GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

AS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 1
2700U10-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 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.

WJEC GCE ENGLISH LANGUAGE - UNIT 1

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

UNIT 1: EXPLORING LANGUAGE

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 (**AO**s) 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, 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.

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: Analysing language

	AO1	**AO3**	**AO4**
Section A	20 marks	15 marks	20 marks

1.	**Analyse and evaluate how the language used in each of these texts represents artificial intelligence.** In your answer you should consider: • the purpose of each text and the ways in which the writers engage their audiences • how the writers portray robots • the similarities and/or differences between the texts. **[55]**

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, to evaluate how the contextual factors have shaped meaning, and to explore meaningful connections across texts that demonstrate an understanding of how language is used.

Overview

Aspects of language study candidates are likely to explore include, but are not limited to:
• features of genre (audience; function; bias; content)
• tenor
• the effect of language choices (e.g. connotations of words, subject specific language, subordination to reflect conditionality)
• contextual factors (e.g. place of publication; form and structure)
• connections between the texts.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:
• purposeful selection and analysis of the representation of robots as initially challenging (Text A) or threatening (Text B and Text C)
• insightful discussion of points of similarity and/or contrast that explore language use e.g. devices to convey AI as a threat (Texts B and C) and devices to convey AI as a promising innovation for the future (Text A)
• insightful consideration of how the context of production (e.g. specialist technology magazine versus international news magazine versus UK tabloid) affects the construction of meaning and attitudes.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:
• general points about the dangers of artificial intelligence without considering the fact that Text A, for example, is more nuanced in its attitudes
• the arguments put forward may be implicit and difficult to follow
• a lack of close consideration of contexts when comparing and contrasting the attitudes expressed.

Notes

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

Genre
- extract from a specialist technology magazine, an online news article from an international news organisation, an online article from a UK tabloid newspaper
- function: to give a personal account of an experience with artificial intelligence (Text A); to inform and warn (Text B); to offer a cautionary account (Text C)
- the importance of engaging an audience (to entertain, inform and engage).

Content
- Text A: personal account about adapting one's professional circumstances by using AI
- Text B: informative article about the implications and potential hazards of using AI in the home
- Text C: a tabloid article about the potential dangers posed by a future living with AI.

Register
- levels of formality e.g. predominantly formal in all three texts, although some colloquialisms in Text C e.g. *shut down* and *boffins* which are consistent with the tone of a tabloid newspaper
- use of direct speech in Text A to reproduce a personal experience; use of direct speech in Text C to offer an expert perspective
- scientific and technological lexis e.g. *interface* and *telepresence* (Text A); *operations* (Text B); *communication* (Text C)
- 21st century English features e.g. *IM* (Text A); *bots* (Text B and Text C).

Lexis and Semantics
- adjectives: to convey a sense of technological interaction e.g. *tinny* and *pixelated* (Text A) versus human interaction e.g. *normal* (Text C); to convey a sense of technological threat, e.g. *creepy* (Text A); *dystopian*, *ubiquitous*, *Malevolent* and *untrustworthy* (Text B); *dangerous* (Text C)
- complements: to convey a sense of the power imbued by technology e.g. I felt <u>so superior</u> (Text A); to warn e.g. *The take-home message is <u>clear</u>* (Text B)
- adverbs: to convey encroaching threat e.g. *increasingly* (Text B), *incredibly* (Text C); to convey a sense that the threat is already here e.g. <u>too</u> *late* (Text A), <u>frequently infiltrated</u> (Text B)
- concrete nouns: to describe technology we already live with e.g. *camera* and *microphone* (Text A), *vacuum* (Text B), *machines* (Text C)
- abstract nouns: to refer to communication e.g. *instructions* and *interface* (Text A), *interaction* (Text B), *language* (Text C); to convey threat and menace e.g. *embodiment* and *nemesis* (used ironically in Text A), *dangers* (Text B); to convey a dystopian future e.g. *chatbots*, *algorithms* and *supervisors* (Text C)
- clipped nouns e.g. *bots* (Text B and Text C), *app* (Text B)
- initialisms e.g. *IM* (Text A) and *AI* (Text C) to illustrate our modern familiarity with technology
- colloquialisms e.g. *freak out* (Text A), *chums* (Text B) and *Boffins* (Text C)
- verbs: to convey traditional human interaction e.g. *talk*, *say* and *heard* (Text A), *respond* (Text B), *negotiate* (Text C); to convey technological interaction e.g. *tweet* and *clicked* (Text A), *developing* (Text C)
- modal verbs: to mark a shift in attitude e.g. *could* versus *would* (Text A); to imply a sense of cautious moderation e.g. *may* (Text B)

- proper nouns: to name companies associated with technology e.g. *WIRED* and *Double Robotics* (Text A); to name social media platforms e.g. *HipChat* (Text A), *Tinder* (Text B) and *Facebook* (Text C); to name experts e.g. *Professor Kevin Warwick* (Text C); to humanise the robots e.g. *Alice* and *Bob* (Text C); to convey the international pervasiveness of artificial intelligence e.g. *San Francisco* and *Boston* (Text A), *South Korea* (Text B)
- adverbials: temporal e.g. … *since May* (Text A), *in February* and *Once* (Text B), *… when the scientists returned …* (Text C)
- modification: to convey dehumanising experience of the modern workplace e.g. *pixelated image* and *headless coworkers* (Text A); to convey menace and threat e.g. *untrustworthy bots* (Text B); to describe the modern place of work e.g. *crucial face-to-face* meetings and *spontaneous brainstorm* training (Text A), *conversational* skills (Text C)
- pronouns: first person singular *I* to frame a personal account (Text A); first person plural *we* to convey a sense of the commonality of experience (Text B); *they* to refer to the scientists (Text C); second person singular *you* (Text A) to establish a sense of conversation
- determiners e.g. *their* own language (Text C) to convey the idea that the robots have agency
- figurative language e.g. simile *like a foal* (Text A); metaphor *nemesis* (Text A), *spell* (Text B) and *milestone* (Text C); cliche *head in the sand* (Text C).

Form and Structure
- simple noun phrases: to convey human control over artificial intelligence e.g. *my robot* (Text A) and *her robot* (Text B); to suggest a sense of agency for the AI e.g. *the bots* (Text C); to convey power relations in the work place e.g. *my boss* (Text A), *the scientists* (Text C)
- longer noun phrases (modification underlined): to convey disconnection e.g. *a remote worker* and *a camera with no peripheral vision* (Text A); to reflect the potentially duplicitous nature of technology e.g. *bots posing as real people* (Text B); *their own machine language* (Text C)
- simple sentences: to reflect the convenience of modern communication e.g. *We talk on the phone* (Text A); to introduce a sense of dual identity e.g. *I have been part robot since May* (Text A); to convey the powers of artificial intelligence e.g. *Robot intelligence is dangerous* (Text C)
- complex sentences: to indicate the global nature of modern business e.g. *… while most of WIRED is in San Francisco, I live in Boston* (Text A); to convey the idea that artificial intelligence can be liberating e.g. *… which would be my physical embodiment at headquarters, extending myself through technology* (Text A); to give a word of caution e.g. *Once you've invited a bot into your own home, you need to …* (Text B); to imply the robots are learning e.g. *Although what the machines said was nonsense, …* (Text C)
- marked themes e.g. *And instead of ears …* (Text A), *But when the scientists returned …* (Text C)
- patterns: to convey a sense of the human race merging with AI e.g. *Instead of legs … Instead of a face …* (Text A); to convey a sense of human communication e.g. *We IM. We talk … We tweet …* (Text A)
- parentheses: to present quote from an expert e.g. — *where intelligent devices "spell the end of the human race"* — in Text B; to attempt to humanise the machines e.g. — *known as Alice and Bob* — in Text C
- minor sentence: to convey failure to immediately master technology e.g. *Nothing* (Text A)
- mood: predominantly declarative used in all three texts to convey the idea that AI is a reality and to convey advice e.g. *you need to manage your expectations* and *it's important to avoid …* (Text B); interrogative mood in dialogue to convey a sense of confusion e.g. *"How do I move it?"* (Text A).

Pragmatics
- Text A: a merging of human and artificial intelligence
- Text B: advice on hazards of having robots in the home, with subtle allusions to dystopia
- Text C: a categorical warning of the dangers of ceding the human world to machines.

Possible Connections/Points of Comparison
- the sense of potential versus the sense of threat associated with artificial intelligence
- the global versus the local
- the concept of the future versus a diagnosis of the present
- the presentation of 'natural' human interactions versus technological or machine communication.

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 Unit 1: Section A

BAND	AO1 20 marks	AO3 15 marks	AO4 20 marks
5	**17-20 marks** • Intelligent methods of analysis • Confident use of • terminology • Perceptive discussion of texts • Coherent and effective expression	**13-15 marks** • Confident analysis of contextual factors • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning • Intelligent evaluation	**17-20 marks** • Subtle connections established between texts • Perceptive overview • Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	**13-16 marks** • Appropriate methods of analysis • Secure use of terminology • Thorough discussion of texts • Expression generally accurate and clear	**10-12 marks** • Secure analysis of contextual factors • Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation	**13-16 marks** • Purposeful connections between texts • Focused overview • Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	**9-12 marks** • Sensible methods of analysis • Generally sound use of terminology • Competent discussion of texts • Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	**7-9 marks** • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation	**9-12 marks** • Sensible connections between texts • Competent overview • Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	**5-8 marks** • Basic methods of analysis • Some accurate terminology • Uneven discussion of texts • Adequate expression, with some accuracy	**4-6 marks** • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Simple discussion of the construction of meaning • Some attempt to evaluate	**5-8 marks** • Some basic connections between texts • Broad overview • Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	**1-4 marks** • Limited methods of analysis • Limited use of terminology • Some discussion of texts • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	**1-3 marks** • Some awareness of context • Limited sense of how meaning is constructed • Limited evaluation	**1-4 marks** • Some links made between texts • Vague overview • Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	**0 marks:** Response not credit worthy		

Section B: Contemporary English

TripAdvisor Reviews

	AO2	**AO3**
Section B	15 marks	10 marks

2.	**Use your knowledge of contemporary English to analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect how the writers use language in these TripAdvisor reviews. [25]**

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 twenty-first century language concepts and issues and should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Overview

Examples must be selected from the data provided.

Characteristics of a successful response may include:
- well-informed analysis of the mode e.g. stylistic features in written forms indicative of the spoken or mixed mode
- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- a thorough exploration of the colloquial nature of TripAdvisor posts e.g. inclusion of non-standard English
- a thoughtful evaluation of contextual factors e.g. as nationality and the global nature of the platform, and the identities of the individual contributors.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:
- a focus on the surface evaluative features of the posts
- lack of engagement with a somewhat superficial overview of issues/concepts
- limited engagement with how language conveys opinion
- relies largely on describing and/or summarising content
- superficial consideration of the role contextual factors play in the construction of attitudes and meaning.

Notes

Responses may explore some of the following points but there is no requirement to cover them all or to deal with all texts. Reward all valid discussion:

Medium
- TripAdvisor reviews from people who briefly provide opinions on the qualities of their experiences when visiting Stonehenge
- a sense of a spoken voice e.g. *So, okay* (Text 1)
- contributors from anywhere in the world can post their reviews
- some contributors are using English as a second language (Text 2)
- purpose—consideration of appeal for different age groups e.g. *9yr old son* (Text 1) and *pupils* (Text 2)
- star rating used by all as a shorthand for their more detailed opinions
- some disconnect between the rating given and the subheadings e.g. *Must see…* conveys a sense of positive evaluation (Text 1)
- thumbs-up icon to indicate approval
- titles added by all contributors, which give a brief summary of their opinions
- some initialisms consistent with 21st century English e.g. *tbh* (Text 1)
- some acronyms consistent with 21st century English e.g. *lol* (Text 1)
- use of acronyms and abbreviations in Text 1 e.g. *lol* and *9yr* to convey a sense of a relatable persona
- symbols substituting for words e.g. *$$$* (Text 3)
- anaphoric reference: to refer to the stones e.g. *them* and *it*
- measured use of punctuation in Text 2 versus non-standard use of punctuation in the exclamatory *My 9yr old son had a blast!!!* (Text 1)
- mixture of ellipsis e.g. *Stonehenge* (Text 1) and Standard English e.g. *Retrospectively, I cannot …* (Text 2)
- crafted use of non-standard syntax e.g. … *the shuttle it was* … (Text 1) versus use of grammatically complete structures in Text 2.

Positive points made
- minor sentences to convey enthusiasm e.g. *Freakin lit!* (Text 4) and *Wonderful* (Text 5)
- complements to convey satisfaction e.g. … *it's <u>awesome</u> …* (Text 4) and *Staff are <u>friendly and helpful</u>* (Text 5)
- colloquialism to dispel cynicism e.g. *bunch of rocks* (Text 4)
- figurative language to convey otherworldly enthusiasm e.g. *blown away* (Text 4) and *Fairy dust!!* (Text 5)
- exclamatory sentences e.g. *My 9yr old son had a blast!!* (Text 1) and *Wow amazing experience!!!* (Text 5) with intentional use of non-standard punctuation
- reference to the experiences of family members e.g. *My 9yr old son* (Text 1) and *the husband* (Text 5) to enhance the appeal of the experience of visiting Stonehenge
- use of 5 star rating in both Text 4 and Text 5 to convey complete satisfaction
- some disconnect between the rating given and the subheadings e.g. *Must see …* conveys a sense of positive evaluation (Text 1)
- minor sentence e.g. *Stonehenge* (Text 1) to craft a sense of monumental importance of the attraction
- figurative language e.g. *had a blast* and a *ton to see* (Text 1)
- adjectives to convey positive evaluation e.g. *beautiful England* (Text 1) and *a amazing time* (Text 5).

Negative points made

- non-standard capitalisation in subheading e.g. *Money Grabbing* (Text 3) to emphasise the contributor's outrage at the cost of the visit
- hyperbole e.g. in the subheading *Money Grabbing* (Text 3) to reflect the strength of negative feeling about how something about a common heritage is being commodified
- cultural reference to *Avebury Stone Circles* (Text 3) to compare Stonehenge unfavourably to another similar attraction
- direct speech to criticise tourists who merely want to collect experiences e.g. *"I've seen it"* (Text 3)
- symbols as shorthand for expense *$$$* (Text 3) which also relates to the contributor's Australian nationality
- complements to convey opinion e.g. … *they aren't <u>really interested</u>* (Text 2).

Assessment Grid Unit 1: Section B

BAND	AO2 15 marks	AO3 10 marks
5	**13-15 marks** • Detailed critical understanding of concepts • Perceptive discussion of issues • Confident and concise selection of textual support/other 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	**10-12 marks** • Secure understanding of concepts • Some intelligent discussion of issues • Consistent selection of apt textual support/other examples	**7-8 marks** • Effective analysis of contextual factors • Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning • Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication
3	**7-9 marks** • Sound understanding of concepts • Sensible discussion of issues • Generally appropriate selection of textual support/other examples	**5-6 marks** • Sensible analysis of contextual factors • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning • Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication
2	**4-6 marks** • Some understanding of concepts • Basic discussion of issues • Some points supported by textual references/other examples	**3-4 marks** • Some valid analysis of contextual factors • Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning • Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication
1	**1-3 marks** • A few simple points made about concepts • Limited discussion of issues • Little use of textual support/other examples	**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	