

GCE 2004  
*June Series*



## Mark Scheme

### English Language and Literature A *(NTA5)*

---

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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

#### 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

*Dr Michael Cresswell Director General*

June 2004

NTA5

## MARKING GRID

## Section A

		<b>AO4 (25 marks)</b> <b>Understanding the ways language shapes meaning in different contexts.</b>	<b>AO5 (25 marks)</b> <b>Identifying and considering the ways attitudes and values are conveyed.</b>
<b>Band 5</b> <b>21 – 25</b>	23 – 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated analysis of the language of the extract <u>and</u> text in order to explore the question</li> <li>Insightful demonstration of how language shapes meaning</li> <li>Thorough overview</li> <li>Entirely relevant response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed analysis of the range of methods used to convey attitudes and values</li> <li>Relevant understanding of dramatic techniques used</li> <li>Skilful interpretation of how language is used</li> <li>Analytical comments</li> </ul>
	21 – 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceptive analysis of the language of the extract <u>and</u> text in order to explore the question</li> <li>Skilful grasp of how language can shape meaning</li> <li>Sound overview</li> <li>Thoroughly relevant response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes range of references to how and where attitudes and values are conveyed</li> <li>Detailed reference to the text</li> <li>Clear understanding of different ways attitudes/values are conveyed by the dramatist</li> <li>Mostly analytical comments</li> </ul>
<b>Band 4</b> <b>16-20</b>	18 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound engagement with the language of the extract and text in order to explore the question</li> <li>Confident grasp of how language can shape meaning</li> <li>Explores a range of contexts</li> <li>Clear sense of overview</li> <li>Relevant response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant and accurate comment on how and where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>Some detailed exploration of the text</li> <li>Mostly analytical as well as descriptive comments, with a good range of reference</li> </ul>
	16 - 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grapples with the language of the extract <u>or</u> the text in order to explore the question</li> <li>Some clear engagement with how language shapes meaning</li> <li>Sustains a clear line of argument</li> <li>Explores at least two contexts in detail</li> <li>Relevant response</li> <li>Overview provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evident understanding of how attitudes/values found in the text</li> <li>Appropriate reference to some relevant parts of the text</li> <li>Descriptive and analytical comments.</li> <li>A range of relevant ideas</li> </ul>
<b>Band 3</b> <b>11-15</b>	14 - 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some exploration of the language of the extract <u>or</u> the text in order to explore the question</li> <li>Some relevant awareness of how language shapes meaning but under-developed</li> <li>Consideration of at least two contexts</li> <li>Accurate and generally relevant response</li> <li>Some overview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can identify a number of attitudes/values found in the text</li> <li>Some awareness of how and where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>Mostly descriptive comments – analysis emerging</li> </ul>
	11 - 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly reference/response to question</li> <li>Isolated/unfocused exploration of language of either text <u>or</u> extract</li> <li>Beginnings of understanding of how language can shape meaning, but comments lack depth</li> <li>Some comment on at least two relevant aspects of language</li> <li>May feature spot</li> <li>Ideas mostly simple/unsophisticated but accurate</li> <li>Limited overview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General or broad awareness of where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>Adequate, if limited, comment</li> <li>Mostly descriptive comments</li> <li>Ideas mostly simple/unsophisticated but accurate</li> </ul>

<b>Band 2 6-10</b>	8 - 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly a largely narrative response</li> <li>• General awareness of the writer's techniques but on the level of assertion and/or generalisation</li> <li>• One aspect of language referred to</li> <li>• Possibly only occasional relevance</li> <li>• Some flaws in understanding may be evident</li> <li>• No real sense of overview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple / oblique comments on attitudes/values</li> <li>• Probably lacking textual evidence</li> <li>• Unsupported assertions</li> </ul>
	6 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial understanding of language and context</li> <li>• Simplistic ideas</li> <li>• Flaws in understanding are likely to be evident</li> <li>• Possibly largely irrelevant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited grasp of how attitudes/values conveyed</li> <li>• Some explanation may be attempted</li> </ul>
<b>Band 1 0-5</b>	4 - 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited ideas about how language shapes meaning</li> <li>• May identify a feature of language but unable to comment on effect of this</li> <li>• Likely to be irrelevant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly no comment or only brief passing reference to attitudes/values</li> </ul>
	0 - 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no understanding shown of the text, question or language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments/wholly erroneous comments on attitudes and values</li> </ul>

## Section B: Adaptation of Texts for an Audience

### Question 13a: Practical Writing

13a) Using relevant information from these texts, write the text of a letter from the RSPCA to members of the general public appealing for donations and support. You should aim to present information on the charity and its work in a persuasive way.

You should adapt the source material, using your own words as far as possible. Your writing should be approximately 350 – 400 words in length.

**Key words:** Letter – RSPCA – to general public – appeal – donations and support.

**Assessment Focuses:** Show understanding of contextual variation – choice of form, style and vocabulary – shape meaning of texts – expertise and accuracy for specific audience and purpose – knowledge of literary texts and features of language.

	AO6 (25 marks x 2) (Style/accuracy)	Indicative Content/skills
<p>24 – 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Band 5</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expression precise and wholly appropriate</li> <li>• Subtlety of effect</li> <li>• Cohesive writing that works</li> <li>• Audience completely engaged</li> <li>• Stylish</li> <li>• Rare errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All aspects of task addressed</li> <li>• Skilful adaptation of material from <u>both</u> texts</li> <li>• Style is wholly appropriate and convincing for audience and purpose</li> <li>• Successfully contextualised</li> <li>• Key content</li> <li>Text C: skilfully adapted.</li> </ul>
<p>21 – 23</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>• Confidently meets requirements of task</li> <li>• Firm control of accuracy</li> <li>• Confident style</li> <li>• Rare errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective writing</li> <li>• Effective use of information from both texts</li> <li>• Key content</li> <li>Text C: effectively adapted</li> </ul>
<p>18-20</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Band 4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>• Fulfils requirements of task</li> <li>• Mostly technically accurate</li> <li>• Secure style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing</li> <li>• Ability to produce and handle an appropriate form</li> <li>• Appropriate use of information from both texts</li> <li>• Material clearly adapted for new context</li> <li>• Key content</li> <li>Text C: well adapted</li> </ul>
<p>16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>• Sound approach to task</li> <li>• Underlying technical control</li> <li>• Some slips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear awareness of audience and purpose</li> <li>• Sound style, but may be slightly inconsistent</li> <li>• Information mostly appropriate – any lapses very minor</li> <li>• Sound focus on task</li> <li>• Sound adaptation</li> <li>• Key content: some attempt to adapt Text C</li> </ul>
<p>14-15</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Band 3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear attempt to use appropriate style for audience <u>or</u> purpose although some lapses</li> <li>• Expression clear and generally controlled</li> <li>• Some technical flaws</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of audience and form</li> <li>• Generally sound focus on task</li> <li>• Appropriate content with some gaps</li> <li>• May concentrate more on one text</li> <li>• May be some invention of information</li> <li>• Reader will have some engagement</li> <li>• Mostly appropriate adaptation</li> </ul>
<p>11-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shaping evident and some awareness of appropriate style for audience <u>or</u> purpose but patchy</li> <li>• Expression may lack flexibility or accuracy</li> <li>• A number of technical flaws but limited basic error</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach may not be entirely appropriate for audience/purpose</li> <li>• Information from texts may not be well adapted or totally accurate</li> <li>• May invent some information rather than re-cast</li> <li>• Patchy sense of context</li> </ul>

<p><b>8-10</b></p> <p><b>Band 2</b></p> <p><b>6-7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Style/approach not especially convincing, although some attempt to shape for audience or purpose</li> <li>• Likely to be a range of flaws in expression</li> <li>• Likely to be frequent technical errors</li> <li>• Limited sense of context</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Style not secure for audience/purpose</li> <li>• Likely to be simplistic in language or approach</li> <li>• Likely to have intrusive errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to be some noticeable misjudgements about audience/purpose</li> <li>• Likely to reveal some misreading/misunderstanding of original text(s)</li> <li>• May invent a good deal of material</li> <li>• Possibly some unadapted lifting</li> <li>• Not well contextualised</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments limited and general</li> <li>• Probably unadapted lifting</li> <li>• Likely to reveal major misreading/misunderstanding</li> </ul>
<p><b>4-5</b></p> <p><b>Band 1</b></p> <p><b>1-3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occasional awareness of audience/purpose glimpsed</li> <li>• Intrusive basic errors</li> <li>• Highly simplistic</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequent weaknesses in expression</li> <li>• Major technical flaws</li> <li>• Entirely inappropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited awareness of audience or purpose</li> <li>• Basic misjudgements of form</li> <li>• Very limited use of information from texts</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No sense of form or shaping of material for audience/purpose</li> <li>• Totally unfocused</li> </ul>

**Question 13b: Commentary through Analysis**

13b Compare your own writing with **either** Text A **or** Text B **or** Text C in order to highlight the choices you have made in your writing. In your comparison you should show:

- how language and form have been used to suit audience and purpose
- how vocabulary and other stylistic features have been used to shape meaning and to achieve particular effects.

You should aim to write about 400 – 500 words in this comparative commentary.

**Key words:** Compare – Texts A **or** B **or** C and own text – to highlight – choices made – own writing – language used to suit purpose – audience – vocabulary – stylistic features – shape meaning – particular effects.

**Assessment Focuses:** Show understanding of contextual variation – choice of form, style and vocabulary – shape meaning of texts – expertise and accuracy for specific audience and purpose – knowledge, understanding and insight gained from literary and linguistic study – appropriate terminology.

	<b>AO1(25 marks)</b> (knowledge/terminology/ analysis of language)	<b>AO4(25 marks)</b> (context/comparison/language choices)	<b>Indicative skills/content</b>
<b>24 – 25</b>  <b>Band 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searching and confident literary/linguistic analysis</li> <li>• Wholly accurate use of appropriate terminology/concepts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skilful comparison showing thorough understanding of context(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explores languages and engages closely with meaning</li> <li>• Insight shown into a range of features</li> </ul>
<b>21 – 23</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely accurate use of appropriate terminology/concepts</li> <li>• Sustained and cogent argument</li> <li>• Clear and detailed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed and confident comparison showing understanding of how form, style and vocabulary shape meaning</li> <li>• Uses examples from both texts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework for analysis skilfully employed</li> <li>• Grapples with meaning</li> <li>• Confidently and accurately expressed</li> <li>• Uses a range of examples from both texts, clearly analysed</li> </ul>
<b>18-20</b>  <b>Band 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherent/illuminating analysis of distinctive language features</li> <li>• Well sustained argument using a range of literary/linguistic terms/concepts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close focus on both texts</li> <li>• Confident analysis and comparison</li> <li>• Clear awareness of contextual variation</li> <li>• Clear comments on key areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages with meaning and draws thoughtful conclusions</li> <li>• Identifies p.o.s and SS accurately</li> <li>• Points will be well made</li> <li>• Close focus on some details</li> </ul>
<b>16-17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes significant language features</li> <li>• Some exploratory analysis</li> <li>• Framework terms used mostly accurately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and competent comparison</li> <li>• Sound awareness of contextual variation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows engagement with the texts</li> <li>• Points mostly well made</li> <li>• P.o.s and SS mostly accurately identified</li> </ul>

<p><b>14-15</b></p> <p><b>Band 3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis emerging but not sustained</li> <li>Literary/linguistic framework used fairly accurately</li> <li>Analysis lacks depth</li> <li>Distinguishes between some details</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes some valid comparisons</li> <li>Some understanding of contextual variation but not fully explored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation evident</li> <li>Own text explored and compared to other text</li> <li>A number of features commented on but gaps</li> <li>Some apt examples but also some imprecise/general comments</li> </ul>
<p><b>11-13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks precise linguistic/literary terminology</li> <li>Makes mostly general points about language and style</li> <li>Limited ability to deal with complex ideas</li> <li>Analysis under-developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparisons made but mostly on a general level</li> <li>Some limited comment on context</li> <li>Likely to focus more on content than on language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tends to refer vaguely to language levels and appeal to/impact on audience rather than analysing specific details</li> <li>Identifies features mostly accurately but makes some errors and leaves points half made</li> <li>Lack of precision and limited number of examples</li> <li>May feature spot</li> <li>Possibly focuses more on content than style</li> </ul>
<p><b>8-10</b></p> <p><b>Band 2</b></p> <p><b>6-7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness of basic characteristics of specific genre</li> <li>Simple points made about language</li> <li>Partial use of framework</li> <li>Some misunderstanding evident</li> <li>May be very limited analysis</li> <li>Rare language choices commented on</li> <li>Response to surface features</li> <li>Minimal use of frameworks/terminology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited comparisons made</li> <li>Partially sees how context influences language use</li> <li>Some general comment on techniques</li> <li>Very limited comparisons made</li> <li>Superficial/simplistic ideas on language use in relation to context</li> <li>Vague awareness of audience/aim</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tends to make very vague comments</li> <li>Comments are broad and general with few examples</li> <li>Ideas fairly accurate but some misunderstanding/error may be evident</li> <li>Possibly focus on design/layout/graph/content</li> <li>Simplistic understanding and exploration of one area</li> <li>Very few, if any, examples</li> <li>Some errors of explanation</li> </ul>
<p><b>4-5</b></p> <p><b>Band 1</b></p> <p><b>1-3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No analytical insight</li> <li>Misreadings/misunderstandings evident</li> <li>No literary/linguistic insight shown</li> <li>Many errors/misreadings/misunderstandings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably no comparisons made</li> <li>Very limited or no awareness of context</li> <li>Very limited/no ideas on how language shapes meaning</li> <li>No comparisons made</li> <li>No awareness shown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partial purely descriptive comments</li> <li>Intrusive errors</li> <li>Major misunderstandings of text and task</li> <li>Commentary is not explanatory</li> </ul>