

# English Language

Advanced GCE A2 7827

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3827

## Report on the Units

---

**June 2008**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

© OCR 2008

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

Advanced GCE English Language 7827

Advanced Subsidiary GCE English Language 3827

### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner's Report	1
2701 Frameworks for the Description of English	2
2702 Variation in Usage of English	3
2703 Experiments in Writing (coursework)	5
2704 Language Contexts – Structural and Social	6
2705 Language Research Topic (coursework)	8
2706 Exploring, Analysing and Evaluating English	9
Grade Thresholds	14

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

There was some outstanding language work produced, especially at A2 level. There was a significant increase in confident application of terminology, more detailed structural illustration and a greater confidence in conceptual application when responding to the diversity of A2 questions.

At AS level there was a clear improvement in Assessment Objective 1 (AO1), supporting a more assured approach to linguistic basics. Across the specification this meant that markers found greater evidence of firm approaches to the important AO3, AO4 and AO5 objectives. The number of candidates submitting pre-packaged materials was also further reduced. This clearly indicates greater confidence and diversity of approaches from those engaged in teaching the subject. This freshness of interest and use of new resources and reference material was noted in a number of papers. The only cautionary note was the minority of candidates who, despite constant reference in previous reports, did not read the rubric of questions carefully enough. Centres are to be congratulated on the quality of much of the work which has lifted the overall standard to a very satisfying level.

## 2701 Frameworks for the Description of English

This year's paper generated an excellent range of responses and the candidates appeared to be very engaged and really open minded at all levels. The markers commented on the fact that there was a good deal of solid language knowledge and confident use of technical terminology. The age of the speakers was obviously an important contextual feature that shaped the way that they spoke, as well as their regional background and on the whole this was handled effectively and sensitively, with only the occasional comment that might have suggested that Grace was 'confused' or that the speakers were 'struggling' in some way. Overall there was an awareness of the richness and complexity of the language. As recommended in the PE report for January 2008, candidates were continuing to be tentative and allowing the data to lead their answers rather than basing responses on assumptions about class and social background.

Of the four main frameworks for assessment at AO3, semantics is often neglected. However, this paper generated lots of interesting comments in this area, such as the meaning and use of words like '*razzmatazz*' (defined by one or two candidates to be a Blackpool nightclub!) and 'tonic'. There were some fruitful discussions of semantic shifts and the effect of regionality and age on semantics. Nonetheless, there was still concern from markers that this was a less addressed area. Grammar and syntax is still rather neglected; it would be helpful for candidates to be given a grounding in clause analysis and the application of terms such as subject, object, voice, mood, simple, complex and compound clauses. There was much made of the speakers' accent and dialect which led to interesting comments around lexis and phonology and some excellent observations about the use of euphemism (*he's got all his faculties put it that way*), which also linked into discussion of AO4 issues of politeness and attitudes towards language.

There was some judicious and open-minded use of theories and ideas at AO4. There was some helpful use of gender theories such as the work of Coates and Lakoff, but also some less helpful use of 'folk linguistics' that were unaccredited assertions such as 'women tend to talk more than men.' A good starter text for language and gender would be *Language and Gender* by Angela Goddard (published by *Intertext*), which deals with theories and their application very helpfully.

AO1 was addressed best by candidates that took a systematic approach to the data, dealing with the frameworks and the issues that arise, rather than taking a line by line approach or merely feature-spotting. However, there is still interchangeable use of the terms *accent* and *dialect* and a large number of candidates who do not use a capital 'E' for 'English'. The best responses are able to employ a wide range of technical terminology accurately and have a good grammatical grounding. Good practice that has been put into place by a number of centres has been to develop a glossary of terms that is available to all students on the school computer network and is developed by the students as they work through the course. This is particularly helpful as there is no single set text book that covers everything that the students need to know. Overall, this appeared to be an accessible paper with some excellent responses, demonstrating the fact that a good number of centres are using past papers, mark schemes, Principal Examiner reports and the online support services from OCR very effectively.

## **2702 Variation in Usage of English**

### **General Comments**

Markers note some very sound work produced in the upper bands. These candidates had been well-prepared to meet the question-specific issues both in sections (a) and (b). In the lower bands, whilst there was evidence of a growing confidence in handling linguistic data, a number of candidates failed to reach their full potential by not addressing precisely what the rubric asked. Even though this has been raised in several previous reports, markers felt that some candidates were still unaware of this need, which is a requirement to meet the particular Assessment Objectives on a given question.

### **Question 1**

E-languages and their digital offshoots remained a popular choice. There were some sound responses, looking at the syntactical and semantic contents of this now quite common variant. However, a number of papers simply wrote unqualified lists and did not respond to the rubric-specific points of linguistic analysis.

Legal language has become more firmly established. Candidates used the steer passage as a key for further commentary and illustration. There was some interesting work on women's magazines in which an attempt was made to tie in feminist issues with language variation. This proved to be a valuable and potentially rewarding development. Sociological comments on newspaper readership showed a welcome decline. Nevertheless, the continuing presence of advertising materials nearly forty years of age indicates a lack of attention to the synchronic aims of the paper. There were a few papers which addressed literary works; however, the demands of syntactic and grammatical commentary meant that the task was too difficult to match to a rather sporadic knowledge of cited texts.

### **Question 2**

The passages proved quite popular and some candidates were clearly familiar with the locations mentioned. It was interesting that the candidates seemed to feel that passage (a) had the higher level of formality. Given that it was a rather sardonic look at part of the modern UK, it is possible that its origins in the generic form of 'Decline of England' seemed to be making more realistic journalistic points, whereas the deliberately retro style of passage (b) probably seemed both old-fashioned and lower key in its structural organisation. The actual gentility of the writing and the focus on traditional seaside resort ambience certainly was a different kind of discourse. This made a sound platform to analyse passage (a) in its more abrasive language and its evocations of subcultural activities. It might be noted that no candidate could adequately deal with the lexical sets 'synthetic cultural tourism', 'the language of Britain' and the richer implications of what a 'resort' suggested. It was also interesting to read a number of candidates who felt that 'fish and chipperies' was an archaism. Markers also noted weaker analytical attention to 'equable', 'tranquil' and 'elegance'; three strong discourse markers in passage (b).

### **Question 3**

It was noticed that some candidates are still approaching this question in the deficit mode of commentary about language acquisition despite previous reports and the clear key noun SKILLS in the rubric. 'She should have used/spoken' being the usual methods employed. Candidates should remember, also, that this is not a question where repeating the criteria for 2701 answers will be detailed enough. Answers must look in detail at grammar and collocation/cohesion in lexical setting. The more incisive answers showed, correctly, that Jennifer was an articulate and confident speaker who could code-switch and organise her language in a linguistically detailed fashion. Her lexical competence could be seen in her first speech where she used six nouns in a strongly collocative utterance, developing the equivalent of a complex declarative sentence. It is not necessary for candidates to run through all the various stages of speech in their answers. Nor is it necessary to try and attach specific language to broader theories of acquisition. The mark scheme is explicitly focused upon rewarding what can be found within the data in the passage.

## **2703 Experiments in Writing (coursework)**

Once again Centres had encouraged their candidates to produce a diverse range of writing, with many challenging topics and texts attempted. A great deal of carefully crafted work was produced in all three categories: adaptive, creative and re-creative.

It was obvious that candidates had been strongly supported and well advised in their choices. Many candidates had drawn upon personal interests producing what, in many cases, were quite adventurous pieces. Spoken language pieces figured prominently with many transcripts of radio programmes, spontaneous conversations and interviews. Creative pieces included short stories, monologues, song lyrics and poetry. Many candidates produced tabloid and broadsheet articles on many topical issues and music and film reviews were popular once again.

In the majority of cases candidates were fully engaged with their work, writing with competence and enthusiasm. The best practice occurred where there was a clear balance between the original writing and the analytical commentary.

Commentaries were generally thoughtfully written, employing apt linguistic and analytical frameworks. The best were detailed and illuminating, explaining essential decisions related to topic, genre, audience and purpose and discussing in detail linguistic and stylistic choices made.

Weaker commentaries were less detailed, containing generalisations about the use of language but lacking in detailed examples to illustrate the points being made.

Teachers helpfully annotated work, highlighting strengths and weaknesses and making useful reference to the assessment objectives.

For the most part Centres were accurate in their marking, with minor moderator adjustments being made at the bottom end of the scale, where there was often sufficient evidence to warrant higher marks.

All administration was carefully carried out. One or two centres were a little careless in the completion of cover sheets, omitting candidate numbers or failing to provide a summative comment but this was a small minority.



## 2704 Language Contexts – Structural and Social

### General Comments

There was some interesting formal linguistic work from a number of centres. It appeared that candidates had been given more explicit guidance about presenting language analysis. It also appeared that there had been more focused guidance on approaching the relevant AO's across the question paper. Markers noted some scripts of real academic maturity and indicated that candidates had generally responded very positively to the chosen questions.

### Comments on individual Questions

#### Section A - Structures

##### Question 1      *Language and Speech Sounds*

The passage proved to be popular with those specialising in phonology. The conversation led them effectively into broader issues about prosodic and phonological methods. Candidates understood 'technical' to mean using some phonemic symbols and some other tools for indicating methods for analysing speech in depth. Good candidates thought carefully about 'London' intonation and offered some valuable ways of marking what this might have been. It was also a pleasure to read scripts which could use the vowel quadrilateral correctly in determining diphthongal glides. Only a minority of candidates doing this question reverted to the more simplified methods used in discussing transcribed speech, indicating that their practices had not really developed from the standards of AS commentary.

##### Question 2      *Language and Grammar*

Many candidates seemed to find the passage both interesting and challenging. This led to some unusually detailed work on grammatical analysis, using tree structures and linear clause analysis to illustrate their answers. There were also some appropriate literary/stylistic approaches, picking up the different way the subject speaker was woven into the syntax. There was quite a wide use of technical terminology, complementing the AO3ii objective, though not always used with consistent accuracy in lower band work. There were also some interesting comments on the discursive patterns in presenting the topic of motor cars. The minority of less focused scripts tended to drift away from the rubric issues, talking loosely about lexis and summarising the contents of the passage.

##### Question 3      *Language and Meaning*

Responses to this question showed greater variability in method and application. Stronger answers covered all the given data, assigning likely grammatical categories and offered some real depth in lexicographical information, discussion and problems raised in studying semantics. A few candidates made strong efforts to attribute root etymologies and, given the wide range of sources for the words, this was a very commendable technical effort. Perhaps the surprising sticking points in terms of meaning came with phrases like 'reality TV' and 'digitalised ether'. Very few candidates could see that these posed real semantic and conational problems, possibly because of their near contemporaneity. Weaker answers failed to attempt all the examples and often wrote little more than simple synonyms for the terms, thus not developing the necessary semantic space for AO3ii analysis.

## **Section B - Social Contexts**

### **Question 4      *Language Change***

Passage (a) proved rather popular with candidates, allowing them to mine a whole range of grammatical and lexical shifts and obscurities. In fact a number of answers spent too long on Anys's problem and too little time on the 21<sup>st</sup> century passage. Though few candidates could work out what her transgressions had actually been, they recognised a legal register, in what seemed a very formal address. It was interesting that some candidates seemed to feel that Bishop Lowth 'invented' proper English grammar in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This was because of mistaking the multi-clausality of passage (a) for poor sentence structure. Few candidates really picked up the modern transgressiveness in passage (b). In fact there was some evidence that some of the lexis in this passage was not really understood, especially the noun 'victimhood'. This moral problem would have made an interesting contrast with both the patriarchal authority and the not inconsiderable formal powers possessed by 'Mr Mayor' in passage (a).

### **Question 5      *Language and Gender***

Markers were pleased with the quality of some answers to this question. These responses moved away from the litany of stereotypes and irrelevantly applied feminist theories. Instead they worked methodically through the lexis, raising semantic points around possible gender language and trying to link this with some more recent work on gender politics (both male and female). What they responded to, and a few recognised, was the Mars/Venus syndrome in journalistic guise. They also realised the irony that this was set with 'lifestyle' pretensions. Weaker answers moved into broad sociological assertions and often talked about male/female speech being different. This despite the fact that the sources were clearly identified as being published. Such pre-packaged materials do not help the candidates at all in addressing the specific structural issues in the chosen data.

### **Question 6      *Language and Society***

As in several papers, candidates seemed to find difficulty in dealing with issues surrounding dialect(s). Very few saw the humour of the north of England biting back at the implied linguistic authority of London. There was adequate material in the passage to encourage a reflection on what it was saying and as a pilot to illustrate further dialects, idiolects and sociolects. However, few candidates seemed to have adequate material for such AO4/AO5ii development. Several candidates attempted to turn the passage into an answer about speech, which it clearly was not. There have been a range of issues surrounding dialects in past 2704 papers and there is a mass of material available on a variety of websites. It is helpful if candidates are given structured guidance in learning more about such areas, which are clearly quite popular in 2705 research work as well. Without this basic information, they will continue to find it difficult to deal with the wider AO4 issues and difficult to have an incisive linguistic focus on contextual matters necessary to meet the AO5ii objective.

## **2705 Language Research Topic (coursework)**

Candidates submitted an interesting and diverse range of projects which investigated many contemporary language related issues. Many of the subjects chosen seemed to have grown out of areas of the course which candidates had found stimulating and many candidates were quite adventurous in terms of the texts chosen and issues covered. Most centres seem to have perfected the balance between closely directing candidates and giving them an appropriate degree of autonomy to pursue their own interests.

Many candidates chose to write on language and gender, child language and the language of advertising. Several investigations focussed on the language of the Internet, examining the language of text messages and chat rooms and there was some excellent work produced on humour. Film and music were other popular topics.

Many candidates submitted thoughtful investigations which had clear objectives and appropriate methodologies. Occasionally poorly worded, open ended research titles restricted candidates who would have benefited from a more precise focus. Most candidates demonstrated clear personal engagement with their investigations, addressing relevant issues of language choice and stylistic appropriateness. Topics were usually well-researched and theoretical knowledge applied critically and concisely. Data was thoroughly analysed and findings were clearly communicated. The writing was fluent, accurate and enthusiastic in tone.

With weaker submissions there was sometimes a tendency to be descriptive rather than analytical and to overgeneralise where detailed discussion would have made the point more clearly and succinctly.

In the majority of cases tasks were helpfully structured to address well the assessment objectives but some projects were rather vague in their intentions. More clearly defined lines of research would have resulted in fuller conclusions.

The application of the assessment criteria was accurate in the vast number of centres. Problems occurred at the top of the range where good work tended to be over-rewarded and at the very bottom end where weaker submissions were under-rewarded.

Most work was helpfully and appropriately annotated by teaching staff showing clear progression from the assessment objectives, to task setting, to assessment. Where annotation was absent it was sometimes difficult to understand the thinking behind the marks awarded.

## **2706 Exploring, Analysing and Evaluating English**

### **General Comments**

The paper worked well in enabling responses which explored, evaluated and analysed the use of language in the passages. Differentiation was clearly achieved, with stronger candidates coping well with the complexities of Passages B and D. All candidates engaged with Passage A, the transcription of part of a conversation in which four sixth form students are talking about their tastes in hot drinks.

Accurate knowledge of, and analysis of, word-classes and basic syntax (AO3) mark out the best candidates. Although such skills should be fundamental to a study of English Language, only the stronger candidates in each session have automatic recourse to their use. It is perhaps understandable, but still a cause for concern, that weaker candidates reach for what they see as the security and certainty of assertions about the expected features of particular text types rather than looking closely at what is actually in front of them. The fifteen minutes of reading time should allow candidates to consider the textual evidence without pre-conception. Clearly, knowledge and experience of 'typical' features of (for example) media texts can be helpful at some point, but the initial engagement must be with what is in the Reading Booklet.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Section A

- 1(a) The transposition task was to write a report on attitudes to hot drinks amongst 16-18 year olds. The audience was a national company operating a chain of coffee bars, and keen to increase its appeal to this age group.

There were some lively responses to the task, which was a successful one overall, mainly because there was a good balance between the accessible source data and the transposition task. Candidates responded well to a transcription from their own peer group, and this probably made it easier for them to make at least sound comments on the non-standard utterances and register, all of which needed removing or refining to create the business-like report to the company.

A typical answer revealed some understanding of the register required for a (comparatively) formal report. Some candidates used the less formal context of an e-mail rather than a more traditional written report, altering the level of formality and terms of address accordingly. The better scripts were those able to maintain the chosen style while remaining faithful to the attitudes and content of the original. Weaker answers, as usual, resembled simple summaries, more or less accurate, of the material in the transcription, sometimes exhibiting inconsistent or inappropriate lexical choices.

Strong responses drew heavily on the lexical/semantic fields of business, profit, research, and clients, creating a new text with a very identifiable target audience, register, context and purpose. A few candidates decided to make the report a little persuasive, taking the idea that the researchers compiling the report had an agenda to push. When attempted well, this resulted in a richer piece, with attention-grabbing headlines ('*Coffee – hot or not?*') and a 'hard sell' tone. When attempted badly, the transposition reduced itself into the copy for a print-based advertisement, and did not really answer the brief.

- 1(b)** The second part of the task was a commentary making comparison of the candidate's transposition with the original transcription.

Some skilful transpositions were (disappointingly) followed by thin part (b) commentaries, which missed the opportunity to explain and explore what had seemed rather subtle language choices. There is still a discrepancy between the twin AO2 dimensions: the ability to make appropriate choices of language still runs ahead of the ability to explore and analyse those choices in linguistic terms. Candidates also made worryingly basic errors, for example in confusing word-classes. Many picked up on the emphatic use of "love" and "hate" in the transcription, and commented on how they had used (or not used, or varied) these terms in their transposition. However, they often described the terms as "abstract nouns" or "adjectives" when clearly they are *verbs* in the transcription!

A typical answer tended to begin with a survey of the transcription, identifying and commenting on features typical of natural speech. Brief references to research on male/female speech styles were sometimes useful in this discussion, as was exploration of ways in which the speakers showed signs of typical teen-speak (e.g. downward convergence and slang). The best answers applied such knowledge to what was actually in the transcription, rather than asserting as incontrovertible truth the thesis that men use more declaratives and women more interrogatives.

Stronger candidates noticed that there were actually very few signs of sociolect or idiolect, and barely any indication of dialect or accent. They went on to suggest ways in which phonological and supra-segmental features might be indicated. They were also more likely to analyse accurately the grammatical and syntactical features of their own transpositions.

Weaker answers were defective in this last point, tending to describe their transpositions as 'much more formal' even when they were not markedly so. The least successful commentaries tended to focus on how hard the candidate had found the task because of the typical features of spoken language (especially the lack of punctuation) in the transcription.

Weaker commentaries tended to be either very short, or lengthy and repetitive. The shorter commentaries showed a weakness in self-analysis – stronger on AO4 than AO2. Centres need to encourage candidates to practise analysing their own work and comparing it to transcribed speech, evaluating the differences and explaining the stylistic, lexical, syntactic and editing choices made. Many candidates would have done much better had they simply said more about their own texts in the Commentary. Other candidates tended to offer very basic AO4, albeit over several pages. Terms such as 'word' rather than naming the specific class, or phrases such as 'making the conversation have more flow', are not really precise enough for A2. Terminology should cover a range of non-fluency features, syntax and phonology.

Notwithstanding all of the above, almost all candidates at least described the structure and content of the transposition, going on to make some general points (AO4) about the presentation of speech in written form. Candidates also brought in the issues of prosody and pronunciation by offering different phonemic transcriptions of some lexemes.

## Section B

This section of the paper tests candidates' knowledge of linguistic frameworks and their ability to apply them (AO3) to four different passages linked, this year, by the theme of coffee. The AO5 dimension entails exploration of language variation according to time and context.

Many candidates every year adopt a systematic passage-by-passage approach. Others organise their responses according to a series of frameworks (e.g. purpose, audience, register, lexis, grammar, phonology). Both approaches work well enough for informed candidates, though the better answers are usually those more skilful in using cross-reference.

Purpose and audience (AO5) were regularly addressed (though not always accurately understood) and there were genuine attempts to engage (AO3) with grammatical and syntactical features. Weaker answers tended to collect examples of field-specific lexis without exploring morphology or semantics.

In general, the better answers were those where Passage A (the transcription) was brought in to show its differences from the other three extracts, with the most significant features being rightly commented on and evaluated. Indeed, some candidates seemed to have been given the very useful advice that discussion of Passage A works best when left until last.

The more astute candidates noticed the co-operative nature of the transcribed conversation, evident in overlaps and back-channel features. Some argued that the apparent dominance of Tim was a function of his being the only male; others suggested that his repetitions and self-repairs were more indicative of nervousness than of floor-holding strategies. Either view, or indeed any other coherent interpretation of the dynamics of the conversation, was entirely acceptable if clearly explained and supported by reference to the data.

Weaker answers were those in which discussion of Passage A formed the bulk of the analysis, repeating points made in Section A's Commentary, and resulting in insufficient time being left for Passage D.

In fact, careful attention to Passage D was the most obvious single marker of stronger candidates. Some commented on features of 'literary' language such as symbolism, metaphor and irony, and on the use of 'pathetic fallacy' in the interplay between "rain" and "I cried". It was equally possible to approach the poem from an entirely linguistic perspective: better candidates noted how the rhythms, enjambments and repetitions ("And I, I took ...") mimic speech, and drew several interesting connections with Passage A. Less confident candidates struggled with the syntax, some arguing that there were no 'proper' sentences, others that there was only one sentence because there was only one full stop. Some rather better answers homed in on obvious features such as the preponderance of simple third person past tense dynamic verbs in the active voice ("He put ... he put ... he drank ... he set down ... he made ...") and complete absence of explicit emotion (as might be shown by stative verbs) until the last three lines, where there is a shift to the first person and an action ("I cried") which does reveal emotion.

Passage B has in most sessions been the 'older' passage, and was regularly (and correctly) identified as the most formal, this formality being simply attributed in weaker answers to its age. In more developed answers, candidates showed an awareness (AO5) that the 1650 audience was likely to be limited by economic and social factors, and that an 'advertisement' for such a novel item as coffee would need to inform as well as persuade.

The question of 'archaisms' causes problems every year. Weaker candidates tended to make the general observation that a certain word was no longer in use. Fear of the unusual/unknown led to some loose and unhelpful assertions; candidates avoided any attempt at analysis based on word-classes or grammar, and made wild suggestions of modern equivalence, for example that "groweth" would now be rendered as 'growth'. More secure candidates resisted such impulses to panic, and deployed good knowledge of appropriate lexical and/or morphological and semantic frameworks to point out that the "-eth" suffix was an inflectional ending marking the present tense of the verb, now marked by the "-s" ending. Less secure answers tried to argue that such features of language change were matters of spelling and/or orthography, phonology or punctuation.

More encouragingly, many candidates identified a lexical field of medicine in the passage, noting that coffee was being 'marketed' as "a most excellent remedy against the spleen, hypochondriac winds, and the like". Some explored the semantic shift in "hypochondriac". It was apparent that some Centres had taught semantics well, and had made clear its significance in this unit. Some candidates were consequently systematic in both AO3 and AO5 dimensions, offering proficient comment on morphology, explaining the differences between 'then' and 'now'. They identified cultural shifts such as those in the meaning of "consumptions", "exceedingly" – one student relating it to modern day advertising of a well-known cake brand! – and "fumes", all of which relied on their seventeenth century context. An impressive number identified and analysed the shift in pronoun use from "one" to "you" in lines 24-25.

Pronoun use provided a neat link to Passage C with its inclusive "each of us ... our lives ... our lifestyles". Candidates were keen to find informal features 'typical' of a web-site, but most were flexible enough to see that the register was mixed and included some more complex lexis and syntax. Some made much of the use of "Turkish", seen as more 'politically correct' than the "Turks" of Passage B, and explored the ramifications of using "Arab" as noun and adjective. Less careful answers asserted that there were many passive constructions but failed to identify, or mis-identified, them. More careful candidates accurately located passives and polite imperatives in the 'instructions' section ("The Filter Method") from lines 19-22.



# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE English Language 3827 / 7827  
June 2008 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2701	Raw	60	47	42	37	32	28	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2702	Raw	60	44	40	36	32	28	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2703	Raw	60	48	43	38	33	28	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2704	Raw	60	44	39	34	30	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2705	Raw	60	50	44	39	34	29	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2706	Raw	60	45	41	37	33	29	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3827	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7827	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3827	11.6	31.0	58.4	80.6	94.1	100	510
7827	16.4	43.4	73.5	93.2	99.7	100	366

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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

© OCR 2008

