



GCSE MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2016

**ENGLISH/ENGLISH LANGUAGE
UNIT 1: READING (HIGHER TIER)
4171/02**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2016 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

GCSE ENGLISH/ENGLISH LANGUAGE

UNIT 1: READING – HIGHER TIER (40 marks)

Look at the first page of the newspaper report in the separate Resource Material: 'Mud and barbed-wire hurdles: It's the extreme fitness trial,' by Peta Bee.

1 1 What are Peta Bee's thoughts and feelings about Tough Mudder events? **[10]**

This question tests knowledge and use of text and inference / interpretation. It also tests appreciation of language.

0 marks: nothing worthy of credit.

Give 1 mark to those who make simple comments with occasional reference to the text, or copy unselectively. These answers will struggle to engage with the text and/or the question.

Give 2-4 marks, according to quality, to those who make simple comments based on surface features of the text, and/or show awareness of more straightforward implicit meaning. These answers may be thin or tending to be unselective in their choice of textual material.

Give 5-7 marks, according to quality, to those who select appropriate detail from the text to show clear understanding. These answers should be mostly secure in their focus on the question. Better answers should sustain a valid interpretation and be at least beginning to make inferences.

Give 8-10 marks, according to quality, to those who select appropriate detail from the text to sustain a valid interpretation. These answers should be thorough as well as methodical, covering a range of points accurately.

Some points candidates may explore:

- she reiterates the point that the event is insane "madness" "lunatic" "deranged"
- she thinks people who take part have strange motives "it's weirder still if you try it"
- she thinks it is dangerous "perilous hidden trenches" "brutally cold" "deadly"
- dirty / filthy
- she feels it is mentally challenging "psychological ordeal" / she thinks it causes huge emotional swings "One moment I'm calm"
- she feels it is exhausting/draining "staggering" "throbbing limbs" – it hurts "painful"
- she thinks the different obstacles are extreme "water-slide into a pond so shockingly icy"
- physically demanding/gruelling she has "to remind myself to breathe" / "ultra endurance trial"
- she feels participants are challenged "only three quarters of starters cross the finish line" – it is challenging
- it can be completed by a range of people "competitors come in all shapes and sizes"
- overcoming fears and working as a team is part of the experience
- she thinks the events make you feel like you have achieved "sense of accomplishment."

Overview

- she thinks those who participate are completely mad
- she recognises how enjoyable and rewarding these events can be
- varies from straightforward to hugely challenging / very different to 'normal' events

Reward valid alternatives. This is not a checklist and the question should be marked in levels of response.

Now look at the second page of the newspaper report.

1 2

According to the second page of the report, why do people take part in Tough Mudder events? [10]

This question tests knowledge and use of text and inference. It also tests appreciation of language.

0 marks: nothing worthy of credit.

Give 1 mark to those who make simple comments or unsupported assertions with occasional reference to the text, or copy unselectively. These answers will struggle to engage with the question and/or the text.

Give 2-4 marks, according to quality, to those who make simple comments based on surface features of the text or show some limited development. These answers may be thin or tending to be unselective in their choice of textual material.

Give 5-7 marks, according to quality, to those who reach a valid, sensible explanation based on a range of appropriate evidence from the text. These answers should show understanding and some cohesion.

Give 8-10 marks, according to quality, to those who reach a detailed and well-considered interpretation based on methodical exploration of the text. These answers should be thorough, selective and coherent.

General points:

- the events have been designed to be sociable as other events are “pretty antisocial”
- so many people are taking part in them/popular “more than two million people”
- they have been designed to offer a “challenge”
- they are enjoyable “really good fun” (unlike boring running / cycling)
- they offer collaboration/people work together “This is about camaraderie, teamwork.”
- you can miss obstacles – not forced to do anything you can't / don't want to do
- it is thrilling for the participants “mental exhilaration” / “doing something you had previously thought impossible.”
- they are new, exciting and unique “people want something different”
- they offer a wealth of positive emotions, “a sense of achievement” / feel amazing “pride”
- rewards at the end “free pint of beer” “orange Tough Mudder survivors’ headband”
- doesn't physically exhaust you like a marathon
- allows you to tell a really good story / show off

Overview

- it offers a real physical and mental challenge
- it brings great emotional/mental rewards
- it brings out the best qualities in people

Reward valid alternatives. This is not a checklist and the question should be marked in levels of response.

Now look at the internet article on the opposite page: 'Tough Mudder wasn't so tough – in fact I enjoyed it,' written by Stuart Heritage.

1 3

How does Stuart Heritage convince us that he enjoyed the Tough Mudder event? [10]

This question tests the ability to follow an argument, distinguish between fact and opinion and evaluate how information is presented.

0 marks: nothing worthy of credit.

Give 1 mark to those who make unsupported assertions or simple comments with occasional reference to the text, or copy unselectively. These answers will struggle to engage with the question and/or the text.

Give 2-4 marks, according to quality, to those who make simple comments based on surface features of the text and/or show limited development. These answers may be thin or tending to be unselective in their choice of textual material, or use unsupported/inappropriate spotting of devices.

Give 5-7 marks, according to quality, to those who make valid comments based on a selection of appropriate detail from the text. These answers will probably rely on spotting factual content. Better answers may show some awareness of authorial method and/or language, although they may rely on spotting key words and phrases.

Give 8-10 marks, according to quality, to those who explore the text in detail and make valid comments/inferences. The best answers should combine specific detail with overview and show understanding of authorial method and/or language.

Some points candidates may explore:

- tells us he was initially “reluctant” but has clearly now changed/been converted
- experienced Tough Mudders tried to persuade him that it “wouldn't be that bad.” So he apologises to them
- tells us it was not as expected “it really wasn't that tough. Or muddy.” - humour
- he is really honest in his approach “I'll admit that I found elements of it hard”
- you don't need to be superfit “vaguely out-of-shape...only been running... five months”
- sounds like great fun – appeals to inner child “Disneyland” “would-be soldier fantasies” – like a funfair
- people are quick to sign up again reinforcing the positive experience they have had
- shares the negatives then tells us he would do it again “In a heartbeat”
- the whole event is expertly managed “couldn't have been better organised”
- the atmosphere is “fantastic”
- the other participants are great “teamwork and camaraderie”
- no unhealthy competitiveness
- tells us he was “terrified” suggesting he now feels differently
- makes it sound very straightforward “But it was fine. It was a lovely day out. “Time of his life”
- enjoys the fact that it didn't last too long
- expresses desire to do more of these types of events “I might be a little bit into this” “what should I try next?”
- “what could be better than that?” suggests it is undisputedly enjoyable

Method:

- honest, frank and open style/tone
- humour used to tone down the challenge “Trying to work out where the car was parked” “Mini Petes”
- reinforces the idea of a team “20,000 of us”
- constant repetition of “teamwork” and the reinforcement of many other positive qualities
- language is lively, buoyant and positive
- the text is structured to contrast between his fearful perception of the event and the Disneyland fun.
- use of rhetorical questions “what could be better than that” to show this is the best event
- enjoyed it because he was prepared for the worst and ended up with “a lovely day out”
- shares all of his doubts with the reader to show that he has changed his mind

Reward valid alternatives. This is not a checklist and the question should be marked in levels of response.

To answer the next question you will need to refer to both texts.

1 4

Compare and contrast what the two writers say about the dangers of Tough Mudder.

[10]

You must make it clear from which text you get your information.

This question tests the ability to select material appropriate to purpose and to collate material from different sources.

0 marks: nothing worthy of credit.

Give 1 mark to those who copy unselectively. These answers will struggle to engage with the question and/or the texts (fail to identify writers/texts).

Give 2-4 marks, according to quality, to those who identify the texts/writers and see a limited range of points and show the ability to collate and select information.

Give 5-7 marks, according to quality, to those who identify the texts/writers, see a range of valid points and organise their answer clearly and appropriately. These answers will collate materials from different sources.

Give 8-10 marks, according to quality, to those who identify the texts/writers, see a wide range of valid points and organise their answers clearly and appropriately. These clear and coherent answers will collate material from different sources, making comparisons and cross-references.

Some points that candidates may include:

Stuart Heritage / internet article

- hypothermia inducing ice bath / extreme temperatures
- electrocution
- dehydration
- can fall off a 13ft wall and 'black out' / heights
- man died while competing
- likelihood of broken bones
- danger of underwater activities

Peta Bee / newspaper report

- perilous hidden trenches / tunnels
- any reference to freezing water
- barbed wire
- grown men buckle and collapse / electric shocks
- broken leg
- 13ft wall to be sealed
- dangerously stopped breathing (for several seconds)
- battered and bruised
- racing through flames

Both

- broken bones
- electrocution
- icy water

Reward valid alternatives. This is not a checklist and the question should be marked in levels of response.

GCSE English/English Language Unit 1 (Reading) - Higher Tier MS (June 2016)