



## General Certificate of Education

# English Language and Literature 5721 *Specification A*

*NTA1 Language Production*

## Mark Scheme

*2005 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.

## DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND WEIGHTINGS

The table below is a reminder of which Assessment Objectives will be tested by the questions and the marks available for them.

### Unit 1

Assessment Objective	AO4	AO6
Question 1 Production	25 (x2)	25 (x2)
Question 2 Commentary		25 (x2)

### Question 1 – Production

#### Marking procedure

- 1 Use the question specific mark scheme first to get a sense of which band the candidate's work falls into – then use the grid.
- 2 Use of AO4 must be seen **through** AO6; mark the piece of writing where context and choice of form by the candidate are reflected in their own writing, and where they have made informed choices in their own work.
- 3 Award 25 marks for each AO, multiply each by 2 to arrive at a mark out of 100.

### Question 2 – Commentary

#### Marking Procedure

- 1 Assessment of AO6 is concentrated upon the second part of the AO; mark piece of writing where commentary reflects and explains candidate's own writing, and where informed choices have been made based upon their own reading in AS English Language and Literature.
- 2 Award 25 marks for AO6, multiply by 2 to arrive at a mark out of 50.

## **Marking notations for English Language and Literature**

Use guidelines in the assistant examiner’s handbook as the basis of your marking, but supplement with these specific notations used across all units of the specification.

### **Points that are correct**

✓ (tick)	to indicate a positive point (not rhythmical ticking)	Q1 and Q2
straight underline/ vertical line at side	to indicate a good passage	Q1 and Q2
expl	candidate explains	Q2
pr	personal response	Q2

### **Errors (in body of script)**

ringed or marked with S	spelling mistake	Q1
squiggly underline	poor expression/poor or wrong idea	Q1 and Q2
x (cross)	to indicate a point is wrong	Q2
p	punctuation error	

### **Marginal annotation**

pnm	point not made (if idea is not explained)
-----	---

### **For Question 1**

BE	basic error
gr	grammatical error
voc	vocabulary error
exp	flaw in expression
p	punctuation error
ww	wrong word

### **For Question 2**

aud	point made about audience
purp	point made about purpose
con	point made about context
form	point made about form
voc	vocabulary point made
gr	grammatical point made
imag	point made about imagery
phon	point made about phonology
coh	point made about cohesion
struc	point made about structure
eg?	lack of example given

**Generic Grid: Question 1**

		<b>AO4 (25 marks x2)</b> <b>Awareness of context/form/use of content</b>	<b>AO6 (25 marks x2)</b> <b>Style/accuracy</b>
<b>Band 5</b>	<b>24-25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated interpretation of context</li> <li>Sophisticated use of form</li> <li>Engaging content for audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expression precise and wholly appropriate</li> <li>Audience completely engaged</li> <li>Stylish and sophisticated</li> <li>Rare errors</li> </ul>
	<b>21-23</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skilful interpretation of context</li> <li>Skilful &amp; knowledgeable use of form</li> <li>Engaging content for audience &amp; purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skilful &amp; sustained use of appropriate style</li> <li>Cohesive writing that works</li> <li>Rare errors</li> </ul>
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>18-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confident sense of context</li> <li>Content well selected for audience and purpose</li> <li>Convincing control of form</li> <li>Shows evidence of a number of qualities of the band above but not secure in all of these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustained use of appropriate style</li> <li>Approaching fulfilment of aims</li> <li>Firm control of technical aspects</li> </ul>
	<b>16-17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound sense of context</li> <li>Content fulfils task</li> <li>Competent handling of form</li> <li>Successful approach for context/audience/purpose</li> <li>Soundly structured</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective register</li> <li>Clear stylistic shaping and communicative intent</li> <li>Underlying technical control</li> <li>Successful use of language for context/audience/purpose</li> <li>Few technical flaws</li> <li>Lacking sense of style of higher bands</li> </ul>
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>14-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sense of context</li> <li>Audience clearly targeted</li> <li>Awareness of form</li> <li>Clear focus on set task</li> <li>Appropriate content with some gaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definite if inconsistent register</li> <li>Expression clear and generally controlled – mostly suitable for genre</li> <li>Some relatively minor technical flaws</li> </ul>
	<b>11-13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic awareness of context and form, with some uncertainty evident</li> <li>Content broadly appropriate</li> <li>Approach broadly - but not entirely - appropriate for audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some uncertainty about appropriate style but some conscious shaping</li> <li>Expression communicates ideas but lacks flexibility/sophistication</li> <li>Some technical flaws but few basic errors</li> </ul>
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>8-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly some misunderstanding about one of the following: audience/purpose/form</li> <li>Some attempt made to address audience/purpose, which reveals some awareness of context, albeit on a very basic level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style/approach not entirely convincing but possibly some broad shaping for audience</li> <li>Some flaws in expression</li> <li>Probably frequent technical errors</li> </ul>
	<b>6-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sense of purpose but style/approach not convincing for context/form</li> <li>Weak focus on audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style not secure for audience/purpose</li> <li>Ideas and expression likely to be naïve and vocabulary limited</li> <li>Intrusive errors</li> </ul>
<b>Band 1</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very limited awareness of context</li> <li>Basic misjudgements of form</li> <li>Weak focus on audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occasional awareness of audience/purpose glimpsed in the language used</li> <li>Intrusive basic errors</li> </ul>
	<b>0-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No sense of context</li> <li>No sense of form or shaping of material for audience/purpose</li> <li>Does not focus on task</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent weakness in expression</li> <li>Major flaws in technical aspects</li> <li>Style likely to be entirely inappropriate</li> </ul>

**Question 1** Your task is to write a review for a magazine or newspaper of your choice on **one** of the following:

- A film
- An exhibition
- A theatre performance
- A music performance
- A TV programme

You should specify the type of publication in which your review will appear.

You are advised to write approximately 300 – 400 words.

Text A is an example of review writing and is provided to give you ideas about how you *could* approach this task.

**Key Words:** review – magazine or newspaper – film **or** exhibition **or** theatre performance **or** music performance – specify type of publication

**Assessment focuses:** choice of form, style and vocabulary – expertise and accuracy for specific audience and purpose – knowledge of literary text and features of language

**Band 5: (21 - 25 marks)**

**21 – 25** Skilful and entirely convincing review which reveals complete awareness of form and purpose  
Thoroughly engaging  
Excellent balance between information and opinion/entertainment  
Sophisticated use of language  
Cohesive, stylish and accurate writing

**Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)**

**18 – 20** Confident review which reveals a very sound awareness of form  
Convincing writing which holds the reader’s attention  
Well-judged balance between information and opinion/entertainment  
Confident use of language  
Sustained use of appropriate style  
Firm control of technical aspects

**16 – 17** Clear and competent review which reveals a sound awareness of form  
Content appropriate for audience and purpose  
Effectively presents information and opinion and has entertaining features  
Approach fulfils the task. Well-expressed  
Style is appropriate with some stylistic shaping. Few technical errors

**Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)**

**14 – 15** General awareness of review form, with some inconsistencies  
Audience clearly targeted and content largely suitable  
Possibly some imbalance between information and opinion/entertainment but a clear focus on set task

Expression generally clear and controlled  
Candidate strives for suitable style, but some, relatively minor inconsistencies.  
Possibly some technical flaws.

- 11 – 13** Basic awareness of review form but some misjudgements about style  
Content broadly but not entirely appropriate  
Information given and attempt made to be entertaining but ideas and expression lack sophistication  
Approach broadly but not entirely appropriate for audience/purpose  
Possibly a number of technical flaws – few basic errors

**Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)**

- 8 – 10** Candidate has written about a film etc but approach reveals limited understanding of review form  
Some suitable ideas but the writing is unlikely to be very engaging, although some, limited attempt to entertain has been made  
Content and style patchy in terms of suitability for audience/purpose  
Some flaws in expression  
Likely to be frequent technical flaws

- 6 – 7** Some limited sense of film etc conveyed but approach not convincing for audience/purpose  
Some relevant content but very limited/simplistic ideas  
Unlikely to be engaging or informative  
Unsophisticated approach/simplistic language  
Intrusive errors

**Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)**

- 4 – 5** Basic misjudgements in approach reveal very limited awareness of task or review form, although a few ideas may be suitable at a very basic level  
Content very limited in terms of useful information  
Writing likely to be poorly constructed and difficult to follow  
Style/approach unlikely to engage audience or be entertaining  
Lacks audience awareness  
Intrusive basic errors

- 1 – 3** Very little or no sense of review form  
Unlikely to be any sense of how to make language entertaining  
Style likely to be entirely inappropriate  
Major flaws in technical aspects

**Generic Grid: Question 2**

<b>AO6 (25 marks x 2)</b>		
<b>Band 5</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear overview of creation of a range of effects for audience and purpose</li> <li>• Sophisticated/subtle understanding of how language works at different levels</li> <li>• Engages thoroughly with meaning of text</li> <li>• Comments fully supported by examples</li> <li>• Framework for analysis skilfully employed</li> <li>• Cogent and cohesive</li> <li>• Confidently and accurately expressed</li> </ul>
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>18-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishes a range of significant features</li> <li>• Clear and detailed comment on the text's communicative intent</li> <li>• Engages with meaning</li> <li>• Well supported comments showing linguistic insight</li> <li>• Successful and detailed use of framework for analysis</li> <li>• Competently expressed</li> <li>• Few errors</li> </ul>
	<b>16-17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishes key features of style and effects created</li> <li>• Explains, using some detail, about grammar and style</li> <li>• Comments embedded within a framework for analysis</li> <li>• Explanation is clear – commentary is effective</li> <li>• Firm control of technical aspects</li> </ul>
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>14-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation evident</li> <li>• Framework for analysis used</li> <li>• Comments focus on a number of important linguistic choices</li> <li>• Some apt examples given but also some over-generalisations</li> <li>• Clear communication of ideas, although there may be some – relatively minor – technical errors</li> </ul>
	<b>11-13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments make mostly general points about stylistic features</li> <li>• Awareness of effect, audience and purpose and own intentions shown</li> <li>• Some lack of precision and a limited number of precise examples given</li> <li>• Explanation generally clear but lacking subtlety</li> <li>• Comments on at least two language features</li> </ul>
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>8-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempt made to reflect on some ideas and choices</li> <li>• Some reference made to vocabulary and style but in a very general way</li> <li>• Ideas are basically accurate although some misunderstanding may be evident</li> <li>• A limited number of ideas explored and very few examples given</li> <li>• Partial use of framework for analysis</li> <li>• Some flaws of expression</li> <li>• Comments on at least one language feature</li> </ul>
	<b>6-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak focus on audience and purpose</li> <li>• Comments simplistic and general</li> <li>• Focus on content rather than style</li> <li>• Probably no precise examples given to support ideas</li> <li>• Some errors of explanation</li> </ul>

<b>Band 1</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Partial and purely descriptive comments</li><li>• Occasional awareness of audience and purpose</li><li>• Simplistic ideas which include a number of inaccuracies</li><li>• Intrusive technical and expressive errors</li></ul>
	<b>0-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commentary is not explanatory</li><li>• No focus on task</li><li>• Fragmentary points</li><li>• Frequent weakness in expression</li></ul>

A06: Demonstrate expertise and accuracy in writing for a variety of specific purposes and audiences, drawing on knowledge of literary texts and features of language to explain and comment on the choices made.