



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

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

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.

WJEC GCE AS ENGLISH LANGUAGE

UNIT 2: LANGUAGE ISSUES AND ORIGINAL AND CRITICAL WRITING

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.
- 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.

**Question 1(a): Written language to make people follow regulations
(Language and Power)**

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

- 1. (a)** The text below is an extract from a Penalty Charge Notice, a parking ticket, attached to the windscreen of a car that was parked in the wrong place.
Read the text and then answer the question below. You should use appropriate terminology and provide relevant supporting examples.
- In your answer to the question that follows, you should consider:
- relationships between text producers and intended audience
 - lexical and grammatical choices
 - contextual factors relevant to this text and other examples of written texts.
- Using the extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate how written language is used to manage people's behaviour. You must refer to other examples of written language to manage people's behaviour in your response.** [40]

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

Overview

Analysing the extract given will provide a starting point for most responses. In all responses, there should be explicit demonstration of language knowledge. It will be important to judge the relevance of issues, concepts and theories in context and this should be done succinctly, showing clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question.

As well as their use of the extract, candidates must use a range of examples from their own experience e.g. student-school or college contracts; signs such as JCQ's signs in examination rooms; T&Cs when buying a product such as a mobile phone or on the back of tickets (for travel as well as events); following government public health advice. Discussion of key concepts will address recognisable language use e.g. deontic modality, direct address through second person pronouns and possessive determiners, formal lexical choices, enumerators, conditionals, subordination in clauses, (a)syndetic listing, discourse cohesion etc. Discussion of key issues will address the social implications of language use e.g. the relationship between dominance and status, relationship between text-producer and intended audience, contextual factors.

Amplification of 'managing behaviour': To ensure drivers comply, the parking ticket offers a 'discount of 50%', a noun phrase that is more commonly associated with a bargain. By suggesting that the driver is actually getting a special offer, the text producer is attempting to manage the behaviour of those who receive a ticket in not only paying their fee, but paying it promptly. Similarly, in advertising, text producers often suggest that they are doing the audience a favour, as for example in L'Oréal's slogan 'because you're worth it', where the synthetic personalisation conveyed through the direct address creates a relationship where the audience's expectations (about the quality of the products) results in the desired behaviour of buying the products.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- confident analysis of the extract as a starting point before developing the argument to encompass a range of appropriate, carefully analysed wider examples
- explicit demonstration of language knowledge e.g. use of deontic modal verbs 'must' and 'will' to make receiver of parking ticket comply
- critical application of relevant issues, concepts and theories e.g. appeals to positive face of receiver of parking ticket by acknowledging possibility of an appeal against the ticket, implying parking attendant made a mistake, not the driver
- comprehensive evaluation of effect of contextual factors e.g. negotiation of power, construction of authority
- clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

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

There are several theories/concepts/issues that candidates could explore. Candidates may be competent in applying traditionally spoken language theory to written contexts:

- register and tenor
- audience positioning (Althusser; Hall) – how text producers make assumptions about audience and expect compliance from the audience
- synthetic personalisation (Fairclough), types of power e.g. instrumental, political etc. (Wareing)
- use of jargon/specialist lexis to intimidate
- Standard English e.g. avoid legalese and use 'plain' English
- oppressive discourse strategies versus repressive discourse strategies – strategies in which the exercise of power is unmitigated and obvious versus more polite strategies to make it seem that audience's face needs are respected and power difference is less obvious
- accommodation theory (Giles) – how powerful text producers may converge to audiences in order to achieve compliance
- face theory and politeness (Goffman; Brown & Levinson)

- speech act theory (Austin, Searle) (despite its name, this theory can be applied to written language!) – the way in which language is used to make something (il)legal or compulsory.

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

Notes

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

Candidates should analyse and evaluate how, in the extract, the Penalty Charge Notice, language is used to encourage compliance, before moving on to a wider consideration of written texts that aim to manage people's behaviour. Candidates **must** also analyse different examples of written texts where the text producers are instructing their audience.

Responses may make some of the following points:

- the importance of context i.e. situation, purpose, genre, register etc. e.g. signs in public places, terms and conditions etc.
- relationship between text producer and intended/target audience.

Medium

- written mode text found on a car windscreen by the driver (usually owner, but not always)
- other examples of written texts including public signs, contracts etc.

Tenor

- determined, but not aggressively so, some acknowledgement that receiver may wish to challenge (the parking attendant may have been wrong)
- power is exercised in subtle manner (repressive discourse strategies as opposed to oppressive discourse strategies) to encourage compliance e.g. the 'discount of 50%'.

Content/Context Details

- present tense verb phrases 'is now payable' – sense of the urgency of the issue and fact that violation of rules is recent with the PCN currently outstanding
- deontic modal verbs 'must be paid' (also passive voice to focus on the PCN itself rather than the audience – several instances of passive voice across the text – can be part of cohesion, but also has a mitigating effect, less direct face-threatening act)
- cohesion through layout features such as paragraphing, bold headings and subheadings in bullet pointed asyndetic list, but also cohesion through lexical choices e.g. semantic field of payment and repetition of PCN and related lexical items e.g. 'penalty charge'
- direct address, use of 2nd person pronoun 'you' and 2nd person possessive determiner 'your'
- imperative mood (several examples e.g. 'follow the links...' – often imperatives are mitigated, for example through politeness marker 'please have the vehicle details', at times in combination with use of conditional e.g. 'If payment is made... please detach... complete the details...')
- declarative mood e.g. 'A penalty charge of £70.00 is now payable'.

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

BAND	AO1	AO2	AO3
	20 marks	10 marks	10 marks
5	17-20 marks - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology - Perceptive discussion of topic - Coherent, academic style	9-10 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of supporting examples	9-10 marks - Confident analysis of a range of contextual factors - Productive discussion of the construction of meaning - Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication
4	13-16 marks - Effective methods of analysis - Secure use of a range of terminology - Thorough discussion of topic - Expression generally accurate and clear	7-8 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt supporting examples	7-8 marks - Effective analysis 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	5-6 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples	5-6 marks - Sensible analysis 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	3-4 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by examples	3-4 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	1-2 marks - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Few examples cited	1-2 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		

(b) Write an extract from a story in which a character gets into trouble.

[20]

In planning your response, you should consider:

- the key features of the genre
- the relationship with the target audience
- lexical and grammatical features.

Aim to write approximately 350 words.

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- form suitable for narrative extract
- sophisticated sense of genre
- focused, thoughtful content e.g. techniques and effects
- effective stylistic choices e.g. dialogue, narrative point of view, structure
- clear understanding of the purpose e.g. entertain
- insightful awareness on the audience/reader's needs e.g. accessible topic in choice of the issue(s) the character faces
- linguistic choices appropriate to genre e.g. semantic fields, lexical sets, subject specific lexis
- consistent control of viewpoint e.g. unreliable narrator, omniscient 3rd person narrator
- appropriate and relevant information e.g. revealing the trouble character gets into
- clear, logical and appropriate structure to engage the audience/reader e.g. flashback to provide relevant details and develop narrative
- imagery techniques to encourage audience sympathy e.g. metaphor
- creative development of appropriate details
- well-selected and developed content e.g. nature of trouble experienced
- astute contextual awareness of the medium e.g. extract can mean that the trouble remains
- effective stylistic choices e.g. contrasting characters, structural devices e.g. circular
- a creative depiction of character in trouble
- appropriate, accurate and coherent written expression.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- misunderstanding of the genre e.g. completed story
- limited awareness of the reader's/audience's needs e.g. undeveloped narrative
- unconvincingly meeting the requirements of the task e.g. character is not in trouble, not an extract of a story
- limited differentiation of characters e.g. dialogue presents characters as too similar to be distinct
- awkward, inappropriate or incoherent written expression
- struggle to maintain focus on observation of character e.g. telling rather than showing
- issues with clarity and accuracy
- loss of tight focus of prescribed viewpoint e.g. undeveloped notion of 'being in trouble'
- over-reliance on stimulus material e.g. character in trouble because of finding a parking ticket; number of phrases from stimulus material used.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 1(b)

BAND	AO5 Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English in different ways
5	17-20 marks • High level of creativity with some flair • Confident and original expression • Skilful engagement with audience • Form and structure linked intelligently to content
4	13-16 marks • Thoughtful creativity • Well-crafted and controlled expression • Effective engagement with audience • Form and structure purposefully linked to content
3	9-12 marks • Reasonable creativity • Sound expression • Clear attempt to engage audience • Form and structure sensibly linked to content
2	5-8 marks • Some creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Some attempt to match form and structure to content
1	1-4 marks • Limited creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Limited attempt to link form and structure to content
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy

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

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

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- well-chosen references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis making effective use of examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources/ideas
- critical application of relevant issues, concepts and theories, where appropriate
- clear understanding of spoken/written language features evident
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- productive explorations of the implications of context factors
- well-informed analysis of stylistic variation
- comprehensive evaluation of effect of contextual factors
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance on largely describing and/or summarising content
- lack of specific focus on the question
- lack of specific examples selected to support all points
- focus on irrelevant general features of spoken/written language
- some stylistic inconsistency
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- context discussed in general terms.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 1(c)

BAND	AO2	AO3
	10 marks	10 marks
5	9-10 marks - Confident interpretation of the task - Confident understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	9-10 marks - Confident analysis of contextual factors - Productive discussion of the construction of meaning - Perceptive evaluation
4	7-8 marks - Effective awareness of the task - Secure understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	7-8 marks - Effective analysis of contextual factors - Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning - Purposeful evaluation
3	5-6 marks - Sensible awareness of the task - Sound understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	5-6 marks - Sensible analysis of contextual factors - Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning - Relevant evaluation
2	3-4 marks - Basic awareness of the task - Reasonable understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	3-4 marks - Some valid analysis of contextual factors - Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning - Inconsistent evaluation
1	1-2 marks - Some general awareness of the task - Some understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	1-2 marks - Some general awareness of context - Limited sense of how meaning is constructed - Limited evaluation
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy	

**Question 2 (a): Speakers interacting in difficult situations
(Language and Situation)**

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

- 1.** The extract below is a transcript from an episode of *The Supervet*, a real-life documentary television series. In this extract, a dog-owner is consulting the vet about his dog's serious back problem.

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

- (a)** In your answer to the question that follows, you should consider:
- lexical and grammatical choices
 - relevant features of spoken interactions
 - contextual factors relevant to this extract as well as other examples of interactions.

Using the extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate how participants interact in difficult situations. You must refer to other examples of spoken interactions in which speakers are facing a difficult situation in your response.

[40]

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

Overview

Analysing the extract given will provide a starting point for most responses. In all responses, there should be explicit demonstration of language knowledge. It will be important to judge the relevance of issues, concepts and theories in context and this should be done succinctly, showing clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question.

As well as their use of the extract, candidates **must** use a range of examples from their own experience, e.g. pupil with teacher, child with parent/caregiver, employee with employer, doctor and patient, etc. Discussion of key concepts will address recognisable language use e.g. non-fluency features in spoken discourse, discourse markers, prosodic features. Discussion of key issues will address the social implications of language use e.g. the relationship between speakers, nature of the difficult situation, contextual factors.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- confident analysis of the extract as a starting point before developing the argument to encompass a range of appropriate, carefully analysed wider examples
- explicit demonstration of language knowledge e.g. the vet's use of the adjective 'honest' in the direct address of the dog owner 'I'll be honest with you' both signals his trustworthiness as the expert in the situation, while at the same time also conveying connotations of bad news, so preparing the dog owner for the difficult conversation about their dog's treatment.
- critical application of relevant issues, concepts and theories e.g. the vet employs an appeal to the dog owner's positive face in the final utterance so as to reassure him that he is not to blame for their dog's problem
- comprehensive evaluation of effect of contextual factors
- clear critical understanding of the relationship between specific ideas and the focus question
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

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

There are several theories / concepts / issues that candidates could explore:

- register (such as professional sociolect) and tenor (personable, supportive)
- accommodation theory (Giles) – the way in which speakers converge, such as the expert (vet) adjusting to the non-expert speaker (dog owner) by avoiding jargon, using analogies etc.
- conversational status and types of power (Wareing) – e.g. the expert has knowledge as power, superior status in this context
- overt prestige (Labov) – the way in which the expert (vet) derives status from his role in the situation
- Grice's maxims – speakers may flout relevance so as to avoid having to say upsetting things explicitly
- euphemism / anthropomorphising
- face theory and politeness (Goffman; Brown & Levinson; Leech) – speakers might use mitigation when giving bad news and advice related to this.

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

Notes

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

Candidates should analyse and evaluate how, in the extract, speakers interact in a difficult situation, before moving on to a wider consideration of other speakers in a range of difficult situations. Candidates **must** also analyse different examples of how speakers interact with each other when dealing with a difficult situation.

Examples may include (but need not be limited to):

- teacher telling student off, giving bad feedback, permanent exclusions
- employer having to let an employee go / reprimanding
- relationship breakup
- argument / disagreement with friends / family
- police arrest in aggressive situation
- medical professional giving bad news, unexpected diagnosis to a patient.

Responses may make some of the following points:

- the importance of context i.e. situation, purpose, genre, register etc. e.g. the relationship between speakers
- how different speakers' level of expertise might affect the interaction.

Medium

- spoken interactions, can be face-to-face or via telephone.

Tenor

- sense of sympathy, warmth / awkwardness depending on situation and relationship between speakers.

Content/Context Details

- non-fluency features as speaker (vet) tackles difficult issue, bad news, evaluative discourse marker 'I'll be honest with you' also used to signal that the prognosis is not good, mitigating the impact of bad news
- use of direct address with second person pronoun 'you', combined with first person 'I' to create a connection between expert (vet) and non-expert (dog-owner), use of analogy to explain dog's condition with the conditional 'when you and I put our hand...'
- subject specific lexis, some jargon e.g. 'genetic abnormality' combined with high-frequency lexis in adjective 'bony' and verb 'squishing' to allow non-expert participant to understand, whilst maintaining trust in the expert
- repetition 'she was born with it' to make sure that the dog-owner realizes fully it was not their fault, reassurance given by the vet; third person pronoun 'she' used to refer to dog helps to recognize the importance of the dog to her owner – contrast with the normally used 3rd person subject pronoun 'it' to refer to non-human creatures
- discourse markers used by expert (vet) to check understanding of the non-expert speaker to check understanding e.g. 'so this is two three', combined with demonstrative pronoun 'this' used as deictic references to point out details on scan/ X-ray image or dog itself.

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

BAND	AO1	AO2	AO3
	20 marks	10 marks	10 marks
5	17-20 marks - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology - Perceptive discussion of topic - Coherent, academic style	9-10 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of supporting examples	9-10 marks - Confident analysis of a range of contextual factors - Productive discussion of the construction of meaning - Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication
4	13-16 marks - Effective methods of analysis - Secure use of a range of terminology - Thorough discussion of topic - Expression generally accurate and clear	7-8 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt supporting examples	7-8 marks - Effective analysis 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	5-6 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples	5-6 marks - Sensible analysis 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	3-4 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by examples	3-4 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	1-2 marks - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Few examples cited	1-2 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		

(b) Write an advisory webpage aiming to give wellbeing advice to teenagers.

[20]

In planning your response, you should consider:

- the key features of the online genre and advisory writing
- the relationship with the target audience
- lexical and grammatical features.

You don't need to set it out like a webpage. Aim to write approximately 350 words.

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- sophisticated sense of genre
- focused, thoughtful content e.g. techniques and effects
- effective stylistic choices e.g. direct address and synthetic personalisation to create relationship
- clear understanding of the purpose
- insightful awareness on the audience/reader's needs
- linguistic choices appropriate to genre
- consistent control of viewpoint
- clear, logical and appropriate structure to engage the audience/reader
- content drawn from the stimulus material but creative development of appropriate details
- well-selected and developed content
- a creative depiction of wellbeing generally or specific aspect of wellbeing
- demonstration of expertise and self-assurance, flair and originality
- language consciously and creatively manipulated for effect
- understanding of genre and style underpins choices made about form/structure
- confident voice
- appropriate, accurate and coherent written expression.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- over-complication of advice or definition of wellbeing
- limited awareness of the reader's / audience's needs e.g. wellbeing
- an inability to convincingly meet the requirements of the task e.g. no sense of advisory purpose
- limited exemplification or explanation
- awkward, inappropriate or incoherent written expression
- a struggle to maintain focus on topic
- over-reliance on stimulus material e.g. writing about pets being diagnosed with medical problem
- limited engagement of audience e.g. ineffective language / stylistic choices
- issues with clarity and/or accuracy.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 2(b)

BAND	AO5 Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English in different ways
5	17-20 marks • High level of creativity with some flair • Confident and original expression • Skilful engagement with audience • Form and structure linked intelligently to content
4	13-16 marks • Thoughtful creativity • Well-crafted and controlled expression • Effective engagement with audience • Form and structure purposefully linked to content
3	9-12 marks • Reasonable creativity • Sound expression • Clear attempt to engage audience • Form and structure sensibly linked to content
2	5-8 marks • Some creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Some attempt to match form and structure to content
1	1-4 marks • Limited creativity • Basic expression with some accuracy • Some awareness of audience • Limited attempt to link form and structure to content
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy

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

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

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- well-chosen references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis, making effective use of examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources/ideas
- critical application of relevant issues, concepts and theories, where appropriate
- clear understanding of spoken/written language features evident
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures
- thoughtful understanding of how context affects linguistic choices
- productive explorations of the implications of contextual factors
- well-informed analysis of stylistic variation
- comprehensive evaluation of effect of contextual factors
- sophisticated awareness of the importance of audience, purpose, situation and occasion.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- a demonstration of some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance upon largely describing and/or summarising content
- lack of specific focus on the question
- lack of specific examples selected to support all points
- focus on irrelevant general features of spoken/written language
- some stylistic inconsistency
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- context discussed in general terms.

This is not a checklist. Reward other valid approaches.

Assessment Grid Unit 2: Question 2(c)

BAND	AO2	AO3
	10 marks	10 marks
5	9-10 marks • Confident interpretation of the task, e.g. genre and purpose • Confident understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	9-10 marks • Confident analysis of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Perceptive evaluation
4	7-8 marks • Effective awareness of the task, e.g. genre and purpose • Secure understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	7-8 marks • Effective analysis of contextual factors • Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation
3	5-6 marks • Sensible awareness of the task, e.g. genre • Sound understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	5-6 marks • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation
2	3-4 marks • Basic awareness of the task, e.g. genre • Reasonable understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	3-4 marks • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning • Inconsistent evaluation
1	1-2 marks • Some general awareness of the task, e.g. genre • Some understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	1-2 marks • Some general awareness of context • Limited sense of how meaning is constructed • Limited evaluation
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy	