
AS LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE

7701/1

Report on the Examination

7701

June 2022

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

General

It was clear that students of all abilities were able to access the data used for this series and were able to meet the assessment objectives, but with varying degrees of success. The data, while accessible, did allow for differentiation within the ability range ensuring the more able were challenged and able to meet the criteria of the higher levels.

Criteria used to award marks

The assessment objectives for Question 1 and 2 were AO1 and AO3.

For AO1, students were rewarded for the accurate and precise identification of a range of language features from different language methods, using appropriate terminology.

For AO3, students were rewarded for discussing contextual aspects such as audience, genre, mode and purpose linked to the data. They were also rewarded for considering the various representations in each text.

The assessment objective for Question 3 was AO4. For this AO, students were rewarded for making connections between the two texts. A range of different connections were credited, with a focus on language similarities and differences a feature of the higher levels.

Specification Content

The specification outlines how, in this unit, students should analyse texts and explore language. In doing so, they should use linguistic terminology when analysing different areas of language including graphology, lexis, grammar, pragmatics and discourse (AO1). In this series, almost all students used some linguistic terminology – very few students relied on using ‘the word’ in place of the precise term. There was a clear understanding from students of all abilities that identification of language features was what was being assessed for AO1.

The specification also states that in this exploration of language, students should consider how language is shaped by context including audience, purpose and genre (AO3). It was evident in response to the 2022 paper that students of all abilities did show a clear awareness of context and were confident when, for example, identifying the audience and purpose of both texts.

Finally, the specification outlines how the exploration of language when analysing texts should focus on representations. The number of students moving beyond the aforementioned contextual points to discussing representation increased again this year. It is very clear that centres are aware of the specification requirements and are successfully directing students to look for and discuss different representations.

Focus on Assessment Objectives

AO1: the range of terminology used by students across all centres was impressive. It is clear that centres are following the guidance from previous reports by ensuring students are precise when identifying specific features. However, it is important that centres remind students of the need to identify features which are of value to the task rather than any ‘random’ feature they have found. Furthermore, in order to gain the higher marks, students should be precise when identifying specific language features. Importantly, precision will be rewarded more than range. Real precision when labelling an appropriate number of relevant language features is far better than

using more general terms in a wide range of less relevant features. Some centres had clearly taught this to their students and the precision seen was excellent. Examples of such precision would include classifying a noun (for example, concrete or abstract), an adjective (for example, a superlative) or a pronoun (for example, second person subject pronoun).

AO3: it was clear that students were aware of the need to move beyond the identification rewarded for AO1, and link their example to context and/or representations. Those students achieving the lower marks focused solely on mode, purpose and audience with little engagement with representation. However, the number of students who did address representation in a methodical manner once again improved this year. Many of those students who were awarded the higher marks for AO3, structured their response around various representations (that is to say, writing a paragraph on each of the representations they had identified). However, it is important to note that focusing solely on these representation and contextual factors is a feature of band 2 of the mark scheme and centres should remind students of the need to exemplify such points by referencing specific examples from the data (AO1). It is important that students link language features with meanings and representation. Centres are reminded again of the need to reference the data when discussing AO3 if students are to achieve a mark in levels 3 and above (the criteria for level 3 clearly states 'link specific language choices with an aspect of context'). This was often not the case when students wrote an introductory paragraph covering audience and purpose. This was very common again this year and centres should ensure that if they do teach students to write such a paragraph that there must be exemplification and the contextual point must be linked to AO1. A general paragraph stating, for example, that the audience of the text is dog owners and the purpose is to instruct without any link to the data is not good practice and should be discouraged.

Question Focus

All questions were answered equally well by students which was very pleasing to see. Both texts allowed for detailed analysis and exploration of language.

Question 1

With regards to AO1 in this question, those students achieving the higher marks were precise in their identification and accurate labelling of language features. Common terms used included: noun phrase, pre-modifying adjective, superlative, first person subject pronoun, second person subject pronoun, first person plural pronoun, modal verb, main clause, subordinate clause and complex sentence. Students who achieved lower marks tended to use less precise terminology such as: adjective, pronoun, word and sentence. Students who were awarded marks in the top band were also aware of patterns; that is to say, they recognised how several language features can work together to create meanings and representations. Some of these key representations included:

- The role of the dogs
- The impact of the dogs
- The dogs as members of staff
- The staff at the university
- Students
- Anxiety and mental health issues
- Middlesex University.

Question 2

Once again, the data allowed students to access the higher levels through precise identification of language features. Typical terminology used at this level included: imperative verb, imperative sentence, second person subject pronoun, second person possessive pronoun, noun phrase, modal verb, main clause, subordinate clause and complex sentence. Recognising patterns of use was also typical of the higher levels as was, for AO3, the discussion of a range of representations. These included:

- The Department of Environmental Food & Rural Affairs/the Government
- The guidance of the code/rules
- Dog owners
- Nature/other animals and wildlife
- Farmers.

Q1 and Q2: A Summary

To summarise, best practice was seen in questions 1 and 2 when students:

- identified a wide range of specific and relevant language features, using precise and accurate linguistic terminology when labelling
- linked these language features to a range of contextual factors, moving beyond audience, purpose, mode and genre and considering a range of ideas regarding representation.

Less successful responses for questions 1 and 2 included:

- a narrow range of language features identified by students (some only identifying two or three from the whole text) or a lack of precision when writing about language
- a lack of exemplification for AO1
- limited discussion of representation
- writing about context without any reference to the data (particularly in an introductory paragraph about audience, purpose, mode and genre).

Question 3

Students offered a range of comparisons across the two texts, considering similarities and differences, which was pleasing to see. Students achieving at the lower end tended to focus on discussing audience, purpose, mode and genre with limited focus on language or exemplification from the texts. It is imperative that in this question, students do use clear examples and, when appropriate, identify and classify specific language features. It is also important that as part of their comparison, they link these language features to context. Those students achieving the higher levels compared the use of specific language features, including pronouns, adjectives and modal verbs.

To summarise, best practice in Q3 was seen when students:

- compared and contrasted language, context and content offering a range of connections
- exemplified their discussion with specific language features, integrating linguistic knowledge into their comparisons.

Less successful responses to Q3 included:

- a focus solely on content to compare and contrast.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.