

GCE 2004

June Series



Mark Scheme

English Language and Literature A (NTA4)

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

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**NTA4****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 4

Assessment Objective	AO1	AO2ii	AO4
Questions 1 - 12	25 (x3)	25 (x2)	25

Marking Procedure**Questions 1 - 12**

1. Assess each AO equally; use the grid to ascertain the relevant band, sub-band and then mark.
2. Use of Indicative Content is advisory and not prescriptive; additional points and ideas will be added at the co-ordination meeting.
3. Award 25 marks for each AO, multiply AO1 by 3, multiply AO2ii by 2, add to AO4 to arrive at a mark out of 150.

Marking notations for English Language and Literature**Points that are correct:**

- ✓ (tick): **to indicate a positive point**
straight underline/
vertical line at side: to indicate a good passage
- pnm: point not made (if idea is not explained)

Errors:

- BE: basic error
Mistakes: ringed or marked with S
Squiggly
underline: for poor/wrong idea

Marginal annotation:

- voc: for a vocabulary point made
gr: for a grammatical point made
phono: for a phonological point
imag: for imagery identified/commented on
coh: for a cohesive/structural point made
aud: for a point made about audience
purp: for a point made about purpose
att: attitudes and values commented on
fos: feature of speech noted, commented on

Unit-specific notations for Unit 4

- anal: for analytical point made
comp: comparative point made
con: context understood, commented upon
expl: candidate explains
pr: candidates makes personal response
eval. candidate evaluates

MARKING GRID FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE 6721

	Communication of knowledge, understanding and insights gained from combined literary and linguistic study; use of appropriate terminology and written accuracy AO1 (25 marks x 3)	Responding with knowledge and understanding to different texts from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons AO2ii (25 marks x 2)	Understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape textual meaning AO4 (25 marks)
Band 5 21 – 25	Searching and confident linguistic or literary analysis; conceptualised reading; technical terms enhance textual response.	Exploratory. Significant similarities and differences are analysed in an original manner. Evaluative and illuminating work.	Sophisticated reading of context and meaning. Assimilates and contextualises references with flair and originality. Total overview including full understanding and appraisal of external contexts.
Band 4 16 – 20	Coherent analysis of distinctive language features and patterns. Analysis illuminates grasp. Describes significant language and/or literary features and patterns. Some exploratory analysis.	Coherently compares and contrasts writer's choice of form, structure, mode and language. Subtle. Begins to probe; expresses clearly comparisons and contrasts between two texts. Carefully illustrated points.	Skilful and subtle analysis and commentary, where a clear sense of contextual variation and contextual influence underpins reading. Clear interplay between text and context, real sense of contextual variation; comments clearly on all areas. Analysis related to external contexts.
Band 3 11 – 15	Clear and accurate; distinguishes between details; sense of patterns emerging. Increased ability to deal with more complex ideas; some literary and linguistic features noted.	Developing argument underpinned by vocabulary and structure to aid comparison; comparative framework used. Makes links between implicit meanings and attitudes in two texts. Some comment on linguistic comparisons.	Develops a line of argument underpinned by comment on features, form, structure and language; list-like in construction; accurate but interplay not necessarily noted. Wider external contexts noted. Context clearly commented on; features, form, structure and language are implicitly understood; responds to implicit meanings.
Band 2 6 - 10	Is aware of characteristics of specific genre; simple linguistic points made. Some lexical or textual choices commented on; may respond to surface features.	Responds to obvious links and comparisons. Sometimes comments on less important links. Occasional insight but not sustained; one area of study noted.	Sees how context influences language use; general awareness of writer's techniques and impact on meaning. Superficial idea of context; simplistic ideas on language use and relation to context.
Band 1 0 - 5	Some misreadings; no analytical insight. No literary and/or linguistic insight shown; misreadings.	Superficial points without relevance to both texts. Few if any connections noted or seen. Weak ideas.	Some awareness of context; very limited ideas on how language features shape meaning. Formal structural or linguistic features identified erroneously.

The Miller's Tale – Geoffrey Chaucer
and
Talking Heads 2 – Alan Bennett

1. Compare Chaucer's presentation of Absolon in *The Miller's Tale* and Bennett's presentation of Henry in 'Nights in the Gardens of Spain'.

Key Words: compare, Absolon, Miller's Tale, Henry, 'Nights in the Gardens of Spain'.

Focus: Relevant sections of *The Miller's Tale* and 'Nights in the Gardens of Spain'.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure and exploratory understanding of the presentations of both Absolon and Henry. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the characters are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent knowledge and understanding of how both Absolon and Henry are presented. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with specific reference to the ways in which the characters are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features shape these presentations. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which Absolon and Henry are presented in the designated texts. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features with a clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which the characters are presented in the designated texts. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to the two designated texts, and to the presentations of Absolon and Henry. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of the presentation of the specified characters. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the presentations of Absolon and Henry. Attempts to focus on how the writers create their characters, and can identify and comment on at least two linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.

6 - 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which Absolon and Henry are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts/characters treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 - 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

2. Compare the ways in which Chaucer in *The Miller's Tale* and Bennett in *Talking Heads 2* present the relationships between married couples. You should refer to appropriate sections from *The Miller's Tale* and either **one** or **two** of Bennett's monologues.

Key Words: compare, ways, Chaucer, Bennett, present, relationships, married couples, appropriate sections, one or two monologues

Focus: Relevant sections of *The Miller's Tale* and **one** or **two** monologues from *Talking Head 2*.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

- 21–25** Totally secure and exploratory understanding of Chaucer's and Bennett's presentation of married couples. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the marriages are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

- 18–20** Coherent knowledge and understanding of how both writers present married couples. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with specific reference to the ways in which the marriages are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features shape these presentations. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.
- 16–17** Clear focus on the ways in which married couples are presented in the designated texts. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features with a clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14 – 15** Clear comparison between the ways in which the characters are presented in the designated texts. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.
- 11- 13** A comparative approach to the two designated texts, and to the presentations of married couples. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of the presentation of the specified characters. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between the presentations of married couples. Attempts to focus on how the writers create their characters, and can identify and comment on at least two linguistic features. Some narrative/description elements may be present. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 - 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which married couples are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts/characters treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 - 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

The Dead Sea Poems – Simon Armitage
and
Mean Time – Carol Ann Duffy

3. Compare the ways in which Armitage and Duffy present painful experiences in their poems. You should refer to **two** poems from each poet.

Key Words: compare, ways, Duffy, Armitage, present, painful, experiences, refer, two poems.

Focus: painful experiences, two poems by each poet

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21–25 Totally secure and exploratory understanding of Armitage’s and Duffy’s presentation of painful experiences. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the marriages are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18–20 Coherent knowledge and understanding of how both poets present painful experiences. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with specific reference to the ways in which the painful experiences are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features shape these presentations. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.

16–17 Clear focus on the ways in which painful experiences are presented in the designated texts. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features with a clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14–15 Clear comparison between the ways in which the experiences are presented in the poems selected. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to the selected poems and to the presentations of painful experiences. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of the presentation of the experiences. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the presentations of painful experiences. Attempts to focus on how the poets create a sense of the experiences, and can identify and comment on at least two linguistic features. Some narrative/description elements may be present. Does not fully address all key words.

6 - 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which painful experiences are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the poems at a simple level. The poems are treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 - 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of poems shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

4. Compare ‘C.V.’ by Armitage with ‘Like Earning a Living’ by Duffy, paying particular attention to how thoughts and feelings are presented.

Key Words: compare, ‘C.V.’, ‘Like Earning a Living’, particular, attention, how, thoughts, feelings, presented.

Focus: painful experiences, two poems by each poet

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both poems. Significant similarities and differences analysed in a detailed manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and how the poets use these to shape their presentations of thoughts and feelings. Informed and confident analysis of tone. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both poems. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Coherent and close comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the designated poems and how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts, including vocabulary and style. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the designated poems and how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Linguistic features required by the question identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to the two designated poems, and to how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the two designated poems, and how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Attempts to focus on some specific details, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features required by the question. May be some narrative elements. Does not fully address all key words.

6 - 7 Some knowledge of both poems. Some superficial comparison how the poets present thoughts and feelings. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Poems treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 - 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of poems shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

Measure for Measure – William Shakespeare
and
Murmuring Judges – David Hare

5. Compare the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented in *Measure for Measure* and *Murmuring Judges*.

Key Words: compare, ways, attitudes, sex, presented, *Measure for Measure*, *Murmuring Judges*.

Focus: Appropriate sections of *Measure for Measure* and *Murmuring Judges*.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure and exploratory understanding of the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the characters are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent knowledge and understanding of how attitudes about sex are presented. Perceptive points of comparison made with specific reference to the ways in which ideas are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features shape these presentations. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented in the designated texts. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features with a clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14 – 15** Clear comparison between the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented in the designated texts. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.
- 11- 13** A comparative approach to the two designated texts, and to the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of the presentation of the specified characters. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented. Attempts to focus on how the writers create their characters, and can identify and comment on at least two linguistic features. There may be some narrative/descriptive elements. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which attitudes about sex are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

6. Compare the role and presentation of Angelo in *Measure for Measure* and Barry in *Murmuring Judges*.

Key Words: compare, role, presentation, Angelo, Barry.

Focus: detailed focus on the Angelo and Barry.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both *Measure for Measure* and *Murmuring Judges*. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner with reference to the roles and presentations Angelo and Barry. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which each writer presents his designated character. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both plays. Perceptive points of comparison made between the Angelo and Barry with reference to the ways in which the writers present the characters and define their roles within the play. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect on the reader/audience. Confident and informed response. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers present the designated characters and their roles in the plays. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which Angelo and Barry are present and their roles in the plays. Specific linguistic features are identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the ways in which the characters are presented. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to the two designated characters and to the ways in which Shakespeare and Hare present the characters and their roles within the plays. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between Shakespeare’s and Hare’s presentation of the designated characters. Attempts to focus on ‘role’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.

6 – 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which the writers present the designated characters. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 – 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

The Shipping News – E. Annie Proulx
and
Snow Falling on Cedars – David Guterson

7. Compare Guterson’s presentation of Ishmael Chambers in *Snow Falling on Cedars* with Proulx’s presentation of Jack Buggit in *The Shipping News*. You should refer to the section of *Snow Falling on Cedars* beginning “Ishmael slid a notepad into the pocket of his pants...” to “You’re your father’s son”. (pages 26 – 31 in the recommended edition) and the section of *The Shipping News* beginning “On his second Monday morning...” to “I hates a Newfie joke.” (pages 63 – 69 in the recommended edition).

Key Words: compare, presentation, Ishmael Chambers, Jack Buggit, refer to sections.

Focus: Presentation of Ishmael Chambers in *Snow Falling on Cedars* and Jack Buggit in *The Shipping News*.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the way in which Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers present the Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14 – 15** Clear comparison between the ways in which Proulx and Guterson present Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.
- 11- 13** A comparative approach to ways in which Guterson presents Ishmael Chambers and Proulx presents Jack Buggit. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between Proulx and Guterson’s presentation of Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit. Attempts to focus on ‘presentation’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which Ishmael Chambers and Jack Buggit are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

8. Compare the ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques in *Snow Falling on Cedars* and *The Shipping News*.

Focus: whole of each text

Key Words: compare, ways, Guterson, Proulx, use, flashback, techniques, *Snow Falling on Cedars*, *The Shipping News*.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers use flashback techniques.. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between Guterson's and Proulx's use of flashback techniques. Attempts to focus on 'compare ways', and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which Guterson and Proulx use flashback techniques. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

The Ghost Road – Pat Barker
and
The Railway Man – Eric Lomax

9. Compare the ways in which Barker and Lomax conclude their narratives. You should refer to the final section of *The Ghost Road* from “the barrage was due to start” (page 270 in the recommended edition) and the final section of *The Railway Man* from “We flew to Osaka...” (page 269 in the recommended edition).

Key Words: compare, ways, Barker, Lomax, conclude, narratives, refer, sections

Focus: The specified sections of each text.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

- 21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the writers conclude their narratives. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

- 18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which the writers conclude their novels. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.
- 16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers conclude their novels. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which the writers conclude their novels. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to ways in which the writers conclude their novels. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the conclusions of the novels. Attempts to focus on ‘ways’ and ‘conclude’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.

6 – 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which the writers conclude their novels. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 – 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

10. Compare the ways in which Barker and Lomax use the narrative voice to create their effects.

Key Words: compare, ways, Barker, Lomax, use, narrative voice, create, effects.

Focus: whole of each text.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between the ways in which the narrative voice is used in the novels. Attempts to focus on ‘ways’ and ‘use’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which the writers use the narrative voice. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

Frankenstein – Mary Shelley
and
Dracula – Bram Stoker

11. Compare the ways in which Shelley and Stoker explore the nature of good and evil in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*. You may base your answer on **one** episode from each novel **or** range more widely.

Key Words: compare, ways, Shelley, Stoker, explore, nature, good, evil, one episode, range more widely.

Focus: relevant episodes or the whole of each text.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

- 21 –25** Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the Shelley and Stoker explore the nature of good and evil. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

- 18 –20** Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.
- 16 -17** Clear focus on the ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14 – 15** Clear comparison between the ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.
- 11- 13** A comparative approach to ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made between the ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Attempts to focus on ‘ways’ and ‘explore’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which the writers explore the nature of good and evil. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

12. Compare the narrative techniques which Shelley and Stoker use in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*.

Key Words: compare, narrative, techniques, Shelley, Stoker, use.

Focus: the whole of each text.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and the narrative techniques which Shelley and Stoker use. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made of the narrative techniques which the writers use the nature of good and evil. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effects in each text. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the narrative techniques which the writers use. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison of the narrative techniques the writers use. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to narrative techniques the writers use. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

- 8 – 10** Comparison made of the narrative techniques the writers use. Attempts to focus on ‘techniques’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.
- 6 – 7** Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the narrative techniques the writers use. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

- 4 – 5** A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.
- 1 – 3** Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

Wuthering Heights – Emily Brontë
and
The French Lieutenant's Woman – John Fowles

13. Compare the ways in which Brontë and Fowles make use of narrative voices in *Wuthering Heights* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*.

Key Words: compare, ways, Brontë, Fowles, make use, narrative voices.

Focus: the whole of each novel

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

- 21–25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the ways in which the writers use narrative voices. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

- 18–20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which the Brontë and Fowles use narrative voices. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.
- 16–17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers use narrative voices. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

- 14–15 Clear comparison between the ways in which the writers use narrative voices. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to ways in which the writers use narrative voices. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the ways in which narrative voices are used in the novels. Attempts to focus on ‘ways’ and ‘use’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. Does not fully address all key words.

6 – 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which the writers use narrative voices. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 – 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.

14. Compare Brontë's presentation of Cathy Earnshaw in *Wuthering Heights* with Fowles' presentation of Sarah Woodruff in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*.

Key Words: compare, Brontë's, presentation, Cathy Earnshaw, Fowles', presentation, Sarah Woodruff.

Focus: Elements of texts relevant to the presentation of Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff.

Assessment Focus: knowledge, understanding and insights gained from the combined use of literary and linguistic study, using appropriate terminology and accurate written expression – respond with knowledge and understanding to texts of different types and from different periods, exploring and commenting on relationships and comparisons between them – showing understanding of the ways contextual variation and choices of form, style and vocabulary shape the meaning of texts.

Band 5: (21 – 25 marks)

21 –25 Totally secure exploratory understanding of both novels. Significant similarities and differences analysed in an original manner. Conceptualised understanding of linguistic frameworks and their effects on the way in which Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff are presented. All key words fully and confidently addressed. Autonomous and informed response.

Band 4: (16 – 20 marks)

18 –20 Coherent understanding and knowledge of both novels. Perceptive points of comparison made between the two with reference to the ways in which Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff are presented. Coherent comparison of the ways in which linguistic features are used in each text. Analysis of the effects of these features, and evaluation of their contribution to the effect. Confidently addresses all key words.

16 -17 Clear focus on the ways in which the writers present the Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff. Some analysis evident in the comparison. Reference is made to linguistic features in both texts. Clear evaluation of the contribution these features make to the effect of each text. Addresses all key words.

Band 3: (11 – 15 marks)

14 –15 Clear comparison between the ways in which Bronte and Fowles present Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff. Linguistic features identified in each text, with some evaluation of their contribution to the effect of each text. Attempts all key words, not necessarily consistently.

11- 13 A comparative approach to ways in which the writers present Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff. Relevant linguistic features in each text are identified, though not necessarily analysed. Some evaluation of the contribution these features make to the overall effect of each text. Most key words accounted for.

Band 2: (6 – 10 marks)

8 – 10 Comparison made between the ways in which the writers present Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff. Attempts to focus on ‘presentation’, and can identify and comment on at least two of the linguistic features. There may be some narrative sections. Does not fully address all key words.

6 – 7 Some knowledge of both texts. Some superficial comparison of the ways in which Cathy Earnshaw and Sarah Woodruff are presented. Descriptive and narrative rather than analytical. Some attempt to identify linguistic features, though not all key words are addressed. Views of language may be implicit.

Band 1: (0 – 5 marks)

4 – 5 A superficial response, which is mainly narrative and/or descriptive, showing knowledge of the texts at a simple level. Texts treated separately, with little or no attempt at comparison. Difficulty in engaging with the question. Difficulty with key words.

1 – 3 Minimal response. Some simple knowledge of texts shown. No comparison. No reference to linguistic features.