

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Components

June 2005

9910/MS/R/05

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced Extension Awards English (9910)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
9910	English	1

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
9910	Principal Examiner's Report	18
*	Grade Thresholds	27

Mark Scheme 9910
June 2005

Introduction

This guidance complements the question- and passage-specific notes given later in the mark scheme. The mark scheme for this, as for all units, is derived from the generic mark band descriptions given in the specification document.

Further exemplification and amplification of the standard to be applied is given at the Standardisation Meeting.

The sections that follow deal with:

- 1 Specification aims
- 2 Assessment Objective
- 3 Rubric
- 4 Awarding marks
- 5 Annotation
- 6 Generic band descriptions
- 7 Question specific band descriptions
- 8 Notes on the sections of the paper
- 9 Notes on the passages

1 Specification Aims

The Advanced Extension Awards should:

- challenge the most able advanced level candidates by providing opportunities for candidates to demonstrate greater depth of understanding than that required at Advanced GCE;
- ensure that the most able candidates are tested against standards comparable with the most demanding to be found in other countries;
- be accessible to all able candidates, whatever their school or college, and whichever specification they are studying;
- help differentiate between the most able candidates, particularly in subjects with a high proportion of A grades at Advanced GCE, in order to obviate the need for universities to develop their own entry tests.

The AEA in English should be accessible to the most able candidates studying English Language, English Literature, and English Language and Literature. (Some AEA candidates may have studied other specifications.)

The AEA in English should require candidates to:

- acquire greater skills of enquiry, analysis and synthesis within the three English disciplines;
- write with precision and conviction;
- sustain their interest and enjoyment of literary and/or linguistic study;
- engage intelligently and creatively with a wide selection of unseen texts, regardless of the Advanced GCE English specification(s) being followed;
- work with insight and originality on tasks that move beyond those of the English Advanced GCE synoptic modules.

2 Assessment Objective

The AEA in English will assess candidates' abilities to apply and communicate effectively their knowledge and understanding of English, some of its methodologies and texts, using the skills of critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis.

3 Rubric

Answer Question 1 and one other question.

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

- answering only one question;
- answering two questions from Section A or two from Section B (credit as appropriate material relevant to the demands of each section);
- answering more than two questions (mark all the answers; record the highest scoring answer in each Section).

4 Awarding Marks

Assessment materials and mark schemes will lead to awards on a two-point scale: *Distinction* and *Merit*. Candidates who do not reach the minimum standard for *Merit* will be recorded as *Ungraded*.

(i) Each question is worth 30 marks.

(ii) For each answer, a single overall mark out of 30 must be awarded, as follows:

- refer to the question-specific mark schemes for descriptions of levels of skill and likely content;
- using 'best fit', make a holistic judgement to locate the answer in the appropriate mark band: how well does the candidate address the question?
- locate the answer within the band and determine the appropriate mark out of 30. Use the grid in section 6 below (page 6) as a guide.

Please mark positively. In this examination you should expect the unexpected. Within, as well as between, centres, candidates' answers will differ widely in approach and range of reference, as well as quality of discussion. You must be alert to individuality and resourcefulness in candidates' management of their material.

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

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

(iii) When you have marked the complete script:

- if necessary, follow the instructions concerning rubric infringements;
- add together the marks for the two answers, to arrive at the total mark for the script;
- cross-check this mark against the generic mark band descriptions – does the overall mark fairly reflect the achievement demonstrated in the script as a whole? Review the marking of individual questions, if necessary.

5 Annotation

At the end of each answer record the *band* in the left margin, your *comment* in the space between the margins, and your *mark* in the right margin. On the script's front page, provide a comment summarising the features of the script as a whole. Against the total mark for the script, record your examiner's number (Team/Position). Make sure that everything you write on a script is legible.

Your summative comment at the end of each answer must make clear why you have awarded your mark; your marginal notes and other running annotations point to the evidence for the mark/comment. Your comment at the end of each answer should summarise the answer's positive and negative qualities briefly, using terminology from the band descriptions as appropriate. Since the paper's emphasis is on skills of

critical analysis and management of complex material, your overall comment on the front page should refer to the quality of the candidate's expression and organisation, as well as to the value of her/his ideas.

6 Locating the answer within the band to arrive at a mark

The following grid can be used in conjunction with the band descriptions as a guide to locating an answer within a band to determine the mark.

Band 1	30	top
	29	upper
	28	
	27	clear
	26	
	25	just
	24	<i>borderline</i>
Band 2	23	top
	22	upper
	21	
	20	clear
	19	
	18	just
	17	<i>borderline</i>
Band 3	16	top
	15	upper
	14	
	13	clear
	12	
	11	just
	10	<i>borderline</i>
Band 4	9	upper
	8	
	7	
	6	weak
	5	
	4	
	3	poor
	2	
	1	
	0	

6 Generic band descriptions

<p>Band 1</p> <p>24 - 30</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar passages in ways that demonstrate critical understanding and insight, drawing on appropriate conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and knowledge of contextual factors to express secure personal judgements; establish complex connections and comparisons between passages/texts, exploring relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss literary/linguistic issues rigorously, elucidating debates with knowledge and evidence, and arguing a coherent, personal point of view; write with an individuality of approach and maturity of style, making fluent, effective use of the language of the subject.
<p>Band 2</p> <p>17 - 23</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar passages perceptively and cogently, with some reference to relevant conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and contextual factors; make thoughtful connections and comparisons between passages/texts, considering relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss literary/linguistic issues in developed, coherent argument informed by knowledge of debates and supported by appropriate evidence; write in a cogent and convincing style, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
<p>Band 3</p> <p>10 - 16</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar passages in ways that demonstrate competent understanding of their concerns, with some awareness of conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and contextual factors; make relevant connections and comparisons between passages/texts, exploring the arguments/positions they embody and the means by which they are presented; demonstrate awareness of literary/linguistic issues and debates, with evidence of a personal point of view; write coherently and accurately, showing some awareness of the language of the subject.
<p>Band 4</p> <p>0 - 9</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> attempt some analysis of the concerns of unfamiliar passages; make a few relevant connections and comparisons between passages/texts, with limited development of argument or exploration of methods of presentation; offer some comments on literary/linguistic issues and debates; write with some accuracy but with superficial reference to the language of the subject.

7 Question specific band descriptions

Section A, Question 1

In passages A to K travellers' encounters with "a different world" are described, in a variety of styles and registers. By comparative analysis of any two or more of these passages (A to K), consider ways in which different experiences are presented. Use any approach you think appropriate, based on your studies of language and/or literature.

Begin your answer by explaining the approach you are adopting. In your conclusion, assess the usefulness and/or the limitations that you have found in your approach.

Band	Description
1 24-30	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse their chosen passages in ways that demonstrate secure critical understanding and insight; they should show that they can identify and evaluate the approach(es) they have adopted; establish complex connections and comparisons between passages, exploring relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss the formal features of their selected passages, and the issues they raise, with confidence and precision, synthesising their findings into a convincing argument; write with an individuality of approach and maturity of style, making fluent, effective use of the language of the subject.
2 17-23	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse their chosen passages in ways that demonstrate critical understanding and insight; they should show that they can identify and appreciate the approach(es) they have adopted; make thoughtful connections and comparisons between passages, considering relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss the formal features of their selected passages, and the issues they raise, with a degree of confidence and precision, synthesising their findings into a clear argument; write in a cogent and convincing style, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
3 10-16	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse their chosen passages in ways that demonstrate appropriate understanding and insight; they should show that they can identify the approach(es) they have adopted; make relevant connections and comparisons between passages, exploring the arguments/positions they embody and the means by which they are presented; discuss the formal features of their selected passages, and the issues they raise, effectively, with an attempt to synthesise their findings into an argument; write coherently and accurately, showing some awareness of the language of the subject.

4 0-9	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• analyse their chosen passages with limited understanding and insight; make some connections and comparisons between passages, exploring the arguments/positions they embody and the means by which they are presented;• identify some formal features of their selected passages, and the issues they raise, with some attempt to synthesise their findings into an argument;• write with some accuracy but with superficial reference to the language of the subject.
----------------------------	---

Section B, Questions 2 – 5

Generic criteria

Band	Description
<p>1</p> <p>24-30</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present a convincing argument in response to the question/passage selected, showing detailed understanding of implications and issues addressed; • offer informed discussion of issues, strongly supported by appropriate evidence and illustration; • synthesise their ideas into a well structured discussion/analysis, perhaps taking account of a variety of possible approaches; • write with an individuality of approach and maturity of style, making fluent, effective use of the language of the subject.
<p>2</p> <p>17-23</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present a cogent argument in response to the question/passage selected, showing clear understanding of implications and issues addressed; • offer clear discussion of issues, supported by appropriate evidence and illustration; • synthesise their ideas into a coherent discussion/analysis, perhaps identifying a variety of possible approaches; • write in a cogent and convincing style, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
<p>3</p> <p>10-16</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present a competent argument in response to the question/passage selected, showing a broad understanding of implications and issues addressed; • offer relevant discussion of issues, generally supported by evidence and illustration; • attempt to synthesise their ideas into a coherent discussion/analysis; • write coherently and accurately, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
<p>4</p> <p>0-9</p>	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present the outline of an argument in response to the question/passage selected, showing limited understanding of implications and issues addressed; • offer some discussion of issues, supported by limited evidence and illustration; • make a limited attempt to synthesise their ideas into a coherent discussion; • write with some accuracy but with superficial reference to the language of the subject.

Section B, Question 6

Select one of the passages from the Reading Booklet:

- i) re-write it in another form and style (eg the Bishop poem as a short story, or the Morris passage as a poem); and
- ii) discuss linguistic, literary and/or stylistic transformations that your re-writing has entailed.

Band	Description
1 24-30	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compose a successful transformation of the chosen passage into an appropriate and effective form and style; • offer a comprehensive commentary, discussing in depth issues and difficulties encountered in adapting the material, and critically evaluating their experience of the task; • focus sharply on issues such as organisation/reader/audience, relating these clearly to the choices made for the transposition; • write with an individuality of approach and maturity of style, making fluent, effective use of the language of the subject.
2 17-23	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compose a largely successful transformation of the chosen passage into an appropriate and effective form and style; • offer a perceptive commentary, discussing in some depth issues and difficulties encountered in adapting the material, and discussing their experience of the task; • focus on issues such as organisation/reader/audience, relating these appropriately to the choices made for the transposition; • write in a cogent and convincing style, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
3 10-16	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compose a competent transformation of the chosen passage into an appropriate form and style; • offer a straightforward commentary, discussing in some detail issues and difficulties encountered in adapting the material; • make some reference to issues such as organisation/reader/audience, relating these to the choices made for the transposition; • write coherently and accurately, showing some awareness of the language of the subject.
4 0-9	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempt to compose a competent transformation of the chosen passage into an appropriate form and style; • offer a limited commentary, with some basic discussion of issues and difficulties encountered in adapting the material; • make limited reference to issues such as organisation/reader/audience, with some attempt to relate these to the choices made for the transposition; • write with some accuracy but with superficial reference to the language of the subject.

8 Notes on the Sections of the Paper

Section A

Some candidates will deal with only two passages; some will range very widely across the material in the booklet, perhaps attempting a chronological or thematic survey that may cover most – or even all – of the passages. All these strategies are acceptable, depending on the quality of the candidate's analysis of the writing/presentation and exploration of relationships between passages (both detailed analysis and comparative discussion are required).

The question asks the candidate to identify the approach s/he adopts, *and* to evaluate its effectiveness. These are serious requirements and should be borne in mind when you are deciding on a band and a mark for the answer: where the candidate simply ignores the instruction, note this on the front page of the script. Some declarations and evaluations will be simple/structural (eg "I'm going to compare Passages D and F ... I wish I'd had time to consider B and H as well"); some may announce their specification affiliation (eg "I am a language student, and I'm going to concentrate on linguistic register ... "); some may identify a critical position (eg "I shall be doing a practical criticism of H and J ... this worked quite well, but a contextualising discussion would have added a different dimension – for example ..."); some may adduce a more sophisticated theoretical framework (eg "I shall approach the passages from a feminist perspective, analysing and comparing gender expectations within the passages I have chosen ... this was helpful in highlighting specific issues, but it meant that other issues were not dealt with, for example ..."). Your mark and comment must relate to the candidate's performance, not on what you think of the approach.

Section B

The rubric to this section makes clear that the candidate is expected to refer both to passages in the booklet and to material drawn from her/his own studies in any of the three "English" specifications; if only one of these bodies of material is referred to, this should be noted in your comment on the answer. Each Section B question refers the candidate to the argument/discussion of the passage as a whole: answers which locate the issue identified in the question within the passage's overall argument should be rewarded, though a full extrapolation of the selected issue, well supported by evidence from passages and other material, may of course also receive very high marks. Different materials/texts cited should be *discussed* and not simply catalogued; differences as well as correspondences between materials/texts may be helpfully explored. Remember that the passages in the booklet deal with complex issues and the candidates have only an hour to absorb them; and be careful not to allow your expectations to rise as you become familiar with candidates' responses.

9 Notes on the passages

These are merely suggestions on possible areas for consideration, to be amplified in the standardising meeting, in the light of candidates' actual responses.

Passage A: Around Europe Advertisement

The travel feature markets the experience(s) using a number of advertising conventions. Candidates should see the package is wrapped in a cultural/lifestyle narrative, exactly the same as any other kind of branding. They should be able to

pick up the salient features from the wealth of material, possibly starting with the possessive pronoun in the trailer on the main photograph, leading into detailed discussion of how the discourse(s) work, noting the dialogue at the beginning and the tick box style conversations at the end. This use of spoken voice, despite an upmarket social register, is very similar to *vox pop* techniques used in broadcast media. The main narrative is full of "fascinating" cultural icons that "we" have consumed – then recuperated each evening with gastronomic consumption and elegant living, which mirrors the written structures in any number of lifestyle magazines. Those concerned with national identity might comment upon how "Adonia (is) a reassuring piece of Britain". The grammar of this paragraph will undoubtedly appeal to those who worry over position of co-ordinating conjunction. The lexis overall is full of semantic possibilities - the geographical substantives seem to carry ideological approval and the cultural settings occur in simple clausal structures. Candidates might see the passage as heavy with adjectival intensification. They might wish to comment upon graphological features and other issues drawn from media studies. If this effectively raises issues about mediation in terms of meanings then it is acceptable. Useful comparisons can be made with Sinclair, Morris and Nortje, though the passage is flexible enough to be effectively used with any other A-K; see also Pope's "inescapable tendency to construct 'other' cultures in relation to one's own" (eg "Everywhere is so clean ...").

Passage B: Transcriptions

Some candidates might discuss the transcriptions who are unfamiliar with conventions of transcribed speech; this should not prevent good answers. However, I would expect some language candidates to comment upon absence of phonemic/prosodic marking, so making accent fairly difficult to judge linguistically. Conventional orthography is used to capture a likely social register in Transcription (1) whereas in (2) register is more likely to be captured in lexis/fluency features. Passages make sharp contrast with A. Certainly (1) has much in common with horrible holiday experiences described on tv - though the narrative in the transcriptions is uncensored and shows more monitoring and hedges than would be likely in broadcast media. Candidates who say (2) looks as if it should have the interviewing voice are picking up the individual agendas of the speakers in the transcription. Hence though the noun phrase, "jet-skis" expresses the speaker's outrage, candidates might note how the speakers define themselves via particular lexical sets. There is little monitoring and no real back-tracking in (2), making it seem more fluent and suggesting the situation has some familiarity for the speakers. The anchorage points, again, are variants on *vox pop* and should make effective contrast with, especially, the written speech in Passage A.

Passage C: Iain Sinclair, from *London Orbital*

Candidates might read this passage in a number of ways – as journalistic travel-writing, social document, imaginative collage. There are a number of cultural references in the passage and some candidates may pick up indications of a political/ideological position. Some will be unfamiliar with the geographical references in lines 20-30. However, there is still adequate material in the narrative to identify a particular authorial voice, constantly referring to very "different worlds". A good example of this is the intertextual insert from the tabloid press, adding an interesting layer for candidates who might be addressing discourse variation. There are also indications of a scenario/script; candidates familiar with particular recent British film genres might find material here. There is great lexical density in the text - the first paragraph providing a veritable semiotic playground. Candidates might wish to look at some of the grammatical features - complex clausal structure, minor sentences,

idiom, unusual lexis, an unusual verbal compound etc. An important feature is the reference/presence in the text of a sound-track which accompanies the writing – "acoustic interference". Could compare/contrast rather well with Morris Passage E – especially in the architectural references. Or it could be contrasted with cumulative/impressionistic and more conventional(?) observations in Nortje Passage F.

Passage D: Shena Mackay, from 'Tinsels and Kalashnikovs'

Well-meaning/ Blue Peter (?) model of 3rd world conditions and needs – dependent on 1st world "relief". Narrator (insistent 1st person) sympathetic but helpless to intervene: ironic about value of western technological aid (Taylor's Frame) and her own relation to the refugees ("beautiful flower concerned about women's rights"/ no more chewing gum to give them). Positioned as "tourist of other people's suffering" by refugees' performances ("cane work" / skills in reading and writing") and as "roving ambassador of hearts" by own response ("on the verge of tears"). View of/ attitude towards refugees: historical process ("waves of persecution"); capitalism already established ("shops and enterprises"); men and children (where are the women?); "result of incestuous marriages, we were told" (who "told" them? implications = ?); contrast of conditions in final para ("childhood" a western invention?). cp Kingsley Passage K view of Africa: conditions of the "different world" compared with taken-for-granted western norm. "Others' ... seen on a scale of 'more or less' relative to the observer's own culture" (Pope): here less *privileged* in all sorts of ways. Lawrence Passage J reverses the gaze: how "they" see "us". cp 'My Secret Europe'/ Bishop - tourists without conscience.

Passage E: Jan Morris, from *Among the Cities*

Likely to be a popular passage. Candidates may well engage with Morris's sexualised description of the 'orgasmic' allure of Manhattan, the heft of male skyscrapers, the watchful female shadows, and this may form part of an extensive discussion of strongly gendered moments in the paper (e.g. Bishop's feminine tentativeness, Tolkien's epic male confidence). Suggestive gauzing, veiling and vapour effects contrast with the unhelpful blind alleys off the M25 in Passage C and the damaging effects of blindness in Passage D (in Morris "heavy eyed" is good). As an aesthetic evocation of place Morris's description is both less mannered and less patronising than Kingsley's in Passage K, and more enraptured and involved than Nortje's efforts to come to terms with London in passage F. Sudden movement in this place of impressive "confinement" is like "changing continents": contrast the tentative, wobbling movements of Bishop's speaker in passage G. Some may find Morris's rapid generalised vista-making ("fudging every edge") a little bland when contrasted with the human detail of dispossession in Passage D or of alienation in Passage E. Those familiar with American literature may usefully contrast Morris's "monument" to scrambling individualism ("Free-For-All") with Steinbeck's (albeit quizzical) description of the Open Road in Passage I; and first world America might be contrasted with its deprived counterparts further south in Passages G and J. Answers may point out the large amount of work done by adjectival insistence in the passage ("fearful", "mammoth", "stupendous", "phallic") and by gasps of admiration ("But the glowering ecstasy of it!"). Some will pick up the irony in the reference to "wastelands of slum or demolition" created by 9.11.

Passage F: Arthur Nortje, 'London Impressions'

Fruitful juxtaposition of two poems: Bishop's American x Nortje's African tourist responding to/ making sense of/ taking possession of "Foreign" circumstances. The Empire writes back. Nortje = Caliban in Prospero's home territory; resolutely unimpressed by contemporary mess and reminders of history; wily sexualised as potential predator of available white women ("girl ... dolly ... nymph"). Impressionistic mode/ self-consciously western references (*Tempest*/ pastoral). Shock of last two stanzas' reminder of apartheid: solitude/isolation (psychological/cultural/historical); "cross the road" (= ?); power of "young and shackled for my sharpness". cp Lawrence and Kingsley (Africans looking back at her world "in their uncivilised way").

Passage G: Elizabeth Bishop, 'Arrival at Santos'

With her customary playful seriousness Bishop explores the teasing interface between "native" culture and the visitor's effort to come to terms with it, the difficulty of taking in anything meaningful about the arrival port beyond ubiquitous detail ("coins", "paper money", "stamps", the "flag"). This parallels the way the *Adonia* neatly samples each country in turn as it cruises the Baltic in Passage A. The only meaningful contact between cultures is the awkward, brief one as a boathook tangles with Miss Breen's skirt. Bishop points out that the tourist's "demands for a different world/and a better life" are indeed immodest: of all the passages this is perhaps the most knowingly concerned with issues of (dis-?) assimilation. Comparison/contrast may be made with Lawrence's much tougher treatment of the foreign visitor in Passage J (a "white monkey"); with Shena Mackay's wish/effort to break in on the foreign and make a difference in Passage D; with Nortje's earnest/ironic efforts to understand a foreign city in Passage F; with Mary Kingsley's genteel patronage of Africans and Africa in Passage K. In its gentle irony Bishop's poem seems oddly wiser, more artful, too, and better answers will pick up on prosodic detail. The rhymes in lines 2 and 4 of each stanza seem to confine the visitors to a flippant, doggerel world. Extravagant enjambement across the stanza breaks suggests the awkwardness of trying to bridge a continental gulf in lines 24/28 and the discomfort of distancing from home in lines 28/29.

Passage H: J.R.R. Tolkien, from *The Two Towers*

"We can only know of that world what the words tell us. No other place exists where we might go to get further information." (Hillis Miller – Passage N) Passage H presents "a different world" *created* by the text – no referent in the "real" geo-historical world of the reader; description validated by internal comparisons – Dead Marshes/ Mere of Dead Faces/ Noman-lands – and by persistent metaphor/simile. Writing extraordinarily adjective-heavy; negatives evoked by positive absence ("... not even the leprous growths ... diseased beyond all healing ... even the sunlight was defiled"); almost entirely visual cp Morris on Manhattan. Contrast over-wrought texture of prose with Sinclair/Kingsley.

Passage I: John Steinbeck, from *The Grapes of Wrath*

Some may remember more romantic associations of Route 66 and register the irony of Steinbeck's treatment of the western journey to "the rich California valleys ... where the oranges grow"; echoes of the route of the pioneers and other "people in flight", *forced* into travel/displacement (cf Frodo and Sam) which others in the Booklet *choose* for different reasons. Travel as anxiety/torture/exploitation cp Kingsley. Contrast portentous 3rd person narrative overview x colloquial construction of personal experience.

Passage J: D.H. Lawrence, from *Mornings in Mexico*

Lawrence's empathetic presentation of the outlook of the Mexican Indian is part of his "Savage Pilgrimage". Though some will find his attempt to "go native" contrived and even patronising, others may be surprised and impressed by the inversion of normal European views and values, a clear example of what Rob Pope in Passage L calls setting "the record straight drawing on a variety of "native" perspectives". Contrasts readily offer themselves with Mary Kingsley's Eurocentric view of West Africa, where the natives are mainly there to provide wood for her boat's boiler. Other contrasts may be taken up with the experiences of the visitors in Passages F and G, where well-intentioned speakers fail to bridge cultural gaps: Lawrence proves the effort fruitless ("these people have no correspondence with one at all"). Where Bishop's tourist fusses about money, Lawrence shows that coins mean nothing to the natives. Instead he explores their rather incurious assumptions about outsiders, recalling Reah's comment in Passage M that "if a particular culture has little respect for certain groups, concepts or beliefs, then the language for expressing ideas about those groups, concepts or beliefs will reflect that attitude". The thrust of the whole passage is anti-empirical, anti-intellectual and in conflict with a calibrated privileged world: some answers may make comparison with Lawrence's intuitiveness/primitivist preferences/disdain for materialism in other texts they have read or studied. There is much evidence of the author's characteristically insistent, repetitive, argumentative register ("a horrible, a truly horrible, monkey-like passion").

Passage K: Mary Kingsley, from *Travels in West Africa*

Utter confidence/insouciance of the British Victorian traveller (Pope: travel "associated with a range of colonial and imperial projects ..."); visual/aesthetic appropriation of the riverscape – as if *designed* for European delectation; persistent reminders of European audience/consciousness - riverscape translated into culturally familiar concepts, "otherness" domesticated ("Cleopatra ... Quaker ... prevailing fashion among West African trees ... any symphony Beethoven ever wrote ... *leit motifs* ... legging it like lamp-lighters"). Condensing/humorous/indulgent attitude to childish behaviour of the "inhabitants ... in their uncivilised way" (fruitful comparison with Conrad/Marlow/Achebe on riverbank communities in *Heart of Darkness*). cp 'My Secret Europe' ("everything is so clean")/ Bishop/ Morris ("the glowering ecstasy of it")/Lawrence. Reah: "Language can inhibit people from evaluating the opinions and views they hold ..."

Passage L: Rob Pope, from *The English Studies Book*

Some useful comment on travel writing here, readily related to passages in the Booklet: eg comparison/clash of cultures; representation in some measure fictional as well as factual; construct "other" cultures in relation to one's own; gradually be seen in and on their own terms; associated with range of imperial/colonial projects; relation to current counterparts in film/tv; "abroad" = commodity as package holiday. Also suggests just about any act of writing = "'travelling' in space and time": the world of the text (cp Hillis Miller); fantasy/science fiction; utopian/dystopian writing.

Post Colonialists might wish to approach through the idea of a largely British view of places - the way authors make anthropological assumptions about "otherness". There is a good steer for language interest in comments about identity and economic and social attitudes in the way in which different worlds are constructed in the texts. Travel feature Passage A and Transcription Passage B offer some fertile areas for this, as well as for the idea that modern media could be seen to have neo-colonial leanings. Further media comments might take on board the fact that different places are often primarily experienced through some kind of journalistic/media representation and many travel books borrow a number of conventions from feature articles and can appear in extracts in glossy magazines. The use of the noun

commodity in line 35 could appeal to the candidates who wish to protest about the commercial nature of some of the passages and offer an alternative view by referring to Lawrence Passage J or Kingsley Passage K.

Passage M: Danuta Reah, from *The Language of Newspapers*

The passage offers some similarities with views of Pope – "cultural loading", "encoding values", "concealed ideology". Lines 17-22 raise a range of issues germane to language studies, without saturation in complex theoretical issues. Candidates should find little difficulty in applying these to the passages and testing them against the implications being raised by the author. The ideas could also be tested against visual media, which also, clearly, encode values and play a significant part in the way advertising works, as referenced in line 15. Candidates interested in speech might point out that the phonological conventions in speech have rather different syntactical, grammatical and structural organization and are often under-valued against the supposed permanency of the written. See for instance how little real speech is employed in a major examination in English. The fact that grammar, lexis and syntax do *create* the cultural context as well as *reflect* it should appeal to candidates interested in the relation between language and power, something which is certainly a constituent of Passage A. The passage might also appeal to candidates who wish to raise broadly philosophical points about truth/reality and how this might link to the culture in which the language "exists". This explicitly directed passage could provide any candidate with material for both comparative appraisal of the texts and also dissent in terms of alternative ways in which writing can be analysed.

Passage N: J.Hillis Miller, from *On Literature*

Some may take up the echo of the paper's title, 'a different world', in the "unique world" that the words of a given text create for us: reading literature is like travelling to a different country where the words the author chooses provide the only guide. Most will consider the "limited" world of literature, full of elision, ellipsis and lacunae, as inevitably circumscribed and inferior to/dependent upon our outer world, though the question directed at the second half of the passage, and their own reading experience, should lead them on to explore how borders and absences in a text serve to demonstrate the inevitability and sometimes the arbitrariness of what can or cannot be known. Essays will be at their most involving when they consider the evocative power of absent spaces or deliberately withheld knowledge. Favourite examples from wider reading may include: the deliberate ambiguities of 'The Turn of the Screw'; the unresolved nature of Beckett's *Godot*; the mystery of what happens between *Gatsby* and *Daisy* when Nick leaves them alone; obscure and compelling details in Pinter (such as why the tramp needs to/never does go to Sidcup); and mysterious textual gaps in Victorian fiction, such as the impossibility of knowing for certain whether or not *Tess* is raped, or the silence where *Dracula's* testimony might be in Stoker's novel. Candidates are likely to suggest that fantasy literature particularly depends on fruitful suggestion, silence and uncertainty, with examples taken from the Gothic or ghost-story. ["We should question the work as to what it does not and cannot say, in those silences for which it has been made" (Pierre Macherey)]

Passage O: Robert Eaglestone, from *Doing English*

Two questions on the passage. First invites discussion on relations between "literary" and "everyday" language (might be informed by acquaintance with Formalist theory that literary language draws attention to itself as part of process of de-familiarisation/ making strange). Many of the passages appropriate for reference: eg comparison of transcription in Passage B with other identifiably "literary" passages; comparison of Sinclair's journalistic style with Morris's evocative/poetic writing; Steinbeck's imitation of colloquial speech with Nortje's stylised/pointed rendering of

thought/visual processes. Second question invites discussion of relation between contextualised reading/study and formal analysis of "what makes the text special as 'literature'". This passage likely to be the most popular for Section B answers, with the usual unpredictable range of illustrative material.

Report On The Units

June 2005

Advanced Extension Award in English

Principal Examiner's Report

Entry to the paper continues to grow, traditionally by 10% each year. This year there were over 1800 candidates, by a long way exceeding the entry to any other AEA paper.

There is general agreement among examiners that the general quality of work was higher this year, with few misguided entries. One examiner, echoed by many, reports: "I was impressed by the quality of the scripts this year. Even the weakest seemed to manage to address *some* significant issues raised in the passages while (as usual) I was astonished by the ability of the best to write with such sophistication and maturity on material that, for most of them, was completely unfamiliar".

Examiners felt this was "an excellent paper, very well pitched in terms of difficulty and range of material"; perhaps as a result, no Section A passage seemed more popular than any other, the first time this has happened. It was particularly striking that Question 5, inviting discussion of ways of studying/discussing texts by considering the relation between "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" approaches to texts, was overall the least popular Section B question, whereas in previous years questions raising similar issues have attracted a majority of Section B answers. It may be that the other questions this year were more equally attractive to candidates; and/or that methods of study now established at AS/A2 have made such questions less contentious; and/or that the particular formulation this year was less provocative, or that the passage came last in the booklet, or was too long for comfort. However, since, as examiners point out, the "intrinsic/extrinsic" model was fruitfully invoked in many Section A answers, it may be that candidates decided this was the appropriate context to address these issues and turned their Section B attention into other interesting directions. It would be helpful to hear teachers'/candidates' views.

Many more candidates than in previous years wanted to say something about how language worked in the passages and a number, including many clearly coming from Literature specifications, used some quite specialist terminology very effectively. There were more scripts fruitfully developing approaches deriving from work in Language and Language and Literature specifications. It is clear that candidates from these backgrounds have no difficulty finding accessible material in the paper. In relation to answers based on work in any of the three kinds of specification, a discriminating factor is the degree to which the candidate considers the *effects* of the features identified (eg variations in register, lexical/semantic fields, simple/compound/complex sentence structure, imagery, assonance/ alliteration) in the context of the passage being discussed; the more substantial answers go well beyond merely identifying/tabulating characteristics of the language of the passage, which are used as the basis of analysis of their contribution to meanings and effects.

There were few complaints from examiners about quality of written communication. Problems remarked tended to concentrate in familiar areas such as subject/verb agreement and the use of the apostrophe (even in otherwise technically scrupulous answers Dicken's is now virtually the default formulation, extended occasionally as in "Dicken's's novels"). A particular oddity, in view of the saturation coverage that this author has recently attracted, was that *Tolkein* was the preferred spelling on almost every script. Timing problems were, as usual, relatively rare: examination technique is clearly a strong suit of most of the candidates the paper attracts.

The requirement that candidates explain and evaluate the approach that they intend to use in their Section A answer is still causing problems for some candidates, though the majority now seem prepared to deal with it. We emphasise that this requirement has two functions:

- It is a reminder of the emphases of the AEA paper's single Assessment Objective, to "assess candidates' abilities to *apply and communicate* effectively their knowledge and understanding of English, some of its *methodologies* and texts, using the skills of *critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis*";
- It is also intended to encourage candidates to think structurally about how the material in their answers will be directed and systematically organised.

In the best answers this year the candidates clearly identified a thematic approach or analytical procedure that allowed them to control the ensuing argument or, less typically, outlined a theoretical position that then informed the subsequent comparative discussion. Less helpful is what an examiner has called a "generalised clearing of the throat ('I will use a literary critical/largely linguistic/comparative approach...')". Quite often the candidate may state a very precise theoretical approach ("I will write from a psychoanalytical perspective based on the work of Jacques Lacan...") that s/he then ignores in the body of the answer. This requirement should not take any candidate by surprise, since the terms of the question have not changed! In preparing for the examination, the candidate should think through the range of approaches with which s/he is familiar, in order to select the most appropriate in the context of this paper.

Examiners have commented on some significant tactical shifts:

- more candidates than in previous years have addressed only two or three passages rather than surveying a wider selection: in many cases this was held to be advantageous as it usefully "concentrated attention and produced more detailed and precise answers"; however, since some of these answers became repetitive, some candidates might have done better to range more widely;
- a number of Section A answers specifically addressed issues raised in Section B passages, indicating that candidates had used their preparation time profitably by reading to the end of the reading booklet before starting to write; in some cases candidates used a proposition from Section B to help define their approach in Section A;
- in our report on last year's work we noted that "much more use was made of materials in the reading booklet in order to supply illustrative ballast for answers on questions in Section B of the paper"; this year again many candidates drew healthily on both reading booklet material and their own reading, particularly but not exclusively, of texts studied for AS/A2; however, some examiners have noted that the balance seems to be tilting the other way, in that some Section B answers have invested in discussion of reading booklet passages to the exclusion of wider reference;
- in some scripts the range of material discussed was particularly narrow, since the Section B answers returned to passages already considered in answers to Question 1; while not a rubric infringement this does seem against the spirit of the paper, and usually limited the candidate's possible achievement since material was repeated between the answers.

Conversely, many candidates' Section B references were very wide-ranging, and seemed under better control than in previous years. As always the favourite author was Blake, probably followed by the Brontës, Jane Austen and George Orwell; Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and *Measure for Measure* were particularly in evidence;

and much use was made of American literature, especially texts by Tennessee Williams, Scott Fitzgerald, Arthur Miller and Toni Morrison.

As usual, a handful of candidates explained that they didn't really want to take the exam, and were only there to pacify their teachers; some of these went on to write interesting answers. On the other hand, some candidates wrote notes at the end of their scripts saying how much they had enjoyed the paper, and regretted the lack of time. One candidate is reported to have said it was "easily the best exam I ever sat, sir. I really enjoyed that."

The Questions

Section A

Unusually popular this year were approaches from a Marxist viewpoint, generally focusing on the ruin of capitalism that is the M25, third world deficiencies in Shena Mackay, false visions of Jan Morris's Manhattan, and wreckage of the American Dream in Steinbeck. The few feminist responses concentrated on Morris's presentation of sexuality in Manhattan's architecture, often combining it with a study of Shena Mackay's good intentions. There were very few answers from other theoretical perspectives.

Some very interesting and original comparisons/connections were presented.

- Sinclair [C] and Steinbeck [I]: two numbered roads presented from different perspectives, motivation, attitudes and registers;
- Tolkien [H] and Steinbeck [I]: characters' journeys with similar anxieties and tensions but different tone, style and purpose;
- Morris [E] and Nortje [F]: bitter/sweet duality of urban experiences, both sexualised; paradox of chaos/beauty v impressionistic/ironic representation;
- Nortje [F] and Bishop [G]: mirror-inversions of encounters with different cultures, in contrasting poetic forms with strikingly different effects;
- Morris [E] and Kingsley [K]: celebration/criticism of man-made mess of a great city and natural beauty and calm of a large forest; different locations, language, imagery, mood;
- Passage A and Passage B: positive/ negative aspects of holiday experience but different narratives and conventions;
- Lawrence [J] and Mackay [D]: third world experiences in relation to western norms; comic/satiric Mexican/ Indian perspective v well-meaning/agonised Western view (both patronising in different ways?); how "others" look to us and *vice versa*
- Kingsley [K] and Nortje [F]: writing the Empire ... and the Empire writes back.

Notes on the Passages

Passage A: 'My Secret Europe'

Candidates delighted in unmasking the assumptions behind the advertisement: its veiled xenophobia, appeals to bourgeois consumerist complacency, even its thoughtlessly retained mis-spellings. The passage proved an excellent discriminator: the best saw that it was an artificial construction, and discussed its linguistic features, making intelligent use of Passage B to highlight its portentousness, and exploring the effects of graphological elements. Some were subtle: 'The description of the cruise needs to be slightly unrealistic to fit in with the pleasant fantasy of a cruise the reader already has.' Some created images which were unintentionally as amusing as the

original ("glissing bubble baths and smooth chocolate on the pillows"); and others were confused ("Passage A is written in the fourth person"). Passage A was paired with every other passage and generated some excellent responses. There were a number of contrasts with Passage B, comparing transcribed with invented speech; another popular pairing was with Mackay, "seeing how the other half lived (or choosing not to)". Clive and wife became the leads in a number of transformations (one especially good one featured a *Telegraph*-reading, manipulative mother writing home to a would-be dissident daughter).

Passage B: Transcriptions

Though this passage was less popular than others, those who tackled it as a prime element of comparison and those who made use of it in passing references to support points being made were usually informed and informative. Answers that perceived and explored differences in speech patterns between the transcriptions (class? gender? age?) were particularly perceptive. A number of answers argued that transcriptions are inherently more "believable", because authentic, than "literary" representations. There were many profitable transformations of these anecdotes, mainly into short stories, including one in which the encounter with a jet-ski marked one balding yachtsman's mid-life crisis.

Passage C: Sinclair, *London Orbital*

Sinclair's meditation on the M25 was most frequently paired with the cruise, with Steinbeck (two versions of 'On the Road'), or with Morris (alternative responses to urban environments). Some candidates were interested in the writing's effect of "making strange" familiar locations and experiences; many in the nostalgic intimations of a rich, authentic past diminished, under the aegis of "an autocratic government", into a fake, consumerist, violent and automated present. There was more interest in the content of the passage than in the mechanics and effects of Sinclair's journalese prose, though effects of graphic metaphors ('the orbital motorway is a security collar fixed to the neck of a convicted criminal') and coinages ("imagineered") were explored by some.

Passage D: Mackay, 'Tinsels and Kalashnikovs'

This passage was very popular and generated a wide range of responses, in terms both of approaches and sensitivity. There were some highly perceptive details: the artificiality of the (ostensibly enviable) American way of life was best shown by the "loungers on the astroturf"; "she says she does not want to be 'a tourist of other people's suffering', then she becomes exactly that"; using the term "victims of congenital blindness" is tendentious in "associating victims of persecution with those suffering from a condition present from birth". Some were unsure about whether the irony of the woman "who was learning to do housework" was intended, or which direction it might work in. Weaker answers tended simply to declare sympathy for the blind. Generally the passage was taken as representative of liberal – or just western – guilt, and paraphrased at some distance from the text, though with relatively accurate command of content. Some answers were severely critical of this "deficit model" representation of third world communities, some of these noting the apparently complimentary reference to the emergence of western-style capitalism among the refugees ("These people have set up shops and enterprises..."), and wondering whether this really constitutes progress in these circumstances.

Passage E: Morris, *Among the Cities*

Candidates found the purple allure of this passage highly seductive. The sexualised imagery proved especially provocative: "Morris uses a slightly smutty lexical field"; "I found myself considering that part of the imagery [erections thrusting] as much as the main part [concealment] - but perhaps that's my sheltered upbringing". Attention to the words of the passage was never closer than here: candidates were particularly interested in the final vista of fairy-tale cities, whether or not it represented the fulfilment or the meretriciousness of the American Dream (see the view of the city from across the river in *The Great Gatsby*).

Passage F: Nortje, 'London Impressions'

This passage was not only popular in section A answers, but also figured largely in responses to Q.6, either as the passage to be transformed or the template for other passages. Answers were generally sensitive to the implications of apartheid and many picked up on the effects of the final words which, they nearly all observed, meant they had to go back and read the poem again in a new light; often, these second readings had become politicised ("Whitehall shadows" and "the bronze paws of a lion" suggested to some that even in London "freedom" may be circumscribed, though even so "I do not want to cross the road again"; "the word brown means something different the second time you read it"). Sometimes the ironic reference to *The Tempest* ("The isle is full of foreign noises") was picked up, but almost never that "England expects" was a further reference to Nelson (some guessed Churchill). Nortje's poem offered fruitful comparisons with post-colonial waverings in Bishop's poem. A few answers explored the poem's interaction with the Kingsley passage, which reversed the African→European gaze. Some candidates thought the Nortje poem was unrhymed and arbitrarily organised; others probed the effects of rhyme and half-rhyme, line distribution and enjambement.

Passage G

Possibly because its formal devices are so conspicuous (eg multi-syllable rhyme; enjambement between stanzas) candidates reflected on the poetic features of this passage. Close readers were able to discriminate with great subtlety between the first person narrator in the poem, who seems trapped within privileged assumptions about travel, Brazil and "home", and the wiser inner ironic voice which mediates those experiences to us. "It is almost like here are two voices," wrote one candidate, "one of the baffled tourist's perceptions and another with a more grounded rational perspective". Weaker answers convicted Bishop of xenophobia, petulance and snobbery. Despite the headnote some candidates thought Bishop was male; one thought her British. In some ways, sight unseen, this was the most demanding text on the paper: subtle, wry, quietly desperate. Many candidates rose well to the challenge.

Passage H

Inevitably this passage proved very popular, with nobody experiencing any difficulty in placing it in a wider narrative context, whether knowledge came from reading novel or film. Candidates were particularly keen to situate Tolkien's work in its twentieth century contexts: the reference to the Dead Marshes drew explanations that this was Tolkien's fantastic recreation of the landscape of the Great War (though he would have deplored such identification himself); Mordor, with its Dark Lord, recalled for some the rise (and fall) of Nazism. Close attention was often paid to Tolkien's

language (this passage was an unexpected favourite with language candidates, noting eg the extraordinary accumulation of multiple modifiers). Regular pairings were with Steinbeck, Morris and 'My Secret Europe', usually involving a consideration of the nature and power of fantasy. Miller's "we can gain access to the unique world [of the text] only by reading the words on the page" (Passage N) and Pope's "some sense of 'travelling' in space and time is entailed by just about any act of writing" (Passage L) were often invoked in relation to the experience of reading the invented world of this passage, which candidates clearly enjoyed writing about. This passage was a popular resource for answers on Q6, eg re-written as a holiday brochure in the manner of Passage A, or as a right wing diatribe complaining that Sauron's immigration policy was not rigorous enough.

Passage I: Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*

The Steinbeck extract was very successful in generating thoughtful responses. Many candidates wrote as if they were at least generally familiar with *The Grapes of Wrath*; certainly they adjusted well to the passage's epic vision of demoralised but still hopeful humanity on the move while the tappets rattle and homespun voices talk about fan-belts. Parallels were drawn with Kerouac's *On the Road* and with other dreams of the west. Candidates moved comfortably between Steinbeck's portentous voice-over and the direct speech without inverted commas (some interesting comment on ways of representing dialectal speech – cp Passage B).

Passage J: Lawrence, *Mornings in Mexico*

A minority took issue with Lawrence's stance ("who is he to presume to tell us about the vision of the Indians?") but most seemed transfixed by the confidence of his assault on the reader and western conventions. The passage was rarely the main support in an essay: typically candidates would move on to him as a third or fourth string. His confident inversion of the conventional gaze contrasted well with Kingsley, the haughty visitor, or with Mackay's tentativeness and abstraction. Those at all familiar with Lawrence's characteristic voice – and some who weren't – made hay with the "hectoring tone", the repetitions and the expostulations. This was the paper's ubiquitous passage.

Passage K

This passage provoked the widest range of responses on the paper. Some candidates admired Kingsley's use of luxuriant imagery in an uncritical way; others demonstrated how the would-be anti-(in some ways)-imperialist herself subjects West Africa to imperialistic patronage through her choice of words and images. The equatorial forest is called a "monotony in green", redeemed by the splashes of colour that are the "prevailing fashion among West African trees", and applauded for the "beauty and passion" associated with a Beethoven symphony. Kingsley's writing, wrote one candidate, "has the effect of removing one from the reality of the situation, by being allowed to disappear into the world of artifice and distraction." Some suggested that translating the riverscape into culturally familiar concepts is a laudable attempt to meet the problem of how to evoke the qualities of an entirely unfamiliar world for the reader; others that this translation is itself a form of colonialist appropriation (cp Pope's "inescapable tendency to construct 'other' cultures in relation to one's own"). Lots of candidates noticed that Mary Kingsley must have been on her travels at the same time as Joseph Conrad, comparing her with Marlow and sometimes with Kurtz. "Kingsley, despite her intentions, was still an imperialist," wrote one, "which was how she got to travel around Africa in the first place." Another argued: "although she may have advocated a closer understanding of Africa she

clearly did not include the people themselves within her premise, for her attitude towards them in her writing is very pejorative ('in their uncivilised way ...')" No passage discriminated more sharply than this; it drew excellent, confident comment in the best answers.

Section B

Question 2 (Passage L: Pope, *The English Studies Book*)

The question asks for consideration of how writers construct other cultures in relation to their own. This was a popular question, generally well handled (one examiner said these were "some of the best answers that I marked") since candidates found much material in the reading-booklet relevant to the issues, from Passage A ("I didn't realise how high the standards of living are in all the countries") to Passage K ("This forest is a Cleopatra to which Calabar is but a Quaker"), and even Lawrence, it was noted, "constructs" the consciousness of "the native" in terms of difference from the white monkey's. *A Passage to India* was a fruitful resource here; the representation of the Europeans in *Things Fall Apart* was an interesting example to follow up; similarly Marlow's views of African figures in *Heart of Darkness*. The other proposal in the question, "some sense of 'travelling' in space and time is entailed by just about any act of writing", was less often taken up: some candidates explored the act of travelling undertaken by characters in the text (eg Frodo and Sam in Passage H, Marlow in *Heart of Darkness*); others recognised Pope's metaphorical inflection and argued that through initiation into the 'different world' of eg *The Handmaid's Tale* and *1984* the reader becomes "a traveller in imagination". Some really thoughtful answers argued that this kind of imaginative encounter with "a different world" allows us to see our own world in a different light (cp Althusser on ideological disruption, and Marcuse on "the aesthetic dimension"). Pope's brief reference to Friel's *Translations* prompted detailed and apposite discussion of the play: this text seems to have generated enthusiastic and informed responses. One very impressive answer discussed Kipling's 'We and They' to excellent effect ("... would you believe it?/ They look upon We/ As only a sort of They!").

Question 3 (Passage M: Reah, *The Language of Newspapers*)

Candidates explored the issues of "emotional and cultural 'loading'" from the perspectives of both language and literary study. Language candidates were aware of language as fundamentally a cultural creation, that values and attitudes are implicitly inscribed in the words we use (some discussion of gender privileging here), and of the function that language exercises in signalling membership of cultural communities and constituting outsiders as "other". Some answers explored ways in which this connotative function may be exploited by eg advertising (eg Passage A) and political rhetoric. As in previous years, *1984* was often invoked to illustrate ways in which language may be manipulated to control consciousness as well as behaviour; there was some penetrating discussion of Kingsley's language in conjuring up a system of values in relation to which the African riverscape is being implicitly registered.

Question 4 (Passage N: Miller, *On Literature*)

Candidates were ingenious in citing "mysterious" moments in texts with which they were familiar. One candidate pointed to the unnamed yellow book that "poisons" the young man's mind in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* as the type of all such literary secrets. More than one candidate brilliantly recalled Keats's definition of "negative capability", as a kind of synonym for what Miller means by "mystery". *The Turn of the*

Screw was discussed as a text which refuses to privilege any one of its possible readings. Orwell's Room 101 as a place of mysterious threat was a frequent example, as were Emma's underwritten proposal in Austen's novel (called up by Miller's reference to Isabel Archer) and, most popular of all, the uncertain relationship between the Duke and Isabella at the end of Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*; among a few film references, the final scene of *The Italian Job* was often cited as an instance of a text that refuses closure. *The Great Gatsby*, *Waiting for Godot*, Blake's 'The Sick Rose' were also popular resources to consider the value/effect of what is obscured or enigmatic. One candidate quoted Hemingway's ice-berg model of writing/reading to illustrate that what is suppressed by a text is as significant as what is revealed. Gothic and fantasy genres were discussed to suggest how absent spaces, deliberate ambiguities, mysteries, silences, uncertainty, inconclusive endings all help to generate debate, interest, curiosity, intrigue in the readers. The better answers offered a discussion of the proposition that literature characteristically deals in secrets withheld entirely or eventually disclosed, not just a train of relevant examples. A few candidates took up the echo of the paper's title, 'a different world', in Miller's model of the "unique world" that the words of a given text create for us, pursuing the idea that reading literature is like travelling to a different country where the words the author chooses provide the only guide.

Question 5 (Passage O: Eaglestone, *Doing English*)

There were almost no answers on the first half of the question; the most interesting of these pursued the Formalist argument that literary language draws attention to itself, rather than to what it represents as is the case in other modes of writing. The second half of the question offered candidates the opportunity to write about literary context in a way familiar from earlier papers. Though fewer candidates than we might have expected took up this invitation, those that did wrote with conviction and discernment, generally arguing that both "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" approaches are helpful, even necessary, in understanding and evaluating texts. There were one or two invidious glimpses into consequences of the emphasis on "extrinsic" study at A level: "It becomes a routine - learn a few pretentious contextual links and the examiner can tick the box for A05." That this kind of study has in fact paid off was evident in discussion of eg Milton (context of Puritanism and civil war), Blake (psychological/political/economic/moral factors associated with industrialisation/urbanisation deftly characterised and related to the poetry) and Wilfred Owen. Some argued that extrinsic study leads to *understanding*, while intrinsic concentration yields *pleasure* (Marvell and Keats cited here). One candidate pointed out that the structure of the AEA paper places a premium on "intrinsic" analysis since the reading booklet passages are virtually context-free: "however 'dull and unrewarding' intrinsic criticism might appear to be, if we can't do it we're really in trouble here!"

Question 6

Examiners report that there were fewer responses to the re-creative opportunity than in previous years, certainly fewer that suggested the question was regarded as an easier option than others: candidates may well feel there is an element of risk about this process, particularly those inexperienced in the exercise. One examiner felt that there had been a breakthrough on this question this year: "The depth and quality of the commentaries was impressive - the writers had either thought carefully about what they were doing or at least worked hard to justify what they had done." Some of the transformations were resourceful, like the recasting of Passage C as an educational poster for final year primary school students. Others were brilliantly inventive, like the folk ballad based on the extract from *The Grapes of Wrath*. A minority were bizarre, (placing the M25 in the psychiatrist's chair for therapy). Some

were witty and entertaining (changing Passage H from *The Lord of the Rings* into a script from 'Friday Night With Jonathan Ross'). The very best responses were those which managed to incorporate relevant reference to their own wider reading in the commentary - this was often found where the transcriptions were into a form not represented on the paper (eg Passage A as a Thomas Pynchon pastiche). There were also excellent answers which employed one of the set passages as the template: (eg Passage E [Morris] in the style of A ['Secret Europe'] and H [Tolkien] in the style of G [Bishop]. Candidates should be advised that if they have compared only two passages in Section A it is not best practice to transform one of those two passages in Q6. As usual, there were cases where the transformation was more impressive than the commentary, and some *vice versa*; this was often a result of time running out.

**Advanced Extension Award English (9910)
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
1	60	44	33	0

Overall

	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
Percentage in Grade	29.8	35.7	34.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	29.8	65.5	100.0

The total entry for the examination was 1892.

These statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

