

**GCE**

**English Language**

Unit **H470/01**: Exploring language

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.













All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
	Positive Recognition: Place in main body of the text
	Assessment Objective 1: Place in left hand margin
	Assessment Objective 2: Place in left hand margin
	Assessment Objective 3: Place in left hand margin
	Assessment Objective 4: Place in left hand margin
	Assessment Objective 5: Place in left hand margin
	Attempted or insecure: Place in main body of text
	Analysis : Use to indicate higher Band developed detail
	Detailed: use to indicate Higher Band developed detail
	Vague
	Irrelevant: Place in left hand margin

**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 a page from an instruction booklet that came with the computer game, <i>Sims 2</i>, released in 2004.</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): The booklet that this text was taken from comes from the era when games were released on a disc rather than downloaded. The language of the field of computing, however, is still mostly current, with phrases like ‘Main Menu’, ‘Click on’ etc. Although printed booklets are now unlikely to be sent out with computer games some of the language used here might be replicated in online advice to players of virtual world games of this kind. Importantly, whilst it is an instruction booklet, it seems to be trying to engage its gaming audience and to entertain them too. Thus, while the language under the heading ‘Starting The Game’ is transactional and practical, the ‘Introduction’ contains a number of interactional discourse features, designed to begin a conversation with the reader, such as the question at the start of the</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. Possible features could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lexis from the field of computing and technology (‘programs... main menu... click on’) suggests assumed knowledge of readers</li> <li>• Lexis from a domestic, family semantic field (‘neighborhood... family... wife’) locates the game in a genre of virtual reality gameplay</li> <li>• The noun ‘simoleon’, which is a ‘virtual’ currency, suggests specific knowledge of the game <i>Sims</i>, this being a sequel to the original game (which has now moved on to <i>Sims 4</i>)</li> <li>• Compound lexis such as ‘Autorun’ typical of language of technology, where neologisms are common</li> <li>• Semantic change, such as in the verb ‘click’ (which, pragmatically, is understood to mean a movement of the computer mouse) also part of technology, where words undergo a semantic broadening – familiar to the likely readership</li> <li>• Candidates might want to comment on the Americanisms, with American spellings (e.g. ‘neighborhood’ - arguably more commonly used in American culture to depict an</li> </ul>

	<p>section. This balance is maintained throughout and should provide rich material for candidates to comment on.</p> <p>Pragmatically the booklet is interesting. Readers would understand that the people referred to are virtual, not real, but that the enjoyment of the game, and this booklet, comes from the idea that they should be treated as if they <i>were</i> real.</p>		<p>area, suburb, parish etc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of idioms such as ‘time will tell’ part of conversational feel and friendly tenor of text</li> <li>• Some lower frequency Latinate lexis, such as ‘inheritances’, and field-specific neologisms like ‘simoleons’ but mostly core vocabulary – important for a readable text.</li> <li>• Personal pronoun ‘you’ and determiner ‘your’ used – direct address is key to success of text</li> </ul> <p><b>(b) identify and analyse the way sentences are constructed in this text. Possible aspects could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• verb mood: uses of interrogative, sometimes to imply that this is a conversation, albeit one-sided, and sometimes rhetorical (‘Doesn’t that kid look like Betty and Roland Sim?’) – designed to take booklet away from typical instructional language. Imperatives used, however (‘Insert the disc...’ etc), remind us of the main purpose of the text – although some are also part of the entertaining purpose (‘Watch it all come to life!’ for example)</li> <li>• Questions come in succession (e.g. from ‘Will Diego and Sophia realise their dreams?’ there are four in a row), in the tradition of quaestio in rhetorical speech – perhaps trying to raise excitement in the reader</li> <li>• complete grammatical sentences throughout, perhaps unusual given informal feel</li> <li>• Complex sentences used, but they tend to be short (two</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<p>or three clauses). In the introduction three out of four initial sentences are simple – all about readability. Sometimes simple sentence used for effect – eg the short ‘Only time (and you) will tell.’ Follows the lively sequence of questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Left-branching complex (periodic) sentences, such as ‘Once you are in the game ... neighbourhood’ – these create suspense and give the instructional writing a more lively feel.</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><i>'In our society it is important that we have a standard form of spoken English.'</i></p> <p>Write an entertaining column which engages critically with the quotation above (a column is a type of article where writers can express their own opinions), suitable for a national daily newspaper. You do not need to include the exact words of the quotation and you may invent your own title if you wish. You should write about 500 words.</p> <p>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</p> <p><b>AO5</b></p> <p>In terms of genre, there are plenty of good models for this kind of piece around. To demonstrate flair, the piece should probably have a snappy title (hence the invitation in the question to go their own way). From there, many approaches are possible. They might opt for the 'drop intro' where we are placed in a scenario somewhere in society (on a bus, in Parliament, at school etc) then tackle the issues from paragraph two or three onwards. The piece might be discursive, or personal and anecdotal, or a mixture of them all. A 'set it up and knock it down' approach can work well, where candidates pose a position that they do not agree with, only to then undercut it in the rest of the article.</p>	24	<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>This task allows students to cover varieties of spoken English in terms of grammar and/or pronunciation, and to bring in to that language change, language and power, language and gender and, perhaps, language acquisition. The quotation is deliberately ambiguous, allowing students to argue that society requires standard forms in many places, even if it is wrong that that is the case. There is room here to adopt the voice of Lynne Truss or other more prescriptivist writers, but that will need to be done cleverly, or the 'critical engagement' aspect of the task will be lost. A descriptivist position is probably easier to pull off. In terms of theoretical knowledge; candidates should demonstrate that they know the difference between standard and non-standard forms of pronunciation and/or grammar. They could bring in sociolects, dialects and idiolects. They may be very ambitious and argue that standard English and/or RP is actually impossible to pin down and could be considered unhelpful as a term in the first place – thus the piece could be about trying to abandon the very terms in the quotation. In terms of areas of study, aside from the obvious aspect of varieties of English, the task invites candidates to consider some of the following:</p> <p><b>Below are some areas that could be covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language and power: overt prestige forms, used in formal settings as a means of maintaining authority</li> <li>• Covert prestige (see Trudgill, Cheshire etc): how in some areas of society standard forms are not just unnecessary, they are actually disadvantageous</li> <li>• Standardisation: what is the 'standard', where did it come</li> </ul>

<p>Some candidates might want to try their hand at a piece of satire, where they take the voice of someone with blinkered views about standard English (see AO2 comments). The key word in the question is ‘entertaining’ – candidates who simply deliver a lecture on correctness cannot access the highest band. That said, entertainment can be achieved in lots of ways – any approach that would engage readers should be rewarded. Moreover, it is not necessary for candidates to produce a polished broadsheet register. A convincing piece of tabloid-style writing which achieves the main objectives signalled in the question is fine. Unlike blog posts, the piece should have a defined structure and come to a clear conclusion (ideally one that seems planned by the writer!) if it is to achieve high marks.</p>			<p>from? Accident of one Midlands dialect being adopted by those in power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language acquisition: what should be taught/allowed/discouraged in school in terms of adoption of slang</li> </ul> <p>Again, to show assured knowledge and understanding, depth in particular areas – a personal piece focusing on how we should guide children (or shouldn’t!) – could be more effective than ranging 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>Of course this task is actually a form of transformation for candidates, where they are taking what they have learnt about the specified concept and re-presenting it for a non-specialist audience. The topic would require some high level thinking, but a wide range of formality levels could be justified, depending on the kind of publication, as long as it is kept consistent through the text. Some challenging vocabulary might make it in, but any jargon such as ‘prescriptivist’ or ‘covert prestige’, would need skilful glossing if it is going to make it in at all. The piece is likely to have some colloquial touches including uses of idiom and contractions (‘don’t’, etc.) and minor sentences used <i>deliberately</i> (easy to spot this kind of purposeful rule-breaking if the rest of the article uses accurate standard punctuation!) but will not be relentlessly chatty, even</p>		

	<p>in a tabloid paper.</p> <p><b>Synthesising AO2 and AO5</b></p> <p>It is important that candidates do not simply 'rant'. All good discursive or argumentative writing has to be supported with evidence and this evidence must be engaged with, critically, for high marks. Candidates will need to have learnt some facts, 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.</p>		
--	--	--	--

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. 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

<b>1</b>	<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>	<b>1–2</b>	<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>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li></ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li></ul>	<b>0</b>

**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><b>Text B is an extract from a transcript of a family mealtime conversation, recorded by Ella, aged 17. Laura is Ella's mother, Daniel her father and Joan her grandmother. Joan is talking first about someone at her bowling club and then about how the department store Marks and Spencers looked after the health of its employees when she worked there in the 1950s. Laura also worked at the store, but more recently.</b></p> <p><b>Text C is an extract from an 'Employee Welfare Timeline' downloaded from the website 'marksintime.marksandspencer.com', an official site created by Marks and Spencer which charts the history of the company.</b></p> <p><b>Using appropriate linguistic concepts and methods, analyse the ways in which language is used in these two texts. In your answer you should:</b></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</li> </ul>	36	<i>Phonetics, phonology and prosodics</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'ahah' paralinguistic feature, expression of disgust – partly to amuse others; likewise, 'ooh' - expression of delight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final exclamation ('M&amp;S Welfare... 80 years!') has sense of speech – suggests excitement in the voice.</li> </ul>
			<i>Lexis and semantics</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High frequency lexis, typical of speech, but with touches of formality here and there (e.g. 'mislaid') where Joan's tone becomes more serious</li> <li>• Lexis from the fields of health and finance</li> <li>• Joan speaks mostly in standard English but occasionally uses non-standard lexis such as 'pound' instead of 'pounds' – reflecting her idiolect and possibly (given her general adherence to standard English) the informal context</li> <li>• Ella's 'cool' from a different sociolect to the others</li> <li>• Idioms used ('all the rage', 'wiped out') typical of spoken discourse, adding colour to expression, to entertain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More formal than text B throughout, with higher proportion of Latinate lexis ('promote... committed... subsidised... cervical'), underpinning the serious issue of employee health, perhaps</li> <li>• Field-specific lexis, relating to field of work and welfare used throughout ('work experience initiative', 'working conditions') – reflects M&amp;S's professionalism.</li> <li>• lexis from field of health, particularly women's health ('cervical', 'breast screening' etc) – engaging with range of health issues in a frank way</li> <li>• bias towards representation of women (e.g. 'slimming clubs' accompanied by picture of woman being measured); semantic field of pregnancy and family appears in several places – implied female audience, perhaps, and context of predominately female workforce</li> </ul>

	<p><b>meaning.</b></p> <p><b>A03</b></p> <p>The informal setting of Text B, of a family meal, dictates the lexis and grammar of the discourse. It is a friendly conversation which is designed to entertain and inform. In Text C, the situation of this document on a website created by the company means that it is informative, but with an agenda to represent M&amp;S in a good light. Everything here is about opportunity and possibility. The strong representation of women in the text suggests that the implied reader might well be female, perhaps people who are interested in working for the company. To get as far as this document (which is a PDF) readers must be reasonably dedicated and have got past 'clicking' through images on the website. The audience of Text B is internal, of course, with Joan, in particular, enjoying reminiscing with her daughter and granddaughter</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• language reflecting sensitivity to representation of certain groups (e.g. 'disadvantaged people', 'lone parents') – modern context of equal opportunities etc</li><li>• neologisms relating to the M&amp;S brand – e.g. 'Marks and Start', meant to show the flexibility and range the brand can encompass, perhaps</li></ul>
--	---	--	---

			<i>Pragmatics</i>	
			Text B	Text C
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• implication of the list of services ('the dentist the doctor' etc) is that Joan is impressed</li> <li>• 'I can't imagine lying in bed...' etc, implies that Daniel would not want a beard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'at a younger age than is available on the NHS' implies that they are exceptional and impressive (replicated throughout)</li> </ul>



Question	Guidance	Mark	Text features	
3	<p><b>A04</b></p> <p>Whilst the topic is similar between these two texts, there is a clear contrast here between an informal family meal, where the conversation is free-flowing and part of the enjoyment of eating together and the specific purpose of the timeline, which is to inform and persuade the reader of M&amp;S's strong record on employee health. Joan is enthusiastic about what the company achieved, but there is some criticism there when she talks about all these benefits being removed and the store not doing as well – something the timeline would not include.</p> <p>In terms of structure, the topic of conversation in Text B moves freely, directed mostly by Joan, the control of topic perhaps being granted to her because of her seniority. In text C the discourse structure is determined by the flow diagram structure, and the fixed linearity of the dates. Candidates may well wish to discuss their work on language and power here – arguably Joan has a degree of social power (see Wareing) The power in Text C is all influential, since the text is from a website and the reader is under no compunction to respond to what is said. Gender might also be relevant, in that Daniel dominates the early part of the conversation, staying on topic but arguably directing the way it</p>	36	<i>Grammar and morphology</i>	
			<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mostly simple sentences or interrogatives formed of declarative clause and tag questions – typical of informal, spontaneous conversation, could link to language and gender</li> <li>• Minor sentences ('Oh God', 'yep' etc) typical of spoken discourse, expressing emotion, supporting others etc.</li> <li>• Non-standard grammar (e.g. 'sort of umm (2) breast (.) clinic come round') – given standard grammar from Joan elsewhere suggests either covert prestige or simply a sense of informality in the context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• passive voice often used (e.g. 'A new Family Care Policy is launched') – perhaps to retain formality, perhaps to foreground the welfare initiative</li> <li>• More pre-modified noun phrases than Text B ('mobile breast screening unit', 'free cervical screening' etc) belongs to professional register/ puts M&amp;S in a better light; adjectives fit persuasive secondary purpose (e.g. 'excellent working conditions')</li> <li>• More multi-clausal complex sentences than Text B – belongs to formality of this semi-official document; relative clauses (e.g. 'which visits stores nationwide') makes services seem comprehensive</li> <li>• Use of 'historical present' tense (e.g. 'is launched... includes') throughout, perhaps to give immediacy to M&amp;S's programmes</li> </ul>

<p>unfolds. The women discourse constructively and supportively, with supportive feedback and no interruptions or sudden changes in topic. In Text C the fact that women make up a large portion of the images and are mentioned frequently in the text suggests the importance of women in the world of domestic retail. There is some interesting representation, too, with ‘A Girl’s Future’ above a picture of what is clearly a young woman – the parallel modern text always uses ‘women’ showing a change in representation of gender.</p> <p>Candidates will want to discuss the single mode of speech in Text B, compared to the multimodal format of Text C. The text in C is quite formal and not part of spoken mode, with plenty of uses of passive voice (‘is selected’, ‘are selected’ etc) and more formal lexis.</p> <p>Across the texts therefore a degree of variety, with some non-standard grammar appearing in Joan’s speech, within a conversation which is mostly informal standard English, compared to a text which adheres firmly to expectations of formal standard English throughout in Text C</p>	<i>Discourse</i>	
	<b>Text B</b>	<b>Text C</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spontaneous discourse so not schematic</li> <li>• Joan seems to dictate topics – due to age (social power?)</li> <li>• Repeated adjacency pair where Joan makes a statement with tag question and receives positive reinforcement from Laura – shows power structure perhaps</li> <li>• Generally cooperative dialogue, suggests that the two main female participants are comfortable with each other</li> <li>• High number of non-fluency features, including fillers and plenty of false starts - shows that this talk is unplanned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• multimodal discourse – linear structure with repeated image-text multimodal pairings – suggests a serious document but designed to be readable and friendly on some levels</li> <li>• A range of other discourse structures on display (e.g. the 1940s advert, where reader connects ‘girl’ in picture to the company name, the newspaper, the pensive pose and the main caption – background suggests escape from domestic setting, perhaps?)</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. 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>

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

