

English Language

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F651**: The Dynamics of Speech

Mark Scheme for January 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

SUBJECT-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE**Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)**

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	Total
1	5	15	10	0	30
2	5	15	10	0	30
3	5	10	15	0	30
4	5	10	15	0	30
Totals	10	25	25		60

These are the Assessment Objectives for the English Language specification as a whole.

AO1	Knowledge, Application and Communication select and apply a range of linguistic methods, to communicate relevant knowledge using appropriate terminology and coherent, accurate written expression
AO2	Understanding and Meaning demonstrate critical understanding of a range of concepts and issues related to the construction and analysis of meanings in spoken and written language, using knowledge of linguistic approaches
AO3	Contexts, Analysis and Evaluation analyse and evaluate the influence of contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken and written language, showing knowledge of the key constituents of language
AO4	Expertise and Creativity demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English in a range of different contexts, informed by linguistic study

PAPER-SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: F651 THE DYNAMICS OF SPEECH

Candidates answer one question from Section A and one question from Section B.

Assessment Objectives AO1, AO2 and AO3 are addressed in both sections.

AO2 is dominant in Section A, AO3 in Section B.

AO1 is equally weighted [5 marks] in all questions.

The **question-specific Notes on the Task**, which follow on **pages 4 to 8**, provide an indication of what candidates are likely to cover in terms of AO1, AO2 and AO3. The Notes are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive: candidates should be rewarded for any relevant response which appropriately addresses the Assessment Objectives

Quality of Written Communication

Quality of Written Communication is assessed in all units and credit may be restricted if communication is unclear. Candidates will be assessed on their overall competence in using language accurately and effectively in constructing well-argued responses to assessment tasks for the specifications.

Candidates will:

- ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear;
- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter;
- organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

The assessment of the *quality of written communication* is included in AO1.

Awarding Marks

(i) Each question is worth 30 marks.

(ii) For each answer, award a single overall mark out of 30, following this procedure:

- refer to the question-specific Notes on the Task for descriptions of levels of discussion and likely content;
- using 'best fit', make a holistic judgement to locate the answer in the appropriate mark band: regardless of any perceived deficiencies for particular AOs, how well does the candidate address the question?
- to place the answer precisely within the band and to determine the appropriate mark out of 30, consider the relevant AOs;
- bearing in mind the weighting of the AOs, place the answer within the band and award the appropriate mark out of 30.

Mark positively. Use the lowest mark in the band only if the answer is borderline/doubtful.

Use the full range of marks, particularly at the top and bottom ends of the mark range.

(iii) When the complete script has been marked:

- if necessary, follow the instructions concerning rubric infringements;
- add together the marks for the two answers, to arrive at the total mark for the script.

Rubric Infringement

Candidates may infringe the rubric in one of the following ways:

- only answering one question;
- answering two questions from Section A or two from Section B;
- answering more than two questions.

If a candidate has written three or more answers, mark all answers and award the highest mark achieved in each Section of the paper.

QUESTION-SPECIFIC NOTES ON THE TASK FOLLOW ON PAGES 4 - 8.

BAND DESCRIPTORS FOR BOTH SECTIONS FOLLOW ON PAGES 9 - 10.

Section A – Speech and Children		
Question Number	NOTES ON THE TASK	Max Mark
1	<p>This is a transcription from American public radio of part of <i>The Money Pit Home Improvement Radio Show</i>. Here the presenters Tom and Lesley are talking on the telephone to Mark about do-it-yourself projects. Mark's four year old daughter Lexie joins in the telephone conversation.</p> <p>How do Lexie and the adults use language here to interact with each other? Support your answer by referring to specific examples from the transcription.</p> <p>In this transcription, the four year old child Lexie is introduced spontaneously into the conversation as a kind of novelty; but soon she becomes the focus of attention. Candidates should find plenty to say about the different ways in which Tom, Lesley and Mark integrate Lexie into the existing dynamic.</p> <p>AO1 (5) Appropriate methods may involve the use of some or all of the following terminology and concepts: turn-taking, adjacency pairs, agenda-setting and topic management, open and closed questions, re-formulation, length of utterance, role, child-directed speech. Candidates should use coherent and accurate written expression.</p> <p>AO2 (15) Basic answers are likely to demonstrate a grasp of how specific linguistic detail works to construct a role for Lexie in the group dynamic, noting for example how her father Mark shifts from the third-person pronoun to direct address in order to speak <u>to</u> Lexie instead of <u>about</u> her: <i>she's four years old and we've been making projects together since she was (.) how old Lexie? two?</i></p> <p>Stronger answers are likely to analyse ways in which the adults modify their language to accommodate the child, for example when Tom re-formulates his reference to Mark: <i>so (.) your <u>daddy</u> (.) Daddy's a good carpenter</i>. They may discuss how the younger child's typical preference for the concrete and the immediate is reflected in the adults' speech to Lexie.</p> <p>AO3 (10) Candidates may draw on their knowledge of theories of child language acquisition to analyse Lexie's utterances, and their understanding of child-directed speech to comment on differences between Tom and Lesley in their treatment of Lexie. They may also explore the (limited) evidence of speech sounds. Less secure candidates may make assertions about what they see as gendered features of language use, or generalise about American accent(s) with little reference to the phonemic transcription evidence.</p> <p>Candidates who show a sustained awareness of the context(s) of this exchange – radio, telephone and DIY elements – should be rewarded.</p>	[30]

Question Number	NOTES ON THE TASK	Max Mark
2	<p>This is a transcription of part of a conversation between two thirteen year old girls who have just attended an anti-smoking day at their school.</p> <p>How do the two speakers use language here to explore the topic of smoking? Support your answer by referring to specific examples from the transcription.</p> <p>Anna and Baljit are at the upper end of the age-range specified for this Section of the Unit. Nonetheless, candidates may wish to explore what they see as developmental elements of speech, in terms both of individual utterance and of co-operative dynamics. They may also notice how Anna avoids responding directly to Baljit's assumption: <i>obviously YOU dont smoke</i>.</p> <p>AO1 (5) Appropriate methods may involve the use of some or all of the following terminology and concepts: agenda-setting and topic management, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, length and type of utterance, co-operative overlaps and echoes, open and closed questions, non-fluency features (hesitations, filled/voiced pauses, repairs, self-correction). Candidates should use coherent and accurate written expression.</p> <p>AO2 (15) More limited answers may simply trace the dynamics of exchange, making some reference to the content and to simple features of the girls' utterance as individual speakers and as co-operative participants. Baljit's frequent repetitions and self-repairs may be interpreted as nervousness or uncertainty – <i>so why why why they got it like that is maybe because if theyre gonna sell /əm/ (.) theyre gonna sell the ...</i> Similarly, the fact that Anna's first two utterances are declaratives which seem to summarise prior exchanges or information may be taken as evidence that she is (to some extent) dominant.</p> <p>Stronger answers may develop this line of argument, perhaps noticing that in the second half of the transcription Anna asks a series of questions and reflects/echoes one of Baljit's replies: <i>doesn't take any notice of /əm/ ...</i> Baljit's final utterance – <i>so what do you say (.) huh</i> – may be seen as a closing signal.</p> <p>In terms of conceptual-linguistic development, candidates may trace the fairly limited 'exploration' of the topic – <i>everyones aware of the the threat that it poses ... all know smokings bad ... weve told /im/ many times its not right</i> – and analyse the grammatical and syntactical aspects of how disapproval is expressed and discussed.</p> <p>AO3 (10) Candidates may begin from a position of identifying what is 'child-ish' about the conversation, ie how it might differ from a conversation between adults on a similar topic. (Answers which simply speculate about this or about the girls' levels of intelligence/maturity will not gain much credit.)</p> <p>Stronger answers may involve comment on how the agenda moves from what seems to be the girls' response to the anti-smoking day to discussion of how the topic affects them individually in their families. Lexically, this is evident in the shift from the general or conceptual (<i>warning ... threat</i>) to the personal (<i>family ... friends</i>).</p>	[30]
	Section A Total	[30]

Section B – Varieties and Social Groups		
Question Number	NOTES ON THE TASK	Max Mark
3	<p>This is a transcription of part of a radio programme about the re-discovery of ancient knowledge about spices and perfumes. Here the presenter of the programme is asking Avraham, an expert perfume-maker from Israel, about the ingredients used in ancient Hebrew (Israeli) recipes for perfumes.</p> <p>How do the two speakers use language here to communicate specialist knowledge to a radio audience? Support your answer by referring to specific examples from the transcription.</p> <p>This task invites candidates to look at a dense transcription involving quite a high level of detailed expert knowledge, and with only minimal mediation from the radio programme presenter. There is plenty of evidence of co-operative speech: although the two speakers interrupt and overlap each other, the intention is to collaborate rather than to seize and hold the floor.</p> <p>The lexical field of foreign-names-for-herbs-and-spices is an obvious instance of ‘specialist’ language. Careful readers will also pick up the lexis of religion, and the historical connections between the art of the perfumier and religious belief.</p> <p>Candidates may well comment on the way in which language can create social/occupational cohesion groups and suggest attitudes and values, although the question does not explicitly require this. They may also sense that Avraham is not operating in his first language, and should be given credit for appropriately linguistic/analytical comment on this aspect.</p> <p>AO1 (5) Appropriate methods may involve the use of some or all of the following terminology and concepts: agenda-setting, turn-taking, length and type of utterance, co-operative overlaps, deixis, non-fluency features (hesitations, filled/voiced pauses, repairs, self-correction), register.</p> <p>AO2 (10) Stronger responses may look at such concepts and issues in language use as turn-taking and politeness strategies, showing awareness that the speakers have to consider the radio audience as well as each other’s needs as immediate audience. They are likely to explore variations in fluency, noticing that Avraham’s utterance becomes more hesitant when he is attempting to explain the complex connections between the technical aspects of his art and religious (even meta-physical) ideas.</p> <p>More limited answers are likely to notice and comment on some features of interaction between the speakers, for example the tag question <i>isn’t it</i> each of them uses to invite agreement about the smell. They may notice the contrast between relatively formal exchanges and the more colloquial <i>can i have a sniff</i>, or they may simply make relatively unsupported assertions about register.</p> <p>AO3 (15) Stronger answers may explore the fairly unstructured dynamics of speech here. Candidates may notice and be able to analyse how the presenter allows Avraham the time and space to develop his (quite complex) analogy between the <i>FOUL</i> (.) <i>STINKing galbanum</i> and the individual <i>EVIL-doer</i>. They are likely also to trace the presenter’s responses and to comment on how these might shape and/or anticipate the effects on a listener.</p>	[30]

Question Number	NOTES ON THE TASK	Max Mark
	Weaker answers are likely to show some awareness that both speakers have the radio audience in mind, and to refer to some specific details to support this – for example, the presenter’s opening description of Avraham’s work-desk. However, they may have some difficulty in making clearly <i>linguistic</i> points, and may be diverted into speculation about Avraham’s background or beliefs.	

Question Number	NOTES ON THE TASK	Max Mark
4	<p>This is a transcription of part of a conversation in which three women friends in their forties are talking about clothes and the impressions they create.</p> <p>How do the three women use language here to interact with each other and to express particular attitudes? Support your answer by referring to specific examples from the transcription.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to see the women speakers as a tightly-knit friendship group, highly supportive of each other's attitudes and values. The more astute will notice that the speakers are not averse to criticising or laughing at other women, and that some of their language – for example, <i>slaggy or slutty</i> – might in another context be seen as offensive.</p> <p>AO1 (5) Appropriate methods may involve the use of some or all of the following terminology and concepts: agenda-setting, turn-taking, length and type of utterance, co-operative overlaps, slang and Standard English, register, para-linguistic features.</p> <p>AO2 (10) Stronger responses may look at such concepts and issues in language use as turn-taking, floor-holding and interrupting, and co-operative/group story-telling. They may analyse the structure of exchanges to see that Jane never gets to the 'punch-line' of her story – <i>and i just went</i> – but still manages to clinch the shabby/Chablis joke. Detailed attention to grammatical/syntactical structures may lead to insights about how intonation and pauses, as well as lexical choices, can express attitudes: <i>and (.) i looked at her (.) and i said ...</i> Less secure responses may simply identify a range of linguistic features in the speakers' exchanges.</p> <p>Group identity/solidarity is reinforced through individual exchanges and in the larger movements of discourse structure. For example, Lesley expresses Jane's thought (or at least a compatible idea) for her – <i>how come its the <u>look</u> if it doesnt look <u>nice</u></i> – then Dana introduces the new concept <i>image</i>, which her friends are happy to take on.</p> <p>AO3 (15) Contextual factors for exploration may include discussion of gendered speech characteristics within the stereotype of women-discussing-clothes. The conversation is fairly light-hearted, and includes imitation of the speech-sounds of a younger woman (<i>the girl assistant</i>) and a joke based on a mis-hearing.</p> <p>There are no phonemic representations of accent in the utterances of the three speakers, so weaker candidates may be tempted to make assertions about social class and RP. Such an approach may be more or less helpful according to how well it is supported by reference to other (grammatical/syntactical/lexical/intonational) evidence in the transcription – for example, the effect of Dana's lowering of register/lexis (and tone!) when she says <i>when your <u>bellys</u> hanging out</i>.</p> <p>Stronger answers are likely to be well-focused on the question-wording, paying close attention to <u>interaction</u> and <u>attitudes</u>.</p>	[30]
	Section B Total	[30]
	Paper Total	[60]

Band descriptors: Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

Band 6 26-30 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • excellent and coherent argument consistently developed with relevant and detailed exemplification • critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, accurately and consistently used • excellent use of a range of linguistic methods • consistently accurate written expression, meaning is consistently clear
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • excellent, well developed and consistently detailed discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech • excellent and consistently effective use of relevant linguistic approaches
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well developed and consistently effective analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • thoroughly detailed and accurate knowledge of the key constituents of language
Band 5 21-25 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well structured argument, clearly developed with relevant and clear exemplification • critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, used accurately • good use of a range of linguistic methods • good level of accuracy in written expression, only minor errors which do not inhibit communication of meaning
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developed and coherently detailed discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech • clear and good use of relevant linguistic approaches
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developed, clear analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • good knowledge of the key constituents of language
Band 4 16-20 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • straightforward argument, competently structured and supported by generally relevant exemplification • critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter used competently • competent use of a range of linguistic methods • generally accurate written expression, there are errors that occasionally inhibit communication
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some developed discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech with some relevant details • competent use of some relevant linguistic approaches with some relevant details
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • competent analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • some competent knowledge of the key constituents of language

Band 3 11-15 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some structured argument evident with some relevant exemplification • some competent use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter • some use of a range of linguistic methods • some clear written expression but there are inconsistencies that inhibit communication of meaning
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some attempt to develop a discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech with some basic relevant details • some attempt to use some relevant linguistic approaches
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some attempt to structure the analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • some basic knowledge of the key constituents of language

Band 2 6-10 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited attempt to structure argument with limited or irrelevant exemplification • limited use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter • limited use of linguistic methods (evidence of only one or two) • mostly inconsistent written expression and errors inhibit communication of meaning
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech with limited use of relevant details • limited or inconsistent use of relevant linguistic approaches
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited attempt to structure the analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • limited knowledge of the key constituents of language

Band 1 0-5 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little or no attempt to structure argument with little or irrelevant exemplification • little or no use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter • little or no use of linguistic methods (partial use of one or two) • persistent writing errors that inhibit communication of meaning
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little or no discussion of concepts and issues relating to the construction and analysis of meanings in speech; few or no relevant details • little or no use of relevant linguistic approaches
	AO3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little or no attempt to analyse and evaluate the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of spoken language, as appropriate to the question • little or no knowledge of the key constituents of language

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553