



**A Level English Language**

**H470/02** Dimensions of linguistic variation

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration:** 2 hours 30 minutes

**MAXIMUM MARK**      **80**

**This document consists of 25 pages**

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

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

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

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the Scoris 50% and 100% deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, by email or via the Scoris messaging system.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**  
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

**Longer Answer Questions** (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:
  - there is nothing written in the answer space.

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The Scoris **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.** If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the Scoris messaging system or e-mail.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to your Team Leader (Supervisor) by the end of the marking period. The Assistant Examiner's Report Form (AERF) can be found on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support. Your report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

## 10. 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
	Assessment Objective 1
	Assessment Objective 2
	Assessment Objective 3
	Assessment Objective 4
	Attempted or insecure
	Implicit or vague

**INTRODUCTION**

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

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

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

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

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



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

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

### WEIGHTING OF ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

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

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

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

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

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

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

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

**PAPER-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: H470/02 Dimensions of linguistic variation**

Candidates answer all the questions on the paper. The paper addresses assessment objectives 1-4:  
Assessment Objectives AO1 and AO2 are addressed in question 1.  
Assessment Objectives AO2 and AO3 are addressed in question 2.  
Assessment Objectives AO1, AO3 and AO4 are addressed in question 3.  
AO5 is assessed in components 1 and 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 transcript from a private data source.</b> Rob is aged three. He is playing with some toys and talking to his grandfather.</p> <p><b>Using the appropriate terminology to explain your findings, examine the language development stage of the child-participant as evidenced in the transcript. You should identify and analyse the phonology, grammar and meaning of his utterances.</b></p> <p><b>Use your knowledge of theories and concepts of child language acquisition to support your answer.</b></p> <p><i>Meaning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob uses labelling correctly ‘cards’/ b u: ns / [balloons] – and also numbers and the determiner ‘some’ and ‘all’ and ‘lots’.</li> <li>• Rob initiates and directs the play despite his grandfather’s objections, ‘I’m not [playing] (.) I’ve played nine or ten times already’.</li> <li>• Rob notices and addresses the family dog as an additional significant presence, repeating ‘mister doggie’.</li> <li>• Rob repeats the first-person pronoun ‘I’ throughout; his focus is on what he is doing and on the ways in which he expects his grandfather to participate/support him.</li> </ul>	20	<p><i>Phonology:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is consonant cluster reduction ‘/sæp/’ and ‘/f i: /’.</li> <li>• There is addition/ the use of the diminutive ‘doggie’, which is repeated.</li> <li>• Deletion as well as consonant cluster reduction on ‘/peɪŋ/’.</li> <li>• There is further repetition throughout: ‘/sæp/ /sæp/’, ‘lots of /b u: ns/ are coming up’; the first time this appears to be related to reduplication, prompted by enjoyment of imagining the turtle’s ‘voice’; the second seems more directive, perhaps as a means of informing/exerting conversational control.</li> <li>• Rob uses largely standard pronunciation; the non-standard words tend to be those which are repeated.</li> <li>• Several words are stressed, indicating prosodic variation/emphasis, particularly imperatives, ‘<u>look</u>’, ‘<u>now watch me</u>’, ‘<u>go</u>’.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grammar:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of Rob’s utterances are short telegraphic constructions ‘I going to hide’/‘that go there’, showing age/stage-characteristic omission of auxiliary verbs (could also suggest innatism).</li> <li>• Rob makes use of the inclusive personal pronoun ‘we’ to help him involve his grandfather in the game ‘come on then (.) here we all going (.)’.</li> <li>• Having done this, he switches to direct address ‘you catch’.</li> <li>• Rob uses a range of dynamic verbs e.g. ‘throw’, ‘catch’</li> </ul>

			<p>(and past tense 'caught'), hide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob employs a range of determiners including numbers, 'some', and 'all'. He also counts up to six and appears to manage the card sorting '/f i: / [three] each'.</li> <li>• Some use of concrete nouns 'cards', '/b u: ns/[balloons]' reflecting topic/activity.</li> <li>• Rob uses the present progressive 'lots of /b u: ns/ are coming up' (could link to Brown/acquisition of the -ing morpheme) as well as the present simple 'I want it' and past simple 'I caught it'.</li> <li>• Rob uses standard syntax (e.g. <i>subject-verb-object</i>) appropriately ('I got it now'/'I hide all of the /b u: ns/').</li> </ul> <p><b>There may be specific relevant comment on the grandparent's interventions; these should be rewarded (although the focus needs to remain with the child participant). For example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The grandfather uses a mixture of interrogative, imperative and declarative sentence functions ('are you', 'come over here Rob', 'I can see you') to assist Rob in his games but also to guide him and provide boundaries.</li> <li>• He also recasts Rob's refusal 'no' as a question, perhaps giving him chance to reflect.</li> <li>• He also successfully diverts Rob's attention from the card game (albeit briefly) by throwing him a balloon.</li> </ul>
Question	Guidance	Marks	Text features
1	<p><i>Concepts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob's initial utterances seem to relate to Halliday's imaginative function of language; later his language becomes more directive, e.g. 'you catch' (regulatory function)</li> <li>• Rob's non-standard utterances, such as 'here</li> </ul>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the utterances include or revolve around the cards and/or balloons (and dog, to a lesser extent), supporting Nelson's findings that nouns/naming words represent 60% of children's early word production.</li> <li>• Possible links with innatism e.g. universal grammar: Rob's use of simple S+V+O construction 'I going to hide some...'; also shows common omission of auxiliary.</li> </ul>

	<p>we all going', would not have been copied (supports Chomsky).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The grandfather's interaction with Rob provides scaffolding (Bruner) throughout and positive attention/encouragement (Skinner).</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rob's use of imperatives/directives '<u>now watch me</u>' could be related to Goodwin's research on male assertions of power</li><li>• Use of 'mister' for doggie could be seen as a form of over-extension (Aitchison/Rescorla).</li><li>• Capacity for imaginative play also suggests cognitive development (link to Piaget) and the balloon-hiding/revealing resonates with hide and seek games centred on object permanence. A more direct example of this is Rob's repeated utterance 'you can't see me now'.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--

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

Decide on a mark for AO1 out of 10, and then a separate mark for AO2 out of 10. Add the two marks together to reach a total out of 20 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different bands for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

Level	AO1	Mark	AO2	Mark
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assured reference to a wide range of language features, with appropriate and well-selected examples which support a focussed analysis.</li> <li>The response will be enhanced by consistently accurate use of a wide range of appropriate terminology; writing is in a secure academic register.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make assured reference to stages of development explained and explored effectively, with well-selected examples.</li> <li>The response will make discerning/perceptive links to theory or concepts in a way that suggests assured understanding of the relationship between theory and practice.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make consistently accurate and sustained reference to a range of language features, with appropriate examples and developed analyses.</li> <li>The response will make consistently accurate use of a range of appropriate terminology to enhance the response; written expression is coherent.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make consistently accurate reference to stages of development with appropriate examples and an analysis which demonstrates awareness of the complexity of the processes involved.</li> <li>The response will consistently connect the elements of the participants' language usage with a variety of concepts/ theories in a way that suggests secure understanding of the relationship between theory and practice.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make generally accurate and developed reference to language features from the three levels specified in the question, with appropriate examples.</li> <li>Accurate use of appropriate terminology will enhance the response; written expression is clear.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make generally accurate reference to stages of development, with appropriate examples and supporting comment or explanation.</li> <li>The response will connect the elements of the participants' language usage with concepts and theories in a way that is valid and relevant.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>

Level	AO1	Mark	AO2	Mark
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will identify some relevant language features, though only exploring two out of the three levels specified in the question, with appropriate examples and relevant comments.</li> <li>Appropriate terminology will be used accurately, although the range of terminology will be limited; written expression has some errors but the meaning remains apparent.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make some accurate reference/s to stages of development, with some explanation or appropriate examples.</li> <li>The response will make valid connections between elements of the participants' language usage and concepts or theory.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will accurately identify features of the material, but will make very few relevant or valid points about these features. The response may cover only one of the language levels specified in the question.</li> <li>Little or no accurate use of appropriate terminology; writing may at times obscure meaning.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response will make little or basic reference to stages of language development.</li> <li>Few if any valid links between elements of participants' language and appropriate stage/s of development or other relevant concepts.</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	Marks	Text features
2	<p><b>Text B</b> is an extract from an online article posted on October 10<sup>th</sup> 2012, in the section of a BBC website where advice and information about web usage is provided for the general public.</p> <p><b>Using your understanding of relevant ideas and concepts, investigate how language features and contextual factors construct meanings in this text.</b></p> <p>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</p> <p>The text is multi-modal, and its topic spyware, rooting it firmly within the realm of technology. This article will raise issues about the nature and representation of computer technology; some candidates may also choose to link it to power, as it is posted on the BBC's website and is being presented as an authoritative and trustworthy guide. It makes interesting use of language to represent the power of technology too, another possible interpretation that should be rewarded. Because the article deals with content which relates to computer technology, candidates would be expected to comment on the electronic context of the text as well as its BBC provenance. The issue of language change is also pertinent, and candidates may refer to neologisms emerging from new technology, and so on.</p>	24	<p><b>Possibilities are provided below for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accompanying image, which includes what appears to be a pair of binoculars, reinforces the message of the written text, for example the adverb 'secretly' is used twice in the first two paragraphs.</li> <li>• Mixed register – includes some mildly informal elements e.g. elision (they're); starting sentence with a connective 'But there are also some malicious programs...'</li> <li>• Some temporal cohesion – superlative 'earliest' and past tense verbs ('did'/'used'), followed by the adverb 'still' and present tense verbs ('goes on'/'is').</li> <li>• Mainly vocative voice – 'you' – creates a sense of discussion with helpful ally 'you may never know'.</li> <li>• Graphological features that are characteristic of genre e.g. links to social media.</li> <li>• Lexical fields of technology, 'functionality', 'freeware', 'passwords', reflecting topic.</li> <li>• Inclusion of technology-related neologisms e.g. 'spyware', 'freeware' – (noun + suffix) – language change/Tim Shortis.</li> <li>• Compounding including use of prefixes 'anti-virus', 'anti-spyware'.</li> </ul> <p>Pragmatics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represents computer viruses as morally bankrupt – they are 'imposters' which aim 'to trap as many people as possible'; the viruses are 'very dangerous' and offers of</li> </ul>

		<p>free software are likely to be 'fraudulent'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interestingly the emphasis is on the programs rather than the people who create them; the systems/functions are foregrounded and personified.</li> <li>• The article plays on readers' fears about online privacy; there is an assumption about their attitudes in relation to this.</li> <li>• Authorship is represented as a joint endeavour ('the WebWise Team'); emphasis on the collective approach may connote power/expertise (this authorship is presumably a familiar feature for regular readers).</li> <li>• Audience not necessarily expert – definition of spyware ('Spyware' is the generic name...) would be unnecessary if so.</li> <li>• The BBC is representing itself as purveyor of reliable information which readers can use to combat misinformation from fraudulent companies. These are represented as lacking the BBC's solidity; unlike the untrustworthy sites, 'more established sites have their reputation to maintain, so their guarantees can usually be relied upon... it's a good idea to download only from reputable software sites'; implicit reference to influential power (Fairclough).</li> <li>• Repetition of modal auxiliary 'can' reflects purpose of advising reader of possible courses of action available to them.</li> <li>• Transactional text</li> <li>• Assumption of shared values, 'what you do on your computer – could link with Fairclough's synthetic personalisation.</li> <li>• Article highlights, implicitly, the computer users ongoing need to navigate safety, privacy, cost etc – reference to taking information on trust, verbs such as masquerading, reference to online reviews – experiences of others as reliable reference point.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

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 AO3 out of 12. Add the two marks together to reach a total out of 24 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different bands for each AO: allocate the mark according to the level of competency demonstrated for each AO individually.

Level	AO2	Mark	AO3	Mark
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates show an assured knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts and issues.</li> <li>• Candidates engage critically with the ways concepts and issues inform their analysis of the text's patterns of language use.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates offer a discerning exploration of a range of contextual factors and language features, and how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>• Candidates evaluate in perceptive detail how contextual features inherent in the text are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> </ul>	<b>11–12</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates show a good knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts and issues.</li> <li>• Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues to offer informed comment of the text's patterns of language use.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates respond in detail to a range of contextual factors and language features, and how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>• Candidates will analyse in detail how contextual features inherent in the text are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates show a sound level of knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts and issues.</li> <li>• Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues to comment on some language features in the text.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates make a sound attempt to respond to a range of contextual factors and language features, and how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>• Candidates make clear, relevant response to the contextual features inherent in the text and how these are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates show a largely accurate knowledge and understanding of language concepts or issues, although is likely to lack the depth needed to be convincing.</li> <li>• Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues to comment generally on language use in the text.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates make some attempts to respond to contextual factors and language features and make some points about how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>• Candidates make general comments regarding the contextual features inherent in the text, showing some understanding of how these are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>

Level	AO2	Mark	AO3	Mark
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates' knowledge and understanding of concepts/issues is likely to have inaccuracies or be muddled.</li> <li>Candidates use concepts/issues to comment on the text, although connections may be lacking or confused.</li> </ul>	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make a limited response to contextual factors and language features and how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>Candidates show a basic understanding of how contextual features inherent in the text contribute to the overall meaning.</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates select irrelevant or unconnected concepts or issues, or presents erroneous accounts of concepts.</li> <li>Candidates attempt to use concepts or issues to the text, although these will be superficial.</li> </ul>	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates make only one or at the most two references to contextual factors and language features and how they are associated with the construction of meaning.</li> <li>Candidates make little attempt to show understanding of how one or more contextual features inherent in the text contribute to the overall meaning.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response or no response worthy of any credit.</li> </ul>	0

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

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance					
3	<p><b>Text C</b> is an extract from a treaty made in 1868 between representatives of the American government and leaders of different groups of Sioux Native American Indians about land ownership.</p> <p><b>Text D</b> is an online article, posted in December 2016, reporting on the moment when war veterans asked for forgiveness from Native American Indians. It was posted on a US website owned by a digital media company who say their aim is to promote ‘positive journalism’.</p> <p>By detailed analysis of the writing in both passages, discuss and illustrate the variations in language between the 19<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Answers should explore the ways language is used in each text, as well as how contextual factors influence the way meaning is constructed.</p> <p><b>AO3:</b></p> <p>Text C’s general contextual features: Text was a formal treaty between two sets of leaders (19th century and geographical considerations). The context is military to establish the ongoing land ownership terms between the US and the Sioux – it</p>	36	<p><i>Lexis and semantics</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="976 373 2033 1399"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="976 373 1473 408">Text C</th> <th data-bbox="1473 373 2033 408">Text D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="976 408 1473 1399"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature of document – between people and about places – lends itself to multiple proper nouns. The context means these will be formally presented i.e. full titles, Lieutenant General William T. Sherman.</li> <li>• Collective noun ‘bands’/plural nouns ‘chiefs and headmen’ used to represent the Native American Indians – could be contrasted with individualised proper nouns for US army leaders.</li> <li>• Relatively high proportion of Latinate language, ‘annuities’, ‘prescribe’, ‘regulations’ reflects formal/legal context.</li> <li>• Abstract nouns reflect subject matter, ‘peace’, ‘honor’.</li> <li>• Lexical fields of law/property, ‘authority’, ‘pledge’, ‘wrong’.</li> <li>• Legal phrasing, ‘herein named’, ‘provisions of this article’ reflects context.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1473 408 2033 1399"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listing, ‘rubber bullets, tear gas, and water cannons’, also mirrored in Clark’s list of US offences against the Native American Indians (see verb choices in grammar section for specific examples).</li> <li>• Lexical field of conflict, ‘protesting’, ‘struggle’, ‘fight’.</li> <li>• Collocations: ‘addiction issues’, ‘life expectancy’, ‘peaceful protest’.</li> <li>• Emotive lexis, ‘atrocities’, ‘forgiveness’.</li> <li>• American orthography, ‘traveled’, ‘organized’, ‘globalization’.</li> <li>• Repetition of numbers: ‘2000 veterans’, ‘2000-strong group’ – emphasises strength of the veterans’ support for Clark’s action.</li> <li>• Emotive metaphors ‘human shield’, ‘taste of justice’.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Text C	Text D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature of document – between people and about places – lends itself to multiple proper nouns. The context means these will be formally presented i.e. full titles, Lieutenant General William T. Sherman.</li> <li>• Collective noun ‘bands’/plural nouns ‘chiefs and headmen’ used to represent the Native American Indians – could be contrasted with individualised proper nouns for US army leaders.</li> <li>• Relatively high proportion of Latinate language, ‘annuities’, ‘prescribe’, ‘regulations’ reflects formal/legal context.</li> <li>• Abstract nouns reflect subject matter, ‘peace’, ‘honor’.</li> <li>• Lexical fields of law/property, ‘authority’, ‘pledge’, ‘wrong’.</li> <li>• Legal phrasing, ‘herein named’, ‘provisions of this article’ reflects context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listing, ‘rubber bullets, tear gas, and water cannons’, also mirrored in Clark’s list of US offences against the Native American Indians (see verb choices in grammar section for specific examples).</li> <li>• Lexical field of conflict, ‘protesting’, ‘struggle’, ‘fight’.</li> <li>• Collocations: ‘addiction issues’, ‘life expectancy’, ‘peaceful protest’.</li> <li>• Emotive lexis, ‘atrocities’, ‘forgiveness’.</li> <li>• American orthography, ‘traveled’, ‘organized’, ‘globalization’.</li> <li>• Repetition of numbers: ‘2000 veterans’, ‘2000-strong group’ – emphasises strength of the veterans’ support for Clark’s action.</li> <li>• Emotive metaphors ‘human shield’, ‘taste of justice’.</li> </ul>
Text C	Text D							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature of document – between people and about places – lends itself to multiple proper nouns. The context means these will be formally presented i.e. full titles, Lieutenant General William T. Sherman.</li> <li>• Collective noun ‘bands’/plural nouns ‘chiefs and headmen’ used to represent the Native American Indians – could be contrasted with individualised proper nouns for US army leaders.</li> <li>• Relatively high proportion of Latinate language, ‘annuities’, ‘prescribe’, ‘regulations’ reflects formal/legal context.</li> <li>• Abstract nouns reflect subject matter, ‘peace’, ‘honor’.</li> <li>• Lexical fields of law/property, ‘authority’, ‘pledge’, ‘wrong’.</li> <li>• Legal phrasing, ‘herein named’, ‘provisions of this article’ reflects context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listing, ‘rubber bullets, tear gas, and water cannons’, also mirrored in Clark’s list of US offences against the Native American Indians (see verb choices in grammar section for specific examples).</li> <li>• Lexical field of conflict, ‘protesting’, ‘struggle’, ‘fight’.</li> <li>• Collocations: ‘addiction issues’, ‘life expectancy’, ‘peaceful protest’.</li> <li>• Emotive lexis, ‘atrocities’, ‘forgiveness’.</li> <li>• American orthography, ‘traveled’, ‘organized’, ‘globalization’.</li> <li>• Repetition of numbers: ‘2000 veterans’, ‘2000-strong group’ – emphasises strength of the veterans’ support for Clark’s action.</li> <li>• Emotive metaphors ‘human shield’, ‘taste of justice’.</li> </ul>							

	<p>is a legal document and intended to constitute a permanent and binding document for both parties.</p>		<p><i>Grammar and morphology</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="976 209 1473 240">Text C</th> <th data-bbox="1473 209 2033 240">Text D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="976 240 1473 1380"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>American orthography, 'honor', 'authorized'.</li> <li>Use of 'shall commit'; formal modal usage recurs.</li> <li>Auxiliaries used to create a sense of future/possibility.</li> <li>Syntactical parallelism 'and its honor is hereby pledged to keep it. The Indians desire peace, and they now pledge their honor to maintain it' reflects notional partnership.</li> <li>Foregrounding of US names – links to context.</li> <li>Verb choices reflect legal context: commit'/prescribe'/reimbursed'/punished'.</li> <li>Largely declarative sentences, mostly complex or complex/compound.</li> <li>Use of present tense; heightened use of temporal adverbials: 'The Indians <u>desire</u> peace, and they <u>now pledge</u> their honor to maintain it'.</li> <li>Third person used throughout.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1473 240 2033 1380"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several sentences start with conjunctions 'And...', 'But...' – heightens sense of drama.</li> <li>Complex sentences with embedded clauses.</li> <li>Use of dynamic verbs: 'we fought', 'we broke'.</li> <li>Proper nouns 'Standing Rock', 'Wes Clark', 'Lake Oahe', 'North Dakota' – facticity.</li> <li>Verb choices represent US as aggressors 'fought', 'took', 'broke', 'stole', 'blasted', 'polluted'; this representation is reinforced in rest of text, e.g. 'Centuries of oppression'.</li> <li>Pre-modification. links with dramatic nature of text: 'powerful moment', 'creeping icy front'.</li> <li>Emphatic sentence used for climactic effect following the explanation of the origin and nature of the conflict between the two sides, 'And they won'.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Text C	Text D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>American orthography, 'honor', 'authorized'.</li> <li>Use of 'shall commit'; formal modal usage recurs.</li> <li>Auxiliaries used to create a sense of future/possibility.</li> <li>Syntactical parallelism 'and its honor is hereby pledged to keep it. The Indians desire peace, and they now pledge their honor to maintain it' reflects notional partnership.</li> <li>Foregrounding of US names – links to context.</li> <li>Verb choices reflect legal context: commit'/prescribe'/reimbursed'/punished'.</li> <li>Largely declarative sentences, mostly complex or complex/compound.</li> <li>Use of present tense; heightened use of temporal adverbials: 'The Indians <u>desire</u> peace, and they <u>now pledge</u> their honor to maintain it'.</li> <li>Third person used throughout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several sentences start with conjunctions 'And...', 'But...' – heightens sense of drama.</li> <li>Complex sentences with embedded clauses.</li> <li>Use of dynamic verbs: 'we fought', 'we broke'.</li> <li>Proper nouns 'Standing Rock', 'Wes Clark', 'Lake Oahe', 'North Dakota' – facticity.</li> <li>Verb choices represent US as aggressors 'fought', 'took', 'broke', 'stole', 'blasted', 'polluted'; this representation is reinforced in rest of text, e.g. 'Centuries of oppression'.</li> <li>Pre-modification. links with dramatic nature of text: 'powerful moment', 'creeping icy front'.</li> <li>Emphatic sentence used for climactic effect following the explanation of the origin and nature of the conflict between the two sides, 'And they won'.</li> </ul>
Text C	Text D						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>American orthography, 'honor', 'authorized'.</li> <li>Use of 'shall commit'; formal modal usage recurs.</li> <li>Auxiliaries used to create a sense of future/possibility.</li> <li>Syntactical parallelism 'and its honor is hereby pledged to keep it. The Indians desire peace, and they now pledge their honor to maintain it' reflects notional partnership.</li> <li>Foregrounding of US names – links to context.</li> <li>Verb choices reflect legal context: commit'/prescribe'/reimbursed'/punished'.</li> <li>Largely declarative sentences, mostly complex or complex/compound.</li> <li>Use of present tense; heightened use of temporal adverbials: 'The Indians <u>desire</u> peace, and they <u>now pledge</u> their honor to maintain it'.</li> <li>Third person used throughout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several sentences start with conjunctions 'And...', 'But...' – heightens sense of drama.</li> <li>Complex sentences with embedded clauses.</li> <li>Use of dynamic verbs: 'we fought', 'we broke'.</li> <li>Proper nouns 'Standing Rock', 'Wes Clark', 'Lake Oahe', 'North Dakota' – facticity.</li> <li>Verb choices represent US as aggressors 'fought', 'took', 'broke', 'stole', 'blasted', 'polluted'; this representation is reinforced in rest of text, e.g. 'Centuries of oppression'.</li> <li>Pre-modification. links with dramatic nature of text: 'powerful moment', 'creeping icy front'.</li> <li>Emphatic sentence used for climactic effect following the explanation of the origin and nature of the conflict between the two sides, 'And they won'.</li> </ul>						
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Guidance</b>				

<p><b>3</b></p> <p>Text D’s general contextual features: Online article about a veteran’s apology to Native American Indians for US violation of treaties. It contains several hyperlinks and a strapline, in line with its context, as well as a substantial quotation from a key figure.</p> <p><b>AO4:</b></p> <p>Whilst both texts focus on disputes over land between the US government and the Native American Indians, one is part of a treaty between the parties concerned whereas the other is a contemporary online article. As well as linguistic features that relate to the temporal context, a significant difference in tone arises from the fact that Text C is a legal document whereas Text D is an online article. This means that the writer of Text D has produced an outsider’s view of proceedings; Text C, on the other hand, is a primary text.</p> <p>Both texts exhibit a degree of bias; in C this is in favour of the US and in D it is in support of the American Indian population.</p> <p>Possibilities are provided (right) for guidance but any valid response should be rewarded. Each language level is taken in turn to illuminate the likely</p>		<p><b>36</b></p>	<p><i>Discourse</i></p>	
			<p><b>Text C</b></p>	<p><b>Text D</b></p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Textual cohesion is provided by extended conditional sentences outlining consequences of breaking the treaty conditions, ‘If bad men among...’.</li> <li>• The first article is prefaced by a note of the names/identities of those involved in the negotiation, putting the treaty from which it has been taken in context.</li> <li>• The first paragraph of the article pledges a state of peace. The second outlines actions to be taken against those from the US who break the rules outlined; the third (much longer one) details action to be taken against ‘bad men among the Indians’ who do so.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporates extended quote from key figure Wes Clark Jr. Switches between third person narration and first person quotation; provides factual scaffolding and also refers to the event’s impact on social media as part of the reporting: ‘The video has been shared and liked thousands of times, and many Twitter users commented on how moving their apology was’.</li> <li>• Triadic structure, ‘Centuries of oppression, indignity, and disregard’ contributes to representation of Native American Indians as victims. Set against this is the emphasis on the ‘power of [their] peaceful protest’, and the ‘powerful moment’ when they received their apology.</li> <li>• Information provided in apposition, ‘Clark, an army vet now pursuing screenwriting in Hollywood’ – characteristic of journalistic style.</li> <li>• Syntactic parallelism used within Clark’s speech provides cohesion, ‘We took your land. We signed treaties that we broke. We stole minerals from your sacred hills. We blasted the faces of our presidents on your sacred mountain’.</li> <li>• Emphasis on active voice (see previous) reflects Clark’s desire to</li> </ul>

<p>connections which may be explored by candidates across both texts.</p>			<p>acknowledge responsibility.</p>
		<p><i>Pragmatics</i></p>	
		<p><b>Text C</b></p>	<p><b>Text D</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asymmetry reflected in nature of (and amount of detail about) the consequences for either side of breaking the treaty.</li> <li>• Moral overtones throughout; binary value system: 'good', 'bad'.</li> <li>• Marked term 'chiefs and <u>headmen</u>' reflective of historical context.</li> <li>• Emphasis throughout on property and capacity of the US to punish offences against it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible allusion to well-known speech from <i>Julius Caesar</i> evident in Clark's quoted speech, 'We came. We fought you. We took your land'.</li> <li>• Explicit reference to power in representing Clark's apology; the writer says the need for his action is 'rarely ever acknowledged by people in power today'.</li> <li>• Contrast between the representation of the peaceful behaviour of the Native American Indians, protecting their 'sacred burial grounds' and the 'excessive police force' used against them.</li> <li>• Situation is represented as reflective of wider global issues, 'this pattern is echoed across the world... indigenous people's culture and history... razed by colonialists'.</li> <li>• Final sentence is used to highlight previous injustice – suggests this is not entirely cancelled out by Clark's action.</li> </ul>

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

Decide on a mark for AO1 out of 12, and then a separate mark for AO3 out of 12, and a separate mark for AO4 out of 12. Add the three marks together to reach a total out of 36 marks. It is possible that candidates may achieve different bands 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 ways that language has varied over time.</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 has varied over time.</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 has varied over time.</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 across both texts, although sometimes unconvincingly.</li> <li>• They will make more general connections and will attempt to compare particular features associated with the ways language use has varied over time, 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 show proper grasp of production and reception and so is of very limited use.</li> <li>Evaluation of points is not happening in this band 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 use has varied over time.</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 band. There may be one or two connections here and there but these do not help with notions of how language use has varied over time.</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	5	0	0	0	<b>10</b>
<b>2</b>	0	6	6	0	0	<b>12</b>
<b>3</b>	6	0	6	6	0	<b>18</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>40%</b>