



General Certificate of Education

**English Language and Literature
1721**

Specification A

**ELLA2 Analysing Speech and Its
Representation**

Report on the Examination

2010 examination - June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

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 and to consider particular stylistic and thematic matters relevant to the 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

Overall candidates responded to this question well and most had a clear idea of how to structure and organise their response effectively. Very few wrote two separate analyses with a final comparative section, although a few commented on Text A first and then incorporated comparisons while discussing Text B. Most, though, tried to integrate comparisons throughout their responses. It would have helped some candidates, however, to start their more detailed analyses of the texts more quickly than they did. Sometimes candidates wrote quite lengthy introductory sections (sometimes as much as a page) discussing audience, context and possibly purpose in general terms that added little, if anything, to their responses. The use of the acronym CAP as a word in responses to conflate the ideas of context, audience and purpose is not helpful here.

Candidates were often quite assured in their identification of features of speech though sometimes explanations still tended to be rather general and unspecific. For example, comments such as ‘overlaps are either because Sue wants to take the floor or because she wants to offer support to her friend’ add little to the analysis. There was also a tendency to waste too much time (sometimes whole paragraphs) debating who is the dominant speaker to the expense of exploring the point of view and how it is expressed.

Many candidates commented on the dialect shown by the speakers in Text A and that it revealed that they came from a particular area such as “Yorkshire” or the “Black Country” although a number were sure that they came from Essex. Very few picked up that “yer” was more of a sociolect than an area dialect. Quite a few were certain it was a sign of their being “working-class”, “lower-middle class” or “lazy”. It would be helpful if candidates were warned not to try to make pointless sociological deductions.

It was pleasing that most candidates were good at identifying rhetorical features in B such as sentence structure/asyndetic lists/ parallel constructions/appeals to audience and providing apt examples. Analysis sometimes lacked detail; very few, for example, commented on the change from ‘in Britain’ to ‘for Britain’ in the last sentence. Many appeared not to know the difference between compound and complex sentences and some spent too much time deciding whether adjectives were pre- or post- modifying rather than looking at the effects of the particular word choices. It was rather surprising that a number of candidates thought Tony Blair was the speaker in Text B, particularly as the question told them it was Gordon Brown. It is also worth reminding candidates that when using a quotation for support or illustration rather than simply writing the first word or two followed by a series of dots it is important that they make sure that the feature being commented on appears in the section quoted. Needless to say, lengthy quotation should be avoided.

The answers that attracted the lower marks tended to be lists of features of speech with few or no examples. There was some confusion over Kat’s dislike of classroom-based education as some candidates asserted that she hated education altogether, and compared this with Brown’s approval. Simplistically, education was “uni” and “placement” was not.

Technical spelling was frequently inaccurate and many candidates spelt elision “ellision”; and had problems with “repition”, “similie”, “metaphore”, “spontaneous” and spelt Britain “Britian”, even though it appeared in the text several times.

Overall more able candidates showed a sophisticated grasp of features of speech and were able to integrate their comparisons to great effect. Analysis of attitudes in these responses was thoughtful and detailed. Weaker candidates were at least able to identify a range of features even if their ability to comment on effects was limited.

Section B: Analysing the Representation of Speech

Question 2: *Great Expectations*

This question produced some excellent analysis of language and behaviour and many candidates engaged effectively with the text and recognised Magwitch's proprietary attitude towards Pip. The section of speech that was generally well-analysed was the one about his conviction that his gentleman should have "Horses" and candidates used this section to show non-Standard English and comment on Magwitch's sense of triumph and the use of repetition for effect. Some saw the episode as having a rather menacing tone and frequently compared it with the opening of the novel when Pip meets Magwitch in the graveyard contrasting the change in the convict's treatment of Pip. Most responses showed a clear focus on the analysis of speech and a number of candidates commented on the contrast between Pip as narrator and Magwitch.

Question 3: *Eden Close*

Many candidates' responses showed clear engagement and a real sense of understanding and insight into the dynamics of this scene and on Eden's provocative behaviour. Weaker candidates were tempted into narrative responses with little analytical comment and sometimes focused more on Andy than Eden. Most appreciated that Eden was actually attracted to Andy and were able to comment on the features that demonstrated this. The sexual connotations of the scene were very maturely handled and many pointed out the importance of them to the future relationship of Andy and Eden. Candidates often noticed and commented on the demotic language used by Eden and the effects created by it. The episode from "elsewhere" showed that the novel had involved them and there were several different sections chosen with comments showing a good knowledge of the whole text.

Question 4: *The Lovely Bones*

This was a very popular text and the question was generally well answered. Candidates often showed engagement with the text and a loathing for Harvey's duplicity. The commonest fault was that candidates did not make it clear that Harvey was lying and the discourse was just analysed at a basic level with comments on adjacency pairs, hedges etc. Some candidates assumed that the examiner knew what the truth was but it would have been useful to explain more explicitly in order to make it clear that they understood the irony of the situation. More able candidates showed grudging admiration for Harvey's skill in manipulating the conversation and were able to explain how he did it, pointing out the hedging, "Let me get my glasses" and the possible reasons behind his voice "halting". Many admired the skill of his changing the topic by throwing in "I was doing some work on a Second Empire" and explained what he was doing to control the conversation. Some candidates spent too long on Len's view but the better responses pointed out how he was being misled. The episode from elsewhere was often not from a police interview and many candidates used the episode of Salmon questioning Harvey. Some 'elsewhere' selections were completely unrelated to the question.

Question 5: *Enduring Love*

Candidates responded well to this text and many showed a very good grasp of the overall relationship between Joe and Clarissa, both in the extract and in the wider text. Many weaker candidates fell into the trap of just paraphrasing what Clarissa said and explaining her attitude that way; the better ones were able to chart her change in mood and analyse the speech and paralinguistic features to explain it. Joe's attitudes featured too much in weaker candidates' answers and some showed a tendency to drift into commentary on character traits divorced from stylistic evidence. A number of candidates presented a solely content-based, "psychological" answer to the question, despite the requirement for candidates to consider "representations of speech." In some cases this was despite some thorough, detailed analysis

in response to question Q1. Unfortunately, some candidates did not transfer the skills that they clearly possessed to answer on the extract in Section B.

Question 6: *Waiting for Godot*

Responses to this text varied widely from those showing a perceptive analysis of how the treatment of Lucky is presented and the application of this to an existentialist text to ones which showed a complete lack of comprehension of the text or the question or both. Almost everyone recognised Pozzo's attitude to Lucky. Some simply looked on it as extreme bullying but their comments remained simplistic, whereas others became distracted by Beckett's purpose which led in to but general broad comments on them and the Theatre of the Absurd. Few picked up on Pozzo's different attitudes to Lucky and the manner of his speech to Vladimir and Estragon in comparison to his imperatives to Lucky...

Many candidates failed to exploit the opportunity to comment in depth on the many stage directions, and the imperative style of language used by Pozzo. Often broad commentary and narrative prevailed and some responses were very skimpy. The rope attached to Lucky was sometimes mentioned, but the rest of the stage directions and dramatic techniques or the pace of the exchanges at the end of the extract were rarely discussed. Candidates did not track through enough to enable them to analyse the extract and many stopped short before reaching the end.

Question 7: *The Caretaker*

Overall this question was answered well. Candidates were often clear about the presentation of Aston although some lost focus on the question and centred their responses on Davies. Many found that the extract had a lot of interesting features to discuss although weaker candidates did not discuss the stage directions or the silences and pauses. Some missed the speech features and just concentrated on Aston's perceived kindness and his general character. The more able candidates used his dialogue to show how it revealed Aston's character but some were diverted to writing about Davies and a few even wrote about Mick. It is very important that candidates read the question carefully and make sure that the main focus of their analysis centres on what the question asks. There were some thoughtful approaches adopted but sometimes the use of detail as part of an analysis was missing.

Question 8: *Othello*

This was a very popular text and produced a wide range of responses. Quite a lot of weaker candidates just commented on content and discussed Iago from a psychological point of view, or just explained what Iago meant and how he felt instead of analysing "representations of speech and other dramatic techniques". Many confused Iago's comments on Cassio, thinking they applied to Othello. There was some limited vocabulary applied to Iago: "mean" and "nasty" may be true but are limited in terms of analytical comment. Quite a few candidates quoted by using ellipsis but not including the feature they were commenting on.

Better candidates looked at speech patterns, and several commented on the use of enjambment and the breaks in the metrical patterns, though none were very detailed. Some weaker candidates just mentioned these with no examples and others thought because Iago was speaking the extract was in prose. Almost all referred to the racism evident in "Moorship" and "Moor" and many pointed out that Iago would never use this to Othello's face, but called him "My Lord" at other times.

The level of understanding of the text shown by some candidates was poor. Some felt that Iago loved Othello and was extremely loyal to him and some spent more time discussing either Iago's attitude to Roderigo or his attitude to Cassio (sometimes confusing him with Othello). Ironically, several candidates' analysis of the extract was thin, but their analysis of 'elsewhere' was much more detailed, especially for those who made very good use of the scene where Iago

and Roderigo address Brabantio. A number of candidates referred to Grice's maxims, which have little relevance at all when responding to Shakespeare and did nothing but hinder their attempts at analysis.

Question 9: *Equus*

There were some interesting responses to this question showing both a clear understanding of the friction between Frank and Dora Strang and engagement with the play. Sometimes, though, responses lapsed into narrative rather than analysis and candidates were not always able to transfer the skills of speech analysis they showed in Question 1 and apply them to the text question. Most candidates were able to discuss the Strangs' relationship thoroughly, seeing both the negative and positive aspects of their marriage and some went on to consider the characters' differing parenting approaches to Alan.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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