



## **Practice Paper – Set 2**

**A Level English Language  
H470/01 Exploring language**

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration:** 2 hours 30 minutes

**MAXIMUM MARK    80**

**This document consists of 24 pages**

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING****SCORIS**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *scoris assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to Scoris and mark the [insert number] practice responses (“scripts”) and the [insert number] standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the Scoris 50% and 100% deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, by email or via the Scoris messaging system.
5. Work crossed out:
  - a. where a candidate crosses out an answer and provides an alternative response, the crossed out response is not marked and gains no marks
  - b. if a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question and makes no second attempt, and if the inclusion of the answer does not cause a rubric infringement, the assessor should attempt to mark the crossed out answer and award marks appropriately.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option.
8. Award NR (No Response)
  - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
  - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
  - OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the question.

Note: award 0 marks - for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).
9. The Scoris **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**  
If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the Scoris messaging system or e-mail.
10. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to your Team Leader (Supervisor) by the end of the marking period. The Assistant Examiner's Report Form (AERF) can be found on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support. Your report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

**INTRODUCTION**

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the texts which candidates have studied
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

These are the **Assessment Objectives** for the English Language specification as a whole.

<b>AO1</b>	Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression.
<b>AO2</b>	Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use.
<b>AO3</b>	Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning.
<b>AO4</b>	Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods.
<b>AO5</b>	Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English to communicate in different ways.

### WEIGHTING OF ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

The relationship between the units and the assessment objectives of the scheme of assessment is shown in the following table:

Component	% of A level					
	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO5	Total
Exploring language H470/01	11%	6%	11%	6%	6%	40%
Dimensions of linguistic variation H470/02	11%	11%	12%	6%	0%	40%
Independent language research H470/03	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%	20%
	27%	22%	28%	12%	11%	100%

**USING THE MARK SCHEME**

Study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question Papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners' Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates' responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates' responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme. Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected. In your marking, you will encounter valid responses which are not covered by the Mark Scheme: these responses must be credited. You will encounter answers which fall outside the 'target range' of levels for the paper which you are marking. Please mark these answers according to the marking criteria.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**PAPER-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: H470/01 Exploring language**

Candidates answer all the questions on the paper. The paper addresses all of the assessment objectives:

Assessment Objectives AO1 and AO3 are addressed in question 1.

Assessment Objectives AO2 and AO5 are addressed in question 2.

Assessment Objectives AO1, AO3 and AO4 are addressed in question 3.

In each question, the assessment objectives are given equal weighting.

THE INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR EACH TASK provides an indication of what candidates are likely to cover. The notes are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive: candidates should be rewarded for any relevant response which appropriately addresses the Assessment Objectives.

THE LEVEL DESCRIPTORS FOR EACH QUESTION FOLLOW THE INDICATIVE CONTENT.

**SUBJECT-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

- Each level descriptor covers the relevant assessment objectives.
- Where the assessment objectives appear in separate columns, marks should be allocated for each assessment objective independently of one another. There is no requirement for responses to be allocated marks from within the same level across each assessment objective.
- An answer does not have to meet all the requirements of a level descriptor before being placed in that level. The extent to which it meets all of the requirements of a level descriptor will determine its placement within that level.
- The extent to which the statements within the level have been achieved should be the only criteria used when deciding the mark within a level.
- Indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. Any valid response should be rewarded.

**Indicative Content** - *Please note:* indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
1	<p><b>Text A is an extract from a new Terms and Conditions booklet sent out to First Direct bank account holders in 2016. First Direct is a major national online and telephone bank.</b></p> <p><b>Giving careful consideration to the context of the text:</b></p> <p><b>(a) identify and analyse uses of lexis and semantics in this text</b></p> <p><b>(b) identify and analyse the way sentences are constructed in this text.</b></p> <p><i>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</i></p> <p>General contextual points (AO3): This text has a relatively straightforward purpose: to inform account holders of the terms and conditions related to their accounts. What makes it interesting, however, from a language point of view, is that is overtly engaging with the need for legal documents to be readable. It even uses the phrase ‘plain English’ which is the name of a campaign group established in 1979 to make public documents ‘clear and concise’. Readers of the text may not be aware of this context, of course, but language students could certainly discuss it.</p> <p>The text also seems to have a purpose to entertain (not part of the remit of the Plain English campaign), and to liven up what would otherwise be rather a dry and off-putting document.</p>	20	<p>In each of the bullet points below, AO1 is covered at the start of the point and AO3 at the end.</p> <p><b>(a) identify and analyse uses of lexis and semantics in this text</b></p> <p><b>Possible features could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lexis from the field of banking and finance (‘interest’, ‘overdrawn’ etc)</li> <li>• Lexis from the field of story-telling and entertainment (the compound ‘page-turner’, the collocation ‘twists and turns’, ‘bedtime reading’) - part of its purpose to ‘sugar the pill’ of a dry document</li> <li>• Recent lexical acquisitions to the lexicon, such as ‘emoji’, and the phrase (soon to be a compound?) ‘text speak’ – engages with modern context and audience</li> <li>• Modifiers such as ‘gentle’ are unusual for the genre of text – showing how writers are trying hard to entertain</li> <li>• Playfulness with language, like drawing attention to the accidental (was it?) pun ‘first things first’</li> <li>• Trying hard to use core vocabulary, aside from lexis from financial field</li> <li>• Personal pronoun ‘you’ and determiner ‘your’ used – direct address is key to success of text, as is use of inclusive ‘we’ (these professionals are meant to be on our side)</li> </ul>



			<p><b>(b) identify and analyse the way sentences are constructed in this text.</b> <b>Possible aspects could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• verb mood: declarative mood is dominant throughout – part of informative purpose</li><li>• First imperative ‘say hello to’ stands out being direct and deliberately colloquial, to set tone of whole text</li><li>• Generally uses complete grammatical sentences, which underpins an overall recognition of need for standard English in public documents, despite indication of informalisation taking place here</li><li>• Pattern of ‘if’ clauses, but often with single main clause following (e.g. ‘If you’d like to opt out of these messages, please give us a call.’) which is essentially purpose of text, to give out their terms, but in an accessible way</li><li>• Frequent use of contractions part of colloquial register throughout, and also used to soften – e.g. in example above, ‘If you’d... call’, left-branching dependent clause comes first, and has effect of politeness</li><li>• Syntax sometimes reversed with ‘if clauses’ – e.g. ‘You’ll be charged... if you’re...’, perhaps puts main clause first because it is a key aspect of terms, and comes under a emboldened sub-heading</li><li>• Most sentences one or two clauses, with exception of first two larger font paragraphs (‘It’s not got... you need it.’ perhaps because reader is likely to read this larger text right through</li></ul>
--	--	--	--

There are a total of 20 marks available for **Question 1**.

10 marks can be awarded for part **(a)** and 10 marks for part **(b)**. There is one mark per level for each AO. This table should be used twice – firstly to mark part **(a)** and allocate a mark out of 10, and then again to mark part **(b)** and allocate a mark out of 10. Parts **(a)** and **(b)** focus on different language levels, and therefore each part could achieve different levels. Each part should be marked completely separately – there is no need to look for consistency in allocating marks if the responses demonstrate different levels of competency.

Level	AO1 and AO3	Mark
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates clearly identify patterns of language use in precise relation to the linguistic level specified in the task and can closely analyse incisively chosen evidence, with application of appropriate terminology; the writing is in a secure academic register. (AO1)</li> <li>With a precise hold on the language feature specified in the task, candidates perceptively evaluate the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received and understood by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	9–10
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates can single out and analyse relevant examples of language use related to the linguistic level specified in the task, with application of appropriate terminology and coherent written expression. (AO1)</li> <li>Focusing on the language feature specified in the task, candidates can convincingly weigh up some possible effects of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and the way it is received and understood by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some clear points about language use which relate to the specified language level and are supported with relevant evidence; use of terminology is mostly appropriate, although likely to be less densely packed than the level above and written expression is clear but likely not to be economical. (AO1)</li> <li>Having a reasonable sense of the language feature specified, candidates come to some clear conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates attempt to make their writing relevant to the feature and language level specified in the task, pulling out the occasional piece of evidence and using terminology which is partially appropriate; written expression has some errors but the meaning is nonetheless apparent. (AO1)</li> <li>Having some sense of the language feature specified, candidates come to some fairly loose conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced in this text and is received by its audience. (AO3)</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some link to the specified feature and language level and some terms are used, appropriately; evidence, if there, is likely to be barely relevant or only loosely defined (not actually quoted, for example) and writing may at times obscure meaning. (AO1)</li> <li>Conclusions about the possible effect of contextual factors on the way language is produced and is received by the audience will be somewhat indistinct. There may be a vague sense of the text's purpose. (AO3)</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0

**Indicative Content** - *Please note*: indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
2	<p data-bbox="338 341 837 376"><b>2</b> <i>'All language change is good.'</i></p> <p data-bbox="338 437 1010 667"><b>You have been asked to write a talk on this subject to interest a non-specialist audience. You must engage critically with the statement, agreeing or disagreeing with it, or taking a more neutral position. You may give the talk a different title, if you wish. You should write about 500 words.</b></p> <p data-bbox="338 676 394 703"><b>[24]</b></p> <p data-bbox="338 711 969 772">Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</p> <p data-bbox="338 810 405 837"><b>AO5</b></p> <p data-bbox="338 879 1010 1350">It is possible to argue exclusively in favour of this statement. It might make the talk more entertaining, however, if a contrary argument was considered at some point. In order to 'critically engage' with the subject it is important that candidates at least unravel some of the complexities for their audience. In terms of models, probably the most famous is Jean Aitchison's series of lectures recorded by the BBC, 'Language Change, Progress or Decay'. She coined some now famous metaphors such as the 'damp spoon' reaction and the 'crumbling castle'. There would be nothing wrong with using her talks as a jumping off point, if candidates knew of it. It is not necessary, however.</p> <p data-bbox="338 1358 1010 1418">One way to approach it is the simple argument/counter-argument approach. A 'drop intro'</p>	24	<p data-bbox="1180 341 1240 368"><b>AO2</b></p> <p data-bbox="1180 405 1995 908">This task allows students to cover any aspect of language change. This can mean grammatical change over time, changes to spoken English in particular regions, language and technology and, possibly, language and gender. There are discourses in the public domain, such as the Plain English Campaign and the debate over language colonisation and the way languages are becoming extinct, which mean that you could put up a fair argument for using public policy to engineer language change. Using the activities of other cultures and languages, such approach with the vetting of language change that takes place under the Académie française, vs the non-prescriptive policy of the OED, could be also be a theme to develop, though probably with a descriptivist endpoint. In terms of areas of study, the task invites candidates to consider some of the following:</p> <p data-bbox="1180 948 1805 975"><b>Below are some areas that could be covered:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1227 1015 1984 1291" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches to language change, from 16<sup>th</sup> Century onwards (Aitchison, Crystal etc etc)</li> <li>• Preservation of threatened languages and dialects</li> <li>• Language and technology and the rapid pace of language change</li> <li>• Rise of new varieties of English, such as Multicultural London English (MLE)</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1180 1331 1995 1423">Again, to show assured knowledge and understanding, depth in particular areas – just focusing on language change and technology, for example – could be more effective than ranging</p>

<p>or deliberately hyperbolic opening might be possible, where the speaker takes the position of those who assert that the language is disintegrating. To demonstrate flair, the piece should probably have some humour, or if not that some technically skilful uses of language (antithesis, for example). Some candidates might want to try their hand at a piece of satire, where they take the voice of someone with blinkered views about language change (see AO2 comments).</p> <p>The key word in the question is ‘interest’. This is a talk, not a lecture. To get high marks, students need to shape a talk which develops an interesting line or theme in this debate. To be effective it will probably have an engaging beginning and a satisfying conclusion that has been ‘earnt’ by the rest of the talk. A circular structure might work well.</p> <p>The piece should have some of the informality of spoken discourse, probably more than, say, a broadsheet article on a linguistic topic (although many comment pieces do of course have the feeling of spoken mode).</p>		<p>widely across a number of areas of language. It might, however, be possible to join two or more of the points above together.</p> <p>There is no absolute necessity to cover particular language levels. Studying MLE is probably more likely to bring up grammatical elements, while focusing on language and technology will probably bring up more of a focus on neologisms. Candidates are simply aiming to demonstrate that they are ‘assured’ in their knowledge.</p>
<p>In terms of vocabulary, some terms (e.g. ‘prescriptive’) might make their way in to the talk, but a creative way of glossing such terms, or providing a colourful way of tackling the same concept should be well rewarded.</p> <p><b>Synthesising AO2 and AO5</b></p> <p>It is important that candidates do not simply lecture, showing off their knowledge. All good discursive or argumentative writing has to be supported with evidence and this evidence must be engaged with, critically, for high marks.</p> <p>Candidates will need to have learnt some facts,</p>		

	some quotes, some names and statistics to prepare for this exam and have a few personal anecdotes up their sleeve. This will be a place to show their knowledge and to put any wider reading about English Language to good use.		
--	--	--	--

There are a total of 24 marks available for **Question 2**.

Decide on a mark for AO2 out of 12, and then a separate mark for AO5 out of 12. Add the two marks together to reach a total out of 24 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different levels for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

Level	AO2	Mark	AO5	Mark
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show an assured knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>Candidates engage critically with the specified concept and issue.</li> </ul>	11–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An expertly-constructed text showing, perhaps surprising, originality in making the piece appropriate to the form specified in the task.</li> <li>The use of appropriately chosen linguistic features shows flair and the writing precisely suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	11–12
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show a good knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>In their piece, candidates show that they can take a critical angle on the specified concept and issue.</li> </ul>	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A well-constructed text, which is appropriate to the form specified in the task.</li> <li>The use of appropriately chosen linguistic features shows skill and their writing suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	9–10
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates show an essentially sound level of knowledge and understanding of the specified concept and issue and its relevance to language use.</li> <li>Candidates show that they have some ability to think and write critically about the concept/issue.</li> </ul>	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A deliberately constructed text, which contains most of the main elements of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>There is clear use of appropriate linguistic features and the writing has been modulated to take account of the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Their knowledge and understanding of the chosen language concept or issue is mostly accurate, although is likely to lack the depth needed to be convincing.</li> <li>In their piece of writing, candidates have addressed the specified language concept/issue, although not critically.</li> </ul>	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A text which is attempting to match the task's purpose and which is at least recognisable as an example of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>There are some appropriate language features employed and some attempts have been made to take account of the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates' knowledge and understanding of the concept/issue is likely to have inaccuracies or be muddled.</li> <li>The language concept/issue is present in the piece although somewhat indistinct or confused.</li> </ul>	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A text which has some sense of the form specified in the task, but which leaves out key elements.</li> <li>There are some attempts to use appropriate language features, although probably not employing a register which suits the audience defined in the task.</li> </ul>	3–4

Level	AO2	Mark	AO5	Mark
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates do not appear to understand the concept or issue but it is possible to see one or two points relating to it.</li> <li>The language concept or issue will be just barely detectable in the piece.</li> </ul>	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates produce writing which has little sense of the specified task, although there may be one or two superficial features of the form specified in the task.</li> <li>One or two appropriate language features may be present; the audience is not understood or addressed.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0

**Indicative Content** - *Please note:* indicative content *indicates* possible points candidates might make, but this is not an exhaustive account. **Any valid response should be rewarded.**

Question	Guidance	Mark	Text features	
3	<p>Text B is a transcript of a doctor-patient interview broadcast on <i>Behind Closed Doors</i>, a fly-on-the-wall documentary about the work of general practitioners in a GP surgery in Slough, west of London. N is the GP and R is a male patient, aged 65 plus.</p> <p>Text C is an extract from the <i>Richard and Judy</i> show, broadcast on Channel 4 in 2007. Allan Kerr is an addiction and anti-smoking expert and the guests have just seen a piece of film where a journalist tried – and failed, perhaps due to personal circumstances – to give up using Kerr’s method.</p> <p>Using appropriate linguistic concepts and methods, analyse the ways in which language is used in these two texts. In your answer you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explore connections and variations between the texts</li> <li>consider how contextual factors contribute to the construction of meaning.</li> </ul> <p>A03</p>	36	<i>Phonetics, phonology and prosodics</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>substitution of ŋ sound for ‘n’, typical of much informal spoken English, in many dialects; likewise glottal stop – R may be diverging from N as he is under pressure (see Giles), particularly during smoking discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allan is London born, so may be using overt prestige on this national TV show (see Trudgill) – not glottals and few ŋ /n substitutions</li> <li>emphatic stress used – Judy on the dummy auxiliary ‘<b>did</b>’, perhaps to save Allan’s face, as it relates to a ‘failure’ of his system; used by Allan (e.g. ‘<b>prevent</b>’) – part of persuasive technique</li> <li>alliterative ‘terrible trauma’ places emphasis on semi-scientific term ‘trauma’</li> </ul>
			<i>Lexis and semantics</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>field of the body, with common high frequency, OE derived lexis, belonging to R’s schema of a patient consultation (‘thigh... leg... ankles’)</li> <li>R announced his main condition using medical register term ‘type two diabetes’ – to show he knows the professional context</li> <li>N uses same register and schema, shifting slightly when he sums up the condition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more high frequency lexis than B – for benefit of broad audience?</li> <li>field-specific lexis, relating to smoking and the anti-smoking public discourse (e.g. the title of Boatman’s organisation, framed in the imperative, ‘Quit’)</li> <li>specialist medical/scientific terms, such as ‘nicotine’, ‘addiction’ – shows knowledge and expertise, plus these are probably ‘trigger’ words for many viewers</li> <li>adjectives to describe state after</li> </ul>



	<p>Text B is a formal doctor’s interview, with the typical asymmetrical power relationship of such conversations. Whilst initially it is heuristic on the doctor’s part and referential/informative on the patient’s part (a piece of transactional discourse) it changes at the point where the doctor brings up smoking. At this point the doctor’s agenda, whilst informative, is also persuasive. He is working within the context of his role, his occupational power, and the overall context of an NHS which has an interest in reducing the numbers of smokers. Text C contains speakers with different agendas, although it seems clear that Allan Kerr is using the TV chat show as a way of publicising his method. The power relationships here are less clear since the presenters have a duty to entertain as well as inform their viewers and therefore need to be assertive without being too aggressive (the chat show is different from a political interview, for instance).</p>	<p>(‘retention of the fluid’) – professional register, possible element of occupational power (Wareing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N uses ‘injurious’ twice – Latinate low frequency word – sounds almost rehearsed and different register (done at a point of face threatening, so attempt at power within the discourse?)</li> </ul>	<p>stopping smoking – quite evangelical (e.g. ‘free’, belongs to release from prison; ‘happy’, a feeling rather than a physical state)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘trauma’ undergoing semantic shift from medical term to something broader – arguably on the cusp here, works antithetically with happiness they will actually feel</li> </ul>
		<i>Pragmatics</i>	
		Text B	Text C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N uses oblique language (e.g. ‘help is available’), implying that he should get expert advice to stop smoking, saving face</li> <li>• Normally phatic ‘How are you today’ is actually an invitation to describe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• euphemism ‘horrendous personal news’ – inappropriate, perhaps, at time of broadcast to say what this is shorthand to smoking and non-smoking language – e.g. ‘stopping’ does not need the gerund ‘smoking’ – rest is implied</li> </ul>

			symptoms in this context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>modal verb (contracted in 'they'll not only be...') – suggests certainty to their success rate</li></ul>
--	--	--	--------------------------	--

Question	Guidance	Mark	Text features	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>A04</b></p> <p>Whilst the topic is similar between these two texts, there is a clear contrast in the texts in terms of structure and variety. Text B has a fixed and familiar schema, with doctor using his personal power (see Wareing) to try and influence the patient to change his smoking habit. N is more supportive in the first part of the consultation and more assertive in the second half. Text C, meanwhile, also follows a question and answer format. The questions, though, are much fuller, perhaps because the presenters are personalities in their own right. Once Allan he dominates (or is allowed to dominate) with two substantial turns which are fully formed and sound to a degree quite rehearsed.</p> <p>It is interesting that throughout text C there is no use of non-standard grammar. In text B this also mostly the case, but R does seem to diverge from N when he is put under pressure over his smoking habit and some non-standard usage does appear.</p> <p>Candidates have, here, two spoken texts and will want to use the opportunity to really focus on aspects of speech, looking at the power dynamics, the shifting purposes, the variety of forms and so on, without the distractions of other modes of</p>	<p><b>36</b></p>	<i>Grammar and morphology</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R’s description of his symptoms all compound sentences – typical of simple descriptive discourse</li> <li>• R uses ‘if’ clauses, to modify his statements (e.g. ‘if I’m bored’)</li> <li>• non-standard ‘ain’t’ with double negative stands out – might suggest divergence at a point when speaker is under pressure</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• modal verb (contracted in ‘they’ll not only be...’) – suggests certainty to their success rate</li> <li>• Allan uses quite complex constructions (e.g. ‘people assume... smoke for’ complex and puzzling syntax) – belongs to written mode and suggests how often he’s delivered this message; sophisticated syntax perhaps lends strength to his position</li> <li>• pronoun ‘we’ (e.g. in ‘we first remove that’) suggests an inclusive friendly group of caring professionals</li> <li>• patterns of modification (‘shorter, sweeter life’ vs ‘long boring life’; ‘terrible trauma’) suggests frequency of this delivery</li> <li>• adverbs of degree give dramatic quality to Allan’s story (e.g. ‘utterly miserable’)</li> </ul>

	discourse.		<i>Discourse</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• highly schematic – both participants follow a known path</li> <li>• when discussing his symptoms R confidently controls the topic, cutting in over N's 'something new or – ' – suggests degree of assurance</li> <li>• R interrupts N's second statement on effects of smoking – might indicate how face is being damaged</li> <li>• dialogue is cooperative in first part of discourse, but becomes more confrontational after smoking mentioned</li> <li>• R's clearest hesitation ('I-I-(1)') comes after his negative face is threatened by N</li> <li>• N's suggestions of treatment are quite heavily hedged (e.g. 'also sort of (.) please be aware that') – face saving strategy</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less schematic; more of a feel of conversation, but this disguises control by two presenters</li> <li>• interesting dynamic between presenters, with one clear interruption of Judy's speech by Richard – might apply Zimmerman and West</li> <li>• Judy has longer turns than Richard, belying these findings</li> <li>• Allan's two long turns are almost without pauses, suggests this persuasive language is prepared, often used etc</li> <li>• Judy's hesitations and false-starts – possible face-saving strategy, given FTA of raising their journalist's failed attempt using Kerr's system; less practised on this subject than Allan</li> <li>• Allan takes a commanding position at times, for example with interruption/overlap 'well in fact its...' – part of his agenda, suggests expertise</li> <li>• Allan has some (well-practiced?) use of antithesis, done colloquially (e.g. fear of x... which 'we' remove; 'shorter sweeter life... long boring life' – parallel phrasing, shows prepared speech</li> </ul>

There are a total of 36 marks available for Question 3.

Decide on a mark for AO1 out of 12, and then a separate mark for AO3 out of 12, and a separate mark for AO4 out of 12. Add the three marks together to reach a total out of 36 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different levels for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

Level	AO1	Mark	AO3	Mark	AO4	Mark
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates apply a range of appropriate methods in an assured and systematic way, using appropriate terminology and writing in a secure academic register.</li> <li>• They deftly establish and explore patterns of language use and can closely analyse incisively chosen evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates make discerning points about the possible effect of contextual factors on particular features of language, both in terms of production and reception.</li> <li>• They perceptively evaluate their points, suggesting alternatives for how context might account for variations in language use.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates selectively and methodically apply confident knowledge of appropriate linguistic concepts across both texts.</li> <li>• Candidates compare particular linguistic features in the two texts, making illuminating connections between them which clearly establish some of the varied ways that language is used.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates apply a range of appropriate methods to the texts in a systematic way, using appropriate terminology and coherent written expression.</li> <li>• They establish patterns of language use and can analyse well-chosen evidence in some depth.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates make strong and helpful points about relevant contextual factors, showing how context might affect language use, both in terms of production and reception.</li> <li>• They show that they can weigh up how contextual factors might account for variations in language use.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates methodically apply sound knowledge of appropriate linguistic concepts across both texts.</li> <li>• Candidates compare linguistic features in the two texts, making helpful connections between them which show some of the ways that language varies.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>

Level	AO1	Mark	AO3	Mark	AO4	Mark
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply some appropriate methods in a sound way, using mostly appropriate terminology and coherent if uneconomical writing.</li> <li>Analysis is characterised by either a fairly limited number of well-developed points, with relevant evidence, or a larger number of valid supported points that lack depth.</li> </ul>	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make some valid points about context, showing how contextual factors can affect language production and reception</li> <li>They come to some sound conclusions about how contextual factors could cause variations in language.</li> </ul>	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates apply accurate knowledge of linguistic concepts to language features in a way that is mostly appropriate, across both texts.</li> <li>They make some comparisons of linguistic features in the two texts, making some connections between them which show ways in which language use varies.</li> </ul>	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates attempt to apply linguistic methods with some success, and terminology is at times appropriate; written expression contains some errors.</li> <li>Analysis is uneven and is characterised by either scattered points that are supported with evidence or points which may have validity but are unsupported.</li> </ul>	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make a few successful attempts at showing how basic contextual factors affect the way language is produced and received.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn tend to be assertive and simplistic rather than weighed in the balance and are sometimes unconvincing; there may be an elementary sense of how context affects language variation.</li> </ul>	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates have a loose grasp of linguistic concepts and attempt to apply them to both texts, although sometimes unconvincingly.</li> <li>They will make more general connections and will attempt to compare particular features but with only partial success.</li> </ul>	5–6

Level	AO1	Mark	AO3	Mark	AO4	Mark
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make a vague attempt to apply linguistic methods to the texts and some terms are used, with occasional appropriateness; writing is likely to contain errors which sometimes obscure meaning.</li> <li>One or two simple points are made, with little or tenuous evidence; assertive rather than analytical.</li> </ul>	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates can comment on context, although this is unlikely to be show proper grasp of production and reception and so is of very limited use.</li> <li>Evaluation of points is not happening in this level because there is no real exploration of language, but there may be one or two generalisations made about the effects of context on the language.</li> </ul>	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where linguistic concepts are in evidence for each text, understanding is shallow and knowledge of them is likely to be muddled.</li> <li>Some loose connections between the texts are established in one or two places in the answer. These connections are likely to be simple matching or contrasting of features with very little demonstration of how language varies.</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates struggle to apply the linguistic methods; terminology, if present, is inappropriate and accuracy of written expression is very limited.</li> <li>There may be the odd point made but there is no analysis with evidence.</li> </ul>	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or at the most two references are made to the context with no link to language production or reception.</li> <li>Little or no attempt to draw conclusions about the effect of context on different uses of language.</li> </ul>	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any knowledge of linguistic concepts is likely to be mostly inaccurate with perhaps a very vague sense of understanding both texts being present.</li> <li>The notion of comparison is essentially lost in this level. There may be one or two connections here and there but these do not help with notions of the varieties of language use.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0

**APPENDIX 1**

Assessment Objective weightings are given as percentages.

**Assessment Objectives Grid**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1%</b>	<b>AO2%</b>	<b>AO3%</b>	<b>AO4%</b>	<b>AO5%</b>	<b>Total%</b>
<b>1</b>	5	0	5	0	0	<b>10</b>
<b>2</b>	0	6	0	0	6	<b>12</b>
<b>3</b>	6	0	6	6	0	<b>18</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>40%</b>