



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **English Language 5701** *Specification A*

**ENA3      Interacting Through Language**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2008 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 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.

---

## 5701 English Language Marking Scheme How to Mark

### Aims

When you are marking your allocation of scripts your main aims should be:

1. to recognise and identify the achievements of candidates;
2. to put into a rank order the achievements of candidates (not to grade them – that is something that is done later using the rank order that your marking has produced);
3. to ensure comparability of assessment for all candidates, regardless of question or examiner.

### Approach

It is important to be *open minded* and *positive* when marking scripts.

The specification recognises the variety of experiences and knowledge that candidates will have. It encourages them to study language in a way that is relevant to them. The questions have been designed to give them opportunities to discuss what they have found out about language. It is important to assess the quality of *what the candidate offers*.

Do not mark scripts as though they were mere shadows of some Platonic ideal (or the answer *you* would have written). The mark schemes have been composed to assess quality of response and not to identify expected items of knowledge.

### The Marking Grids

The specification has generic marking grids for each Assessment Objective which are customised for individual tasks. These have been designed to allow assessment of the range of knowledge, understanding and skills that the specification demands.

Within each assessment objective there are four broad bands representing different levels of achievement.

Do not think of bands equalling grade boundaries. Depending on the part of the examination, the bands will have different mark ranges assigned to them. This will reflect the different weighting of assessment objectives in particular tasks and across the examination as a whole. You may be required to give different marks to bands for different assessment objectives.

### Using the Grid

You will need to give a mark for each Assessment Objective being tested in a particular question. These marks will then be totalled up for that question. To identify the mark for an Assessment Objective ask:

#### **What descriptors reflect the answer you are marking?**

On some occasions the descriptors in a band will only have one mark attached to them. On other occasions there will be a range of marks. In some bands there are upper and lower descriptors in such cases to help you.

Sometimes you will need to decide whether a script is displaying all the characteristics of a band firmly: if so, put it at the top of the band. As soon as a script has fulfilled one band and shows signs of the next, you should put it into that next band.

If a script displays some characteristics of a band barely, place it at the bottom of the band. If the script shows a range of some of the band's qualities, place it between the top and bottom of the band as seems fair.

### Annotating scripts

It is vital that the way you arrive at a mark should be recorded on the script. This will help you with making accurate judgements and it will help any subsequent markers to identify how you are thinking, should adjustment need to be made.

To this end you should:

- identify points of merit with ✓ or ✓✓;  
(ensure that you don't go into automatic ticking mode where you tick rhythmically every 10 lines - ticks should engage with the detail of a candidate's thinking and analysis);
- write notes in the margin commenting on the answer's relationship to the AOs/grid/key words/focus;
- identify linguistic errors with a ✖;
- identify errors of spelling or punctuation by underlining, eg sentance;
- write a summative comment at the end for each Assessment Objective;
- indicate the marks for each Assessment Objective being tested at the end of the answer in the margin in sequence;
- add up the marks for each Assessment Objective;
- put a ringed total in the right hand margin at the end of each question.

Eg

AO3i 12  
AO5i 12

24

**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	3i	4	5i	Total
Spoken Language Analysis	5	20		20	45
Essay Topics	5		20		25

**Section A – Spoken Language Analysis**

- award a mark out of 20 for AO3i in the right hand margin
- award a mark out of 20 for AO5i in the right hand margin
- add together and put a ringed total out of 40 for question one in the right hand margin

E.g. AO3i 12  
AO5i 12

24

**Section B – Essay Topics**

- award a ringed mark out of 20 for AO4 in the right hand margin

E.g. AO4 20

**AO1 – Quality of Writing**

- **based on both answers**, award a ringed mark out of 10 for AO1 in the right hand margin

E.g. AO1 9

Transfer each ringed mark to the box on the front of the answer booklet. Add together and put the total mark in the box in the top right hand corner. Initial your mark.

<b>Q1</b>	<p><b>Keywords: Comment linguistically on the significant features of this interaction. Explain how the participants use language to create meanings and express feelings. In your answer you should consider: the participants' purposes and roles, the structure of the interaction, interactive features of speech, vocabulary and grammar.</b></p> <p><b>Assessment Focuses:</b> Quality of expression – selection/application of Linguistic Frameworks for Analysis – identifying/describing/interpreting significant language features.</p>		
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO3i: Know and use key features of frameworks for the systematic study of spoken and written English.</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO5i: Distinguish, describe and interpret variation in the meanings and forms of spoken and written language according to context.</b>
<b>16-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explores appropriate range of features.</li> <li>• Describes carefully and accurately significant language features and patterns using lexical-semantic, grammatical, phonological and discourse frameworks.</li> <li>• Makes rare errors.</li> <li>• <i>Demonstrates a consistent analytical method.</i></li> <li>• <i>Uses linguistic frameworks systematically and purposefully.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes grammatical/syntactical features such as clause types and linking, disjunction and ellipsis.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes types of nouns, adjectives and adverbs.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes modals, verb tenses and voices.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes discourse markers, eg "so", "anyway" and "well".</i></li> </ul>	<b>16-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident description and exploration of language features and their explanatory context. Close detailed points.</li> <li>• A subtle interpretation drawing on and integrating various levels of description. Engagement with text's meaning, purpose and effects.</li> <li>• Well integrated use of examples and quotation.</li> <li>• <i>Explores closely the effect of contextual factors such as the enclosed vehicle and the relative unfamiliarity of the participants.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines the function of discourse markers and topic management.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines the interactional and collaborative nature of the conversation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Considers the different strategies Derek adopts during the conversation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines Paul's initially hesitant responses and his later enthusiastic introduction of a new topic</i></li> </ul>
<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives evidence of some range or depth.</li> <li>• Describes a range of significant language features or patterns using lexical-semantic, grammatical, phonological and discourse frameworks.</li> <li>• Writes largely accurately.</li> <li>• <i>Gives a mainly systematic analysis of the transcript.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines some grammatical features such as word classes, eg adjectives "big", "fast" and "botched".</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes turns, monitoring and support such as the use of minimal responses "mmm", "yeah", "ahaa".</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes some sentence moods/types.</i></li> </ul>	<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a range of significant language features.</li> <li>• Understands context's influence clearly and in detail.</li> <li>• Interprets text's communicative intent.</li> <li>• Fully supported interpretations.</li> <li>• <i>Examines effect of lack of familiarity on participants' purpose and meanings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows sensitivity to different speaker behaviour in their 'captive' situation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Explores topics (eg road works, uprooting cherry blossom trees and the direction in which to drive) and topic change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines closely the purpose of phonological features such as stress.</i></li> <li>• <i>Engages with purpose of monitoring, turns, questioning, support etc.</i></li> <li>• <i>Examines some lexical/semantic features such as the field of size and speed, eg "big", "spreads", "very fast".</i></li> </ul>
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes consistent use of linguistic frameworks.</li> <li>• Describes significant language features or patterns using lexical-semantic, grammatical, phonological and discourse frameworks.</li> <li>• Basically accurate.</li> <li>• <i>Begins to examine pronouns and address.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies some interactive features such as prompts and responses.</i></li> </ul>	<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes key features of language variation.</li> <li>• Understands effect of context and what texts are trying to communicate.</li> <li>• Illustrated points.</li> <li>• <i>Describes the mode of fairly relaxed social chat.</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognises that the participants are 'captive' in the stationary car.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies some topics and relates them to purposes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes relationships revealed by spoken interaction.</i></li> </ul>
<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a linguistic framework. Identifies and attempts to describe relevant language features.</li> <li>• Uncertainty of description – some errors occur.</li> <li>• <i>Identifies repetitions, fillers and non-fluency features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Describes question and answer structure.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies some phonological features such as stress.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies some lexical/semantic features such as the field of trees.</i></li> </ul>	<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishes some features of language variation.</li> <li>• Awareness of effect of context and what texts are trying to communicate.</li> <li>• Illustrated points</li> <li>• <i>Relates question and answers/prompts and response structures to informal situation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Begins to consider the relative unfamiliarity of the speakers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Differentiates the speakers' roles.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts to use frameworks for description.</li> <li>• Identifies some relevant language features.</li> <li>• Occasional accuracy of description.</li> <li>• <i>Focuses partially on language but mainly on content.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows some basic awareness of interactive features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Presents a broad account of semantic complexity/simplicity.</i></li> </ul>	<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some features of language variation.</li> <li>• Some use of content: specific references/examples/quotation.</li> <li>• Broad awareness that context has influenced language use.</li> <li>• <i>Shows a limited sense of the effect of context.</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognises the informal context.</i></li> <li>• <i>Gives broad comments about limited range of purposes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Selects and begins to comment on some quotations.</i></li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts to use frameworks but minimal accuracy achieved.</li> <li>• Quotes without linguistic description.</li> <li>• <i>Identifies unhelpful linguistic features and labels with no sense of significant.</i></li> <li>• <i>Begins to discuss level of informality.</i></li> <li>• <i>Tends to dwell on content by paraphrasing.</i></li> </ul>	<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple/generalised/descriptive accounts of the content of texts and data. Paraphrase. Excessive quotation.</li> <li>• Superficial reactions to texts.</li> <li>• <i>Gives unanalysed quotations.</i></li> <li>• <i>Summarises what speakers say.</i></li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal engagement with language of the data extracts.</li> <li>• Rare quotations or reference to the language of the extracts.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major misunderstanding of audience/purpose/context/content/meaning.</li> <li>• <i>Rarely comments on details of the text.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No engagement with data extracts.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text or data have no influence on the work.</li> </ul>

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Key words:</b> What <b>evidence</b> have you found to <b>challenge stereotypes</b> of how <b>women and men interact verbally</b> ? <b>Assessment Focuses:</b> Quality of expression – understanding/exploration of concepts and issues relating to spoken verbal interaction involving men and women.	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Key Words:</b> Discuss the <b>role of one or more</b> of the following <b>features in spoken interactions: openings and closings, phatic talk, turn –taking, discourse markers, monitoring and feedback.</b> <b>Assessment Focuses:</b> Quality of expression – understand/exploration of concepts and issues relating to effective spoken verbal interaction.
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO4: Understand, discuss and explore concepts and issues relating to language in use.</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO4: Understand, discuss and explore concepts and issues relating to language in use.</b>
<b>16-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge about linguistic concepts, theories and research.</li> <li>• Identifies different views and interpretations.</li> <li>• Comments on others' ideas.</li> <li>• <i>Challenges stereotypes, common assumptions and generalisations about the ways women and men interact verbally.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies and explores different functions of interactional strategies, eg tag questions.</i></li> <li>• <i>Comments critically on research from Coates, Cameron et al.</i></li> <li>• <i>Presents open-minded answers based on wide knowledge and reflection.</i></li> <li>• <i>Integrates discussion of gender and other determining factors such as age and status into discussion of spoken interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Explores theories, eg Dominance, Difference, Diversity.</i></li> <li>• <i>Conceptualises the heterogeneity of interactive language users.</i></li> </ul>	<b>16-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge about linguistic concepts, theories and research.</li> <li>• Identifies different views and interpretations.</li> <li>• Comments on others' ideas.</li> <li>• <i>Examines closely one or more of the specified features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Evaluates the role played by these features in spoken interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Explores how these features function in various spoken interactions.</i></li> <li>• <i>Conceptualises different views and assimilates appropriate supporting research, eg Politeness principle, Accommodation theory, Face theory, Grice's co-operative theory.</i></li> </ul>
<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depth/range of knowledge of linguistic ideas/concepts/research.</li> <li>• Develops views on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Challenges stereotypes by referring to interactive strategies used by a variety of speakers in different contexts.</i></li> <li>• <i>Refers clearly to different kinds of interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Integrates some relevant research into argument.</i></li> <li>• <i>Considers the role played by particular lexical, semantic and grammatical features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Begins to challenge research using own experience and research.</i></li> </ul>	<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depth/range of knowledge of linguistic ideas/concepts/research.</li> <li>• Develops views on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• Detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Outlines views on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Examines one or more of the specified features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Gives some particular examples of these features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Comments on the significance of research and ideas about the construction of spoken interaction.</i></li> </ul>
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Outlines views on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Begins to comment on the influence of gender on spoken interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Outlines the importance of context on the use of interactive features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies main features of spoken interactive behaviour and speakers' relationships.</i></li> </ul>	<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed knowledge of linguistic ideas, concepts and research..</li> <li>• Outlines views on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Attempts to comment on some of the specified features but does so unevenly.</i></li> <li>• <i>Looks at a limited range of features such as greetings and non-verbal signals.</i></li> <li>• <i>Outlines some researchers and ideas without close links to the task.</i></li> </ul>
<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Makes sustained explanations.</li> <li>• <i>Shows broad/implicit understanding of issues relating to spoken interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identifies some interactive features but does not comment on them/does not convey the issue of gender and spoken interaction clearly.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows limited familiarity with linguistic debates by name-dropping researchers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Accepts stereotypes.</i></li> </ul>	<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Makes sustained explanations.</li> <li>• Awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Awareness of linguistic approaches.</li> <li>• <i>Identifies generally some features of language which might be interactive.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows limited familiarity with linguistic debates by name-dropping researchers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows broad/implicit understanding of the task but lacks specific examples of language or contexts.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Awareness of linguistic approaches.</li> <li>• <i>Gives broad/partial accounts of basic principles of spoken interaction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Offers very limited relevant examples.</i></li> </ul>	<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of linguistic ideas, concepts and research.</li> <li>• Awareness of linguistic approaches.</li> <li>• <i>Gives broad/partial accounts of some basic principles of spoken interaction without close reference to specified features.</i></li> <li>• <i>Offers a severely limited range of examples of interactive language.</i></li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance.</li> <li>• Uncertain about how to carry out linguistic study.</li> <li>• <i>Makes sweeping generalisations and broad assertions.</i></li> <li>• <i>Gives an anecdotal/non-linguistic account of female/male use of language.</i></li> <li>• <i>Shows little awareness of interactive features.</i></li> </ul>	<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anecdotal/descriptive with implicit relevance.</li> <li>• Uncertain about how to carry out linguistic study.</li> <li>• <i>Identifies some examples of language but does not comment on them clearly.</i></li> <li>• <i>Makes very broad, unsubstantial assertions.</i></li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little focus on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Offers generalised/lay discussion of female/male attitudes and behaviour.</i></li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little focus on linguistic issues.</li> <li>• <i>Gives very generalised discussions of interaction.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of anything concerned with the study of language.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of anything concerned with the study of language.</li> </ul>

<b>Q1 and 2/3</b>	
<b>Mark</b>	<b>AO1: Communicate clearly the knowledge, understanding and insight appropriate to the study of language, using appropriate terminology and accurate and coherent written expression.</b>
<b>8-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rare errors.</li> <li>• Clear stylistic shaping.</li> <li>• Reader guided through structure.</li> <li>• Effective linguistic register.</li> </ul>
<b>6-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firm control of accuracy.</li> <li>• Controlled expression of ideas.</li> <li>• Line of argument.</li> <li>• Controlled linguistic register.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrequent technical errors.</li> <li>• Clear communication of ideas.</li> <li>• Simple list structure; introduction and conclusion present.</li> <li>• Definite if inconsistent linguistic register.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occasional technical errors.</li> <li>• Expression suitable for ideas.</li> <li>• Structure/organisation emerges.</li> <li>• Some control of linguistic register.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequent errors.</li> <li>• Conveys basic ideas.</li> <li>• Scatter gun structure.</li> <li>• Occasional use of linguistic terms.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intrusive basic errors (sentence punctuation, there/their etc).</li> <li>• Simple expression – conveys basic points.</li> <li>• Short/incomplete work.</li> <li>• Misunderstanding of linguistic terms.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major flaws in language.</li> <li>• Communication impeded – but some points are conveyed.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total irrelevance/incomprehensible.</li> </ul>