



General Certificate of Education

English Language 5706 *Specification B*

ENB2 Language and Social Contexts

Mark Scheme

2007 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

Copyright © 2007 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.

Mark Scheme: All Questions

Marks	Content Descriptors
0-5	<p>AO1 Rudimentary observations about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; frequent lapses in control of written expression and negligible use of terminology; highly descriptive.</p> <p>AO3i Very limited attempt to apply frameworks, generally unreliable and unsystematic; observations on data confined to one or two references.</p> <p>AO4 Comment on a factor governing language use in data, though superficial or not fully understood; attempts discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data but with very limited success.</p> <p>AO5i May refer to one or two factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; may refer simplistically to one or two contextual features of data.</p>
6-11	<p>AO1 Some general observations about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; lapses in control of written expression and little appropriate use of terminology; often descriptive.</p> <p>AO3i Limited attempt to apply frameworks, often unreliable and rarely systematic; observations on data confined to isolated references.</p> <p>AO4 Elementary comment on one or two factors governing language use in data, though rather superficial or not always fully understood; attempts discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data but with limited success.</p> <p>AO5i Recognises one or two factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies one or two contextual features of data.</p>
12-17	<p>AO1 Some observations, though not always accurate, about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; generally accurate written expression and some appropriate use of terminology; sometimes only descriptive.</p> <p>AO3i Some application of frameworks but not always reliable, systematic or successful; some valid observations on data, occasionally exemplified.</p> <p>AO4 Some awareness of a limited number of factors governing language use in data, occasionally developed; discusses concept of language in use in relation to data.</p> <p>AO5i Recognises some factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies some contextual features of data.</p>

18-23	<p>AO1 Generally accurate observations about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; accurate and clear written expression and appropriate use of terminology.</p> <p>AO3i Application of frameworks, but not consistently reliable or systematic; some valid and sensible observations on data, sometimes exemplified.</p> <p>AO4 Some understanding of a number of factors governing language use in data, sometimes developed; discusses concept of language in use in relation to data with some effectiveness.</p> <p>AO5i Some awareness of factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies and interprets a number of contextual features of data.</p>
24-29	<p>AO1 Generally clear and accurate observations about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; controlled written expression and sound use of terminology.</p> <p>AO3i Generally reliable and systematic application of frameworks; generally secure linguistic observations on data, often exemplified.</p> <p>AO4 Generally sound understanding of factors governing language use in data, often developed; often effective discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data.</p> <p>AO5i Shows awareness of factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; generally clear description and interpretation of distinctive contextual features of data.</p>
30-35	<p>AO1 Clear and detailed observations about relationships between language and society in reference to prescribed topic area; sophisticated written expression and accurate use of terminology.</p> <p>AO3i Reliable and systematic application of frameworks; informed linguistic observations on data, regularly and appropriately exemplified.</p> <p>AO4 Sound, sometimes perceptive, insight into several factors governing language use in data, tentatively explored and often developed; effective discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data.</p> <p>AO5i Shows understanding of factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; clear description and thoughtful interpretation of distinctive contextual features of data.</p>

Language and Technology: indicative content

- discussion of nature of personal publishing/use of sophisticated format
- nature of audience – some specific, eg friends who author knows use site/some who have left comments/some notional i.e. browsers/surfers – notion of shared community for those who access site regularly
- purpose for writing very mixed – entertain/inform - but depends on mood
- discussion of layout – use of white space/diff. fonts for clarity/images – all chosen by author and personalised to suit taste
- house style of **myspace** – banner at top of page linked to **myspace** identity – persuasive features because of nature of site
- standardised format of entries - emboldened initial topic indicators/humorous details
Current mood:/signing off at end of entry – letter like – effects?
- interactive features – underlining to represent links – user control
- author's idiolect within blog entries – *anywho/toodles/which sucks*
- author's identity – personal space – moods/reflective nature of writing/picture/personal anecdotes/use of humour/personal details
- shared contextual information – music/age-related/personal details/my space genius/invited comments/audience address – pragmatic implications
- non-standard punctuation, eg *Thats all there/comment!!!/im* – mimics prosodic features or issues of speed/informal environment
- use of pronouns – frequency of 2nd person *you* linked to assumptions about audience, and 1st person *I* linked to nature of genre
- non-standard spelling, eg *happpy/preshious/youn/promice* - speed, informal nature of writing, 'correctness' not essential
- use of repetition, eg *so so so/happy happy happy* – for emphasis/humour
- inconsistent lang features/mistakes – informality, speed
- speech-like features, eg fillers *Umm* - phatic openings *Hello Hello/Hello people* - unfinished adjacency pairs – emoticons for paralinguistic features
- relevant discussion of the nature of blog – 'secret' diary but in the public domain - 'diary' like but entries as and when author feels/newsletter style
- relevant discussion of speech/writing boundaries linked to language in blog
- relevant discussion of theory related to personal identity & presentation of 'self'/nature & style of blog/compressed English.

Language and Occupational Groups: indicative content

- general awareness that this extract is a representation of an operation and has been created by the writer(s)/director/actors for entertainment – also that the extract is a transcript of the actual programme rather than a script
- semantic field of medicine, eg *cardiac surgery/operating/chest cavity/coronary arteries/ectopics* etc to add authenticity
- context-sensitive lexis as relevant as technical lexis in creating medical environment, eg *suitable/unstable/identity* etc
- discussion of use of pronouns to add weight to authentic medical talk and verbal battle esp. inclusive *we* and 2nd person *you* (challenging?)
- use of realistic sound effects and awareness that for the viewer the dialogue would be accompanied by visual elements supporting ‘medical’ language
- features of spoken language i.e. contracted forms/overlapping and interruptions used to mimic ‘real’ speech add authenticity to dramatic action – whilst not confusing the viewer
- verbal battle between consultant and the surgeon – combative opening utterance by the consultant followed by a rapid exchange between them leading up to the climax of the scene where the consultant ‘wins’
- power struggle related to roles and ownership of the ‘patient’ – consultant interrupts surgeon on three occasions to assert power. Struggle also seems to be focused on ‘experience’ (consultant) vs. technology (surgeon)
- quantity of talk by surgeon – sets the scene and talks more, thus apparently dominating the consultant – but loses out in climax of scene
- talk should be entirely transactional in nature because of environment, but it seems to be interactional and working on a different level – nature of genre?
- structure of the extract designed to lead to climax for purposes of entertainment – wouldn’t be the case in ‘real’ operation/emergency
- contrast between the surgeon’s use of some non-standard forms (possibly covert prestige) – supports combative nature of dialogue
- setting is fairly formal but not a public environment – occupational setting
- Grice’s maxims deliberately broken to add weight to power conflict.

Language and Gender: indicative content

- relevant discussion of how gender issues are placed alongside other ‘minority groups’ and are areas of concern for a modern police force
- title of extract foregrounds purpose *Devaluing expressions* – need to show that police force is progressive and aware of the fact that language is not neutral and doesn’t reflect equality – is an attempt to alter the way language is used
- discussion of context of workplace and hierarchical structure of police force – language reform here poss. reflects nature of power changes within society
- text acknowledges that terms that are politically correct are subject to change and that what was once acceptable may no longer be so
- discussion of how women have been constrained to describe themselves in male terms – especially true of a traditionally male environment like police force
- discussion of address forms from text and further exemplification and the connotations which these forms carry, eg *boys/girls/ladies/gentlemen/women/men/male/female* etc
- discussion of impact and connotations of titles, eg *Ms* (negative connotations – divorced/feminist) *Mrs/Miss* (marital status clear c.f. *Mr*)
- use of neutral/non-sexist/inclusive terms within the article, eg *people/police officer* – possible discussion of other changes – esp. occupation related, eg *fire fighter/head teacher/Chairperson* etc
- discussion of the use of suffixes attached to female versions of a profession, eg *actor* and *actress* etc or use of modified terms, eg *nurse* and *male nurse/doctor* and *female doctor* indicating gender stereotypes attached to occupation
- negative connotations of lexis used to address women, eg *dear/pet/love* and further examples of patronising terms from language study
- relevant discussion of the image that this extract presents about a modern police force and their attitude towards women – distancing itself from a negative past image – friendly, encouraging tone of extract
- challenge to male working environment by subverting expression “one of the boys” – linked to other relevant examples from language study
- relevant discussion of gender and language theory – deficit, dominance, difference models/derogatory terms/stereotypes.