

A1

- a) There are "badgers on his land". ✓
TB from the badgers are "devastating herds...across the countryside". } not Dave's farm
His son-in-law came down with TB. ✓
- b) The number of cows killed by TB rose from fewer than 6,000 in 1998 to 34,000 in 2011. ✓
- c) Dave says that farmers only want to kill the badgers that have TB. —

3

A1

- a) Dave has had "regular cases of TB in his herd". ✓
His son-in-law came down with TB. ✓
His neighbours have recently gone out of business. —
- b) We know that TB in cattle has got worse over the years as "In 1998, fewer than 6,000 cows were killed because they had TB. In 2011, the figure rose to 34,000". ✓
- c) Dave thinks the problem has got worse as badgers have "no natural predators" and they are not allowed to be killed. ✓

4

A1

- a) Badgers affected Dave by spreading TB around his cows and therefore his cows died because of the disease. ✓
Badgers are now on his land ✓
Dave didn't want to give his real name because he's scared that animal activists might hunt him down because he agrees with killing badgers. ✓
- b) In 1998, fewer than 6,000 cows were killed because they had TB. By 2011 the figure had risen to 34,000. ✓
- c) The problem has got worse because badgers are now protected and farmers are not allowed to shoot them. Dave thinks their numbers are now "out of control". ✓

5

A2

Dave's family works an exhausting 14 hour day, 7 days a week to look after their herd. ✓

? Farmers get paid 4p per litre so they are getting less money now. Farmers have to deal with bad weather and it has been too wet to graze the cows outside. ✓

Because the cows can't graze outside more money has had to be spent on food supplies and the price of grain has increased, making it hard for farmers. ✓

3

A2

- The price of milk paid to farmers has been slashed by 4p a litre. ✓
- It's been too wet to graze cows outside because the weather has been bad. ✓
- The increased price of grain has hit farmers hard. ✓
- Farmers have gone out of business – Britain has lost 40 per cent of its dairy herds. ✓
- Dave's son-in-law has got TB. —

4

A2

- Dave's family works an exhausting fourteen hour day, seven days a week to look after their herd. ✓
- The price of milk paid to farmers has been slashed by 4p a litre this year so they make less money. ✓
- The weather has been bad and it's been too wet to graze the cows outside. ✓
- The price of grain to feed animals has increased and this has hit farmers hard. ✓
- Britain has lost 40 per cent of its dairy farms over the last ten years. ✓

A3

more?

The way the leaflet tries to persuade people to join their campaign is giving a story to the reader and using statistics and bold words, "slaughter" and "say no to killing badgers". They talk about what the public do to help and how you can help or if you want to help. They also add a sympathy story. Also they add pictures which the reader will see and have sympathy for the cull of badgers. The campaign also says "We must unite together to fight this". That sentences is aiming it at the reader as if they are talking to you as an individual.

Shows some awareness of 'how' but lacks detail and clarity in places. Just into Band 2?

4

A3

- The leaflet tries to persuade readers to join the campaign against the badgers by showing pictures of badgers which makes the reader feel sympathy on badgers. (more)
- The writer uses good words which stand out, "Stop the Slaughter" which create an attention to the reader when they read it. 'Slaughter' is a powerful word to use. ✓
- The leaflet gives other people's thoughts and feelings to save badgers (from David Attenborough). (✓) (more to develop)
- The article gives an example about a cull in Ireland. (✓) and here too
- The article says there is no evidence that killing badgers would reduce TB in cattle. ✓ (could expand)
- The leaflet also has a big bold heading to catch our attention.
- They also include us into the article by saying "your". ✓ (more?)
- At the end they talk about people give money willingly because they care. ✓ This makes readers think more about joining the campaign.

The bullet-point approach is limiting - points are not developed. Not the way to tackle this kind of question. 4/5

5

A3

The campaign 'Save the Badger' tries to persuade its readers to join in many ways. It starts off by telling you what they are trying to achieve. "Save the Badger campaigns against culling, trapping, ✓ snaring, baiting or any other forms of persecution of badgers" it talks about how the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) wants to 'slaughter' badgers in parts of Wales. They talk about how they have evidence from scientists that say culling badgers will not reduce the problems but might make them worse. ✓ They have won many court cases. ✓ They also managed to convince the WAG to halt the cull. The leaflet has a quote from Sir David Attenborough saying that "The evidence is that a badger cull on a huge scale will not solve cattle farmers' problems. ✓ Killing badgers is not the answer". In other areas of Britain they have not been affected by TB. ✓ For example, Scotland has no cull and they do not suffer from TB. ✓ However, there are no badgers in Anglesey but they do suffer from TB. ✓

Offers a range of points. Securely Band 2.
Tends to 'spot' - needs more comment
on 'how' to push on.

6

A3

To get the readers' attention, the leaflet has a big bold title and two pictures of the 'Save the Badger' logo on either side. Also by just scanning the leaflet you can see words in bold like 'Slaughter' ✓
more to say? } which would make you read the sentence. Also, to get the reader on the 'Save the Badger' side they have put in a quote from a very trusted animal expert, Sir David Attenborough. ✓ In his short text he says killing badgers on a large scale would not solve the problem. Because he's saying that and he's trusted, many people would begin to support 'Save the Badger'. ✓ ^{OK} Throughout the text they keep saying that killing badgers is not the answer. ✓ Because they say it so many times, the readers may also begin to believe it subconsciously. ✓ They include things like how scientists believe that killing badgers would not stop the problem, ✓ and again because they are trusted people, ✓ the reader would begin to support the cause more and more. At the end they have a picture of them protesting outside the Welsh Assembly and finish ✓ with "Say No To Killing Badgers" in bold just to persuade the reader one last time.

Tracks the text pretty well - selects details
and makes sensible comments on 'how'.
Enough here for 8? 7/8

A3.

The 'Save the Badger' leaflet uses many different ways to persuade the reader to join in the campaign against the badger cull. Firstly, in the first sentence the writer lists the different ways that badgers get treated, "culling, trapping, snaring, baiting". This is important in persuading the reader because it shows the terrible ways the badgers are treated and it makes people sympathise for them. ✓ yes

Secondly, the article uses the word 'slaughter', saying this word would be "more accurate" in describing how they plan to control the badgers. The use of 'slaughter', which is put in bold, is very powerful because it is a terrible word that creates a disturbing image for the reader.

Thirdly they say that "scientific studies" have proven that culling the badgers would be of "little help" in reducing the badger population. This is a smart and good way to persuade the reader because it will make the reader believe that it's true. ✓

Next, another way the article tries to persuade the reader is there is a quote saying that badger culls on a huge scale "will not solve" the problem for farmers. It then goes on to say that "killing badgers is not the answer". This is an expert opinion by Sir David Attenborough. Because of who is saying this, everyone will agree. Everyone has heard of Attenborough and knows how smart he is about animals and wildlife. ✓ OK

Furthermore, it says that it could "exterminate every badger in the UK". This will persuade people because the thought of an animal being wiped out is a chilling reality. ✓

Another way this article tries to persuade the reader is that it says there was a cull in Ireland towards badgers to stop TB. However, "TB still remains a major problem". This shows that the cull is perhaps pointless because it have proven to be flawed and not work. They are now trying an alternative.

Overall, this leaflet uses many different ways to try and persuade the reader, including expert opinion and emotive words.

Good response that's focused on 'how' and uses the textual details well in support.

9/10

A3.

The 'Save the Badger' leaflet persuades the reader. The title 'Save the Badger' is an imperative. It gives orders to the readers, telling them to join in the campaign. ✓ This makes the reader want to read to see what the protest is all about.

The leaflet says we should stand up against "culling, trapping, snaring, baiting" which shows all the horrible ways ✓ they hurt the badgers. The words in the list are powerful and emotional to grab the readers' attention. The leaflet also says that "slaughter" may be a better word for the killing. The word is in bold which ✓ draws the people in. Also, the word 'slaughter' is a powerful and emotional word for the reader. It suggests the horrific pain ✓ they go through, as if they were wiped out like pieces of meat. } good }

It gives a scientific opinion, "culling would be of little help". This gives the reader a better piece of knowledge ✓ because the facts are given from an intelligent scientist. This persuades the reader more as they believe what the leaflet is saying. ✓ In the leaflet, Sir David Attenborough says "Killing badgers is not the answer". This gives a more valid opinion on the leaflet because they have evidence of an expert saying it should be stopped. To back this up it gives examples where TB is found, even where there are no badgers. ✓ "There are no badgers on the island of Anglesey by they have TB". ✓ The leaflet also says the badgers might be "completely wiped out". ✓ This suggests that they would kill all of them to extinction. This would persuade the reader who would not like to see these ✓ innocent animals disappear for ever.

It repeats "we need". This repetition persuades the reader to help because the leaflet is pleading for help. ✓ It also says "you". This is a personal pronoun which makes the reader more involved in the story and sympathise with the organisation because it is asking for you to join in. ✓

At the end it says, "Say No To Killing Badgers!" This is in capital letters and has an exclamation mark at the end. Like the start, it persuades because it's giving orders and ✓ telling readers to not allow the slaughter of the badgers.

The picture says "Save the badger, Cymru Stop the Slaughter" and this persuades because 'slaughter' is a powerful word that could impact on the reader. It shows a badger's face on it and this and the picture of the badger in the wild shows a cute and innocent ✓

animal that is going to be destroyed for no reason. This makes readers feel sympathetic. ✓

Thorough and detailed. Knows exactly how to tackle the question.

10

A4.

Which text?

Vaccinating badgers and cattle against TB is very expensive and there is no suitable vaccine for cows. ✓ Vaccinating badgers is going to be difficult because you have to catch them and have to vaccinated them every year for four years. ✓

?

What scientists say about how to reduce the spread of TB is that badgers have become a problem since 1992 when it was illegal to kill them. ✓ Since then the badger population has grown a lot and TB in cows has increased dramatically.

No texts identified.
Only uses one text so no comparison.

2/3?

2

A4

Save the Badger thinks that vaccinating cattle and badgers is a more effective way of getting rid of TB in cattle for good, ✓ but the internet article says that vaccinating badgers is extremely difficult ✓ because each badger needs to be caught in a cage and vaccinated every year for four years, and that is a very expensive ✓ operation. Reducing the spread of TB can be effective but killing off all the badgers isn't effective because it will cause more problems than first thought.

Names the texts - compares views on vaccinations (but there is more to say).
Nothing on scientists' views. Band 2.

4

A4.

In the first article 'We must not ignore the plight of our farmers' they express that science is very much on the side of culling badgers. However, 'Save the Badger' thinks that every scientist involved is against culling as it would do no good. In my mind I think the article is more reliable as they say "TB was under control in the 1970s and 1980s and has only become a problem since 1992 when it was illegal to kill badgers". The article also thinks vaccinating badgers would be difficult because you have to do it every year for four years. However, 'Save the Badger' say they "strongly believe" in vaccinations.

Identifies the texts and makes some comparisons on each of the bullet points. Band 2.

6

A4

What the two texts say about vaccinating badgers

The article says that vaccinating badgers and cattle is ineffective. ✓
Firstly it states that giving vaccinations to badgers is “incredibly difficult” ✓ because each badger has to be caught in a cage and “needs to be vaccinated once every year for four years. Therefore it’s a “very expensive operation. ✓ The leaflet barely mentions vaccines although it does say that it “strongly believes” in the vaccination of badgers. ✓

What scientists say about how to reduce the spread of TB

In the `Save the Badger` leaflet, scientists have said that “culling would be of little help in reducing the disease and could actually make things worse in some areas”. ✓ The leaflet also says that “nearly every scientist” thinks you could “exterminate every badger” but there would still be TB in cows. ✓ The article however, makes almost no reference to scientists, only about a farmer who thinks badgers should be shot, but it does say “science is on the side of culling badgers”. ✓

Makes a range of valid points/comparisons.

7

A4

In the internet article, they tell us that giving badgers the vaccinations would be too difficult ✓ and too expensive, ✓ and they tell us that there isn't even a vaccine for cows ✓ but in the leaflet 'Save the Badger' they say that vaccination could be more effective at getting rid of TB in cattle for good. They say they "strongly believe" in vaccinations. ✓ The article gives more of an opinion. It

? } makes the government sound lazy and careless, whereas the leaflet has scientific evidence.

In the article they say that "science is very much on the side of culling badgers". ✓ They then go on to give numbers and statistics to show the increase of TB in the past 13 years since they couldn't shoot badgers. ✓ In the leaflet, they actually use a powerful quote from Sir David Attenborough that "killing is not the answer". ✓ They give a lot of scientific evidence that culling "could actually make things worse in some areas". ✓

Good response - clear focus on comparison.
Securely Band 3. 8/9

9

A4

In the article, 'We must not ignore the plight of our farmers', it says that vaccinations are unpredictable as there "is no suitable vaccine for cows". It is difficult to vaccinate the badgers because each badger needs to be "caught in a cage" and "vaccinated...every year for four years". They say this would make it an "expensive operation".

In the 'Save the Badger' leaflet, it says they "strongly believe" in the vaccination of badgers along with "increased levels of testing" and "stricter controls on the movement of cattle".

overview } The article disagrees with the idea of vaccinations because it would be really expensive and impractical but the leaflet promotes the vaccination idea and suggests that testing on cows and restricting their movement is a more animal friendly way to do things.

In the internet article it says that science supports culling badgers as it says that when this was allowed "TB was under control". It's only since it's been made illegal, since 1992 that TB has become a problem. It suggests that since the population of badgers has "grown considerably" that TB in cows has "increased dramatically".

However, in the 'Save the Badger' leaflet, it says that "nearly every scientist" researching the problem is "convinced" that if every badger was killed, it would still "not get rid of TB in cows". Some scientists also think uninfected badgers could be "completely wiped out". Even Sir David Attenborough believes "a badger cull on a huge scale will not solve farmers' problems".

The article says that scientists think culling would help reduce TB in cows, whereas in the leaflet all the scientists say it would do no good.

A detailed and thorough response. Selects appropriate details, making clear comparisons and cross-references.