



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**AS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1
B700U10-1**

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 AS ENGLISH LANGUAGE
COMPONENT 1 – ANALYSIS OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT
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 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.

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: Spoken Language of the Media

	AO1	AO2	AO4
Section A	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

In your response to the question that follows, you should:

- consider the speakers' attitudes to food
- explore the spoken language features which engage the audience
- include some discussion of similarities and/or differences between the two texts.

1. **Analyse the ways in which language is used to engage audiences in these food programmes.** [50]

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 e.g. turn-taking, topic management and prosody
- insightful discussion of points of contrast that explore language use e.g. the disjointed spontaneity of Text A versus the more polished and crafted nature of Text B
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the collegiate friendship between host and guests in Text A is as entertaining as the talk about food
- productive explorations of the issues stemming from pertinent spoken language concepts e.g. attitudes to food expressed through the use of emphatic stress in Text B
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading, engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument e.g. the subtle power dynamics at play in Text A, where the guests 'play' at undermining of the host assured evaluation providing details
- consistent and purposeful analysis
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the transcripts in light of the question set.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language e.g. micropauses that are not linked to meaning
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis of the transcripts
- description of some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- implicit and difficult to follow arguments
- some points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- a demonstration of some linguistic knowledge

- lack of engagement with the detail of the texts, instead providing a somewhat superficial view of the transcripts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance on describing and/or summarising content
- some overview of appropriate points of similarity/difference
- some points of comparison drawn from across the texts.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Notes

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

Genre

- the situation e.g. televised food themed entertainment programmes, where there is some light-hearted interaction between the host and guests in Text A, versus an edited performance in Text B, containing a combination of talk delivered directly to camera and voiceovers recorded in post-production; cooking in situ in Text A and B, with that in Text A taking place in the studio and that in Text B being shot on location as a way of foregrounding the provenance of food ingredients; the good-natured friendly professional relationship between host and guests, and between the guests themselves in Text A versus the solo performance in Text B
- the function of entertaining the audience through ‘banter’ in Text A versus the informative and entertaining function of talk in Text B
- turn-taking and the relationship between participants in Text A versus the combination of edited and spontaneous talk in Text B
- the importance of engaging the audience’s interest, and the understanding of the different ways that audiences would perceive the different contributions of the speakers
- the similarities in the ways speakers use language to describe food ingredients e.g. *seafood curry* in Text A and *butterflied lamb* in Text B
- the use of familiarity in Text A versus the emphasis on the host’s expertise in Text B
- the use of deixis e.g. *this* is *Saturday Kitchen Live* in Text A and *a bit of garlic in there* in Text B.

Prosodics

- the use of rising intonation e.g. *good /morning* in Text A as a strategy to engage the audience and as a strategy to exaggerate his own role as host who expects to be humorously sabotaged by his guests versus the more measured use of voice in Text B to indicate the rehearsed nature of the voiceovers and the natural confidence of the pieces to camera
- an awareness of the similarities and differences between the use of emphatic stress in the two texts e.g. **depth** of flavour in Text A and **cooked** to perfection in Text B to convey attitudes to food; **already** has set the bar very low in Text A to convey ironic self-deprecation
- the use of micropauses in Text A to reflect the fast-paced and spontaneous delivery, versus the timed pauses in Text B which enable the audience to watch Rick demonstrate the cooking
- the greater prevalence of filled pauses e.g. /3:/:/ to reflect spontaneity in Text A, versus the relative lack of such fillers, especially in the voiceover, in Text B

- the use of prolonged speech e.g. *I da:::re you* in Text A to set up a prank, versus the use of *ri:::ght* to establish a sense of anticipation before tasting the food in Text B
- the use of increased volume to convey enthusiasm e.g. *GOOD MORNING* in Text A and *WOW* in Text B
- the use of accel in Text A as an attempt to gloss over the idea of food hell e.g. *some chocolate and cream*.

Register

- the informality of Text A versus the fluctuating levels of formality in the use of voiceover and direct to camera speech in Text B
- terms of address e.g. *Charlie* to reflect the easy familiarity of the relationships in Text A, versus direct address e.g. *any of you butchers out there* to establish rapport with the audience in Text B
- use of culinary lexis in both texts to reflect the expertise of the hosts e.g. *chopped coriander* in Text A and *pimenton* in Text B
- the use of colloquialism e.g. /gʌnə/ in both Text A and Text B to reflect the ease and relaxed nature of the hosts on camera.

Lexis and Semantics

- subject-specific words linked to cooking e.g. *garlic chilli* in Text A and *umami* in Text B; linked to farming e.g. *grazing* and *livestock* in Text B
- abstract nouns: to convey attitudes to food e.g. **depth** of flavour in Text A and *perfection* in Text B; to convey quantities or measures e.g. *sprig* and *teaspoon* in Text B; to convey aspects of the entertainment industry e.g. *guests* and *company* in Text A
- proper nouns: to introduce the guests e.g. *Naga* and *Charlie* in Text A; to establish geographical specificity e.g. *Truro* and *Nancarrow Farm* in Text B
- lexical fields: of food in both e.g. *chocolate*, *cream*, *soup* in Text A and *lemon* and *thyme* in Text B
- modification: linked to flavour e.g. *spicy* in Text A and Text B; linked to the texture of food e.g. *sticky sweet pud* in Text A and *dried chilli flakes* in Text B; to convey a celebratory attitude to local produce e.g. *absolute testimony to good agriculture* in Text B
- adverbs: to set up the prank e.g. *already* in Text A; to prolong the sense of anticipation e.g. *don't tuck in just yet* in Text B; to convey ease and spontaneity of topic management e.g. *incidentally* in Text B; to convey a sense of maintaining focus and order e.g. *now* in Text A
- pronouns: second person singular *you* in Text A to establish the relationships between the participants, versus the second person plural *you butchers* in Text B to connect the host with a specific segment of his audience at home
- verbs: to convey food preference e.g. *like* in Text A; to convey food expertise e.g. *show*, *barbecue* and *cook* in Text B; to describe food preparation processes e.g. *tenderise* in Text B
- metaphors: linked to both the format of the show and the guests' experiences with food e.g. *food heaven* and *food hell* in Text A; to describe a food preparation technique e.g. *butterfly* in Text B
- simile: to convey self-deprecation e.g. *like a performing seal* in Text A
- modal verbs: to convey a sense of tension and anticipation linked to the format of the show e.g. *if the viewers give you heaven it will be spicy seafood* in Text A; to reassure the audience about how the food should appear e.g. *it should be cooked to perfection* in Text B.

Form and Structure (typical of genre)

- non-fluency features in both texts: to convey spontaneity e.g. incomplete utterance *what is th. (.) what is this kind of* in Text A; the relative lack of non-fluency in Text B.
- the disconnect between the high fluency of the voiceover versus the relative non-fluency of the unscripted talk in Text B
- elliptical e.g. to establish consonance and rapport among the guests *not dissimilar* in Text A; to construct a sense of natural self-confidence in the quality of the cooking e.g. *looking lovely* in Text B
- grammatical mood: declarative in both texts to state intentions e.g. *I'm /gʌnə/ make some chocolate and cream* in Text A and *I'm /gʌnə/ cook a whole leg of lamb on the barbecue* in Text B; imperative in Text A e.g. *don't pull that face* to construct a sense of playfulness; *give me some ingredients* in Text A to follow the format of the show; to guide the audience in how best to experience the food e.g. *don't tuck in just yet* in Text B; interrogative to outline the format of the show e.g. *what's your idea of food heaven* in Text A
- conditional tense: to construct the sense of drama around the format e.g. *if they give you heaven it will be* in Text A
- latch on: to establish the rapport among speakers in Text A.

Pragmatics

- the relative familiarity among participants in Text A
- the ease of delivery in Text B
- the importance of place and provenance as well as the taste of the food in Text B
- the use of humour and self-deprecation in Text A.

Possible Connections/Points of Comparison

- levels of formality
- presentation of attitudes to food
- structure and format of the broadcast e.g. the 'game' format underpinning the conversation in Text A versus the more didactic demonstration in Text B
- the use of the countryside as a backdrop in Text B versus the live studio atmosphere of Text A.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid interpretations.

Assessment Grid Component 1: Section A

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression. 15 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use. 15 marks	AO4 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods. 20 marks
5	13-15 marks - Intelligent methods of analysis - Confident use of terminology - Perceptive discussion of texts - Coherent and effective expression	13-15 marks - Detailed understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Relevant and concise textual support	17-20 marks - Subtle connections established between texts - Perceptive overview - Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	10-12 marks - Appropriate methods of analysis - Secure use of terminology - Thorough discussion of texts - Expression generally accurate and clear	10-12 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some focused discussion of issues - Consistent apt textual support	13-16 marks - Purposeful connections between texts - Focused overview - Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	7-9 marks - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology - Competent discussion of texts - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	7-9 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate textual support	9-12 marks - Sensible connections between texts - Competent overview - Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	4-6 marks - Basic methods of analysis - Some accurate terminology - Uneven discussion of texts - Adequate expression, with some accuracy	4-6 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Simple discussion of issues - Some points supported by textual references	5-8 marks - Some basic connections between texts - Broad overview - Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	1-3 marks - Limited methods of analysis - Limited use of terminology - Some discussion of texts - Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	1-3 marks - One or two simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues Limited textual support	1-4 marks - Some links made between texts - Vague overview - Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks Response not worthy of credit		

COMPONENT 1 Section B: Written Language

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section B	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

In your response to the question that follows, you should explore:

- the linguistic features that are used to express the company's aims and values
- how language is used to promote Virgin Galactic.

2. Analyse and evaluate the use of language to present the company and its work in this mission statement. [50]

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- well-informed analysis
- critical engagement with key concepts and issues e.g. self-promotion, brand image, the idea of a frontier, the power of ideas and abstractions
- well-chosen references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures e.g. the company being a pioneer in what they claim to be 'democratic' space travel
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. discussing findings given the question focus
- productive explorations of the implications of contextual factors e.g. technological advancement and breakthroughs to further human endeavour
- conclusions consistently and purposefully tied to the contextual factors and how meaning is created e.g. the use of abstract nouns to convey a sense of ambition and scientific expertise
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the set topic.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis
- description of some relevant linguistic concepts without linking to the question
- implicit and difficult to follow investigation of concepts
- some points that are appropriately and accurately supported with references
- a demonstration of 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 with a somewhat superficial overview of issues/concepts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance on describing and/or summarising content.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Notes

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

Medium

- the use of an online platform to convey a company's vision and ethos, and to promote its work as a commercial enterprise.

Content

- the organisation of the content of the extract: the use of subheadings to outline the ethos of the company and its endeavours
- predominantly declarative as a way to convey confidence and certainty
- semantic field of science
- semantic field of commerce
- semantic field of innovation.

Register

- formal tenor and Standard English throughout; polysyllabic lexis
- space exploration lexis e.g. *spaceship*, *astronaut*, *hub*
- human endeavour lexis e.g. *pioneering*, *boundaries*, *exploration*
- community lexis e.g. *outreach*, *democratizing*, *community*
- business lexis e.g. *company*, *customer*, *programs*
- neologism e.g. *Spaceport*.

Lexis and Semantics

- abstract nouns and noun phrases: to establish technological expertise e.g. *new generation*, *space-based science* and *brilliant engineers*; to convey a sense of the company's exceptionalism e.g. *unique platform* and *pinnacle*; to convey a sense of transcendental significance of the company's work e.g. *awe* and *wonder*; to convey a sense of the future e.g. *planetary perspective*, *the horizon*, *ingenuity* and *the unknown*; to convey a sense of the company's mission e.g. *unity*, *space*, *mission*, *exploration* and *inspiration*; to convey a sense of what mankind will gain e.g. *benefits*
- concrete noun e.g. *spaceship* and *carrier aircraft* to convey the realisation of the ambition of the enterprise
- proper nouns: to convey business e.g. *The Spaceship Company* and *Virgin Galactic*; to name new ventures e.g. *Spaceline for Earth*; to name spaceships, e.g. *WhiteKnightTwo* and *SpaceshipTwo* and *VSS Unity* to convey the sense that this company's endeavours are in the same line as the great voyages of discovery in the Age of Exploration; to refer to educational programmes e.g. *Virgin Galactic Future Astronauts* and *Galactic Unite*; to convey geographical location on Earth e.g. *New Mexico*
- adjectives and adjectival phrases: to describe the unique identity of the company e.g. *world's first commercial spaceline* and *unparalleled customer experience*; to describe the scale of the company's endeavour e.g. *fundamentally challenging ambition*; to convey the purported democratisation of space travel e.g. *private individuals* and *private astronauts* and *global community*
- attributive compound adjectives: to suggest high proficiency of the company and densely pack information e.g. *custom-built*, *passenger-carrying*, *space-based*, *purpose-built*, *space-inspired*
- verbs: to convey the sense of human self-improvement e.g. *learn*, *grow*, *evolve*, *explore* and *improve*
- modal verbs: to convey certainty e.g. *We will achieve it*; to convey the imperative behind the company's endeavour e.g. *must continually learn*
- adverbs: to convey a sense of the company's unique mission e.g. *only*

- metaphor: to reflect the power of scientific ideas e.g. *brainchild*; to convey a sense of possibility within reach e.g. *the urge to see what lies just over the horizon*; to invoke a sense of chivalric tradition, e.g. *WhiteKnightTwo*
- initialisms e.g. VSS to name the ship along the conventions of earth-based exploration
- acronym: to reflect the educational imperative of the company's mission e.g. *STEM*.

Form and Structure

- pre- and post-modification e.g. *the brainchild of our pioneering Virgin Galactic Future Astronaut customers*; to flatter the paying consumer e.g. *the reusable SpaceShipTwo spaceflight system* to convey a sense of sustainability
- complements e.g. *would be unrecognizable* to convey the transformative power of the company's endeavours
- syndetic listing e.g. *find new places to settle, helped us identify new resources, and taught us new skills* to describe the achievements of mankind through history
- parallel pattern in a minor sentence e.g. *Not just for the ingenuity required, but for the fact that* to convey a sense of what human ingenuity and inventiveness has accomplished
- simple sentence e.g. *We are the world's first commercial spaceline and vertically integrated aerospace company* to construct a forthright statement of the company's identity
- parenthetical structure e.g. *to be the Spaceline for Earth* to point to the company's ambition; to emphasise the company's exceptionalism e.g. *for the first time*
- declarative mood throughout to convey confidence
- predominantly complex sentences to convey the company's ease with the complex nature of its enterprise.

Pragmatics

- online mission statement
- the tension between the commercial and the scientific
- cultural references to new frontiers (subtext of the American pioneer spirit)
- explicit awareness of the complexity of the challenge and the scale of the company's ambition to meet it
- the purported democratisation of space.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid interpretations.

Assessment Grid Component 1 Section B

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression. 15 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of language concepts and issues relevant to language use. 15 marks	AO3 Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning. 20 marks
5	13-15 marks - Intelligent methods of analysis - Confident use of terminology - Perceptive discussion of texts - Coherent and effective expression	13-15 marks - Detailed understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Relevant and concise textual support	17-20 marks - Confident analysis of contextual factors - Productive discussion of the construction of meaning - Intelligent evaluation
4	10-12 marks - Appropriate methods of analysis - Secure use of terminology - Thorough discussion of texts - Expression generally accurate and clear	10-12 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some focused discussion of issues - Consistent apt textual support	13-16 marks - Secure analysis of contextual factors - Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning - Purposeful evaluation
3	7-9 marks - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology - Competent discussion of texts - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	7-9 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate textual support	9-12 marks - Sensible analysis of contextual factors - Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning - Relevant evaluation
2	4-6 marks - Basic methods of analysis - Some accurate terminology - Uneven discussion of texts - Adequate expression, with some accuracy	4-6 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Simple discussion of issues - Some points supported by textual references	5-8 marks - Some valid analysis of contextual factors - Simple discussion of the construction of meaning - Some attempt to evaluate
1	1-3 marks - Limited methods of analysis - Limited use of terminology - Some discussion of texts - Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	1-3 marks - Some simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Limited textual support	1-4 marks - Some awareness of context - Limited sense of how meaning is constructed - Limited evaluation
0	0 marks Response not worthy of credit		