GCE 2005
January Series

AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark Scheme

English Language B

ENB6

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.

ENB6: Language Development

General Principles

The aim of this module is to engage candidates in a detailed examination of the concepts and theories of language acquisition and language change using the knowledge, understanding and skills they have developed over all the AS and A2 modules (synopticity). Like Module 2, Module 6 requires candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the interconnection of specific features of language and their appropriate application to different social contexts. There is an additional demand that these contexts will include texts and data relating to the acquisition of English by children and the growth of and changes in language over time.

In common with all modules in this specification, references to research (AO4) relate to the definition published in 2001 by AQA. This definition is as follows and examiners should interpret all references to research in exam questions accordingly:

Research embraces not only published studies encountered in academic sources, but equally the findings of candidates themselves through exploration of their own data in classroom settings and beyond. As a general principle, candidates will be expected to offer appropriate evidence for points they make in their work. The ability to discuss language data and issues in objective and critical ways is at the core of a good candidate performance.

Assessment Objectives

This module requires candidates to:

AO1   communicate clearly the knowledge, understanding and insight appropriate to the study of language, using appropriate terminology and accurate and coherent expression (2.5% A2)

AO3ii   apply and explore frameworks for the systematic study of language at different levels, commenting on the usefulness of approaches taken (5% A2)

AO4   understand, discuss and explore concepts and issues relating to language in use (5% A2)

AO5ii   analyse and evaluate variation in the meanings and forms of spoken and written language from different times according to context (7.5% A2).

The Generic Numerical Mark Scheme and Indicative Content pages that follow specify the criteria and indicators that will guide examiners in judging how satisfactorily candidates have achieved these different objectives.

Examiners should mark scripts holistically but with an awareness of the band they would place the text in for each assessment objective. The final mark should reflect the greater weighting given to AO 3ii, AO4 and especially to AO5ii relative to the weighting given to AO1. Marginal and summative comments should refer to relevant coverage (indicative content) and to the assessment objectives.

Synopticity in a Text and Data Focused Specification

Unit 6 is the synoptic unit test for a text and data focused specification which always starts with language from contexts of actual use and develops relevant description and analysis based on language study principles. As such, unit 6 tests in a more developed and integrated way, knowledge, understanding and skills which will have been learned in the course of modules 1 to 5, as well as in module 6. A key focus for this learning will be the methods for working with texts including knowledge of how to work open-mindedly, tentatively and methodically with varied primary sources, including how to apply the insights of language study and research to this analysis.

Data-focused questions make different demands to essay titles with no associated data. There is more credit for the application of knowledge shown in the detailed engagement with the particular material set. Such engagement includes research skills in reading diverse text types such as transcripts, phonemic symbols, dictionary entries, wordlists, tables, lists of words in their contexts of use (kwiclists) and others. It also includes skills in the selection of details which offer grounds for comparison, awareness of the limitations of the data, and awareness of possible contradictions and anomalies within it.

There will be less credit for the kind of general research surveys associated with essay question answers including the citing of named researchers and their key studies. Whilst such coverage should be credited for demonstrating AO4 knowledge, it may not be of primary importance in relation to AO3 and AO5 which are likely to be focused on the particular data set, its language features and the associated social context.

The June 2002 exam report reported a number of generic features found in stronger and weaker answers which showed this synoptic dimension of working with texts and data.

Stronger answers:

- addressed the question relevantly;
- engaged with the data in detail and with attention to its context;
- identified patterns and examples across the data set;
- expressed ideas clearly and accurately with appropriate terminology;
- identified language features accurately including grammatical and pragmatic aspects;
- showed informed insight into the data set whilst being cautious of its limitations;
- reflected an open-minded and tentative approach to the issues raised;
- showed assured conceptualised knowledge of language theories and studies.

Weaker answers:

- gave little or narrow relevant coverage of the question or the data;
- engaged with the data descriptively or by content summary;
- used language imprecisely with limited terminology;
- asserted ideas with underdeveloped explanations;
- showed limited knowledge and understanding of the issues;
- made no references to research ideas or few and simplistic references;
- treated the dataset as uncomplicatedly representative of the given situation;
- listed examples without observing underlying patterns;
- made sweeping statements on the basis of limited evidence;
- gave narrow or partial coverage of the issues.

General Numerical Mark Scheme: All Questions

Marks		Skills Descriptors
0-5	AO1	Rudimentary observations about relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; frequent lapses in control of written expression and scarcely any use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Very limited attempt at application of frameworks; generally not reliable and systematic; observations on data confined to one or two references.
	AO4	Comments on a factor governing language use in data, though not fully understood; attempts discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data but with very limited success.
	AO5ii	May refer to one or two factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; may refer to one or two contextual factors of data.
6-11	AO1	Some general observations about relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; lapses in control of written expression and little appropriate use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Limited attempt at application of frameworks; generally unreliable and rarely systematic; observations on data confined to isolated references.
	AO4	Elementary comment on one or two factors governing language use in data, though not always fully understood; attempts discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data but with limited success.
	AO5ii	Recognises one or two factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies one or two contextual factors of data.
12-17	AO1	Makes observations, not always accurately, and with limited detail on relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; generally accurate written expression and some appropriate use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Attempts some application of frameworks but not always successfully, reliably or systematically; some valid observations on data.
	AO4	some awareness of a limited number of factors governing language use in data; discusses concept of language in use in relation to data.
	AO5ii	Recognises some features influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies some contextual factors of data.

18-23	AO1	Generally accurate observations about relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; accurate and clear written expression and appropriate use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Application of frameworks to data evident, but some lapses in reliability and lacking in systematic treatment; some valid and sensible observations on data and touching on subtler awareness (including grammatical points or other technical aspects).
	AO4	Some understanding of a number of factors governing language use in data; discusses concept of language in use in relation to data with some effectiveness.
	AO5ii	Some awareness of contextual factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; identifies and interprets a number of contextual factors of data.
24-29	AO1	Clear observations about relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; very controlled written expression and sound use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Generally reliable and systematic application of frameworks to the data; makes generally secure linguistic observations on data. Engages with more technical aspects such as grammar, discourse or cohesion.
	AO4	Sound understanding of factors governing language use in data; often effective discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data.
	AO5ii	Shows awareness of factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; generally clear description and interpretation of distinctive contextual factors of data.
30-35	AO1	Clear and detailed observations about relationships between language and development with particular reference to prescribed topic area; exemplary written expression and accurate use of terminology.
	AO3ii	Reliable and systematic application of frameworks to the data; makes informed linguistic observations on data. Engages with more technical aspects such as grammar, discourse or cohesion.
	AO4	Perceptive insight into many factors governing language use in data; effective discussion of concept of language in use in relation to data.
	AO5ii	Shows understanding of factors influencing form, meaning and diversity in data; clear description and interpretation of distinctive contextual factors of data.

Indicative Content about Texts in the 2004 examinations

The following indicative content gives some of the relevant coverage in relation to assessment objectives 1, 3ii, 4 and 5ii. Examiners should seek to credit the identification of language features of all types in relation to contextual factors. The following lists are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. Given the constraints of this exam, very few candidates will have time to note most of the points made. Credit should also be given for insightful observations other than those made explicit below.

Structure of indicative content: This usually includes some outline of the issues raised by the texts and question and the general indication of what candidates are meant to be doing. This is structured under the assessment objectives headings for AO3ii, 4 and 5ii in the following ways:

AO1:   Credit quality of explanation and degree to which candidate achieves an effective linguistic register (including terminology).

AO3ii: Credit coverage of significant linguistic features identified in relation to their effects.

AO4:   Credit knowledge base of ideas from studies of language in use including research (fieldwork, theory, studies, methods for data analysis).

AO5ii: Credit coverage of contextual factors including situational factors (audience, purpose and context) and developmental factors (LA) or temporal (LC) factors.

Indicative Content

Question 1:   Young Child Talking with Parents

Assessment Objective 3ii

Reward precision of observation and relevant application of terms and concepts about the language levels. Stronger responses will include some comment on grammatical and/or pragmatic choices. Credit groupings of examples across the data.

Lexis and Semantics

Overextensions ('talker'; ' puzz[le]');
Fields of reference relate to play activities and role play;
Pronouns, deictics and reference (shared contexts).

Grammar

Much of Tom's grammar approximates adult forms;
Occasional difficulties with constructions;
Possible overgeneralisation ("you've been ate");
Development of auxiliary verbs ('I sitting on');
Occasional overgeneralisations ('feeled');
Variations in grammatical concord ('is these').

Pragmatics

Social expectations of behaviour in conversations;
Roles taken by Tom (Tom as 'bicycle-mender', story monkey);
Roles taken by parent (explicit, rewarding, cajoling instructional behaviours).

Discourse structure

Adult roles in initiating topics and asking questions;
Adult roles in regulating Tom's behaviour;
Ways in which disagreement is expressed and resolved;
Variety of activities and conversations;
Evidence of turntaking and co-operative behaviour (adjacency pairs).

Phonology

Reduplication;
Shouting.

Assessment Objective 4

Assessment Objective 4 tests knowledge of ideas, methods and evidence from studies of language in use. In Child Language Acquisition answers this will be evidenced by the theoretical and research frameworks the candidate is able to bring to bear on the analysis. The danger of such knowledge and understanding is that it is sometimes used without regard for the particular question and associated data. Examiners should seek to credit relevant knowledge as it applies to the particular data set and question focus and not knowledge for its own sake.

Such relevant knowledge pre-supposes a rich text interpretation. Deficit prescriptive evaluations will allow little relevant purchase on the data. Good candidates should be familiar with the kind of child language metalanguage indicated in the AO3 descriptors.

Stronger answers in the 24-35 range will be informed by secure knowledge of ideas from language study research. Responses will tend to be more explicit and wide ranging in their coverage, more probing and explicit in their analysis and more cautious in the way in which they draw conclusions on the basis of this evidence (due tentativeness). There may be some preparedness to consider the data and research background critically.

Answers in the 12-24 range will show some of the qualities in the range above but coverage will be less secure and consistent. For example answers may be uneven, oversimplified or over-assertive in their coverage of some important material. Some answers in this range may show an informed but undiscerning and/or inflexible use of secondary research.

Answers in the 0-11 band will include relevant answers which demonstrate no more than weak subject knowledge and understanding, and answers that are more fundamentally flawed.

Deficit accounts of children's language as inferior would suggest little understanding of the descriptive rich text interpretation that informs approaches based on language study principles and which is necessary to make sense of such transcripts.

Irrelevant answers may include those which give general chronological surveys of child development and can only be credited where coverage is appropriate to the question set.

Research coverage

Theoretical perspectives from studies of language in use could include focus on research foregrounding children's creativity in generating their grammar from the norms around them (e.g. Brown and Bellugi); also the roles of caregivers in scaffolding child discourse (Wells 1986); also the role of play (Crystal 1995). References to Bruner, Snow, Piaget.

Assessment Objective 5ii

Contextual awareness is likely to be mixed in with coverage of AO3 and AO4 rather than in separate paragraphs. Contextual awareness will relate to:

- the situational variation (use variation). Here this means the way the child uses language in relation to the activities he is performing and the different roles and expectations of adults and children.
- the specific contextual factors relating to language development. The level of linguistic and social development associated with children aged between two and three years old.

Indicative Content

Question 2:   Language Acquisition: Children's *Scooby Doo* Narratives

Assessment Objective 3ii

Reward precision of observation and relevant application of terms and concepts about the language levels. Stronger responses will include some comment on grammatical and/or pragmatic choices. Credit groupings of examples across the data.

Credit references to, and comparisons with, details of children's writing from the students' own fieldwork.

Lexis and Semantics

Words associated with starting and sequencing narrative (stylistic conventions);
Patterns in vocabulary, semantics and word classes;
Elaboration of detail (pre and post modification).

Grammar

Mixed registers and viewpoints including **grammatical** aspects of that (pronouns, tense).

Discourse structure

Relationship of the texts to others likely to have been encountered (written story genre/film/anecdotes);
Structures for sequencing and developing narrative;
Devices to enhance narrative interest;
Patterns of narrative structure and the conventions of storytelling;
Devices for cohesion, coherence and narrative such as connectives and direct speech.

Graphology

Devices to frame the texts along with comments on handwriting formation, lineation, spacing, (issues of practice, repetition and control);
Punctuation and other markers of sentence boundaries and discourse (e.g. paragraphing).

Orthography

Patterns in children's spellings and their underlying principles; norms and variations;
Orthographic principles motivating non-standard realisations (phoneme, grapheme correspondences and their development over time).

Assessment Objective 4

Assessment Objective 4 tests knowledge of ideas, methods and evidence from studies of language in use. In Child Language Acquisition answers this will be evidenced by the theoretical and research frameworks the candidate is able to bring to bear on the analysis. Examiners should seek to credit relevant knowledge as it applies to the particular data set and question focus and not knowledge for its own sake.

Such relevant knowledge pre-supposes a rich text interpretation. Deficit prescriptive evaluations will allow little relevant purchase on the data. Good candidates should be familiar with the kind of child language metalanguage indicated in the AO3 descriptors.

Stronger answers in the 24-35 range will be informed by secure knowledge of ideas from language study research. Responses will tend to be more explicit and wide ranging in their coverage, more probing and explicit in their analysis and more cautious in the way in which they draw conclusions on the basis of this evidence (due tentativeness). There may be some preparedness to consider the data and research background critically.

Answers in the 12-24 range will show some of the qualities in the range above but coverage will be less secure and consistent. For example answers may be uneven, oversimplified or over-assertive in their coverage of some important material. Some answers in this range may show an informed but undiscerning and/or inflexible use of secondary research.

Answers in the 0-11 band will include relevant answers which demonstrate no more than weak subject knowledge and understanding, and answers that are more fundamentally flawed.

Deficit accounts of children's language as inferior would suggest little understanding of the descriptive rich text interpretation that informs approaches based on language study principles and which is necessary to make sense of such transcripts.

Irrelevant answers may include those which give general chronological surveys of child development and can only be credited where coverage is appropriate to the question set.

Research coverage

Textbook coverage of early writing is sparse by comparison with coverage of spoken acquisition research. Examiners should credit the analytical skills the candidates bring to bear on the question and data set even where there are only limited references to secondary sources of research.

AO4 credit should be given for informed, systematic and engaged coverage. The candidates will show awareness that literacy is acquired in a social context with deliberate strategies of support from more literate members of the community (at home or in school). Candidates will show awareness of the complexity of the process at the language levels of sounds and spellings, vocabulary and meaning, grammar and discourse (narrative). They will show an appreciation of the kinds of meanings children are reaching for (albeit with a limited control of language and the written mode): rich text interpretation rather than prescriptive evaluation should form the basis of observations made. At the highest level, candidates will settle into the uncertainty of some details showing due tentativeness about what can be known. As in other units, comments on more sophisticated and technical aspects of structure (grammar, cohesion and discourse) are likely to score more highly than comments about surface levels.

Use of the texts as the basis for observations about how children learn control of writing narratives including references to research and fieldwork and to candidates own examples;
Some awareness of complex detail in younger child's writing;
Some awareness of the relationship between the texts children hear, read and see and the conventions they use in their written production.

Assessment Objective 5ii

Contextual awareness is likely to be mixed in with coverage of AO3 and AO4 rather than in separate paragraphs. Contextual awareness will relate to:

- situational variation. The (unknown) context for the writing. The support which was given to the children once they had the instruction;
- specific contextual factors relating to written language development.

Indicative Content

Question 3:   Letters from Soldiers on Active Service

Grounds of comparability in contexts (temporal and situational dimensions);

Grounds of comparability include the use of capitalisation, **orthography, lexical** and **grammatical** choices which vary in relation to conventions of standard English;

Letters are different in **tone** and construct different identities, relationships with the implied reader (tenor; narratee);

Credit comparison of informational (ideational) and interpersonal content. Greater focus on factual details of campaign in E, and greater interpersonal focus of F;

Patterns of **semantics** in politeness and taboo implied in linguistic choices;

Comparison of representations of non-English group identities (the Russians/ ragheads);

Observations about the kinds of words misspelt in E (logical and often phonological basis of non-standard forms);

Identification of those features constructing a more formal tenor in E;

Comparisons of field specific vocabulary from Active Service;

Relaxed conversational style in F compared to more formal, diffident, anxious tones in E;

One a facsimile and the other a wordprocessed copy (including unclear words); E may have been dictated;

Evidence for the sense of E as a composed record made effortfully, F as more instantaneous and part of a faster and more frequent exchange of communication; Example of the way in which ICT text types incorporate features of speech to achieve rapport;

Manner of address and signing off in E compared to F.

Assessment Objective 4

Assessment Objective 4 tests knowledge of ideas, methods and evidence from studies of language in use. Examiners should seek to credit relevant knowledge as it applies to these texts and to the question.

Stronger answers in the 24-25 range will be informed by secure knowledge of ideas from language study. As a result of this they will tend to be more explicit and wide ranging in their coverage, more probing and explicit in their analysis and more cautious in the way in which they draw conclusions on the basis of limited evidence (due tentativeness).

Answers in the 12-24 range will show some of the qualities in the range above but coverage will be less secure and consistent. For example answers may be uneven, oversimplified or over-assertive in their coverage of some important material. Some answers in this range may show an informed but undiscerning and/or inflexible use of secondary research.

Answers in the 0-11 band will include relevant answers which demonstrate no more than weak subject knowledge and understanding, and answers that are more fundamentally flawed.

Deficit accounts and evaluative accounts of varieties of language as inferior would suggest little understanding of the descriptive rich text interpretation that informs approaches based on language study principles and which is necessary to make sense of such data.

Irrelevant answers may include those which give general chronological surveys of language development and can only be credited where coverage is appropriate to the question set.

Research coverage

Non-standard spellings in H include hybridised forms associated with SMS text messaging, internet chat (letter homophones) and colloquial 'unregimented' spelling;
Changes in expectations of lexical and grammatical choices between the two texts;
Changes in the conventions for correspondence;
Changes in expectations of formality;
Informalisation and conversationalisation of writing in late twentieth century.

Assessment Objective 5ii

Candidates will show awareness that these texts show situational as well as temporal variation.

Situational Variation

- Genre conventions of letters and emails;
- Censorship and news management in combat zones, military discipline;
- Fear and geographical isolation from kin.

Temporal Variation

- Changes in the English language between 1850 and 2003 as a consequence of social changes such as those in educational access, equality of opportunity and political correctness.

Indicative Content

**Question 4:   Language Change Tabloid Newspaper Account of Youth Text Messaging
                  Language**

Credit comment on newspaper account and on embedded examples including sample SMS text.

Identification of **genres** in relation to purposes and audiences: a tabloid newspaper account, school
news/letter;
Genre features of tabloid reportage including reporting conventions and layout to chunk discourse and
allow a variety of reading styles;
Genre features such as principles of headline construction, pull quotes, phonological patterning;
Discourse: way the argument and ideology frames the examples and attempts to influence the way the
reader interprets those examples;
Identification of **orthographic principles of non-standard spelling** including use of terms such as
acronyms, initialisms, phonetic spelling, letter and number homophones;
Lexical choices and collocations for example in the reference to the participants (named and
unnamed, institutional affiliations;
Analysis of schoolgirl text including patterns and features of spelling.

Assessment Objective 4

Assessment Objective 4 tests knowledge of ideas, methods and evidence from studies of language in
use. In Language Change answers this will be evidenced by the theoretical and research frameworks
the candidate is able to bring to bear on their analysis. The danger of such knowledge and
understanding is that it is sometimes used without regard for the particular question and associated
data. Examiners should seek to credit relevant knowledge as it applies to these texts and to the
question.

Stronger answers in the 24-25 range will be informed by secure knowledge of ideas from language
study. As a result of this they will tend to be more explicit and wide ranging in their coverage, more
probing and explicit in their analysis and more cautious in the way in which they draw conclusions on
the basis of limited evidence (due tentativeness).

Answers in the 12-24 range will show some of the qualities in the range above but coverage will be
less secure and consistent. For example answers may be uneven, oversimplified or over-assertive in
their coverage of some important material. Some answers in this range may show an informed but
undiscerning and/or inflexible use of secondary research.

Answers in the 0-11 band will include relevant answers which demonstrate no more than weak
subject knowledge and understanding, and answers that are more fundamentally flawed. **Deficit
accounts and evaluative accounts of varieties of language as inferior** would suggest little
understanding of the descriptive rich text interpretation that informs approaches based on language
study principles and which is necessary to make sense of such data. Irrelevant answers may include
those which give general chronological surveys of language development and can only be credited
where coverage is appropriate to the question set.

Coverage of Research and Ideas from Language Study

Situating adverse comment in a tradition of **prescriptive** conservatism in the face of the inevitability
of language change;

Changes in SMS **texting conventions** and **attitudes** towards them since this article was written: the diffusion of text messaging as a social practice, changes in technology of phones (predictive text), relaxation in attitudes towards SMS novelty;
Reward sceptical comments on the girl's letter which mainly consists of **intialisms** and other more rare SMS conventions;
Polarisation of the positions of youth and of authority located in SMS versus the standard forms expected in school contexts;
Relevant citing of authorities on language and technology: Herring, Thurlow etc.

Assessment Objective 5ii

Candidates will show awareness that these texts show situational as well as temporal variation.

Situational Variation

Tabloid Newspaper sensationalist/popular account;
Well established genre features;
Construction of a popular readership;
Limited concern for the provenance of ideas.

Temporal Variation

Recent changes in language through technological and social innovation;
The educational experiences of the writer in contrast with the school student;
The text messaging experiences of the writer in contrast with the school student.