OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

AS LEVEL

Examiners' report

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

H070

For first teaching in 2015

H070/01 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 1 series overview

The paper contains two questions with no optionality. Candidates demonstrate their ability to apply analytical tools to texts in varying modes.

Question 1 requires candidates to spend approximately 10 minutes reading an unseen text and then construct a purposeful, data-driven analysis of the use of language levels within the text, linking that analysis to apposite contextual understanding to comment on why the writer has used certain features. The brevity of this task demands that candidates use skill and confidence to make insightful judgements about what to include and what not to cover. Selection and organisation of material is as critical as offering precise, succinct explorations. Candidates often tend to rely on formulaic level-by-level analysis which tends to obscure the most interesting linguistic patterns. Standing back from the text and thinking hard about context before diving into word-level analysis will allow candidates to make judicious choices about where the richest material can be found. In this series, candidates were offered a Naked Wines marketing email to explore.

Question 2 focuses on exploring linguistic connections and comparisons between different modes of communication. One spoken text will always be included and, for this paper, the candidates were offered a transcription from a *News at Ten* bulletin. Their companion text was a topically linked opinion article. Candidates are invited to explore the effects of mode across the two texts, focusing on linguistic features and the ways contexts and concepts shape and inform their reading of text construction. Mode, structure, audience and purpose can all be used as frameworks to contrast the use of linguistic levels across the texts. More successful responses usually construct a side-by-side comparison of the two texts, blending comments about AO1 and AO3 to demonstrate solid understanding of the differences between modes.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:
• Divided their time across both questions appropriately.	• Used language levels as a formulaic checklist.
• Gave equal weighting to both texts in Question 2.	• Offered redundant introductions and/or conclusions.
• Selected the most appropriate linguistic features for discussion.	• Wrote uneconomically.
• Wrote with precision.	• Considered isolated pieces of evidence without relating them to the whole.
• Weighed up a range of data in context.	• Labelled features incorrectly.
• Were tentative in their judgements.	• Offer over-generalised conclusions about audience and purpose.
	• Offered simplistic judgements about context.

Section A

Question 1

Read **Text A** in your **Resource Booklet** and answer the following question.

1   Giving careful consideration to the context of the text, identify and analyse features taken from different language levels.   **[24]**

All candidates understood the purpose and broad audience of the Naked Wines text which seemed to be accessible to candidates at all achievement levels.

Many understood the synthetic relationship that the text was designed to reinforce but more successful responses were able to consider more fulsomely how this relationship was being constructed. The use of the vocative, Adam, was noted by many as was the nature of mail-merge communication and the persona of Eamon. Surprisingly few candidates identified the implications of 'wine guy'. In considering the construction of this relationship, centres are reminded to encourage candidates to insert their conceptual knowledge with a light touch – less successful responses often overstate learned knowledge such as Fairclough's theories at the expense of retaining precise focus on data analysis.

Candidates wrote at length about the use of colloquial terms but analysis of register is a key differentiator. Those candidates able to see mixed register and who can contrast the use of terms such as 'WAY', 'crikey' and 'chinwag' with more subtle manipulation of terms that imply class belonging – 'further ado', 'stonking' 'a bit barking'- were able to offer more insightful analysis of the inferred 'club' to which the customer now belongs.

Many candidates understood the need for Naked Wines to use marketing techniques to ensure their customer continues to buy product but were not always able to go beyond straightforward understanding to see how the language was implicating the customer in that financial relationship – for example, with the generous 'top up' to the account or with phrases such as 'Insider prices'.

Graphological features such as the bullet points were very frequently cited but such features in and of themselves are not necessarily helpful lines of enquiry. Simple comments about the bullet listing reinforcing the quantity of benefits available to the email recipient were not often developed. Much of the linguistic interest in the bullet points was therefore lost, including 'Angel-only', 'Insider prices', 'premium' or 'wine nuts' where richer material was available for exploration.

Less successful responses tended to feature-spot for elements to label (the colloquial nature of 'quid', for example). This often leads to isolation of individual language elements but doesn't create a conceptualised response regarding the purpose of the language as a whole, nor the way it is being shaped by context. Those candidates who saw the manipulative chumminess and inferred exclusivity in the text tended to get a lot further in their insights. It has been said before in examiner reports for this component that the best responses to this task always seek to work from the text outwards, rather than fitting the text to pre-learned knowledge or frameworks.

It was impressive to see the range which some students covered, when they only had around thirty minutes to write their answer. Many responses considered a number of language levels, and found valid and often interesting comments to make.

Exemplar 1

1. Text A is an email sent on behalf of Naked Wines to thank a new member of their company. The tone of this email is informal and friendly, it doesn't seem to attempt to maintain a professional distance between the text producer and receiver. The immediate address 'Hello Adam' is direct, as well as synthetic personalisation in the first line 'you've got your wings'. This might make 'Adam' feel the email was written for him especially, as opposed to a mass produced email for all new members. The email is ended with 'Cheers', aligning with the lexical field of alcohol distribution company, that feels as though you are sitting drinking with a friend. The relaxed register is furthered with the sign off from 'Eamon, Wine Guy'. The use of only first names keeps the email intimate and amicable.

Although this email is planned and edited text, prosodic features are added with the purpose of a colloquial feel. For example, a neologism 'have a clinwag' or minor sentence 'Enjoy.' are informal as though the text producer is aiming to build a friendship with their new members. This is probably to keep them on board with their company. so they will continue to spend their money on their wines. Furthermore, adjectives such as 'stonking' and 'scrumptious' persuade the reader of their

great quality wines.

As this text is an ~~em~~ online email, the paragraphs are very short, some just one sentence long. This could be due to the fact it will be read on ~~&~~ a small screen such as a phone or tablet. No one will bother to read long, wordy paragraphs this is why simple sentences ~~are used~~ and ~~language~~ (high frequency lexis ~~is used~~) are used. For instance, the first sentence 'The great day's here - you've got your wings and £20 extra on me.' is broken up into three clauses and is written in bold. This well help ~~the~~ the text receiver to see the key information immediately and engage them to read on. Appeal to ethos is seen with monetary values such as '£20' or '25% to 50% off' giving the producer authority and credibility. This is also done with their company name ~~Naked Writers~~ 'Naked Wines' and becoming 'an Angel'. An almost divine authority is created through deistic lexis as the new member gets their 'wings' and the 'blissful contentment' that comes with tasting their wines.

The text producer, Eamon, writes on behalf of his company 'Naked Wines'. ~~The use of bold text from~~ The email comes across as very friendly and not as a widely produced

email. Idioms are used, 'put my money where my mouth is' and 'got you over the finishing line'. These add to the conversational tone of the extract.

The purpose of this email initially is to thank the receiver for joining. This ~~is shown~~ gratitude is ~~shown through~~ shown through exclamation marks and repeated 'thanks'. However, they are clearly trying to advertise themselves, they write 'thanks for being so patient in the queue'. We can infer from this the popularity of their company and that they have many other clients. The benefits of their company are listed with ~~a~~ short bullet points. For example, declaratives such as 'when you order a case' assume a level of confidence, that comes across to the receiver that they should purchase a case of their wine. ~~Also~~ Modifier chains ~~are used~~ such as 'passionate independent winemakers' and 'WAY better quality wine' that also utilises capitalisation and superlatives. These create a level of influential power as their aim shifts towards selling their product as opposed to thanking them for ~~being~~ joining Naked Wines.

Their company feels accessible as they share a hyperlink to their email address and phone number, should their customer need it.

The candidate's opening is purposeful and immediately analytical. The suggestion that the email is designed to make you think you are drinking with a friend is perceptive and a useful frame for the rest of the discussion. The candidate helpfully notes the inclusion of features which mimic spoken discourse to create the 'chummy' relationship and correctly labels word classes such as adjectives. It is rare for candidates to comment further on lexical choices and this candidate does not always go beyond identification. It was also rare for candidates to explore the angel metaphor successfully as this candidate does - the comment regarding divine authority is insightful. Few candidates explored the implication of the wines being 'Naked'.

The candidate is less insightful on sentence structure and whole text structuring but the on-screen functionality is a useful suggestion in relation to context. The candidate slips into feature spotting with the paragraph on idioms – here, a more developed response would identify how idioms combine with other features of the register to construct a trustworthy non-corporate persona for the purchaser to interact with. The comment about what is inferred by the mention of the queue is a stronger example of the candidate making incisive comments about language in relation to context.

Concepts are deftly handled with the candidate not labouring points on ethos or influential power.

This response achieved marks in Level 5 for both AO1 and AO3.

Section B

Question 2

Read **Texts B** and **C** in your **Resource Booklet** and answer the following question.

2   Using appropriate linguistic concepts and methods, analyse the ways in which language is used in these two texts. In your answer you should:

- explore connections and variations between the texts

- consider how contextual factors contribute to the construction of meaning.   **[36]**

Almost all candidates understood the nature of news format and were generally comfortable with TV news discourse. The *News at Ten* 'bongs' have surprising cultural reach and provided a key anchor to candidates in both texts. Readings of the transcript, however, tended to take the report at face value as formal news. The informality discussed in Text C was not usually translated to a reading of Text B where, understandably, candidates tended to still see 'formal' discourse. One dimensional assumptions about the audience for Text B were often offered – candidates see demographics in very sweeping terms, frequently identifying all 'old people' as being interested in the news.

All candidates understood that Text B was informative and many were able to recognise that, despite the spoken mode of the text, Bradby's language would have been shaped by a script. The sensational nature of news was reflected in strong responses with the mix of factual and emotive language being considered. At a simple level, candidates commented frequently on the emotional nature of the Italian footage with 'Oh God' often cited. Discourse structure was a helpful framework for many candidates with the greetings, headlines, use of journalists and cameras allowing candidates to make sound connections between AO1 and AO3. Features such as micropauses tended to attract candidates' interest more than the linguistic nature of the transcript – again, less successful responses sought features to identify and label at a simple level to allow them straightforward entry into data analysis. However, more successful responses considered the use of lexis, register and tone as well as these more obvious functions of spoken mode.

Text C offered greater challenge to candidates and many responses to Question 2 were not balanced across both texts as a result. Candidates were sometimes able to identify the 'broadsheet' nature of the Independent and a few attempted to comment on its political leaning with some suggesting a lack of bias due to its 'independent' nature.

The mimicking of the 'bongs' for comedic effect was considered by many and many candidates relied heavily on the discourse in this opening paragraph for their discussion. Fewer candidates were able to successfully frame their understanding of O'Grady's cheeky tone, constructed using spoken discourse markers – 'So'; 'Actually…'; 'But now look' - alongside his use of low frequency terms within a mixed register. While most were not known to the candidature, the referencing of former news presenters was frequently cited as cultural references that engaged the – 'older' – audience.

Comparisons relied on contrasting generic features of spoken and written mode with less successful responses variously citing features of one mode which did or did not appear in the paired text. Few candidates were able to relate the content of Text C to the discourse of Text B in a meaningful way. As for Question 1, where candidates rely less on learned frameworks and approach the texts in the paper with fresh and informed eyes, they are often more likely to identify the most meaningful points of interest for exploration.

These examiner reports have previously highlighted the most successful approaches to this challenging comparative task. Candidates who track discourse – comparing beginning, middle and end – often achieve balanced coverage of both texts. As for Question 1, the formulaic listing of language levels is as unhelpful for Question 2 as it is for Question 1, particularly as this generates an approach that merely identifies what one text has which the other lacks. Insightful comparisons are often generated by highlighting a shared contextual factor – such as the audience's engagement with the news, for example – and then considering how the specific linguistic features in the text manipulate, construct or impact, that engagement.

Exemplar 2

2.		Text B is a written transcript of a spoken
		excerpt from ITV News at Ten. It would have
		been broadcast live with the purpose of
		informing it's audience of the most current
		news and affairs. The late night TV is signalled
		with phatic language 'Good evening' before
		Bradby begins his account. Text C is a written
		article of from The Independent online, there
		is a sense that the purpose is more to entertain and
		give opinion on current affairs than Text B, which
		is much more formal. The receiver of Text B
		will be someone who has tuned in to watch the
		~~text~~ news at 10pm, perhaps a middle class audience,
		with a level of education that renders them interested
		in current affairs. Text C is on The Independents'
		website, and might have been deliberately searched
		for suggesting a higher level of interest in politics
		or Tom Bradby specifically.
		There are three speakers in Text B, the
		voiceover, Tom Bradby and the reporter who is
		independent to the Genoa bridge crash. Bradby
		directs the ~~too~~ live account and although there
		are ~~sp~~ three speakers, it is not a conversation.
		Speech is broken up by 'Big Ben news gong
		sounds'. This will give a sense of importance
		and authority to a watcher. The 'gong' marks
		every new piece of news, giving a sense

of structure to the observer and reminds them to listen in. Big Ben is an iconic London landmark, near the houses of parliament thereby giving credibility to the report. In Text C there is an image of Bradby, he is stood just left of the centre, smiling looking fairly relaxed and approachable. This image aligns with the context, which discusses his promotion. Authority is given to the image as he is wearing a smart suit. We can infer a similar level of authority to Bradby in Text B as the camera focuses in 'Bradby in news studio' although we cannot see him a professional sense is maintained.

Both Text B and Text C uses high frequency lexis ~~with different subject specific~~ that allow for accessibility and ease of the listener or reader. Text B uses lexis typical of a news bulletin, for instance 'search for clues' or 'police quickly swooped in' this feels like speech as its colloquial language. Bradby is likely to be reading off of a screen or have pre-planned notes on what to say. In this way his speech is semi spontaneous, as we see spoken language features in his report. For example, emphatic stress is shown through bold text 'yes really' that gives a spoken quality to the report

that makes it different from simply passively reading off his notes. Text C will be planned and professionally edited. The tone is more sensational and gossipy with spoken features added in deliberately for a chatty effect. For example, parenthesis '(The website isn't up to much, either)' as though the text producer has told an extra snippet or secret to make the text receiver feel as though they are in on something. This is different to Text B which although spoken is more formal and direct.

Text C uses opinion, for example 'handsome presents' and 'I am delighted' which feel personal as though we are in a discussion with Sean O'Grady who is writing on behalf of The Independent. Taboo language is used for humour, the 'bulbous red hooter' of Burrett or the ~~strong Holiways~~ *adjectival phrase* adverb 'slurry' implies the past presenters as drunk. This is not the case in Text B, however opinion is given, as the two warehouses were 'mercifully closed'. ~~A~~ *and* 'miraculously'. ~~But in a discussion back would be~~ of. However, this is likely to be a majoritative opinion as it is in reference to lives being saved. There is an element of persuasion as Ben Stokes 'sensationally cleared'. This is certainly an opinion and the text receiver would infer he

should not have been cleared of his actions. This suggests a slightly biased account from ~~the independent~~ ITV, that you would not get from neutral ~~text~~ news producers such as the BBC.

The term 'recovery' in Text C's title suggests an illness or struggle that has been overcome by ~~relevant~~ ITV. They have 'revamped'. Other news anchors are referenced as well as some vague statistics 'some four million viewers', this creates some level of authority and professionalism but fails to fully convince me of their knowledge.

We know Text C is online due to the date 'Monday 2 November 2015' that will tell the text receiver that this is current up to date news. As well as this, we get the authors' handle '@~SeanOgrady' giving him a platform for discussion of his article.

Figurative language is used in Text B for example verb 'crashing down' and 'plunge downwards'. This creates dramatic effect in the report as the 'structure collapsed'. The adverbs 'desperately loping' create a sense of emotion and appeal to pathos as they struggle to save peoples lives. However Text C is more

relaxed. They make jokes at the expense of other TV presenters and conclude 'personality does matter'. As well as this, onomatopoeia 'BONG' is used ironically to mimic the news structure, similar to Text B. Text C uses this to give news bulletin-like authority to their writing. watch the authority of a real news bulletin.

The candidate opens with valid comments on context – assumptions about audience and purpose are suitably tentative. There is clear understanding of TV news discourse and how the interaction between speakers operates in Text B and the comment on Big Ben generating credibility is valid. The candidate does well to contrast this framing with the text-image cohesion in Text C to suggest that the use of a formal suit in the picture also lends authority to the newsreader being discussed – although this is somewhat undermined in the text itself.

Discourse features are contrasted well. The candidate notes the semi-spontaneous nature of the *News at Ten* transcript and contrasts this with the chatty tenor generated in Text C with spoken discourse features. The discussion is framed well here and models a route that does not merely aim at feature spotting. There is some awkward focus where the candidate comments on the drunk demeanour of news presenters being discussed in Text C but 'not.. in Text B' however the candidate is attempting to contrast use of opinion, again framing their analysis through shared contextual factors rather than listed language levels.

Not everything is accurately labelled but the response is nonetheless worthy of a strong Level 5 mark for all Assessment Objectives. The links made are conceptual and there is strong understanding of context in relation to linguistic patterns.

Supporting you

Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website.

Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates.
If you haven't already, sign up here.

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website or visit OCR professional development.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. Find out more.

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an Interchange username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

Find out more.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit
- **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**
- **ocr.org.uk**
- **/ocrexams**
- **/ocrexams**
- **/company/ocr**
- **/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.

I like this **I dislike this**

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.