

Solutions

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

- any four of: exigence, audience, purpose, writer, context, message

2.2

- exigence is the situation that makes writing necessary now; purpose is what the writer wants to happen as a result

2.3

(a)

- the announced closure of the service

(b)

- residents need consequences for their own care explained, so the evidence will be local and concrete rather than statistical

3.1 B

- it supplies the occasion and the surrounding circumstances

3.2 B

- an unlinked device is description, not analysis

3.3

(a)

- more technical data and citation, less analogy

(b)

- specialists share the background knowledge, so evidence that would need translating for a general audience can be stated directly

3.4

- *Row A — Thesis (1)*. One point for a defensible thesis that states an interpretation of the rhetorical situation, not a restatement of it. **Earns the point:** “By opening with his own childhood in the buildings he plans to close, the mayor positions himself as a member of the audience he is about to disappoint, so that the closure reads as a shared loss rather than a decision imposed on them.” **Does not:** “The mayor uses ethos, pathos and logos to persuade the readers” — a list of devices is not an interpretation. *Row B — Evidence and Commentary (0–4)*. 4 points requires specific evidence for **each** claim and commentary that consistently explains **how** the choice functions. A strong response works the whole situation, not one device: the **exigence** (a decision already taken, announced to people it disadvantages); the **audience** (residents who use those two buildings, addressed as neighbours, not ratepayers); the **purpose** (to

convert grief into acceptance, not to inform); the **message** (loss is acknowledged first, benefit second); and the **medium** — a front-page open letter, which reaches the affected residents and the wider city at once, so the mayor is simultaneously consoling one group and justifying himself to another. 3 points: adequate evidence but commentary that explains what the choice *is* rather than what it *does*. 2: evidence that summarises the letter. 1: mostly generalised claims. *Row C — Sophistication (1)*. Awarded for a genuinely complex reading sustained throughout — for example, recognising that the confession of personal attachment is also a **pre-emption**: by naming the strongest objection first and in his own voice, the mayor leaves his opponents nothing to say that he has not already said more sympathetically. A single perceptive sentence dropped into an otherwise ordinary essay does not earn the point