



Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## English Language Mark Scheme

### How to Mark

#### Aims

When you are marking your allocation of scripts your main aims should be:

- 1 to recognise and identify the achievements of candidates
- 2 to put into a rank order the achievements of candidates (not to grade them - that is something that is done later using the rank order that your marking has produced)
- 3 to ensure comparability of assessment for all candidates, regardless of question or examiner.

#### Approach

It is important to be *open minded* and *positive* when marking scripts.

The specification recognises the variety of experiences and knowledge that candidates will have. It encourages them to study language in a way that is relevant to them. The questions have been designed to give them opportunities to discuss what they have found out about language. It is important to assess the quality of *what the candidate offers*.

Do not mark scripts as though they were mere shadows of some Platonic ideal (or the answer *you* would have written). The mark schemes have been composed to assess *quality of response* and not to identify expected items of knowledge.

#### The Marking Grids

The specification has generic marking grids for each Assessment Objective which are customised for individual tasks. These have been designed to allow assessment of the range of knowledge, understanding and skills that the specification demands.

Within each Assessment Objective there are five broad bands representing different levels of achievement.

Do not think of bands equalling grade boundaries. Depending on the part of the examination, the bands will have different mark ranges assigned to them. This will reflect the different weighting of assessment objectives in particular tasks and across the examination as a whole. You may be required to give different marks to bands for different assessment objectives.

#### Using the Grids

You will need to give a mark for each Assessment Objective being tested in a particular question. These marks will then be totalled up for that question. To identify the mark for an Assessment Objective ask:

#### What descriptors reflect the answer you are marking?

On some occasions the descriptors in a band will only have one mark attached to them. On other occasions there will be a range of marks. In some bands there are upper and lower descriptors in such cases to help you.

Sometimes you will need to decide whether a script is displaying all the characteristics of a band firmly: if so, put it at the top of the band. As soon as a script has fulfilled one band and shows signs of the next, you should put it into that next band.

If a script displays some characteristics of a band barely, place it at the bottom of the band. If the script shows a range of some of the band's qualities, place it between the top and bottom of the band as seems fair.

### Annotating scripts

It is vital that the way you arrive at a mark should be recorded on the script. This will help you with making accurate judgements and it will help any subsequent markers to identify how you are thinking, should adjustment need to be made.

To this end you should:

- identify points of merit with ✓ or ✓✓  
(ensure that you don't go into automatic ticking mode where you tick rhythmically every 10 lines - ticks should engage with the detail of a candidate's thinking and analysis)
- write notes in the margin commenting on the answer's relationship to the AOs/grid/key words/focus
- identify linguistic errors with a ✕
- identify errors of spelling or punctuation by underlining, eg sentance
- write a summative comment at the end for each Assessment Objective
- indicate the marks for each Assessment Objective being tested at the end of the answer in the margin in sequence
- add up the marks for each Assessment Objective
- put a ringed total in the right hand margin at the end of each question.

### Distribution of Assessment Objectives and Weightings

The table below is a reminder of which Assessment Objectives will be tested by the questions and tasks completed by candidates and the marks available for them.

Assessment Objective	1	2	3	4	Total
Questions 01/02 Language Variation and Change	10	20	15		45
Question 03 Language Discourses	10	20	15		45

**Section A – Language Variation and Change**

**Question 01/02**

- Award a mark out of 10 for AO1, place in the right hand margin and ring.
- Award a mark out of 20 for AO2, place in the right hand margin and ring.
- Award a mark out of 15 for AO3, place in the right hand margin and ring.

Eg

AO1 Summative Comment (5)

AO2 Summative Comment (13)

AO3 Summative Comment (9)

**Section B – Language Discourses**

**Question 03**

- Award a mark out of 10 for AO1, place in the right hand margin and ring.
- Award a mark out of 20 for AO2, place in the right hand margin and ring.
- Award a mark out of 15 for AO3, place in the right hand margin and ring.

Eg

AO1 Summative Comment (8)

AO2 Summative Comment (18)

AO3 Summative Comment (12)

Transfer each ringed mark to the box on the front of the answer booklet. Add together and put the total mark in the box in the top right hand corner. Initial your mark.

<b>Question 01</b>			
<b>Assessment focus:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Analyse</b> how the writers use language to convey their ideas about the music they are reviewing</li> <li>• <b>Evaluate</b> how their different contexts and periods might have shaped the language of the texts.</li> </ul>			
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO1: Select and apply a range of linguistic methods, to communicate relevant knowledge using appropriate terminology and coherent, accurate written expression</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3: Analyse and evaluate the influence of contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken and written language</b>
<b>9–10</b>	Applies accurately a sophisticated and searching range of frameworks in depth to enhance and illuminate understanding. Guides reader structurally and stylistically. Makes very few technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe sentence and clause types, patterns and elements</li> <li>• organise or synthesise descriptive approaches.</li> </ul>	<b>13–15</b>	Demonstrates analytical grasp of how language works across different levels. Places analysis in wider contexts. Shows perceptive/conceptualised/illuminating/ open-minded approach. Uses interesting and judicious examples and quotation. Evaluates appropriateness/success. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conceptualise tones and approaches</li> <li>• evaluate effect of sentence patterns and structures</li> <li>• conceptualise representation of music.</li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	Applies a relevant range of linguistic frameworks, showing some depth and detail, and with rare errors. Develops a line of argument in a controlled linguistic register. Shows firm control of technical accuracy <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe phrase types</li> <li>• describe word classes in depth</li> <li>• describe verb tense, voice, aspect.</li> </ul>	<b>10–12</b>	Analyses language features, their explanatory context and their communicative impact confidently Makes a subtle interpretation integrating various levels of description. Explores texts' meaning, purpose and effects. Makes evaluative comments which are well supported. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explore effect of mode and genre</li> <li>• analyse representations/evaluations of the music and musicians</li> <li>• examine generic similarities.</li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	Applies linguistic frameworks consistently and largely accurately. Communicates clearly with clear topics and paragraphs. Makes infrequent technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe pronoun number</li> <li>• describe word formation processes</li> <li>• describe word classes</li> <li>• describe sentence functions.</li> </ul>	<b>7–9</b>	Analyses meanings of a range of language features. Analyses context's influence in detail. Engages with texts' communicative intent. Quotes aptly. Makes some evaluative comment tied to textual detail. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• examine new words in B</li> <li>• examine period words in A</li> <li>• explore address: personal, inclusive, interactive.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	Applies a linguistic framework with some errors. Clarifies some linguistic aims. Describes methodology. Expresses ideas with organisation emerging. Makes occasional technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe basic lexical and semantic features</li> <li>• describe pronouns.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	Understands effect of context. Illustrates some effects of producer/audience/mode/purpose/field. Begins to interpret what text communicates. Illustrates using quotations. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comment on informative and evaluative purposes</li> <li>• identify fields and broad judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	Attempts to use linguistic description with occasional accuracy of description. Conveys basic ideas with some organisation. Frequent errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify formality, complexity, graphology, orthography.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	Identifies some features of language variation. Has broad awareness that context has influenced language use. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify hyperlinks, dateline, formality, short paragraphs</li> <li>• identify lists, stars, bold.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	Attempts to use frameworks with minimal accuracy achieved or quotes judiciously without linguistic description. Makes basic errors that intrude on communication.	<b>2</b>	Gives simple/generalised/descriptive accounts of the content of texts and data. Paraphrases. Quotes excessively. Gives well selected but unanalysed quotations.
<b>1</b>	Minimal engagement with language of the data. Quotes/refers to data rarely. Has major flaws in language that impede communication.	<b>1</b>	Misunderstands mode/purpose/context/content/meaning significantly.
<b>0</b>	Does not communicate.	<b>0</b>	Does not analyse texts.

<b>Question 01</b>	
<b>Assessment focus:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Analyse</b> how the writers use language to convey their ideas about the music they are reviewing</li> <li>• <b>Evaluate</b> how their different contexts and periods might have shaped the language of the texts.</li> </ul>	
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO2: Demonstrate critical understanding a range of concepts and issues related to the construction and analysis of meanings in spoken and written language</b>
<b>17–20</b>	<p>Demonstrates a conceptualised overview of theories and research.          Analyses and evaluates alternative views.          Identifies and challenges standpoints.          Employs and exploratory/original/evaluative approach.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>explores issues of changing social values: race, sexual orientation, gender, taboo</i></li> <li>• <i>explore ideas of change with understanding of social and cultural contexts</i></li> <li>• <i>evaluate views of language change (eg Aitchison's damp spoon, crumbling castle and infectious disease metaphors) with reference to examples.</i></li> </ul>
<b>13–16</b>	<p>Shows depth or range of knowledge about linguistic concepts, theories and research.          Identifies different views and interpretations.          Comments on others' ideas.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>identify prescriptivist and descriptivist views of the data</i></li> <li>• <i>explore effects of modes, technology and business as causes of variation and change</i></li> <li>• <i>explore effect of sub-cultures.</i></li> </ul>
<b>11–12</b>	<p>Shows detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas/concepts/research.          Develops views on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>develop a supported view about change as natural</i></li> <li>• <i>analyse word formation processes</i></li> <li>• <i>explains semantic shifts.</i></li> </ul>
<b>9–10</b>	<p>Shows knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.          Outlines views on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>distinguish period features, eg proper nouns, music and popular culture terms, gay, coloured.</i></li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	<p>Reveals familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research.          Makes sustained explanations.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>use fields and topics to explain language use</i></li> <li>• <i>explain some graphological differences broadly.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	<p>Shows awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give examples of distinctive language features</i></li> <li>• <i>use ideas about purpose to explain language use.</i></li> </ul>
<b>3–4</b>	<p>Is anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>make a generalised discussion of language change with little linguistic comment/few examples</i></li> <li>• <i>discuss the history of the English language and its development.</i></li> </ul>
<b>1–2</b>	<p>Has little focus on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give a general discussion of social and historical change.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	Shows no understanding of anything concerned with the study of language.

<b>Question 02</b>			
<b>Assessment focus:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyse how the writer of Text C uses language to report on the incidents of drinking and fighting in local pubs.</li> <li>Referring to Text C, Figure 1 and your own studies, explore whether English is likely to develop as a single global language or fragment into different languages.</li> </ul>			
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO1: Select and apply a range of linguistic methods, to communicate relevant knowledge using appropriate terminology and coherent, accurate written expression</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3: Analyse and evaluate the influence of contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken and written language</b>
<b>9–10</b>	Applies accurately a sophisticated and searching range of frameworks in depth to enhance and illuminate understanding. Guides reader structurally and stylistically. Makes very few technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe sentence and clause types and features</li> <li>describe word order and clause elements</li> <li>describe variations from standard with insight.</li> </ul>	<b>13–15</b>	Demonstrates analytical grasp of how language works across different levels. Places analysis in wider contexts. Shows perceptive/conceptualised/illuminating/open-minded approach. Uses interesting and judicious examples and quotation. Evaluates appropriateness/success. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluate clause and sentence structures</li> <li>analyse tone, attitudes or judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	Applies a relevant range of linguistic frameworks, showing some depth and detail, and with rare errors. Develops a line of argument in a controlled linguistic register. Shows firm control of technical accuracy <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe phrase types</li> <li>describe morphological features</li> <li>describe verbs forms and modality</li> <li>describe word classes in detail.</li> </ul>	<b>10–12</b>	Analyses language features, their explanatory context and their communicative impact confidently Makes a subtle interpretation integrating various levels of description. Explores texts' meaning, purpose and effects. Makes evaluative comments which are well supported. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analyse use of non-standard language</li> <li>analyse representation of events</li> <li>explore possible nature of producers.</li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	Applies linguistic frameworks consistently and largely accurately. Communicates clearly with clear topics and paragraphs. Makes infrequent technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe verb moods</li> <li>describe word classes</li> <li>describe pronoun number.</li> </ul>	<b>7–9</b>	Analyses meanings of a range of language features. Analyses context's influence in detail. Engages with texts' communicative intent. Quotes aptly. Makes some evaluative comment tied to textual detail. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analyse direct address and positioning</li> <li>analyse South African context</li> <li>comment on individual words.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	Applies a linguistic framework with some errors. Clarifies some linguistic aims. Describes methodology. Expresses ideas with organisation emerging. Makes occasional technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe basic lexical and semantic features: African words, unusual meanings</li> <li>describe pronouns.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	Understands effect of context. Illustrates some effects of producer/audience/mode/purpose/field. Begins to interpret what text communicates. Illustrates using quotations. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify reporting of violence, drinking</li> <li>identify non-standard features.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	Attempts to use linguistic description with occasional accuracy of description. Conveys basic ideas with some organisation. Frequent errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify formality, complexity, spelling.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	Identifies some features of language variation. Has broad awareness that context has influenced language use. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify information function broadly</li> <li>note genre/geographical origin broadly.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	Attempts to use frameworks with minimal accuracy achieved or quotes judiciously without linguistic description. Makes basic errors that intrude on communication.	<b>2</b>	Gives simple/generalised/descriptive accounts of the content of texts and data. Paraphrases. Quotes excessively. Gives well selected but unanalysed quotations.
<b>1</b>	Minimal engagement with language of the data. Quotes/refers to data rarely. Has major flaws in language that impede communication.	<b>1</b>	Misunderstands mode/purpose/context/content/meaning significantly.
<b>0</b>	Does not communicate.	<b>0</b>	Does not analyse texts.



<b>Question 02</b>	
<b>Assessment focus:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyse how the writer of <b>Text C</b> uses language to report on the incidents of drinking and fighting in local pubs.</li> <li>Referring to <b>Text C</b>, <b>Figure 1</b> and your own studies, explore whether English is likely to develop as a single global language or fragment into different languages.</li> </ul>	
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO2: Demonstrate critical understanding a range of concepts and issues related to the construction and analysis of meanings in spoken and written language</b>
<b>17–20</b>	<p>Demonstrates a conceptualised overview of theories and research.          Analyses and evaluates alternative views.          Identifies and challenges standpoints.          Employs an exploratory/original/evaluative approach.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluate the global importance of AmEng, UKEng and the significance of other Englishes</li> <li>demonstrate overview of social/political contexts for development of social, regional, national and international language</li> <li>evaluate issues of power and control: eg gatekeeping, ownership, post-colonialism</li> <li>conceptualise issues, eg economic, national identity, intelligibility, demographic power, relationships between varieties.</li> </ul>
<b>13–16</b>	<p>Shows depth or range of knowledge about linguistic concepts, theories and research.          Identifies different views and interpretations.          Comments on others' ideas.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explore specific local factors leading to divergence and diversification</li> <li>explore negative attitudes to pidgins and creoles/positive attitudes to standards</li> <li>explore de-standardising power of technology</li> <li>examine code-switching and repertoires</li> <li>make reference to research and others' views</li> <li>explore power of codification, education, technology, communication, effect of standardisation.</li> </ul>
<b>11–12</b>	<p>Shows detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas/concepts/research.          Develops views on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explore the value of WSE</li> <li>explore the communicative functions of English.</li> </ul>
<b>9–10</b>	<p>Shows knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.          Outlines views on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>give broad evidence for likelihood of standardisation of WSE</li> <li>give broad evidence for likelihood of divergent developments.</li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	<p>Reveals familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research.          Makes sustained explanations.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>show understanding of a range of non-standard varieties of English, eg as L2, creoles, pidgins</li> <li>give examples of different forms of English from across the world.</li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	<p>Shows awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify major national varieties</li> <li>give some examples of their features.</li> </ul>
<b>3–4</b>	<p>Is anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>make a generalised discussion of use of English across the world without linguistic comment/examples.</li> </ul>
<b>1–2</b>	<p>Has little focus on linguistic issues.  <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>give a general non-linguistic discussion of global developments and issues.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	Shows no understanding of anything concerned with the study of language.

<b>Question 03</b>			
<b>Assessment focus:</b>			
• <b>Analyse and evaluate how</b> these two articles <b>use language</b> to <b>present</b> their <b>ideas about the language of texting.</b>			
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO1: Select and apply a range of linguistic methods, to communicate relevant knowledge using appropriate terminology and coherent, accurate written expression</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3: Analyse and evaluate the influence of contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken and written language</b>
<b>9–10</b>	Applies accurately a sophisticated and searching range of frameworks in depth to enhance and illuminate understanding. Guides reader structurally and stylistically. Makes very few technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analyse sentence and clause types, patterns and elements</li> <li>organise or synthesise descriptive approaches.</li> </ul>	<b>13–15</b>	Demonstrates analytical grasp of how language works across different levels. Places analysis in wider contexts. Shows perceptive/conceptualised/illuminating/open-minded approach. Uses interesting and judicious examples and quotation. Evaluates appropriateness/success. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluate modality, tense, sentence structures and effects</li> <li>conceptualise/contextualise nature of discourses about change.</li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	Applies a relevant range of linguistic frameworks, showing some depth and detail, and with rare errors. Develops a line of argument in a controlled linguistic register. Shows firm control of technical accuracy <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe word classes in depth: verb tenses, aspect, modals, adverb types, pronoun types</li> <li>describe phrase types.</li> </ul>	<b>10–12</b>	Analyses language features, their explanatory context and their communicative impact confidently Makes a subtle interpretation integrating various levels of description. Explores texts' meaning, purpose and effects. Makes evaluative comments which are well supported. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explore positive/subversive attitudes in E</li> <li>explore Self's positive attitudes</li> <li>explore self-presentation/creation of authority</li> <li>explore how writers convey ideas persuasively</li> <li>characterise ideal reader.</li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	Applies linguistic frameworks consistently and largely accurately. Communicates clearly with clear topics and paragraphs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes infrequent technical errors.</li> </ul> <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe sentence functions</li> <li>describe word classes</li> <li>pronoun number.</li> </ul>	<b>7–9</b>	Analyses meanings of a range of language features. Analyses context's influence in detail. Engages with texts' communicative intent. Quotes aptly. Makes some evaluative comment tied to textual detail. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analyse expression of Self's negative attitudes</li> <li>explain Truss' use of texting</li> <li>analyse positioning of reader, eg inclusiveness.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	Applies a linguistic framework with some errors. Clarifies some linguistic aims. Describes methodology. Expresses ideas with organisation emerging. Makes occasional technical errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>describe pronouns</li> <li>describe basic lexical and semantic features.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	Understands effect of context. Illustrates some effects of producer/audience/mode/purpose/field. Begins to interpret what text communicates. Illustrates using quotations. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explain focus on texting styles</li> <li>analyse personal address to audience.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	Attempts to use linguistic description with occasional accuracy of description. Conveys basic ideas with some organisation. Frequent errors. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify formality, complexity.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	Identifies some features of language variation. Has broad awareness that context has influenced language use. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify inform, argue and entertain functions</li> <li>make broad deductions about audience</li> <li>identify field of texting and language change.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	Attempts to use frameworks with minimal accuracy achieved or quotes judiciously without linguistic description. Makes basic errors that intrude on communication.	<b>2</b>	Gives simple/generalised/descriptive accounts of the content of texts and data. Paraphrases. Quotes excessively. Gives well selected but unanalysed quotations.
<b>1</b>	Minimal engagement with language of the data. Quotes/refers to data rarely. Has major flaws in language that impede communication.	<b>1</b>	Misunderstands mode/purpose/context/content/meaning significantly.
<b>0</b>	Does not communicate.	<b>0</b>	Does not analyse texts.

<b>Question 03</b>	
<b>Assessment focus:</b>	
• <b>Evaluate these ideas</b> about the <b>language of texting</b> , drawing on <b>your knowledge</b> and <b>study of language change</b> .	
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO2: Demonstrate critical understanding a range of concepts and issues related to the construction and analysis of meanings in spoken and written language</b>
<b>17–20</b>	<p>Demonstrates a conceptualised overview of theories and research. Analyses and evaluates alternative views. Identifies and challenges standpoints. Employs an exploratory/original/evaluative approach. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>develop an overview of language change and the language system</i></li> <li>• <i>challenge/evaluate simple ideas of progress/decay</i></li> <li>• <i>challenge/evaluate prescriptivist/descriptivist stances</i></li> <li>• <i>evaluate specific changes as good, bad, neutral</i></li> <li>• <i>evaluate views of Self and Truss.</i></li> </ul>
<b>13–16</b>	<p>Shows depth or range of knowledge about linguistic concepts, theories and research. Identifies different views and interpretations. Comments on others' ideas. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>classify and analyse views in Texts D and E</i></li> <li>• <i>identify and explain prescriptivist and descriptivist views</i></li> <li>• <i>identify and explain dislike of language changes, eg as age-related and conservative</i></li> <li>• <i>identify and explain evolutionary views of language change</i></li> <li>• <i>identify and explain degeneration views of language.</i></li> </ul>
<b>11–12</b>	<p>Shows detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas/concepts/research. Develops views on linguistic issues. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give particular examples of effects of technology in detail: word formation process, spelling patterns, grammar, genres, structures, functions</i></li> <li>• <i>show knowledge of how changes spread and develop, eg wave theory.</i></li> </ul>
<b>9–10</b>	<p>Shows knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research. Outlines views on linguistic issues. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>mention prescriptivist or descriptivist attitudes without illustration/explanation</i></li> <li>• <i>outline own view of change as good/bad/neutral.</i></li> </ul>
<b>7–8</b>	<p>Reveals familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research. Makes sustained explanations. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give explanation of causes of language change, eg cost, speed</i></li> <li>• <i>show awareness of research by name-dropping or undeveloped references.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5–6</b>	<p>Shows awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give linguistic comment on examples eg punctuation, spelling, capitalisation</i></li> <li>• <i>give history of English Language change.</i></li> </ul>
<b>3–4</b>	<p>Is anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>make a generalised discussion of language change without linguistic comment/few examples.</i></li> </ul>
<b>1–2</b>	<p>Has little focus on linguistic issues. <i>Candidates are likely to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>give a general discussion of social and technological changes.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows no understanding of anything concerned with the study of language.</li> </ul>