General Certificate of Education

English Language and Literature 1721
Specification A

ELLA2   Analysing Speech and Its

 Representation

Report on the Examination
2010 examination - January series

General

Candidates are required to answer two questions. The first question requires an analytical comparison of unseen spoken texts. Candidates are asked to focus on two pieces of speech, one transcribed spontaneous speech, and the second prepared speech or other form of speech representation from a non-literary context.

The second section of the paper requires the candidate to focus on the way speech is used and represented in an extract from the set text they have studied as well as consider particular stylistic and thematic matters relevant to the particular text.

These questions test the ability of candidates to:
- use appropriate terminology to support their analysis
- compare different kinds of spoken texts
- analyse set texts with reference to representation of speech as well as exploration of stylistic and thematic issues
- write fluently and coherently.

Successful candidates:
- showed clear and detailed knowledge and understanding of speech features and their effects
- identified specific features, gave examples of them and explained the effects created
- offered an integrated comparison of the two speech texts
- showed detailed analysis of specific features of language and the effects created
- supported their ideas with examples and comment
- used the appropriate terminology to describe the features they identified
- wrote fluently and accurately
- answered the question.

Less successful candidates:
- offered general comments about speech without giving examples or analysing the effects created
- did not compare the texts in Section A
- did not sustain a clear focus on the question
- offered general comments rather than detailed analysis of the text passage
- ignored the set passages or paid them scant regard and wrote about other parts of the text of their own choosing
- did not focus closely enough on the question
- did not support or illustrate their comments
- did not use a language or terminology appropriate to literary and linguistic study
- showed basic technical inaccuracies in their writing.

Section A: Analysing Speech

Candidates generally answered this question well and there were some very positive responses seen. Overall it was felt that there was a significant improvement in the quality of responses in this series and there were relatively few imbalanced responses to the texts. The majority of candidates were able to range freely between texts A and B and offered integrated comparisons identifying speech features, giving specific examples and analysing their effects. In the majority of cases there was a good grasp of the relative contexts of the texts and candidates often demonstrated a genuine attempt to identify significant features. Analysis of both spontaneous and prepared speech accurately identified a good range of grammatical and stylistic features and offered clear explanations of how these features contributed to the ways in which speech in the given texts operated. Often a good level of detail was supplied to reinforce points made and there was some thoughtful probing of features. It was also encouraging that very few candidates got bogged down in trying to explain the texts in terms of theoretical concepts although Grice's Maxims still put in the odd appearance, but unfortunately such references rarely added anything meaningful to the responses.

Less successful candidates offered more generalised responses, often listing various features without identifying any examples and giving general comments regarding their significance. Some candidates tended to focus on the analysis of features but made limited reference to the attitudes demonstrated by the speakers. Others limited their responses by providing a reasonably detailed analysis of Text A but then largely commenting on Text B in terms of what features it did not possess (e.g. pauses, overlaps etc).

Section B: Analysing the Representation of Speech

Question 2: *Great Expectations*

This was a popular choice and many candidates handled the question very well. There was some excellent analysis of narrative structure and language and some responses were enhanced considerably by candidates' ability to use an earlier episode to provide an overview and explore links between Miss Havisham's changing attitudes and the structure of the novel. Less successful candidates, though, did not focus closely enough on stylistic analysis, sometimes commenting too much on Pip's behaviour and values rather than the presentation of Miss Havisham's feelings. Some seemed to ignore the latter part of the extract altogether while others relied almost exclusively on broad character points with passing reference to the extract.

Question 3: *Eden Close*

Some candidates responded well to this question and presented some detailed analysis in exploring the relationship between Andy and T.J. Sometimes there was a tendency towards some narration of T.J.'s involvement in the novel rather than an analysis of the relationship between T.J. and Andy. However, better answers were able to dissect the language choices to show Andy's underlying distrust of T.J., T.J.'s apparent superiority and how the past impinged upon the present.

Question 4: *The Lovely Bones*

Candidates showed a good grasp of the novel and most were able to focus on how the narrative voice helps to create the character of Ray through vocabulary, tone and descriptive detail etc. and used the later sexual experience to illustrate narrative development and overview. Some candidates, however, focused primarily on Susie and her feelings for Ray rather than analysing the way those feelings created a sense of Ray's character. Others relied far too heavily on simple description and paraphrase to describe the character of ray.

Question 5: *Enduring Love*

There were some very good responses seen on this text and candidates often presented detailed stylistic analysis of the extract, linked to effective supporting references. Some demonstrated an understanding of how Joe is being worn down by Jed's harassment through a detailed analysis of Jed's vocabulary, tone of voice, the use of repetition, body language etc. Less successful candidates found it difficult to identify features in the extract, lacked focus on the presentation of Jed's harassment of Joe or focused too much on Joe's responses and so moved away from the central point of the question.
.

Question 6: *Waiting for Godot*

There were some thoughtful and perceptive responses on this text which showed a good understanding of dramatic technique. Often a comparison with the language and behaviour of Estragon was used to highlight various aspects of Vladimir's character such as his changeability, his optimism and anger, his fatherliness and the repetitive nature of his behaviour and the play's structure. Less successful answers tended to include some regurgitation of received opinion about the play as a whole which failed to examine the specified extract.

Question 7: *The Caretaker*

Some responses showed a lively engagement with this text with candidates especially relishing episodes focusing on the bed, the bag and the Electrolux. Better candidates examined the use of language as well as the violence on stage but some tended to focus more on the stage directions. Less successful responses relied heavily on narrative and some did not have the breadth of vocabulary to present a detailed analysis and restricted themselves to a narrow range of ideas.

Question 8: *Equus*

More successful responses on this text explored the nature of the stage setting and lighting, semantic fields, interrogatives, exclamatives, the use of vocabulary, repetition and the relevance of the monologue as a technique showing how all these techniques are used to reveal Dysart's feelings about his profession. Some candidates, though, concentrated on describing Dysart's feelings without any reference to his profession and this inevitably led to responses which lacked focus on the question. Some candidates struggled to identify the dramatic techniques used in this extract and failed to appreciate the various stylistic features, presenting instead a broad discussion of 'character' and theme – which, while showing a good understanding of the wider text, failed to address the focus set in the question.

Question 9: *Othello*

Overall responses to this question were sound and there was some good work done on religious imagery, terms of address and Desdemona's use of questions and exclamations. Successful candidates identified stylistic features from within the extract which clearly supported specific character traits of Desdemona, and analysed these features, with close reference to the text. Many identified dramatic irony as dramatic technique, but were less successful in describing how that technique worked and how it linked to suitable quotations within the passage. Less successful candidates lost focus on Desdemona and discussed Othello's language and treatment of her in the extract and so drifted away from the question. Others wrote broadly about Desdemona's character traits as revealed in the extract or in the play generally.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades
Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the **Results statistics** page of the AQA Website.