



AS

# English Language

7701/1 Language and the individual

Report on the Examination

7701  
June 2024

Version: 1.0

---

Further copies of this Report are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

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 candidates of all abilities were able to access the data used for this series and were able to meet the assessment objectives. The data ensured there was differentiation within the ability range ensuring the more able were challenged and able to meet the criteria of the higher levels. Furthermore, students engaged in both texts and the inclusion of spoken data was clearly welcomed by many students. Its inclusion allowed students to apply their knowledge of spoken language features which aided the range of language methods which were covered in a typical response.

## Criteria used to award marks

Assessment objectives for Question 1 and 2:

AO1: Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression (10 marks).

For this AO, students were rewarded for the accurate and precise identification of a range of language features, using appropriate terminology.

AO3: Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning (15 marks).

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

Assessment objective for Question 3:

AO4: Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods.

For this AO, students were rewarded for making connections between the two texts. A range of different connections was credited. A focus on language similarities and differences affected by the different contexts characterised 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.

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 2024 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. It is very clear that centres are aware of the specification requirements and are successfully directing students to look for and discuss different representations. This has continued to be more successful over several series and it was very pleasing to see representations at the forefront of the majority of responses.

### **Focus on Assessment Objectives**

AO1: the range of terminology used by students across all centres was, once again this year, impressive. It is clear that centres are following the guidance from previous exam reports by ensuring students are precise and detailed when identifying specific features – the level of detail used by many students was impressive.

It was also good to see students identifying features which were appropriate and linked to representations rather than discussing ‘random’ AO1 features that they had found. Finally, the most successful students recognised how several language features can work together to create a particular representation; that is to say they linked AO1 features together recognising that language choices do not exist in isolation.

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. Often paragraphs began with a clear focus on this area (for example, *One of the representations in Text B is...*). Many of these students were awarded the higher marks for AO3 as they structured their response around various representations. Students also achieved the higher bands by developing more than one interpretation or point relating to language. Using tentative phrases such as ‘*this could suggest ... However, it could also show...*’ showed that some students were really engaging with the data and thinking about different interpretations.

AO4: student responses to the comparison aspect of the paper have improved year on year. It was very uncommon to see students only writing about one text or addressing each text individually without any comparison or use of comparative language. In previous reports, the need for a linguistic focus as part of the comparison has been highlighted. Centres have clearly responded to this as this year saw the greatest number of candidates focusing on language. Comparing, contrasting and analysing specific language features across both texts was much more commonplace which was pleasing to see.

### **Question Focus**

#### **Question 1 (Text A)**

With regards to AO1 in this question, those students achieving the higher marks were precise in their identification and accurate labelling of spoken language features. It was pleasing to see that students used AO1 to develop their discussion of key representations rather than simply listing AO1 features. It

was also pleasing to see how this year, more than ever, students are being very detailed when labelling language features. Centres have clearly prepared students well for this AO and the need to use detailed terminology. Some key, detailed Level 4 features identified in Text A included: noun phrases, second person possessive pronouns, first person plural pronouns, second person subject pronouns, adverb phrases, , pre-modifying adjectives and abstract nouns. In Level 3 were students who identified language features accurately such as adjectives, pronouns and nouns. Almost all students wrote about the spontaneous speech features of pauses and stressed syllables with some offering insightful comments as to why they had been used. AO3 on the whole was well addressed with consistent conclusions drawn from the data. It was very rare to see a student simply feature spotting without linking language with context and meanings; the differentiation of success came from how well developed and insightful these comments were.

### **Question 2 (Text B)**

Once again, the data allowed students to access the higher levels through detailed identification of language features. Typical terminology used at Level 4 for AO1 when identifying language features in Text B included: second person subject pronouns, second person possessive pronouns, first person plural pronouns, pre-modifying adjectives, noun phrases, abstract nouns, modal verbs. Some achieved Level 5 by identifying types of sentence. Similarly to question 1, students were able to accurately identify a range language features but for some students there wasn't the level of detail needed for the higher marks. There was, for example, a reliance on terms such as adjective, noun, verb. With regards to sentences, there was a significant number of students who did not address syntax. Identification of sentence and clause types is rewarded in Level 5. With regards to AO3 for this question, there was a range of representations covered as well as comments linked to audience and purpose.

### **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 detailed and accurate linguistic terminology when labelling
- linked these language features to a range of contextual factors and analysed representation and meanings.

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 focus solely on lexis
- a lack of exemplification for AO1
- limited analysis of representation
- writing about context without any reference to the data (this was often in an opening paragraph with an overview of genre, audience, and purpose with no links to the data)

### **Question 3 (Comparison of Texts A and B)**

Students offered a range of comparisons across the two texts, considering similarities and differences, which was pleasing to see. Many students focused on the different modes of the two texts as well as identifying similar language choices across both texts. It was very uncommon to see students only writing about one text or addressing each text individually without any comparison or use of

comparative language. Students are certainly becoming more aware of the need to compare language features using the correct AO1 terminology and linking them to contexts and representations. Some students did only focus on content without any references to the data but this was quite rare.

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

- compared and contrasted language linked to context and representations 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
- lack of language focus or exemplification.

### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

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