



General Certificate of Education

English Language 6701 *Specification A*

EA4W Language Investigation

Mark Scheme

2005 examination - June series

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.

EA4W: Language Investigation

Distribution of Assessment Objectives and Weightings

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

Assessment Objective	1	3ii	4	5ii	Total
Language Investigation	10	20	10	20	60

Language Investigation

- award a mark out of 10 for AO1 in the right hand margin
- award a mark out of 20 for AO3ii in the right hand margin
- award a mark out of 10 for AO4 in the right hand margin
- award a mark out of 20 for AO5ii in the right hand margin
- add together and put a ringed total out of 60 in the right hand margin

E.g.

AO1	5
AO3ii	12
AO4	6
AO5ii	10
	<hr/>

33

Transfer the ringed mark to the box on the front of the answer booklet. Initial your mark.

Q1	<p>Key Words: Aim-linguistic frameworks – detailed analysis – conclusions – evaluation – further research.</p> <p>Assessment Focuses: Quality of expression – selection/application/evaluation of LFA – exploring issues/concepts – analysing/evaluating language use.</p>		
Mark	<p>AO1 Communicate clearly the knowledge, understanding and insight appropriate to the study of language, using appropriate terminology and accurate and coherent expression.</p>	Mark	<p>AO3ii Apply and explore frameworks for the systematic study of language at different levels, commenting on the usefulness of approaches taken.</p>
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controlled use of technical aspects. • Precise and deft expression. • Cogent, coherent and cohesive. • Subtlety of effect. • Linguistic flair. 	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Searching and confident linguistic analysis. • Selects enlightening range or depth. • Frameworks chosen to enhance and illuminate understanding. • Evaluates frameworks and methodology. • Perceptive methodology. • Explores alternative avenues of investigation. • <i>Describes e.g. sentence functions, types, structures, modification, adverbials of place and time, parallel structures, EFL errors, active/passive voice.</i> • <i>Gives perceptive overview of lexical features: e.g. the language of tourism; promotional language, Russian lexis, subject specific semantic fields e.g. farming, trade, the city/culture of Kiev.</i>
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rare errors. • Clear stylistic shaping. • Reader guided through structure. • Effective linguistic register. 	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illuminating range or depth of features explored. • Selects and identifies a range of illuminating frameworks, showing understanding of their value and commenting on their purpose. • Detailed objectives. • Reflects on methodology. • Clear grasp of fruitful linguistic approaches. • Clear and accurate description of distinctive language features and patterns. • Rare errors. • <i>Describes sentence types and functions precisely.</i> • <i>Makes detailed use of word classes e.g. evaluative adjectives, verb tenses.</i> • <i>Looks closely at lexical range: e.g. stylistic variation: specialist/general, objective/personal, emotive/factual.</i>

<p>6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firm control of accuracy. • Controlled expression of ideas. • Lines of argument. • Controlled linguistic register. 		<p>11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of some range or depth. • Selects a range of frameworks or shows depth. • Well focused aim. • Explanation of methodology. • Describes a range of significant language features or patterns. • Largely accurate. • <i>Generalised discussion of sentence types and functions.</i> • <i>Uses a range of word classes e.g. proper nouns, verbs, and pronouns (person).</i> • <i>Looks at address.</i> • <i>Looks at some formal and informal features.</i> • <i>Looks at some semantic fields related to Ukrainian life.</i>
	<p>5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrequent technical errors. • Clear communication of ideas. • Simple list structure; introduction and conclusion present. • Definite, if inconsistent, linguistic register. 	<p>9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent application of linguistic frameworks. • Purposeful aims. • Selects and identifies frameworks. • Describes significant language features or patterns. • Describes methodology. • Basically accurate. • <i>Limited but accurate use of word classes.</i> • <i>Notes some lexical features e.g. connotation.</i>
<p>4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional technical errors. • Expression suitable for ideas. • Structure/organisation emerge. • Some control of linguistic register. 		<p>7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies a linguistic framework. • Clarifies some aims. • Identifies and describes relevant language features. • Outlines approach. • Uncertainty of description – some errors occur. • <i>Attempts to use word classes.</i> • <i>Identifies broad fields.</i> • <i>Notes mainly informal features e.g. colloquialisms.</i>
	<p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent errors. • Conveys basic ideas. • Scatter gun structure. • Occasional use of linguistic terms. 	<p>5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts to apply frameworks for description. • Selects relevant language features. • Adopts a linguistic approach. • Occasional accuracy of description. • Focuses partially on language. • <i>Dwells on complexity, formality.</i>

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusive basic errors – (sentence punctuation, there/their etc). • Simple expression – conveys basic points. • Short/incomplete work. • Misunderstanding of linguistic terms. 	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feature spotting not tied to any analysis. • <i>Identifies unhelpful linguistic features and labels with no sense of purpose or significance.</i>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major flaws in language. • Communication impeded. • Some points are conveyed. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts to apply frameworks but minimal accuracy achieved.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total irrelevance/ incomprehensible. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal engagement with language or data extracts. • Lacks quotations or reference to the language of extracts.
		0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the data extracts.

Mark	AO5ii Analyse and evaluate variation in the meanings and forms of spoken and written language from different times according to context.
17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytical grasp of how language works across different levels. Ability to place analysis in wider contexts. • Perceptive/conceptualised/illuminating/open-minded. • Interesting and judicious use of examples. • Awareness of the effect of different audiences and readers on meaning. • <i>Strongly evaluative. Overview of social/cultural dimensions.</i> • <i>Explores issues about text type and functions.</i> • <i>Explores audience positioning e.g. the assumptions made about the audience.</i> • <i>Explores how the people and city of Kiev (and Ukraine more generally) are represented.</i> • <i>Engages with tone and tenor, attitudes and values.</i>
13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident analysis of language features, their explanatory context and their communicative impact. • Close detailed points. • A subtle reading, integrating various levels of description. • Well integrated use of examples and quotations. • Exploration of texts' meaning, purpose and effects. • Evaluative comments are well supported. • <i>Thorough and precise exploration.</i> • <i>Considers how Kiev and Ukraine are represented.</i> • <i>Looks closely at the relationship between writer and audience.</i>
9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses meanings constructed by a range of significant language features. • Clear and detailed understanding of contexts' influence. • Engagement with texts' communicative intent. • Fully supported. • Some evaluative comment tied to textual detail. • Sustained analysis of texts' meanings. • <i>Explores some salient features.</i> • <i>Articulates a response to the texts.</i>
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begins to analyse what texts are trying to communicate. • Illustrated points. • Broadly evaluative comments. • <i>Begins to analyse how language conveys meanings e.g. labels broad fields.</i> • <i>Responds to tone and attitudes.</i>
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some use of content: specific references/quotation/examples. • Broad analysis of how context has influenced language use. • <i>Looks very generally at writer, audience, mode, genre, subject matter. Broad statements.</i>

3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple/generalised/descriptive accounts of the content of texts and data.• Paraphrase.• Excessive quotation.• Superficial reactions to texts.• <i>Summarises content.</i>• <i>Identifies some features of language variation.</i>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited understanding/major misunderstanding of audience/purpose/context/content/meaning.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Text or data has no influence on the work.

Mark	AO4 Understand, discuss and explore concepts and issues relating to language in use.
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptualised overview of theories and research. • Analyses and evaluates alternative views. • Identifies and challenges standpoints. • Precisely formulated aim(s). • Exploratory and original investigative approach. • Strong evaluative comments. • <i>Perceptive discussion.</i> • <i>Skilfully integrates theoretical/research knowledge.</i> • <i>Systematic.</i> • <i>Analyses language in the context of social/cultural values.</i>
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge about the nature of linguistic concepts, theories and research. • Identifies different views and interpretations. • Comments on others' ideas. • Carefully formulated aim(s). • Clear rationale for data selection. • Formulates some overviews of issues raised by data. • Thoughtful evaluative comments. • <i>Looks closely at the relationship between language, purpose, genre and audience.</i> • <i>Usefully incorporates theoretical/research knowledge.</i> • <i>Gives some consideration to social/cultural values.</i>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depth or range of knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research. • Develops views on linguistic issues. • Well focused aim(s). • Sound data selection. • Processes and categorises data well. • Sustains evaluative comments. • <i>Able to develop a line of argument from looking closely at the data.</i> • <i>Refers to theories/research to aid analysis and fulfilment of aim(s).</i>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research. • Outlines views on linguistic issues. • Aim(s) informed by key concepts. • Purposeful selection of data. • Some sensible evaluative comments. • <i>Begins to develop a line of argument.</i>

<p>4</p> <p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research. • Sensible aim(s) formulated. • Offers some explanations. • Adopts a linguistic approach to the selection and study of data. • Evaluates. • <i>Some identification of key issues e.g. how genre/purpose/audience affects language use.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research. • Awareness of linguistic approaches. • General aims(s) established. • Simplistic evaluation. • <i>Generates some limited discussion.</i> • <i>Linguistic notions evident.</i>
<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance. • Uncertain about how to carry out linguistic study. • Engages with content only or other non language issues. • Lacks clear aim(s). • Lacks an evaluation. • <i>Data used but linguistic comment is lay/implicit.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little focus on linguistic issues. • <i>Data not commented on in a linguistic way.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of anything concerned with the study of language. • <i>Data not used.</i>