



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

AUTUMN 2020

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2020 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

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

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

EDUQAS GCE AS ENGLISH LANGUAGE
COMPONENT 1 - ANALYSIS OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT
AUTUMN 2020 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 an assessment of the quality of the response at the end of each answer. Your comments should indicate both the positive and negative points as appropriate.
- Use your professional judgement, in the light of 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, 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 are 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 reward valid alternatives where indicative content is suggested for an answer. Indicative content outlines some areas of the text candidates may explore in their responses. **This is not a checklist for expected content in an answer, or set out as a 'model answer'**, as responses must be marked in the banded levels of response provided for each question. Where a candidate provides a response that contains aspects or approaches not included in the indicative content, examiners should use their professional judgement as English specialists to determine the validity of the statement/interpretation in the light of the text 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 schemes.

SECTION A: SPOKEN LANGUAGE OF THE MEDIA

	AO1	AO2	AO4
Section A	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

1. Analyse the ways in which language is used to engage audiences in Text A and Text B. [50]

In your response you should:

- consider how the presenters create interest
- explore the spoken language features which engage the audience
- include some discussion of similarities and/or differences between the two texts.

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 analysis of the differences in the conversational dynamics between speakers in the respective texts e.g. the father-son familiarity between Larry and George Lamb in Text A versus the gently competitive comedic performances of Richard Ayoade and Frank Skinner in Text B
- an exploration of the specific strategies employed by speakers to engage audience(s) e.g. the family anecdotes and insight into a close family bond in Text A, and the humour in Text B
- a consideration of how specific structural features (e.g. speech to camera and displayed photograph) are used to appeal to the respective audiences
- a subtle discussion of how language conveys different types of humour and the different types of relationships between the respective speakers
- an exploration of how language suggests that Larry and Richard are the lead presenters
- select an approach that allows texts to be explored e.g. how the speakers' identity is constructed by register
- a discussion of the variation between scripted and unscripted speech in both texts.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- feature spotting rather than a developed discussion of the language features that engage audiences and convey meaning
- misreading the contexts of both texts e.g. reading Text A as a father-child interaction (where the son is, in fact, an adult), and assuming the cars referred to in Text B are road cars rather than railway cars
- a limited number of points
- relies largely on describing and/or summarising content
- lack of specific focus on the question
- lack of specific examples to support all points
- lack of grasp of the nuances in exploring levels of familiarity, as evident in the interactions between pairs of speakers in both texts.

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 travel programmes where there is some light-hearted interaction between the co-presenters in Text A, and between the main presenter and his companion in Text B; the presence of an established father-son relationship in Text A and the presence of a professionally respectful relationship between fellow comedians in Text B; the structure of transitions within the extracts between pieces to camera and unscripted talk
- the function of informing the audience of the geographical features of Yorkshire (Text A) and of Zurich's surrounding countryside (Text B)
- the function of entertaining the audience with light-hearted talk in both texts
- turn-taking and the relationship between the participants
- the importance of engaging audience interest and the understanding of the different ways audiences might perceive the contributions of the speakers
- the similarities in the way the speakers use language to inform e.g. *Appletreewick* (Text A) and *Lake Lucerne* (Text B)
- the use of familiarity in Text A versus the light-hearted informality in Text B
- the use of deixis in Text A (to support the participants' reaction to seeing the Yorkshire landscape for the first time e.g. *look at ↗this dad*) and in Text B (to refer to the cows e.g. *do you **think** they get annoyed by their own bells?*).

Prosodics

- an awareness of similarities regarding raised pitch to construct awe and wonder at the natural landscape e.g. foregrounding George's surprise and delight at encountering the landscape ↑*wow*↑ in Text A; and the ironic and light-hearted use of rising intonation by Richard Ayoade in his transitions e.g. ↗*rationale* (gently mocking the genre expectations of smooth transitions in the genre of televised travel programmes)
- an awareness of the similarities and differences re: emphatic stress in the two texts e.g. Larry's use of **struggling** to gently mock his son's physical prowess (Text A); e.g. Richard Ayoade's use of **now** (Text B) to construct an ironic relationship between his persona and that of the typical travel presenter
- the idiosyncratic use of timed pauses to allow the audiences to absorb the beauty of the scenery
- the relative lack of fillers, suggesting an ease and familiarity with the requirements of the spontaneous exchange between close family members, except where Larry's age is foregrounded e.g. *it's /3:/ looking a bit fearsome* (Text A), and Frank Skinner's apparent lack of fluency in alighting upon potentially more serious intellectual ideas e.g. *I'm feeling a sense of /3:/ the sublime* (Text B)
- prolonged speech for emphasis e.g. *beau:::tiful countryside* (Text A) to create a sense of wonder.

Register

- the fluctuating levels of formality
- the presence of easy familiarity (Text A) and the constructed spontaneous mood (Text B)
- terms of address e.g. the use of *dad* (Text A) to construct a conversational asymmetry; the use of *we* to emphasise the equal status of both speakers as newcomers to the place they are visiting (Text B)
- the use of colloquialism e.g. *ʌ/ini?/, /jep/*—a relatable accent establishing a sense of familiarity (Text A); the absence of colloquialisms (Text B).

Lexis and Semantics

- subject-specific words linked to transport to the location e.g. *mainline station* (Text A) and *funicular* (Text B) to create a sense of expertise and credibility; linked to the language of the media e.g. *television job* (Text A) and *transition* (Text B)
- nouns: linked to the landscape e.g. *dales* (Text A) and *mountains* (Text B)
- proper nouns to establish geographical specificity e.g. *Yorkshire* and *Malham* (Text A); *Zurich* and *Lake Lucerne* (Text B)
- lexical fields: of the English countryside e.g. *dales* and *sheep* (Text A); of European locations e.g. *alpine* and *mountains* (Text B)
- modification: linked to opinion e.g. *unbelievably beautiful woman* (Text A); linked to self-aware humour e.g. *two middle-aged comedians* (Text B); linked to descriptions of the respective landscapes e.g. *rolling dales* and *God's own country* (Text A) and *alpine idyll* (Text B); related to holidays e.g. *cycling holiday* (Text A)
- adverbs: to introduce an anecdote e.g. *funnily* (Text A); for humour e.g. *now and ...now* (Text B)
- pronouns: second person singular *you* (Text A and Text B) to establish the relationships between participants in both texts; first person plural *we* to establish a sense of two newcomers to a place (Text B); third person plural *they* to introduce the mythical reputation of Yorkshire (Text A)
- proper nouns: *Dent Dale* (Text A) and *Zurich* (Text B), to establish a sense of geographical specificity
- cliché: linked to the location e.g. *right into the heart of it* (Text A)
- personification e.g. *annoyed* and *tinnitus* in relation to the cows (Text B)
- imperative verb: to invite the audience to feel impressed by the engineering ingenuity of the constructors of the funicular railway e.g. *marvel* (Text B)
- modal verb: to evaluate physical capability e.g. *should* (Text A); to ironise the conventions of narrational transitions e.g. *I could try to summon* (Text B).

Form and Structure (typical of genre)

- some non-fluency features in Text A to reflect the nature of spontaneous explanation e.g. incomplete utterance *i.* (Text A) and the relative lack of non-fluency in Text B
- the disconnect between the high fluency of the narrations and less fluent quality of the spontaneous conversations in both texts, but more pronouncedly in Text A
- elliptical e.g. *beau::tiful countryside* /'ini?/ (Text A) to establish a sense of awe and wonder; *ready for Yorkshire* (Text A) to construct a slogan for their imminent experience
- use of complements e.g. *that's amazing* (Text A); *it is beautiful though* (Text B), to convey an appreciation for the beauty of the landscape
- prepositional phrases acting as adverbials: for place e.g. *to Malham* and *on the eastern side* (Text A) and *on nearby Lake Lucerne* (Text B)
- latch ons: to establish the rapport between speakers
- grammatical mood: declaratives to inform and entertain the audience e.g. *they call it God's own country* (Text A) and *we realise that there is only so much cow gazing* (Text B); imperative *marvel at ...* to invite the audience to be impressed (Text B); interrogative *at what level of steepness does ... ?* to seek information from the expert (Text B) and *where do you /wɒnə/ go ?* to establish a sense of direction (Text A)
- use of present tense to describe the geographical location e.g. *it's home to ...* (Text A) and *the funicular car stops three hundred metres short of a mile* (Text B).

Pragmatics

- the relative familiarity between family members (Text A) and fellow comedians (Text B)
- humour in both texts
- anecdote in Text A
- English versus alpine countryside.

Possible Connections/Points of Comparison

- levels of formality
- presentation of the landscape
- structure of the broadcast e.g. the spontaneous conversation and narration in both texts
- the use of the photograph in Text A and of the camera cut in Text B.

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

Assessment Grid Component 1: Section A

BAND	A01 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression. 15 marks	A02 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use. 15 marks	A04 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods. 20 marks
5	13-15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligent methods of analysis • Confident use of terminology • Perceptive discussion of texts • Coherent and effective expression 	13-15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Relevant and concise textual support 	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subtle connections established between texts • Perceptive overview • Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	10-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate methods of analysis • Secure use of terminology • Thorough discussion of texts • Expression generally accurate and clear 	10-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure understanding of concepts • Some focused discussion of issues • Consistent apt textual support 	13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful connections between texts • Focused overview • Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	7-9 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology • Competent discussion of texts • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses 	7-9 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate textual support 	9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible connections between texts • Competent overview • Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	4-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic methods of analysis • Some accurate terminology • Uneven discussion of texts • Adequate expression, with some accuracy 	4-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some understanding of concepts • Simple discussion of issues • Some points supported by textual references 	5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some basic connections between texts • Broad overview • Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	1-3 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited methods of analysis • Limited use of terminology • Some discussion of texts • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity 	1-3 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Limited textual support 	1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some links made between texts • Vague overview • Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy		

COMPONENT 1 Section B: Written Language

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section B	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

2. Analyse and evaluate the use of language in the text as an example of review writing. [50]

In your response you should explore:

- the features that are typical of review writing
- how language is used to judge the restaurant.

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

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- focused discussion of linguistic features which establish a sense of critique e.g. the presentation of lack of authenticity of the food and the gimmickry of the restaurant's concept
- application of appropriate methods of analysis (e.g. interrogative mood to subvert some genre expectations and to establish a sense of contemptuous challenge) to show critical understanding of the linguistic concepts underpinning review writing
- a careful consideration of how certain contextual factors e.g. the concept of the celebrity television chef (flagged up in the review's title) and the restaurant's location in a notorious tourist trap influence the construction of meaning
- a discussion of how the audience is bifurcated: while seeming to be addressed directly to Guy Fieri, it is also clearly intended for consumption by the wider newspaper audience.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- an examination of specific language features rather than a discussion of the wider textual context e.g. the cuisine's inauthenticity
- feature spotting at the expense of considered analysis
- a limited number of points
- relies largely on describing and/or summarising content
- lack of specific focus on the question
- lack of specific examples to support all points
- an imprecise grasp of how language features create attitude.

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 the title *As Not Seen on TV* to establish the context of a celebrity chef cashing in on his television fame to make money through his gimmicky restaurant.

Content

- the organisation of the content of the extract: opening with a vocative to establish a conceit—the review is constructed as a direct address interrogation, which is sustained throughout the piece
- predominantly interrogative with carefully crafted descriptions throughout
- semantic field of science e.g. *nuclear waste* and *formaldehyde*
- semantic field of cooking and ingredients e.g. *garlic-battered brioche*, *croutons* and *calamari*
- semantic field of mental confusion e.g. *insane*, *messing with our heads*, and *hypno-wheel*.

Register

- relatively formal tenor e.g. standard English used throughout; polysyllabic lexis, although with some crafted colloquialism e.g. *Is this how you roll ...* and *Hey ...* to heap derision on Fieri's intentions
- lexis used with regional American references to construct a derisive attitude towards the restaurant's pick-and-mix ethos of gathering together supposedly authentic regional foods in an ersatz environment e.g. *Vegas*, *Rhode Island* and *Creek-stone*
- linguistic lexis to convey a sense of an overwrought menu e.g. *adjectives* and *nouns*.

Lexis and Semantics

- abstract nouns and noun phrases: to establish the genre of review writing e.g. *expectations*, *experience*; to describe the food e.g. *a distant rumour of spice*; to exaggerate the horrifying nature of the experience e.g. *fear*, *panic*, *regret*
- concrete nouns and noun phrases: to refer to food e.g. *that blue drink* and *fish*; to convey a sense of the food's poor quality e.g. *formaldehyde* and *radiator fluid*; to denote the size of particular dishes e.g. *boulder* and *scoop*
- proper nouns: to convey geographical specificity of the food e.g. *Rhode Island*, *Vegas*
- adjectives and adjectival phrases: to describe the disappointing food e.g. *small* and *miniature*, *distant*, *limp* and *oil-sogged*, *shapeless*, *structureless*
- verbs and verb participles: to establish the critique of the confused and frenzied nature of the restaurant's concept and execution e.g. *grip* and *spin*; to convey the full sensory experience e.g. *tastes*, *glows* to convey a feeling of profound disappointment e.g. *droops*, *slumps*, *collapses*
- adverbs: used to establish a subtly scathing attitude e.g. *exactly* and *just*; to convey a sense of the disconnect between what was expected and what was experienced e.g. *actually* and *really*
- pronoun e.g. second person singular *you* to establish the notion that the review is as much an attack on Guy Fieri as it is a critique of his restaurant and food; first person plural *we* to establish a sense of shared disappointment
- figurative language e.g. metaphor *crazy vortex* to evoke a sense of confusion; simile e.g. *about as much as you resemble Emily Dickinson* to sustain a critique of Guy Fieri's pretensions; to humorously deride the food's quality e.g. *like nuclear waste*
- initialisms e.g. *LTOP* and *SMC* to convey a sense of gimmickry and pretension.

Form and Structure

- pre- and post-modification of nouns e.g. *Rhode Island's supremely unhealthy and awesomely good fried calamari* and *a plate of pale, unsalted squid rings* to establish the gap between what the food should taste like and what it actually tastes like; e.g. *the yawning, three-level interior ...* to enable the writer to widen his negative critique to encompass the decor
- simple sentences: to introduce a sense of more direct challenge e.g. *Is this how you roll ...?*
- complements e.g. *... is inedible?* to attack the quality of the food
- tag question e.g. *I didn't say that, did I?* to strengthen the rhetoric
- minor sentence to convey sarcasm e.g. *Thanks*
- syndetic list to describe the disappointing food e.g. *droops and slumps and collapses*; to list ingredients e.g. *lettuce, tomato, onion + pickle*
- parallel pattern to question Fieri on the quality and concept of his restaurant e.g. *Is...? Is...? and Did...? Did...?*
- parenthetical structure to elaborate on an earlier vague reference e.g. *a lunch-only sandwich of chopped soy-glazed pork with coleslaw and cucumbers.*

Pragmatics

- extract from a broadsheet newspaper restaurant review
- scientific references
- references to American regional food culture
- the conceit of a one-sided conversation
- the tone of challenge.

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

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligent methods of analysis • Confident use of terminology • Perceptive discussion of texts • Coherent and effective expression 	13-15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Relevant and concise textual support 	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident analysis of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Intelligent evaluation
4	10-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate methods of analysis • Secure use of terminology • Thorough discussion of texts • Expression generally accurate and clear 	10-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure understanding of concepts • Some focused discussion of issues • Consistent apt textual support 	13-16 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure analysis of contextual factors • Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation
3	7-9 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology • Competent discussion of texts • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses 	7-9 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate textual support 	9-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation
2	4-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic methods of analysis • Some accurate terminology • Uneven discussion of texts • Adequate expression, with some accuracy 	4-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some understanding of concepts • Simple discussion of issues • Some points supported by textual references 	5-8 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Simple discussion of the construction of meaning • Some attempt to evaluate
1	1-3 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited methods of analysis • Limited use of terminology • Some discussion of texts • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity 	1-3 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Limited textual support 	1-4 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some awareness of context • Limited sense of how meaning is constructed • Limited evaluation
0	0 marks: Response not credit-worthy		