's use of the first-person plural pronoun *we* to reflect a sense of his partnership with DB on the programme, versus R's use of *we* to reflect a sense of communal viewership; DB's use of third-person singular pronoun *he* to reflect her pride on working with DG.

Adverbs: DG's use of *ultimately* to describe a sense of finality at being evicted from the programme; DG's use of *really* to describe his hard work and determination to succeed in the competition; DB's use of *actually* to reflect a sense of disagreement with the views of the judges.

Noun phrases: R's use of the noun phrase *an absolute shocker* to reflect his disbelief and convey an element of politeness with his guests; R's polite description of DG as *one of our most diligent students* to make his guest feel valued; DB's description of DG using the noun phrase *an amazing job* to convey her pride at his performance; DG's description of the cha-cha-cha as *a difficult dance* to describe the level of challenge in the competition

Verb phrases: R's use of *vouch for* and *always training* to convey his support for DG's dedication to self-improvement; R's use of the colloquial verb phrase *always really going to town* with it to describe DG's commitment; DG's use of *how we could improve* to demonstrate his evaluative and reflective nature as a competitor.

Tense of verbs: R's use of present continuous *you're watching that now* to convey a sense of immediacy in the reaction to the eviction; R's use of past simple *we all were* to convey a unified sense of shock and disbelief at the pair's eviction from the programme; DG's use of past simple *when I woke up that day* to introduce an element of dramatic irony about the unpredictability of the competition.

Prepositional phrases: R's use of *out of the competition* to state the facts of the pair's situation.

Passive voice: L's use of *get knocked out by everyone* to convey his resilience in the face of personal defeat; DG's use of *ultimately be voted out* to demonstrate the unpredictable nature of the competition.

Adverbials: for time e.g. *a bit later* to describe DG's reaction to his relative status as an ex-competitor, compared with current competitors; for manner e.g. R's *always really going to town* to describe DG's dedication.

Complements: e.g. *quite hard* and *that hard* to describe the high standards the judges held DG to in the competition, due to his talent (a further polite reflection of RCN's esteem for DG's performances).

Grammatical mood: R's use of interrogative mood *did you ever imagine*, consistent with the genre of chat show interviews; RCN's declarative and use of periphrastic *do* in the clause *I do /wɒnə/ give credit* to emphasise his respect for DG; R's conventional celebratory introduction to his guests using imperative mood *let's hear it for ...*

Simple utterances: R's use of *no (.) you can't* to reflect the unpredictability of the competition.

Non-fluency features: R's incomplete word v. ***vouch*** to reflect the drama of Dev and Dianne leaving the competition; DB's use of unintentional repetition *if if* to reflect the dramatic situation she is in; DG's repeated use of the filler *you know* to seek affirmation for his feelings and experiences.

Prosodic features: emphatic stress to introduce a sense of disbelief from R, e.g. ***absolute*** *shocker*, and from DB to describe DG's performances as *an **amazing** job* to flatter her partner; R's phonemic pronunciation of /gɒʔə/ to convey reassurance and informality; R's use of raised pitch and prolonged speech ↑***Dev and Dianne everyone***↑ to encourage audience excitement and celebration of his guests.

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

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section A Question 1

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression 20 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use 20 marks	AO4 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods 20 marks
5	17-20 marks - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology (including spoken) - Perceptive discussion of texts - Coherent, academic style	17-20 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of textual support	17-20 marks - Insightful connections established between texts - Sophisticated overview - Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	13-16 marks - Effective methods of analysis - Secure use of a range of terminology (including spoken) - Thorough discussion of texts - Expression generally accurate and clear	13-16 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt textual support	13-16 marks - Purposeful connections established between texts - Detailed overview - Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	9-12 marks - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology (including spoken) - Competent discussion of texts - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	9-12 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of textual support	9-12 marks - Sensible connections established between texts - Competent overview - Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	5-8 marks - Basic methods of analysis - Using some terminology with some accuracy (including spoken) - Uneven discussion of texts - Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy	5-8 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by textual references	5-8 marks - Makes some basic connections between texts - Rather a broad overview - Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	1-4 marks - Limited methods of analysis - Some grasp of basic terminology (including spoken) - Undeveloped discussion of texts - Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	1-4 marks - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Little use of textual support	1-4 marks - Limited connections between texts - Vague overview - Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy		

SECTION B: LANGUAGE ISSUES

AO1	AO2	AO3
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

Responses in this section, regardless of which option is chosen, test the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect linguistic choices, to demonstrate evidence of wider reading and an awareness of the social implications of language use, and to use linguistic knowledge appropriately. Responses should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response to Question 2/3/4 may include:

- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- well-informed analysis
- effective use of the prompt material at the start before effectively moving on to the candidate's own material
- critical engagement with key concepts and issues e.g. the ways in which written discourse seeks to establish particular power relationships
- well-chosen references, including possibly the research of specific linguists, which support the points made concisely and precisely
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures e.g. the changing attitudes to prescriptivism and descriptivism over time
- intelligent conclusions e.g. discussing findings given the question focus
- productive explorations of the implications of context factors e.g. the way in which speakers alter politeness strategies to meet the requirements of different situations
- purposeful discussion of relevant issues e.g. the way in which lexical choices reflect persuasive power
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the set topic, making effective use of the examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources e.g. exploration of how politeness strategies are negotiated in specific situations, e.g. the marketplace, restaurants, shops and the home.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on analysis
- some relevant linguistic concepts without linking to the question
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- only a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with references
- some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- lack of engagement providing, instead, a somewhat superficial view
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content.

Notes

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

Either,

2. Read the following extract.

Fortunately, now in 1914, the great majority of the English dialects seem of very little importance as representatives of English speech. We can afford to let them go and concentrate on the main objects of our care, namely the prestigious language of literature and the Received Pronunciation of spoken Standard English. There may be some dialects worthy of study, but these certainly differ from the English, let us say, used in an Oxford or Cambridge University common room.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate different attitudes to Standard English. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

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

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

Or,

3. Read the following extract.

Source: *Planet Word: The Story of Language from the Earliest Grunts to Twitter and Beyond* (2011), by J.P. Davidson

Other nations have politeness encoded deep into their language and traditions. Iranian/Persian culture has a rather mystifying code of etiquette called *taarof*, which basically means to pay respect to someone. It involves elaborate compliments and praises and requires that you treat your guests and friends better than your own family. *Taarof* is a verbal dance between the person who is offering and the one who is receiving, the back and forth of insistence and refusal until one of them agrees. *Taarof* governs all levels of daily life, formal and informal – in the marketplace, shops, restaurants, offices and at home.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the importance of politeness in spoken interactions. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- positive politeness forms i.e. to make the hearer feel good (e.g. hedging, use of inclusive first-person plural pronouns, show interest in hearer, compliments, etc) – reflect our need for social acceptance/approval
- negative politeness forms (dominant in British English) i.e. to avoid embarrassment or social awkwardness (e.g. indirect grammatical forms, apologies, passive voice, using interrogatives instead of imperatives) – reflect our unwillingness to impose on others, and how this compares with the Iranian/Persian code of etiquette referenced in the data
- the effect of context and purpose: familiar, informal situations - politeness conventions can be more direct (e.g. 'Please open the window for me.');
- in formal situations, indirect structures avoid offence (e.g. 'I was wondering whether you would be able to open the window for me, please.')
- topic selection: opening tokens (e.g. 'How was your journey?', 'How do you do?', 'Pleased to meet you.', 'Isn't the weather awful.');
- other-orientated (e.g. polite enquiries about family, shared friends); closing tokens ('It was so good to meet you.', 'Do come again.', 'I look forward to hearing from you soon.')
- phatic function of interjections in creating a relationship e.g. 'please', 'thank you' 'sorry'
- terms of address to show respect, equality or familiarity: the use of honorifics or first name pronouns in vocatives; full vs familiar names
- the importance of modality in a range of formal and informal situations (e.g. staff meetings, parental conferences, customer service, dinner-table chat at home)
- the use of non-verbal signals to mark cooperation: non-verbal vocalisations/affirmations, smiles, nods
- cooperative turn-taking: smooth latches rather than interruptions and overlaps; length and content of turns
- conversely, politeness used to challenge; impoliteness – non-collaborative speech acts (e.g. Face Threatening Acts which undermine politeness).

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

Or,

4. Read the following extract.

Source: Email to all employees from a company President and CEO, accessed online

From a memo to all employees from President and CEO:

1. When the receptionist forwards a call to you **ANSWER THE PHONE and DON'T LET IT GO TO VOICEMAIL**. Answering the phone is part of your job in servicing our members. If you can't answer your phone then you are not doing your job and we will find someone to replace you that is willing to answer the calls.
2. Some of our staff members are abusing the privilege of having a mobile at your desk. Mobiles are for emergencies only; **NOT FOR TEXTING AND GOING ON WEBSITES OR FACEBOOK**. **I'm not here to babysit anyone so if you can't refrain from using your mobile during working hours, we will adopt a new policy and you will not be happy!**

If you need any clarification on the above issues, see me in person, and if you are not an offender of the issues above I apologise for you having to read my rant.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which written language is used to manipulate attitudes and behaviours. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- identification of characteristic features through which writers seek to assert authority and control in written language (e.g. imperative mood, capitalisation, modals)
- detailed exploration of particular written situations (possibly drawn from the candidate's own experience) where language is used to modify behaviours, such as public signage, student college conduct contracts and learning agreements, persuasive leaflets
- the language of political discourse where the writer seeks to persuade others of their opinion e.g. election leaflets, editorials, slogans
- the effectiveness of written charity campaigns or promotional materials in encouraging people to donate money
- the nature of written exchanges between professional colleagues where the relationship is asymmetrical (e.g. senior leadership emails to students, Chief Constable memos to members of their force, Prime Minister to their cabinet colleagues or wider parliamentary membership)
- the relationships between users of electronic media, again exploring how language is used to persuade or coerce
- the nature of legal discourse, including the way in which fixed penalty notices and tax penalties are enforced through letters to members of the public
- some brief reference to critical concepts (e.g. legalese or journalese) or theorists (e.g. Fairclough's concept of synthetic personalisation).

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

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression 20 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language us 20 marks	AO3 Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning 20 marks
5	17-20 marks - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology - Perceptive discussion of topic - Coherent, academic style	17-20 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of supporting examples	17-20 marks - Confident analysis and evaluation of a range of contextual factors - Productive discussion of the construction of meaning - Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication
4	13-16 marks - Effective methods of analysis - Secure use of a range of terminology - Thorough discussion of topic - Expression generally accurate and clear	13-16 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt supporting examples	13-16 marks - Effective analysis and evaluation of contextual factors - Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning - Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication
3	9-12 marks - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology - Competent discussion of topic - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	9-12 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples	9-12 marks - Sensible analysis and evaluation of contextual factors - Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning - Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication
2	5-8 marks - Basic methods of analysis - Using some terminology with some accuracy - Uneven discussion of topic - Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy	5-8 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by examples	5-8 marks - Some valid analysis of contextual factors - Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning - Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication
1	1-4 marks - Limited methods of analysis - Some grasp of basic terminology - Undeveloped discussion of topic - Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	1-4 marks - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Few examples cited	1-4 marks - 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		