

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

English Language and Literature A (NTA6)

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

June 2004**NTA6****DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND WEIGHTINGS**

The table below is a reminder of which Assessment Objectives will be tested by the questions and the marks available for them.

Unit 6

Assessment Objective	AO2ii	AO3ii	AO5
Question 1	25 (x2)	25 (x2)	25 (x2)
Question 2		25 (x2)	

Question 1**Marking Procedure**

1. Refer to question specific mark scheme initially to ascertain overall band.
2. Assess each AO equally, using the grid to ascertain the relevant band, sub-band and then individual mark for each AO.
3. Award 25 marks for each AO, multiply each by 2 to arrive at a mark out of 150.
4. Additional points and ideas will be added at the co-ordination meeting.

Question 2**Marking Procedure**

1. Refer to question specific mark scheme initially to ascertain overall band.
2. Assess each AO3ii, using the grid to ascertain the relevant band, sub-band and then individual mark for AO3ii.
3. Award 25 marks for AO3ii, multiply it by 2 to arrive at a mark out of 50.
4. Additional points and ideas will be added at the co-ordination meeting.

Marking notations for English Language and Literature: Summer 2004**Points that are correct:**

✓ (tick):	to indicate a positive point
straight underline/ vertical line at side:	to indicate a good passage
expl:	candidate explains
pr:	candidate makes personal response
pnm:	point not made (if idea is not explained)

Errors:

BE:	basic error
Mistakes:	ringed or marked with S
Squiggly underline:	for poor/wrong idea

Marginal annotation:

voc:	for a vocabulary point made
gr:	for a grammatical point made
phono/style:	for a phonological/stylistic point
coh:	for a cohesive/structural point made
aud:	for a point made about audience
purp:	for a point made about purpose
con:	context understood, commented upon

Unit-specific notations for Unit 6:**Q1**

comp:	candidate compares
att:	attitudes and values commented upon
fos:	feature of speech noted, commented upon

Q2

eval:	candidate evaluates
-------	---------------------

Marking grid for A2 English Language and Literature Unit 6, Question 1

		<u>Responding to different types of text; exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons</u> AO 2ii (25 marks x 2)	<u>Use of literary and linguistic approaches to written and spoken texts; use of frameworks</u> AO 3ii (25 marks x 2)	<u>Identifying and considering the ways attitudes and values are conveyed in speech and writing</u> AO 5 (25 marks x 2)
Band 5	21-25	Exploratory. Significant similarities and differences are analysed in an original/personal, possibly conceptual, manner. All texts effortlessly integrated.	Conceptualised use of frameworks to highlight literary /linguistic study. Possibly conceptual in use of frameworks. Engages closely with meaning.	Responds confidently, making explicit reference to attitudes and values and how/why occur Skilfully handled interpretation with original and thoughtful insights developed.
Band 4	18-20	Coherently compares and contrasts writer's choices of form/structure/mode/language Close focus on texts; integrated and thoughtful.	Detailed and thoughtful engagement with texts through frameworks. Interpretation evident through approach taken/frameworks used. Close focus on details.	Explicitly interprets/comments on how the writer's choice of form/structure/language relate to attitudes and values. Significant number of examples from all texts.
	16-17	Expresses clearly comparisons and contrasts between two texts, but analyses all texts. Carefully illustrated points. May use anchor text; possibly some imbalance in coverage.	Uses/explains/comments through use of frameworks/identification of features/parts of speech. Engages with texts through explanation of features, possible of different modes Possibly under-developed in places.	Comments on how use of lexical patterns and structure link to values and/or attitude. Meaning of each text grasped. Comments may be implicit and underdeveloped in places.
Band 3	14-15	Makes links/comparisons between two texts at a time. Some comment on language use in texts. Imbalance in coverage. Imbalance in coverage. May compare 2 contexts.	Can use different approaches for literary/linguistic study; is able to distinguish between different features/parts of speech fairly accurately but may be unable to comment on effect of features/impact on audience.	Some awareness of how lexis and structure help convey attitude; implicit meaning understood. May have to dig to find attitudes and values, especially with regard to textual form Imbalance in coverage.
	11-13	Comparative framework used but may be partial/simplistic. Imbalance in coverage of texts; possible lacks supporting evidence in places.	Guiding principles present; can identify features mostly accurately. Aware different modes need approaching in different ways but may do so in simplistic fashion. Broad comments on effects.	A little awareness of why writer's lexical choices shape meaning; possible comment on why form and structure are relevant. Probably relates attitudes and values to 2 texts only.

Band 2	8-10	Responds to obvious/broad links/comparisons. Sometimes comments on less important links. May lack detail.	General, perhaps vague, explanation; some awareness of the focus of a text; common sense approach but does not discuss how language works. Few examples.	Occasional points made but may lack evidence from texts; some unfounded assertions.
	6-7	Occasional insight but not sustained; one area of study noted.	Implicit views of language use; superficial ideas, probably no use of frameworks.	Weak ideas on values and attitudes. May attempt explanation but tendency to obliqueness.
Band 1	4-5	Superficial points without relevance to both/all texts.	Little awareness of study of the task. Possible misconceptions regarding frameworks.	Face value reading; no comments made on values and/or attitudes
	1-3	Few if any connections noted or seen. Weak ideas.	No study of literary and linguistic interrelations. Persistent misuse of terms.	Misreads writer's/speaker's attitude.

Question 1

Compare **either** Texts A, B and D **or** Texts A, C and D, commenting on how the writers or speakers use language to convey their feelings about individual people.

In your analysis you should consider the following:

- the writer's or speaker's choice of vocabulary, grammar and style
- the ways in which attitudes and values are conveyed to the intended audiences
- any other aspects which you consider important in your reading of these texts.

Key Words: Compare – commenting on ways – language use – feelings – vocabulary – grammar – style – attitudes and values of writers/speakers – intended audience – other aspects – your reading.

Band 5: (21 - 25 marks)

21 - 25 Insightful comparison which engages closely with meaning; work of the highest order; original/personal/thoughtful analysis; use of conceptualised approach to allow different interpretations; overview of the ways the writers use form, structure and style; use of frameworks enhances and illuminates textual interpretation; confident use of linguistic and literary concepts to support argument; challenging writing (through possible use of theories)

Band 4: (16 - 20 marks)

18 - 20 Secure and coherent reading underpinned by good textual evidence
Interplay noted between each text: attitude of each speaker reflected through lexis, form and structure of each piece, perhaps forms basis of comparative analysis
Grasp of texts very evident through selection of analytical detail; coherent and varied points; use of personalised approach is evident

16 - 17 Close reference to texts; clear comparison
Framework(s) used to highlight reading
Use of methodology for interpretation that highlights differences between texts with clear illustrated points
Comments offered on how attitudes and values revealed
Some contextual points made

Band 3: (11 - 15 marks)

14 - 15 Responds to task with some confidence
Significant features of language noted
Awareness of linguistic and literary choices and how they contribute to feelings
Ideas may not be fully developed
Uses frameworks to comment on more obvious points about form, style and vocabulary
May compare contexts

11 -13 Some recognition of implied meaning with list-like ideas
Relevant but not fully developed
Comments on some reasons for linguistic and literary choices
Some comments (2 or more points) on form, style and vocabulary
May adopt approach that allows different interpretations of speech and writing;
comparative framework makes use of valid/sensible ideas but may be partial
and/or simplistic

Band 2: (6 - 10 marks)

8 - 10 Basic and generalised approach; simplistic structure.
Picks occasional appropriate/relevant linguistic examples but little or no analysis;
one feature of language commented upon
Obvious links: viewpoint of writer, certain forms allow writer/speaker to do
certain things

6 - 7 Superficial analysis/response; basic narrative account/some simplistic
comparative points made
Weak attempt to recognise linguistic features but not able to say why used
Only one area/idea from each text discussed in detail

Band 1: (0 - 5 marks)

4 - 5 Skimpy reading; no direction in response
Narrative points abound/no comparison attempted
No sense of purpose/audience
No sense of how the language is employed

1 - 3 Minimal response to the texts and/or textual misreading
Only focuses on 1/2 text(s) in isolation
Complete absence of points about language use
Little direct response to question

Marking grid for A2 English Language and Literature Unit 6, Question 2

		AO 3ii (25 marks x 2)
Band 5	21-25	Conceptualised and effective evaluation; clearly comments on different approaches to literary and linguistic study/makes use of theoretical framework. Challenges assumptions.
Band 4	18-20	Detailed and coherent commentary; makes reference to varying approaches. Detailed and thoughtful interpretation evident through approach adopted
	16-17	Explains and comments upon approach through reference to literary/linguistic frameworks in a clear manner. Engages with meaning of texts through a particular approach. May be underdeveloped in places
Band 3	14-15	Uses and makes some comments upon approach taken to literary/linguistic study; is able to distinguish between different approaches, probably to do with mode differences
	11-13	Guiding principles present; aware of the need for a particular approaches to textual study but may be limited in evaluation and explanation. Broad comments probable when explaining nature of comparison
Band 2	8-10	General explanation; some awareness of the focus of a text; descriptive rather than explanatory approach. Ideas are generally accurate but do not necessarily help the reading and analysis
	6-7	Implicit views of language use; superficial ideas; partial answer with some comment Sees some rudimentary relationships between language and literature and approaches to its integrated study
Band 1	4-5	Little awareness of study of the task. Little appreciation of literary and linguistic interplay Short and undeveloped answer
	1-3	No study of literary and linguistic interrelations; very brief account No relation seen between literary and linguistic study

Question 2

What approaches have you used in analysing and comparing these texts and how have these approaches helped you to appreciate them?

Key words: approaches – used – analysing and comparing texts – helped appreciate

Band 5: (21 - 25 marks)

21 – 25 Conceptualised and imaginative evaluation; totally evaluative; underpins reading (by possibly challenging others' ideas and approaches); work of the highest order shot through with exploratory detail; perhaps original and displaying overview

Band 4: (16 - 20 marks)

18 - 20 Secure and coherent answer; subtle/varied approach to each text, informing own readings and analytical validity; can justify in detail the use of certain approaches and theories; links closely to own interpretation; moving towards a thorough evaluation; makes reference to alternative approaches

16 - 17 Close reference to own analysis that will have some evidence of evaluation; clear and carefully thought out comments
Moves towards a clear evaluation linked to analytical approach and comparison; uses details to reflect interplay between language and literature; parts of answer may lack development

Band 3: (11 - 15 marks)

14 - 15 Responds to task with some confidence although ideas may not be fully developed
Use details and approach to highlight own interpretation; may offer comments on approach, probably to do with mode differences; some evaluation may be offered

11 -13 List-like ideas which are relevant but not developed, probably broad comments with limited explanation
Aware of approach but may be a simple deconstruction of approach used; a few details from analysis of each text will be used to support evaluation; not necessarily closely ordered and reflective

Band 2: (6 - 10 marks)

8 - 10 Basic and generalised approach; simplistic structure.
Picks occasional examples but mainly descriptive
Ideas are obvious; ordinary points made to substantiate reading of texts
No reason given for adopting a certain approach

6 - 7 Superficial response; partial/narrative account
Some ideas are touched upon
Rudimentary relationships are noted (and perhaps one area of study from a text)

Band 1: (0 - 5 marks)

- 4 - 5** Skimpy answer with little or no direction in response
Short undeveloped answer
Very little in terms of evaluation/limited reflection on own analysis
Ideas are fragmentary and not ordered
- 1 - 3** Minimal response
No evaluation
Very brief account
Little direct response to question