

## **17IOAE04**

### **Script Commentaries**

#### **Candidates who did well**

##### **Script A: Q1 16 marks (level 4)**

An effective response awarded at the bottom of L4. The response is confidently written and discriminates its analysis by using good examples from the text. Their comments on phonology are strong and attempt to explain the differences in sound production compared to RP demonstrating knowledge and understanding. They utilise terminology effectively and are clear in their exemplification. They comment on lexis, phonology and discourse but there is a lack of non-standard features and grammatical analysis which keep it low in the band. Further exploration of these features and more theories beyond 'footing' would award more marks.

##### **Script B: Q2 17 marks (level 4)**

A good response achieving marks mid band Level 4. For A02 the candidate shows an awareness of the different concepts and issues present in varieties of English such as identity, attitudes to English and accommodation theory.

For A03 they comment they examine the contextual factors such as spread of American English via the media making connections between the texts and demonstrate knowledge of the spread of English during British empire. Further comments on lexis and nonstandard features present within the varieties would have made this stronger.

##### **Script C: Q2 15 marks (level 3)**

The candidate scored in the top of level 3 and demonstrated clear application. The candidate makes links between the texts and provides other examples of similar varieties. They also show awareness of the impact of contextual factors and influence of other languages on varieties of English and the understand that speakers may conform to standard English in certain settings. There are some errors and misunderstandings but this is a good attempt.

#### **Marking task**

##### **Script D: Q1: 19 marks (level 4)**

The candidate comments on good features such as lexis, phonetical variation and nonstandard verb usage. A greater range of features would allow for a wider analysis and this would be expected to achieve in level 5. They do address concepts and issues in their discussion, exploring links to contextual factors to explain variations and link accommodation theory to national identity when applying to the Scottish language.

##### **Q2 14 marks (level 3)**

A competent response for question 2 scoring in top level 3. The candidate addresses all three bullet points within the question and works through each of them in turn. This is a good approach to help structure the essay and maintain close reference to the data. There is more focus on context and influence of language than international English which keeps the marks in level 3 but their discussion is good regarding context addressing informality and the convergence to a global standard in other settings. The candidate makes links across each text, utilising the data provided. Each paper has a theme which is why candidates need to ensure they address all sources in question 2 to enable their discussion. The candidate could make links to similar processes which happen in other varieties of English to demonstrate how Scottish variations reflect changes to English worldwide to show wider knowledge.

**Total:** 33 marks out of 50.

## **Candidates who did not do well**

### **Script E: Q1 08 marks (Level 2)**

This is a typical low level 2 response. The candidate shows general understanding when discussing phonology but their response is brief and discussion limited. They show misunderstanding when they state there are no grammatical variations as there are some featured within the text. They make obvious connection, describe what's there haven't written enough to form an effective answer.

### **Script F: Q1 03 marks**

The response is underdeveloped and the candidate is unable to demonstrate an understanding of the question. Their comments are brief and they mistake accent for an 'inability to fluently pronounce'. Candidates should avoid incorrect judgemental comments. They are awarded marks for obvious connection such as informality but this is a weak level 1 response.

### **Script G: Q2 6 marks (level 2)**

This is a low level 2 response. The response is brief and paraphrases a lot of the data. They make some connections across the texts regarding the changes to and attitudes to accent. They make general comments regarding international English but their discussion does not develop beyond a general understanding.

## **Marking task**

### **Script H: Q1 5 marks (level 1)**

The candidate relies heavily on describing what is in the data and paraphrasing statements. One section focusses on the contents of Text B and C which are not relevant to question 1. They make some comments on regarding non-fluency and attempt analysis of accent but don't develop this beyond stating what is there. There is not enough to award in level 2 so the mark falls into level 1 which is characterised by 'descriptive'.

### **Script I: Q2 10 marks (level 2)**

This candidate fulfils all the criteria of level 2 but does not reach the level of clear application, therefore it scores at the top of level 2 with 10 marks. The candidate does refer to the data and identifies connections across the text citing the exposure to other varieties via the media as an influence on English. They demonstrate an understanding of context when discussing converging accents to different settings linking to international English. However, their essay does not reach the complexity required to achieve in the higher levels.