

General Certificate of Education  
June 2008  
Advanced Subsidiary Examination

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE (SPECIFICATION A)**  
**Unit 1 Discovering Language**

**ENA1**



Friday 16 May 2008 9.00 am to 10.30 am

**For this paper you must have:**

- a 12-page answer book.

Time allowed: 1 hour 30 minutes

**Instructions**

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The *Examining Body* for this paper is AQA. The *Paper Reference* is ENA1.
- There are **two** sections:  
    **Section A:** Language Analysis  
    **Section B:** Language Issues.
- Answer Question 1 from Section A and **either** Question 2 **or** Question 3 from Section B.
- Do all rough work in the answer book. Cross through any work you do not want to be marked.

**Information**

- The maximum mark for this paper is 70.
- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- You will be marked on your ability to use good English, to organise information clearly and to use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

**Advice**

- It is recommended that you spend 10 minutes on the reading and preparation of the data to be analysed in answering Section A.

---

**SECTION A – Language Analysis**

Answer Question 1.

---

**1** Read carefully **Text A**, which you will find on page 3. **Text A** is an editorial from the daily newspaper *Morning Star*.

- Comment linguistically on the significant features of the text.
- Explain how these language features contribute to the text's meanings.

In your answer you should consider:

vocabulary and meanings  
grammatical features and their effects  
how the language represents nuclear weapons and the government  
how the language conveys opinions and shapes the reader's response.

(45 marks)

## Text A



## Directed at whom?

LABOUR backbenchers ought to have been to the fore in asking pertinent questions about the government's plans to replace Trident, rather than leaving it to the all-party Commons defence committee.

The government claimed to be initiating a debate three months ago on the future of Britain's supposed independent nuclear deterrent, but no ministers have debated with anti-nuclear campaigners.

Neither has it put forward credible figures to facilitate debate. Nor has it come clean on the details of the relationship between Britain and the US, with regard to the decision-making processes regarding any potential launch of these weapons of mass destruction.

Least of all has it revealed the targets for these nuclear warheads, the destructive power of which dwarves the US atomic bombs that devastated the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

During the cold war, it was clear that the Soviet Union had been designated enemy number one and that, therefore, the rockets would be programmed to incinerate Soviet cities or other targets.

☆☆☆

Now that the US and Britain are most exercised by their bogus war on terror, what role is there for nuclear weapons?

They did not prevent the terrorists who flew their hijacked planes into the World Trade Centre in 2001.

Nor did they deter those who slaughtered dozens of working people on London public transport a couple of years ago.

Have they already been set to destroy Afghanistan's Tora Bora mountains, where Osama bin Laden is said to hide, or have the military bases and capital cities of whichever countries are currently heading George W Bush's fraudulent "axis of evil" been lined up for pulverisation?

The government won't say – probably because it knows that anything that it says will be seen as ridiculous.

So it talks in dark, mystical tones of being ready for anything that the future may throw at us. Best to be prepared. Better safe than sorry.

But, if this is a valid reason for Britain to have nuclear weapons, then it is just as valid for Iran, North Korea or anywhere else.

☆☆☆

It implies that security is guaranteed only by possession of nukes, which is patently untrue. Nuclear weapons haven't prevented Britain and the US from terrorist attacks, while countries such as South Africa, Ukraine and Kazakhstan feel secure despite having renounced previously existing nuclear weaponry.

The government is hell-bent on approving a new system next week, even though there is no compelling reason to do so.

It is hoping to have a brief row before signing contracts and then telling critics that there can be no further debate.

But debate there must be – not only over ending this waste of public finance on an extravagant international status symbol but also about the future of those places such as Barrow where building nuclear submarines is the only source of well-paid manufacturing employment.

Dropping nuclear totems like Trident has to be accompanied by a comprehensive switch to a peace-oriented economy that will put well-paid employment in areas of production at its heart.

Source: *Morning Star*, 7 March 2007

---

**SECTION B – Language Issues**

Answer **either** Question 2 **or** Question 3.

---

**EITHER**

- 2** How far do you agree with the view that it does not matter what words are used to label social groups?

(25 marks)

**OR**

- 3** How far do you agree with the view that all children acquire language in the same way?

(25 marks)

**END OF QUESTIONS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Question 1 Source: *Morning Star*, 7 March 2007

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

M/Jun08/ENA1