



General Certificate of Education

English Literature 5741/6741

*Specification A*

**Examiners' Report**

*2005 examination - June series*

- Advanced Subsidiary
- Advanced

Further copies of this Examiners' Report are available to download from the AQA Website:  
[www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.  
*Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.*

# Contents

## AS Units

LTA1 The Modern Novel ..... 5  
LA2C Shakespeare (Coursework)..... 11  
LA2W Shakespeare (Written) ..... 14  
LTA3 Texts in Context ..... 16

## AS Units

LTA4 Texts in Time ..... 31  
LA5C Literary Connections (Coursework)..... 40  
LA5W Literary Connections (Written) ..... 43  
LTA6 Reading for Meaning..... 51

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades ..... 53

This page has been left intentionally blank

## GCE English Literature A

### General

Across all units of this specification, both examination and coursework, examiners and moderators have assessed a good deal of work of the very highest standard. The confidence of teachers and candidates is evident in their approach to the examination. The way the assessment objectives work is now generally understood and candidates have been appropriately prepared.

The most successful candidates:

- recognise and focus on the key words of the question
- take time to plan their essays
- construct a clear and coherent argument
- know their texts well
- show this by skilfully integrating short and appropriate quotations into their writing
- write clearly, legibly and accurately

## LTA1      The Modern Novel

### General

This was an accessible paper; all questions provided ample opportunities for achievement. There were indeed many examples of scholarly, insightful and original responses from candidates who had clearly not only enjoyed studying their texts but also writing about them. Unfortunately, there was also a significant minority of candidates who did not seem to know their texts and had some difficulty in offering accurate narrative recall. Such candidates often struggled to write accurately and appropriately. They also often had very poor handwriting.

All answers on this paper need to demonstrate:

- knowledge and understanding of text (AO2)
- appreciation of the writer's craft (AO3)
- clear, accurate and appropriate written English (AO1)
- an informed personal response (AO4, first half).

The questions do **not** test:

- different interpretations (second half of AO4)
- knowledge of context.

This is most commonly the first AS examination taken by candidates, and, in terms of the assessment objectives, it is certainly the most straightforward. Candidates do not always do themselves justice because they underestimate how important it is to have a close knowledge of their text. An added problem is that GCSE does not always provide the appropriate base to move seamlessly to the detailed study of a complex, full length prose work. Teachers will no doubt bear these issues in mind when they prepare candidates.

This is the last June examination for two very popular texts:

***The Handmaid's Tale and Enduring Love.***

They will appear on the January 2006 paper as a re-sit opportunity.

The two new texts which will appear from January 2006 will be:

***Cold Mountain and Spies.***

To turn to the texts and questions in detail:

### *The Spire*

This text is a minority choice but the questions were generally well answered. As for its predecessor *The Bell*, the candidature seems to comprise small centres with above average ability. Question 2 proved to be the more popular.

#### *Question 1*

Successful candidates:

- defined and explored **medieval**
- did **explore the ways**
- chose appropriate episodes and quotations to inform their discussion
- discussed the nature of the cathedral community, patronage, attitudes to religion
- addressed the ways the stylistic detail created the medieval world
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- did not understand the term **medieval**
- neglected **the ways**
- described episodes (often at length), but were unable to make a link to **medieval**
- resorted to story telling and descriptions of characters
- provided long descriptions of medieval life and times, unrelated to *The Spire*
- had difficulty focussing on the question
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 2*

Successful candidates:

- attended to the whole novel, often writing apposite introductory overviews in the first paragraph
- focused on **how appropriate**
- showed how the ending was linked across the novel in terms of subject matter, narrative voice and style
- considered both **subject matter and style**
- offered insightful work on the nature of redemption and folly
- analysed language and style, both of the extract and of the novel as a whole
- had a secure understanding of the presentation of Jocelin
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- addressed the whole novel, but in a more general way
- had, at times, an insecure grasp of the complexities of the writing
- found difficulty making links
- simply worked through a list of features, neglecting meaning
- paid little attention to **how appropriate**
- concentrated on the extract from the ending and ignored the rest of the book
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *The Handmaid's Tale*

This is the most popular text on the paper. Candidates tended to perform better on Question 4 and it was, indeed, the more popular question.

#### *Question 3*

Successful candidates:

- focused on the question, particularly on the **ways uses**
- saw the novel as a **construct**
- focused on **Luke** and the **daughter**, linking their presentation to what they considered to be Atwood's message and themes
- often mentioned the possibility that Offred was beginning to re-evaluate her relationship with Luke as the memories were recounted through the book, drawing links with the Commander and with Nick
- saw the memories as an integral part of Atwood's narrative strategy, contextualising them in Offred's present and past
- took the opportunity to limit the focus on an aspect of the novel while also retaining a sense of the whole
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- repeated an earlier question on memories with little focus on **Luke** or the **daughter**
- struggled with the **ways uses**
- re-told memories but with very little argument to explain their relevance
- failed to remember supportive detail
- resorted to a narrative/descriptive approach, and, at worst, simple story telling
- had a tenuous knowledge of text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 4*

Successful candidates:

- used the extract as a **starting point**
- engaged with **ways uses** and what the lives signified
- explored the lives of women in relation to perceptions of power and gender
- made intelligent links across the novel in terms of analysis of style, language choice and presentation
- responded in an illuminating and scholarly way
- ranged widely across **all** women (including Moira and Offred's mother) and had a grasp of hierarchy
- analysed the symbolism in the novel, using apposite quotation
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- often relegated the extract to a subordinate place or failed to refer to it at all
- had difficulty with **ways uses**
- simply described the lives of the women with general accuracy

- mistakenly thought that the **Econowives** were married to Commanders, or saw them as a variety of “unwoman”
- often wrote about the **handmaids** (especially Offred and Janine), having clearly been instructed not to do so
- were unable to engage with the question
- showed themselves to be confused about the identities of econowives, marthas etc
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Wise Children*

Candidates write enthusiastically about this text, showing real enjoyment and appreciation.

### *Question 5*

Successful candidates:

- focused on the **presentation** of Perry, exploring Carter’s magic realism to explain some of the function and characteristics of the character
- concentrated on **importance**, showing how Perry was used to convey Carter’s ideas
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- neglected both **presentation** and **importance**
- simply offered a character study, describing Perry and telling of his deeds
- took the moral high ground about geriatric incest
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Question 6*

Successful candidates:

- linked the “make-believe” element across the whole text, exploring general themes and the ideas of the writer
- used the passage as a **starting point**
- often approached the answer through the Shakespearian motif, producing very convincing and cogent arguments
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- were confused and uncertain about what was required
- clearly did not understand the notion of “flimsy bit of make-believe”
- failed to use the passage as a **starting point**
- often resorted to telling the story of the fire
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately



### **Possession**

Like *The Spire*, this is a minority choice text and its candidature seems to be largely above average in ability.

#### **Question 7**

Successful candidates:

- adopted two ways of answering the question: the first focusing on the actual story of the text; the second seeing “possession” as a theme or a noun
- showed considerable engagement with the text, exploring the nature of dual narratives reflecting each other
- paid attention to both **structure and style**
- did **explore the ways**
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- adopted a general approach to “narrative writing”
- neglected **the ways**
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### **Question 8**

Successful candidates:

- analysed the opening, commenting on the role of poetry and how the meanings of the quoted poem might impact on the rest of the book
- focused on **how appropriate**
- attended to both **subject matter and style**
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- tended to tell the story of the opening, explaining how it linked to the story which followed
- neglected **how appropriate**
- tended to concentrate on **subject matter** but neglected **style**
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Enduring Love**

This text is second in popularity to *The Handmaid's Tale*. The questions were equally popular.

#### **Question 9**

Successful candidates:

- had a clear grasp of the concept of **danger**, seeing it as both a particular experience **and** as a pervading sense of threat whether physical, mental or emotional
- maintained a clear focus on **ways presents**, looking at the presentation in **terms of style and form**
- noted the “twists and turns” of the labyrinthine plot with danger of one kind or another lurking everywhere

- showed the ability to explore **two** episodes in detail or a **range of examples** of danger and see them in the context of the **whole novel**
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- often had a tenuous grasp of **danger**
- used the word danger as a springboard to discuss the “danger of falling out of love” or “the danger of suspicion”
- saw danger everywhere!
- neglected **ways presents**
- tended to describe dangerous moments rather than analyse the presentation of danger
- described or narrated a range of events
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Question 10**

Successful candidates:

- attended to **how important**
- saw Chapter 9 in the context of the whole novel
- noted that Joe is constructing a version of Clarissa to the reader that puts himself into a stronger position
- established narrative viewpoint from the outset
- explored why the writer employs this particular narrative shift
- explored the constructed nature of the narrative on multiple levels – Joe constructing Clarissa’s narrative and McEwan constructing Joe constructing Clarissa
- made clear links to the **whole novel**
- offered detailed analyses of language to identify Joe’s personality and look at his version of events
- had a secure knowledge and understanding of text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- neglected **how important**
- neglected **point of view**, failing to see that it was still Joe narrating
- offered a character study of Clarissa and her lack of support
- did not recall the narrative accurately
- struggled to link to the whole novel
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

## LA2C Shakespeare (Coursework)

### Introduction

Congratulations are due to centres on the overall very high standard of this year's Shakespeare coursework. The lessons of previous years have been learnt and points from moderators' reports have been assimilated. Whatever may be reported in the media, the examination is no easier but the standard of attainment is higher. This is a grand tribute to the quality of work that has been done to prepare students for Unit 2 coursework.

The report is written in two sections: Section A for teachers and Section B to be copied and shared with students.

### Section A

#### Tasks

In general tasks were good and there was much evidence of the practice of differentiation in task-setting to enable students across the ability range to give of their best. A few pointers:

- All tasks must enable students to demonstrate knowledge of the whole play. If one or two scenes are set for special focus a rider must be attached to the task such as "here and in the whole play".
- If tasks are set rather than negotiated, ensure students can choose from an extensive pick-list.
- All tasks should be approved by the moderator.

#### Texts

There were still a few instances of centres offering work on Unit 4 texts. Now that the examination is about to enter its sixth year there can be no excuse for this.

Centres are warned that *Hamlet* is an A2 text for the 2005-7 cohort and cannot therefore be studied for coursework in 2006. Similarly candidates may not submit coursework in 2006 on *Measure for Measure* (formerly popular at AS) and *The Winter's Tale*.

#### Assessment

All moderators reported on the overall high standard of assessment this year. The process of moderation requires moderators to choose, from the initial sample of folders requested, a sub-sample for marking. If moderators agree with the marks no further folders need to be scrutinised. This year, in very few cases only did moderators need to read the full sample and very rarely were the rest of a centre's folders requested.

- Annotation was good enabling moderators to see how marks were awarded.
- Underlining is preferred to ticking. Underlining draws attention to the full meritorious phrase and shows the development of the logic of an answer.
- Every page of every essay must bear signs of having been marked.
- There were signs of close internal moderation where folders bore comments from more than one teacher.
- Final draft essays should bear comments based on the marking grid. Comments addressed to students are irrelevant at this stage.
- Comments on a student's character, motivation or personal circumstances should not be made to moderators. AQA deals with requests for special consideration, not moderators.
- All relevant Assessment Objectives were addressed.

#### Presentation

Although the presentation of folders was generally good, there is still room for some improvement.

- Do not use plastic wallets
- Do use treasury tags long enough to allow folders to be opened easily.
- Do not accept word-processed work which is less than font size point 11.

- Do not accept work submitted in eccentric fonts.
- Students should not use centre-justify for quotations as it makes them hard to read and disrespects the form of the verse or prose.
- Quotations should not be coloured, emboldened or italicised.
- Essays should be 1500-2000 words. Some work was up to 8000 words. Writing to order is in itself an academic discipline.

### **Administration**

All moderators were grateful that most work was submitted on time and were especially grateful to be able to begin the exercise in March and April. Some centres were unacceptably late in submitting marks and coursework.

### **Section B**

#### **Assessment Objectives**

##### **AO1 - Communication**

- Technical weaknesses cannot be sympathetically received when you have access to word processors with spell checks and grammar checks.
- You have plenty of opportunity to re-draft work in the light of your teacher’s comments. Please do take advantage of these opportunities to avoid losing marks for the quality of your written English.
- You must write in a formal register.
- Overall, expression this year was good.

Some examples of where poor AO1 skills were penalised:

- The following words often convey nothing: almost; issues; we the reader (plays have audiences and ‘we’ is a plural pronoun); also; as well; this; clearly; centre around; focus around.
- ‘Positive’ and ‘negative’ are empty adjectives. What words do you really mean?
- ‘Sympathy’ and ‘empathy’ do not mean the same thing.
- A quotation is not a ‘quote’. You must show you understand the difference between the noun and the verb.
- Cleopatra is not “a drama queen”.
- “Viola fancies the Duke” tells the reader you see the characters as real people and not as Shakespearean constructs. It also tells the reader you have difficulty in finding an appropriate expression.
- Malvolio “might really be a genuine, affectionate character, but the writing of Shakespeare hides this” shows you do not see the characters as Shakespearean constructs.
- “When Hortensio describes to Petruchio, he spews out...” tells the reader you do not understand how to express yourself formally, or have not bothered to re-draft.
- You must think carefully about the impact of your language choice on a reader.

##### **AO2i - Understanding**

All the moderators reported that they have been privileged to read some very good essays that reflected engagement with Shakespeare’s plays and showed good understanding of their content. There remain, however, one or two points to consider when showing your understanding.

- Shakespeare is presenting characters he has constructed in order for him to explore various ideas. You should not write as if they are real people in a real world. Such essays can read like accounts of soap operas.
- Try not to take a linear approach to characters and themes. Essays that go through a play can be very boring to read and can be too long. Try to take an overview of a character or theme and break your overview down into four or five key points.
- Do not use the narrative of the play to drive your essay. Such essays rarely earn more than 10/20.

- A detailed exploration of one major idea or theme is likely to gain more marks than an attempt to show off all you know about a play.
- Do not refer to a play by Shakespeare as a 'novel' or refer to its 'readers.'

### **AO3 - Language, Form and Structure**

In the past this has proven to be the least successful assessment objective, but this year's candidates as a whole were prepared to tackle it head-on producing some very good work.

- Avoid clichéd comments about verse for nobles and prose for peasants. You must be more subtle and look at what Shakespeare achieves by his choice of language form.
- If you make comments about verse form and rhythm, you must be prepared to back them up. Too many candidates for example, will write about 'witty banter', 'change in rhythm', or 'stichomythia' without giving detailed, analysed, or explained examples.
- Always remember that Shakespeare is a dramatist and explore the dramatic effects of his language choice, character interaction, scene sequencing.
- Do not just quote from a play but be prepared to explore and unpack the words and images in your chosen quotations. You do not have to do this all the time, of course, but moderators do expect attention to be paid to such matters in such speeches as Enobarbus on Cleopatra, Henry at Harfleur, Goneril and Regan to Lear and Lear to them, for example. To go back to an example of poor expression under AO1, how do we know Viola "fancies the Duke" and why does Olivia fall in love with Viola? Why does Katherine smash a lute over Hortensio's head? The answers are all in the language and you must study it.
- It is not enough to gain high marks to make a point and provide an apt quotation or to describe a scene, you must explore the language and/or form and/or structure to gain marks in or above Band 3 and to gain even more marks your exploration must be supported by analysis.
- Try to embed well-chosen short quotations rather than write down great chunks of text.

### **AO4 - Your opinion**

You do not have to study critics or slog through the introduction to your texts. All you have to do is read the play and offer your, supported, opinions and ideas. Engaging with other people's opinions is a higher order skill that will be examined in Unit 3 and at A2.

If however, you do choose to read some critics in order to gain some ideas, you must make sure you understand the ideas and credit your sources in a bibliography.

It is possible some of your ideas have been informed by a live or recorded production. This is good and we welcome such evidence. Again, you must state in a bibliography the production you have seen. The candidate this year who wrote "we as Americans..." in an essay gave away by the phrasing that the idea had simply been lifted from the internet even though no bibliography was offered.

Moderators, too, have access to the internet and will sometimes, when suspicious, ask a search engine to find a phrase and this, of course, reveals the source of unacknowledged ideas. Always include web-sites in your bibliography.

### **AO5 - Context**

There were very few instances of AO5 irrelevantly intruding this year. Where it did it largely concerned (often bogus) social history on the position of women. There is enough in *The Taming of the Shrew* itself, for example, for you to deduce ideas on women in society without asserting poorly assimilated social history. Similarly there is enough in *The Tempest* itself without you having to write about Montaigne.

In conclusion, well done to this year's candidates and good luck to those of you taking the examination in 2006. The 2005 cohort has given you a challenging act to follow.

## LA2W Shakespeare (Written)

### General

*Richard III* has proved a popular replacement for *Antony and Cleopatra*, providing candidates with opportunities to explore another historical tragedy with enthusiasm and freshness. Once again, all questions were felt by examiners to be accessible and differential, allowing candidates of ranging abilities the opportunities to respond in line with individual capabilities.

### An important note on reading the examination paper

Each year a very small minority of presumably nerve-wracked candidates make the error of selecting the wrong question for the text they are studying, for example, answering *The Tempest* Question 1 on *Richard III*. Whilst there are never more than 10 affected scripts on an entry of over 5000, perhaps it is prudent to stress to candidates, as they are about to sit the examination and through use of actual examination papers as practice papers, that they must select the question from the choice of two on their set text to avoid disappointment and crisis on results day.

### A note on AO1 expression skills

It is still worth reminding candidates that: setting verse out as it was written shows awareness of genre; correctly spelling and punctuating the title, Shakespeare's name, characters' names show alertness to the words on the page.

### Successful candidates:

#### **Question 1** – by far the more popular option of the two on *The Tempest*

- knew the text and engaged exploration of the presentation of power;
- made good observations on history repeating itself;
- handled colonisation and racism well, focusing on how this was manifest in and informed by the text itself;
- demonstrated awareness of parodies of the Milan usurpation.

#### **Question 2**

- made some good remarks on Caliban and his complex nature, especially in this scene;
- worked the comedy of the dramatic function of the episode and its significance within the play.

#### **Question 3** – the more popular of the two questions on *Richard III*

- focused on the scene with short, relevant references to other parts of the play;
- explored theatricality;
- could see subtleties in tone and mood changes after Richard's re-entrance in the scene;
- saw the comedy;
- were alert to the impact and significance of Margaret's curses.

#### **Question 4**

- chose scenes or characters who could yield some fruitful results on presenting ideas about conscience – some obvious examples being Gloucester's prison scene and the debate between the two murderers, the commentary on the murder of the two Princes, Richard's wooing of Anne and later attempted wooing of his niece by proxy, the Richard and Richmond dream scene, the manipulation of the public and church by Richard and Buckingham.
- saw how ideas about conscience were dramatised and motivated and the dramatic, as well as narrative, consequences.

#### **Question 5** – the less popular of the two questions on *The Taming of the Shrew*

- had a view on the role of Biondello;

- made interesting observations about status;
- recognised Shakespeare's use of comedy in the scene.

**Question 6**

- were able to differentiate between and comment selectively on types of love - for example paternal, romantic, monetary, sisterly;
- explored the presentation of ambiguities of love between Katherina and Petruchio;
- considered the final episode with a firm view vis-à-vis the question.

**Less successful candidates:**

There were pleasingly fewer inappropriate addresses of irrelevant AOs 4 (other readers) and 5 (context) in this series. Candidates are getting more skilled at answering the question set.

**Question 1**

- produced lists – e.g “here's another bit of power...” - and lacked a central argument;
- perceived Ariel as female and restricted analysis to a human interpretation thereon in;
- offered limited presentations of Caliban veering to rapist or victim with no exploration of the subtleties in between.

**Question 2**

- identified that the scene was funny but couldn't address why;
- worried that Prospero's safety was seriously threatened.

**Question 3**

- made strange remarks about strawberries...
- confused events, never mind significance, imagining Hastings as an aide of Richard.

**Question 4**

- fell back on simple narrative;
- struggled to take a central or any line on conscience in the play.

**Question 5**

- imagined Bianca and Lucentio were already married;
- narrated the scene.

**Question 6**

- produced shopping lists of love;
- trawled far too widely and tried to cover everything about love in the play;
- got waylaid with debates about the sincerity of Petruchio's love, forgetting the construct altogether.

## LTA3 Texts in Context

This June's LTA3 paper saw the first full appearance of four new texts and the final full appearance of four more. *A Woman of No Importance*, *Comedians*, *Selected Poems of Thomas Hardy* and *High Windows* all featured in the January 2005 paper but examiners saw gratifyingly few responses to these texts then: centres have always been advised that the January series of this unit should be used for re-sit purposes only and few seem inclined to disregard this advice. This summer, however, all four new texts have proved popular: Wilde and Hardy appear set to become the new favourites of LTA3, while Larkin's enduring attraction is indicated by the significant proportion of centres transferring directly from *The Whitsun Weddings* to *High Windows*. Once again, candidates studying the texts about to disappear from the Specification will have a last chance to re-sit this examination in January 2006 but, after that date, there will be no further questions on *Doctor Faustus*, *The Glass Menagerie*, *A Choice of Christina Rossetti's Verse* or *Safe as Houses*. These texts will be replaced by *The School for Scandal*, *All My Sons*, *Selected Poems of the Brontës* and Heaney's *Beowulf* in 2006: questions will feature on the January 2006 paper but, once again, centres are advised to ensure that their candidates are properly prepared for an examination on these demanding texts by first entering them in June 2006.

Once again, I would like to take this opportunity to remind centres that, during this time of change, it is important that centres keep a close eye on exactly *which* texts will be appearing on *which* papers, ensuring that their candidates have been prepared appropriately. Unfortunately, the effects of last summer's text changes were exacerbated this June: in consequence, re-sit candidates in a significant number of centres were unable to meet the rubric's requirement that they answer two questions, due to the disappearance of one of their texts from the specification. It is worth re-stating at this point that, although candidates can theoretically re-sit LTA3 as many times as they wish, in practice their re-sit opportunities will be limited to the shelf-life of their set texts. There will be no more questions on the four texts which made their last appearance in January 2005, just as there will be no more questions on the four texts which disappeared after January 2004; by June 2006, all twelve of the original LTA3 texts will have gone.

The recurring pattern of these rubric infringements puts AQA in a difficult position: the board has no desire to punish candidates for the administrative inadequacies of some centres and it is also well aware that sometimes these errors are the inevitable consequence of the staffing and recruitment problems being experienced throughout the education sector. Nevertheless, the fact remains that any candidate who infringes the rubric has not met the AS Subject Criteria for English Literature and, in theory, could have the qualification withheld. Centres can help to ensure that there is no repetition of these errors by making the most of the many support systems offered by this specification. The essential set text information is disseminated via consortia, subject presentations and previous editions of this report; it is also available in the regular bulletins sent to all centres, on the AQA website and via a telephone call to the subject office in Guildford.

Fortunately, the vast majority of candidates have been prepared for texts which *are* on the specification and examiners continue to find that most have both an understanding of the Assessment Objectives and of the ways they are examined in this module. Most candidates have been trained to construct balanced, relevant arguments in response to the opinions contained in the AO4 questions and to show their contextual knowledge via close analysis of the text in the AO5 questions. Unfortunately, some answers are still unbalanced by a tendency to unload contextual or critical material at the expense of actual attention to the text. It is only natural that teachers should provide their students with support material, but this does not help in situations where candidates lean on the material so heavily that they are unable to integrate it as part of a shaped, relevant response to the question. There also remains some concern about centres without a grasp of the linkages between the texts and the Assessment Objectives. While the teaching of any literary text should involve its context and its different interpretations, candidates must



still bear the dominant Assessment Objectives in mind: there are few marks to be gained from lurid accounts of Duffy's sexuality or irrelevant, bolted-on Marxist interpretations of *Doctor Faustus*.

Examiners were dismayed at the illegibility of some candidates' handwriting this year and were increasingly irritated by many candidates' failure to write the numbers of the questions attempted in the boxes on the cover of the answer booklet. This latter may seem like a petty grumble but, examiners' time is too precious to spend writing out question numbers on the candidates' behalf.

Several examiners expressed concern that centre choices had sometimes disadvantaged candidates: in some cases, those without a Christian background struggled with the theological aspects of *Doctor Faustus*, for instance. On the other hand, many candidates took delight in the opportunity to explore the demotic language of some modern texts: one wrote "Larkin is not afraid to use outrageous language like "fuck" and "piss" – and, come to think of it, neither am I!" The same lesson is to be learned from both of these examples: there are eighteen permissible text combinations on this paper and centres should aim for the one that their candidates will find most enabling, stimulating and enjoyable.

As in previous years, the questions on the paper were welcomed as fair to the candidates: they were seen as enabling, but also as thought-provoking. Less able candidates found the questions accessible, while the more confident had the opportunity to show that they could explore literary texts with insight and autonomy. The mark scheme worked effectively once again and will in due course appear on the AQA website, enabling centres to keep in touch with the ways that the Assessment Objectives are tested in this module.

To look at the achievement of candidates question by question:

### ***Doctor Faustus***

This was the final full appearance of *Doctor Faustus* on LTA3 (although there will be a last re-sit opportunity in January 2006) and the play remained a very popular choice right up to the end. The standard of the responses to this text was pleasing: candidates generally had been well prepared, showing a secure knowledge of the play and a readiness to integrate contextual information in a purposeful, relevant manner. Centres would do well to encourage this approach when preparing their candidates for the replacement text, *The School for Scandal*, next year. Marlowe candidates were fairly equally divided in their choice of question this year.

### ***Question 1***

Many successful candidates wisely opted to define the key term "Renaissance Man" before considering whether it applies to Faustus: most felt that it involved a search for knowledge and a willingness, to use the current phrase, to think outside the box. Candidates were able to provide plenty of evidence for this too: his early boasts of multi-disciplinary success, his intentions to use magic for the acquisition of "strange philosophies" and the admiration of the scholars for Faustus' learning. Even after he has signed the pact, many candidates traced the outline of a Renaissance Man in Faustus' activities: his questioning of Mephistophilis about the workings of the universe and his requests for encyclopaedic books of the cosmos and the planet's natural history - not to mention his classical obsessions, reflected in his mythological sightseeing and his conjuring of Alexander and Helen. Later, however, candidates often felt that Faustus forfeits the title of Renaissance Man, and some noted that he desperately craves a return to a medieval world-view by the end of the play, renouncing his learning with the promise to "burn my books". Some candidates linked the presentation of Faustus to the idea of Marlowe as a Renaissance Man (the over-reacher who, like the Icarus of the Prologue, refuses to accept boundaries), while others felt that the Scholars are the play's true Renaissance Men. Some very sophisticated candidates took a conceptual approach to the question, noting that the Renaissance sees the beginning of developed characterisation in

English secular drama. As one candidate so delightfully put it: “Not only is Faustus a Renaissance thinker but the character, with his individuality, is the beginning of a new Renaissance theatre.”

Successful candidates:

- engaged confidently with the idea of the Renaissance Man
- analysed relevant aspects of the text with assurance
- explored the effects of Marlowe’s dramatic techniques.

Less successful candidates:

- confused the Renaissance with the Reformation and wrote mostly about Calvinism
- produced simple accounts of the development of Faustus’ character
- wrote long accounts of the history of sixteenth century ideas but paid very little attention to the drama.

### ***Question 2***

Although less successful candidates tended to treat these scenes of knockabout comedy in a straightforward manner, more confident students of Marlowe took the opportunity to establish a range of illuminating connections to the play’s major themes. Close readers noted the sombre interlude in which Faustus realises that he is “a man condemned to die” and compares himself to “the thief upon the cross”; many explored the parallels between Faustus’ bargain with Mephistophilis and his transaction with the Horse-courser. Some noted that these scenes are a significant landmark in Faustus’ degeneration: earlier, the comic scenes were used as a commentary on his actions, but now he has become a key player in these scenes (although, as many pointed out, Marlowe reminds us that it’s Mephistophilis who really has the power). Candidates were well aware of the audience-pleasing nature of the way Faustus deceives the Elizabethan equivalent of a dodgy dealer in used motors, but they were unimpressed by his servile behaviour in Scene 11 (one candidate remarked that he has become “a lapdog for the wealthy”).

Successful candidates:

- established the scenes’ importance by making connections to the rest of the play
- made effective use of the question’s bullet points
- explored the dramatic effects Marlowe creates in these scenes.

Less successful candidates:

- gave only a simple account of the scenes
- ignored the idea of the scenes’ importance within the whole play
- were unable to engage with the text as a dramatic construct.

### ***’Tis Pity She’s a Whore***

This text has maintained the considerable popularity which was evident on its introduction to the LTA3 list last year. While many candidates responded to Ford’s play with enthusiasm and engagement, examiners noted that weaker candidates sometimes struggled to adopt a literary critical approach to the drama – either because they became tied up in lengthy explanations of the plot’s complexity or because they were too busy taking the moral high ground when it came to the subject of incest.

### ***Question 3***

This was the more popular *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* question and it was successful in the way that it clearly differentiated the candidates. Many explored Ford’s presentation of the relationship between Giovanni and Annabella in an engaged and well-informed manner, ranging confidently across the whole text; less successful candidates pronounced instant judgement on the incestuous couple without considering what the textual evidence suggests about the writer’s attitudes or intentions.

Successful candidates:

- explored Ford's presentation of incest with confidence
- analysed the ways language and dramatic effects shape the audience's response to the relationship between Giovanni and Annabella
- carefully integrated contextual information, while keeping the text at the forefront of their answers.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple accounts of the plot's incestuous element
- failed to engage with Ford's language or dramatic techniques
- made assertive comments which betrayed an ignorance of the text.

#### ***Question 4***

Although this was the less popular question on the play, those candidates who attempted it found plenty to get their teeth into: the dramatic unmasking and poisoning, the rich variety of language in this scene and the interplay of several key plot elements. Candidates with a secure knowledge of the text were able to explore the ways in which Act IV Scene I is a significant moment within the whole play; less successful answers were often confined to the focal scene without seeking to connect it to what the audience already knows and what will follow. Examiners felt that the question's second bullet point was an important discriminator here: candidates who engaged with Ford's dramatic effects usually produced successful responses.

Successful candidates:

- had a secure understanding of the ways that justice and revenge are presented in this scene
- explored Ford's dramatic techniques
- were able to put this scene into the context of the whole play.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple accounts of the scene
- failed to engage with the dramatic effects Ford creates
- made little reference to the rest of the play.

#### ***A Woman of No Importance***

Making its first full appearance on the LTA3 paper, *A Woman of No Importance* has immediately established itself as a popular pre-1900 drama choice and looks set to become a firm favourite. Candidates responded to Wilde's wit and satire with enthusiasm, while many engaged thoughtfully with his radical opinions on Victorian morality and hypocrisy. Some weaker candidates struggled to understand the severity with which unmarried mothers were treated in the nineteenth century, but the vast majority were contextually well-informed and many integrated their background knowledge in a relevant, perceptive manner. The two questions were fairly well matched in terms of their popularity with candidates.

#### ***Question 5***

Most candidates who attempted this question had a secure knowledge of the text and even the least successful were able to provide an accurate character sketch of Mrs Arbuthnot. Many went far beyond this, exploring the dramatic purposes which were the focus of the question and engaging with Wilde's intentions in his presentation of this character. While a majority of answers inevitably concentrated on Mrs Arbuthnot's major speeches ("The woman suffers. The man goes free.") and her final triumphs over Lord Illingworth (slapping him in the face with his glove, calling him "A man of no importance."), examiners were pleased to note some close reading of the less obvious details of Mrs Arbuthnot's

presentation: the fact that she appears last in the *dramatis personae* (below even the servants) and the way that her initial, unannounced entrance betrays her ignorance of social etiquette.

Successful candidates:

- engaged with the dramatic function of Mrs Arbuthnot
- displayed a secure understanding of the ways Wilde presents her across the whole text
- focused primarily on the text and integrated contextual information as part of a shaped, coherent response.

Less successful candidates:

- produced simple character sketches of Mrs Arbuthnot
- wrote long accounts of Victorian moral standards, rather than focusing on the text
- were sometimes restricted by the weakness of their expression, although they did manage to show some understanding.

### **Question 6**

Most candidates who attempted this question had a good idea of the ways in which the given focal scene introduces key whole-text themes such as social division and the amorality of Lord Illingworth (as one candidate pointed out, “he is determined to remain an eccentric playboy for the rest of his life”). Many were well aware of the scene’s significance in terms of the mechanism of the whole play’s plot: the references to Mrs Arbuthnot’s distinctive handwriting enabled candidates to establish a range of links between this scene and later events. More sophisticated candidates noted the stylistic differences between Wilde’s comedy of manners in this scene and the more melodramatic techniques he employs later in the play; some explored the ways he manipulates the audience: we warm to Lord Illingworth’s anarchic wit here but our response is dramatically altered by subsequent revelations.

Successful candidates:

- explored the scene’s importance with confidence
- had a secure grasp of the different ways Wilde presents Victorian society in this scene
- kept the text at the forefront of their answer and integrated contextual information when it was appropriate.

Less successful candidates:

- produced simple accounts of the events of the scene
- ignored the question’s bullet points
- made little attempt to connect this scene with the rest of the play.

### ***The Glass Menagerie***

This was Tennessee Williams’ final appearance on the LTA3 paper (apart from the re-sit opportunity in January 2006) and *The Glass Menagerie* has remained the most popular modern play to the very end. Once again, this text produced many interesting responses from candidates of all abilities and a significant number of centres will, understandably, regret its passing. However, centres may welcome the renewed opportunity to teach twentieth century American drama next year: this play will be replaced by Arthur Miller’s *All My Sons* in 2006.

### **Question 7**

This was the more popular of the questions, producing a wide range of responses and approaches. Many candidates worked methodically through the question’s keywords “hate, anger and envy”, applying them to some, or all, of the characters in turn. Tom was the most frequent starting point: he hates his job, he is angry with Amanda, he envies both his father and the dead (“How lucky dead people are!”). However,

more aware candidates balanced these ideas by pointing out that Tom sometimes retracts his angry outbursts (“I’m sorry for what I said, everything I said, I didn’t mean it.”) and that he can’t really hate his family (although Amanda acknowledges “I make myself hateful to my children”) as it takes him the whole play to get round to leaving. Amanda also provided plenty of anger and envy examples (she even appears to envy her own past, re-living it vicariously through Laura), but many candidates felt that the psychiatrist’s view was disproved by the passivity of Laura: unafflicted by hate and anger, even her understandable envy is only gently implied by Williams. Successful debaters often paid close attention to the full wording of the given view, arguing that the play is certainly not FULL of hate, anger and envy, as there is plenty of room for alternatives such as love and joy, however short-lived these may be in the world of the play. Many candidates clearly understood that, in order to gain a Band 3 mark, they would have to engage with Williams as a writer and a dramatist: the “turgid smoky red glow” in which some scenes are lit was often cited as evidence that Williams uses effects, as well as characterisation, to fill the stage with anger.

Successful candidates:

- produced balanced discussions of the idea of the play being full of hate, anger and envy
- developed plausible alternatives to the psychiatrist’s view
- explored the ways that Williams’ dramatic techniques present hate, anger and envy to the audience.

Less successful candidates:

- produced simple character sketches and applied the keywords without debate
- showed little awareness of Williams as a dramatist
- spent more time discussing Williams’ psychological problems than they devoted to the actual text.

### **Question 8**

This was the less popular question on *The Glass Menagerie* but it often produced the more thoughtful and original responses: Band 4 answers frequently displayed an impressive degree of sophistication and conceptualisation. Examiners were pleased to note that many candidates shared Tom’s “weakness for symbols”: among the objects recruited to symbolise The American Dream were Laura’s ill-fitting dress, the slide of the pirate ship, the “large glass sphere that hung from the ceiling” of the Paradise Dance Hall and the shoe box on whose lid Tom wrote the poem that got him sacked. Inevitably, Jim made frequent appearances in these responses, seen by many as the embodiment of The American Dream, expecting “nothing short of The White House” and believing that “Knowledge, money and power are...the cycle democracy is built on.” A fascinating range of plausible American Dream definitions emerged in these responses: one candidate felt that it is “intertwined with technological progress: the telephone man, the future of television, radio engineering and electro-dynamics”; others noted that Amanda promotes it by attempting to sell the perfect world presented in ‘The Homemaker’s Companion’; many thought that it is the frontier dream of escape and adventure pursued by Tom. Candidates found plenty of evidence of The Dream’s emptiness too: Williams’ presentation of the squalor of St Louis, Jim’s slowing career trajectory and Tom’s guilty inability to forget what he has left behind (several well-read candidates even noted the Gatsbyesque echoes in his closing lines “I reach...I run...”).

Successful candidates:

- explored Williams’ presentation of The American Dream in a sophisticated and conceptual manner
- engaged with the play’s treatment of emptiness
- gave a balanced response to the question of “To what extent do you agree?”

Less successful candidates:

- wrote about dreams in general, rather than The American Dream specifically
- wrote generally about ‘thirties America and the effects of the Depression

- described the characters as if they were real people, showing no awareness of the literary construct.

### **Comedians**

In its first full appearance on LTA3, *Comedians* was the choice of a small – but not insignificant – number of centres. The play was invariably well taught and candidates of all abilities showed that they were able to engage with this rich, multi-layered text. It seems likely that, as word spreads of what Griffiths has to offer, *Comedians* will grow in popularity: it is certainly worthy of the consideration of the many centres seeking a replacement for *The Glass Menagerie* next year. Examiners noted that, although this is a comparatively recent text, some students felt the need to provide contextual information when considering Griffiths’ presentation of life in ‘seventies Manchester. The past is, indeed, another country: some centres wisely prepared their candidates for this alien territory by showing them the recent television dramatisation of Jonathan Coe’s *The Rotter’s Club* – a useful primer for ‘seventies attitudes.

### **Question 9**

This was by far the more popular question, enabling candidates to explore Griffiths’ presentation of the enigmatic Gethin Price: a task for which most were very well prepared. Many agreed that Price’s shaven-headed bovver boy persona is a frightening construct: his kung-fu exercises, his threats to other members of the class, his desire to smash up trains and destroy the beautiful people who are his social superiors – these all merited close attention. Candidates also found much to admire in Price, particularly his integrity (“I didn’t sell you out, Eddie.”) and his unflinching belief in the forthcoming revolution (“I wait. I’m ready.”). On the other hand, candidates found plenty in Price that they did not admire: his violence against his teacher, his misogyny (“It’s a joke that hates women, Gethin.”) and, indeed, his ironic misanthropy (his class consists of “turds on the Irwell” or those who “stayed put because they’ve nowhere else to go”).

Successful candidates:

- explored the ways that Griffiths presents the character of Price
- were able to support their responses to the keywords with appropriate textual detail
- produced a balanced response to the question of “To what extent do you agree?”

Less successful candidates:

- struggled to engage with the idea that there is anything admirable about Price
- wrote simple character sketches
- found it hard to deal with the question of “To what extent do you agree?”

### **Question 10**

This was not a popular question but it produced some thought-provoking answers: politically aware candidates enjoyed the opportunity to explore the play’s subtext and to engage with Griffiths’ dialectic. Many of those who attempted the question acknowledged the possibility of allegorical interpretation but were inclined to disagree with the suggestion that the play isn’t about comedy at all. Confident candidates sometimes suggested other possibilities: a considerable number of these felt that comedy and Marxism are unimportant in comparison to what Griffiths has to say about the Holocaust.

Successful candidates:

- explored the play’s political sub-text with confidence
- engaged fully with the keywords “comedy” and “Marxist allegory”
- produced thoughtful, carefully balanced debates.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple accounts of the play’s humorous moments

- struggled to apply the keywords
- had difficulty in addressing the question of “How far do you agree?”

### ***Making History***

*Making History* maintained much of the popularity the play enjoyed when it first appeared on LTA3 last year. Examiners commented on how well this text goes down with students and how effective it has proved in stimulating the kind of debate which is a feature of the best AO4 responses: there were many lively and thoughtful answers here which were a pleasure to assess. The two questions proved equally popular with students of Brian Friel.

#### ***Question 11***

Many candidates took this opportunity to explore the complexity of the ways that Friel presents the question of Irish identity in the play: their approach was often confident and perceptive. There was plenty of debate here too and several other contenders for the “central theme” title were nominated – particularly the relationship between history and truth. Less successful candidates sometimes ignored the issue of a central theme altogether and merely wrote confused accounts of the play’s historical or cultural background.

Successful candidates:

- analysed the ways that Friel presents the issue of Irish identity
- evaluated the idea of the play’s “central theme” with insight and confidence
- produced a coherent debate which considered alternative thematic possibilities.

Less successful candidates:

- addressed the question only via narrative or irrelevant background information
- were confused about Irish, English and Spanish identities within the play
- failed to debate the given view or suggest alternatives.

#### ***Question 12***

This question yielded many detailed and thoughtful explorations of the ending of the play; most candidates who attempted it understood that, in order to evaluate the idea of “an effective conclusion”, they would have to link the final scene to what the audience has already witnessed. Successful candidates often made much of Friel’s ultimate coup de theatre: the counterpoint of O’Neill’s submission against Lombard’s version of events. Others explored the effect of the scene’s slow fade-out in comparison to the “*Quick black.*” of other scenes: such close reading was a characteristic of the best answers here. Unfortunately, less successful candidates sometimes failed to grasp the need to make connections to the rest of the play – in consequence, their answers were rather limited.

Successful candidates:

- explored the play’s ending with confidence
- engaged fully with the keywords “an effective conclusion”
- were able to make relevant connections to the rest of *Making History*.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple narratives of the final scene
- struggled to address the question’s keywords
- made little reference to the rest of the play.

### ***The Miller’s Prologue and Tale***

Once again, Chaucer was by far the most popular pre-1900 poet on this paper. *The Miller’s Prologue and Tale* was evidently enjoyed by candidates of all abilities – and their responses to the text were enjoyed by the examiners, too. Examiners were particularly impressed by the candidates’ willingness to handle Chaucer’s Middle English (there were very few translations in evidence this year), by the breadth of their contextual knowledge and by the relevant manner in which many candidates integrated contextual information. On the other hand, this is the text where abuses of the open-book examination are most in evidence: candidates should be aware that examiners will easily spot passages copied verbatim from the introduction and centres should avoid feeding set sentences (and even paragraphs!) to their entire candidature in the vain hope that it will somehow tick the contextual box. The two questions on Chaucer were approximately equal in their popularity with the candidates.

#### ***Question 13***

Many candidates were very well informed about the fourteenth century attitudes to women which they investigated in answering this question. The church’s view that, ever since Eve, women had been “a temptation waiting to happen” (as one candidate put it) was often seen as the root of the problem, while the pure and passive Emily of *The Knight’s Tale* was also used to good effect in considering the broader picture of medieval attitudes. Inevitably, many answers centred on Alison and the way she is treated by the tale’s three main male characters: as trophy wife, as sex object and as over-idealised goddess. One candidate was compelled to draw the conclusion that “Chaucer suggests fourteenth century girls are easy”, while others explored the ways that Chaucer’s language is indicative of contemporary attitudes: the animal similes which are frequently applied to Alison, the tendency to label her “this carpenteris wyf” rather than use her name (a feature that is still evident in the closing lines) and the Miller’s use of laddish colloquialisms of approval (“She was a primerole, a piggesnie”). The ways in which Absolon uses comically effeminate language (“I may net ete na moore than a maide.”) were also seen as a sign of the low esteem in which women were held, but some candidates felt that Chaucer is subtly sending out a distinctly un-medieval, proto-feminist message in the tale: Alison is triumphant and undamaged at the end - the only character to escape punishment. Less successful candidates tended to stick to simple character descriptions of Alison, or wrote generally about women in the Middle Ages, rather than engaging with the ways Chaucer presents attitudes towards them.

Successful candidates:

- supported their ideas about attitudes to women by close reference to the text
- explored the variety of ways that Chaucer presents attitudes to women
- made sensible use of wider reading, but maintained their primary focus on *The Miller’s Prologue and Tale* itself.

Less successful candidates:

- struggled to engage with the idea that Chaucer presents different attitudes through the tale
- wrote simple character sketches of Alison
- produced long contextual accounts of fourteenth century society, but made minimal reference to the text.

#### ***Question 14***

This question produced some very lively and engaged responses, as candidates used the introductory description of Absolon as an opportunity to explore his presentation throughout the whole tale. The fact that he is “somdeel squaymous of farting” was an inevitable feature of these answers and candidates were well aware of the significance this phrase will assume later in the tale. The differences between Absolon’s “small rubible” and Nicholas’ mighty, bedroom-shaking instrument also caused much merriment. However it was “Poules window corven on his shoos” which aroused the most derision from candidates (one noted that “he uses religion as a fashion statement”), while also enabling them to explore



the ways Chaucer uses Absolon as a vehicle for his satire of the medieval church. Candidates had a secure grasp of the idea that Absolon is also a satirical Courtly Lover: he is “designed to look ridiculous” and always gets things wrong – from his refusal to accept offerings “for curteisie” to his hitting the wrong target at the end of the tale. Among other points enjoyed by examiners were the ideas that, because Absolon can “clippe and shave”, he is “a stereotypical male hairdresser”, and that his obsession with sweet smells (such as those of the “sencer” in the focal passage) is a metaphor for his idealised, sanitised view of sex. It was widely agreed that this was a very successful question.

Successful candidates:

- made connections between this section and the rest of *The Miller's Prologue and Tale*
- explored Chaucer's presentation of Absolon with confidence and insight
- read the text closely and, in employing neat supporting details, showed their mastery of Middle English.

Less successful candidates:

- produced paraphrases of the passage or simple sketches of Absolon
- made no attempt to establish links between the focal section and the rest of the text
- showed no awareness of Chaucer's techniques or intentions.

### ***Selected Poems of Thomas Hardy***

This new text was a very popular choice but examiners felt that it was not always a successful one. While there was plenty of evidence that candidates had responded to Hardy's poetry with engagement and enjoyment, concerns were expressed that some candidates seemed to have decided which poems they were going to write about (and, indeed, what they were going to say about these poems) before they opened the examination paper. Worryingly, some centres seemed to have prepared their candidates by drilling them to write a set, all-purpose answer on Hardy, despite the objections to such an approach expressed in previous editions of this report. This is an approach which can only disadvantage candidates: the generalised nature of these responses will earn a Band Two mark at best, while it becomes impossible for an examiner to differentiate a centre's candidates when they write virtually identical answers. If candidates are to be successfully prepared to write about Hardy's poetry, they must be trained to read the question first and then choose the most appropriate poems to fit the question's keywords: centres should bear this in mind when teaching this text next year.

### ***Question 15***

This was the more popular and more successful Hardy question, although there was a tendency for less confident candidates to focus on the content of their chosen poems rather than “the ways Hardy presents the past”, as required by the question. The selections from *Poems of 1912-13* were, inevitably, a frequent choice among the candidates who attempted this question: often they were well handled, but some candidates overdid the biographical information at the expense of attention to the poems themselves. Other approaches considered the ways Hardy looks back at his own childhood (‘The Roman Road’ and ‘The Oxen’ were popular choices) or at the historical past rather than the personal.

Successful candidates:

- selected appropriate poems in which Hardy presents the past
- explored their chosen poems in a confident and perceptive manner
- integrated contextual information while keeping the text at the forefront of their answers.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote paraphrases of their chosen poems
- showed little awareness of Hardy's poetic technique
- produced biographical accounts which paid minimal attention to the poems themselves.

### **Question 16**

This was the less popular Hardy question and, although some candidates paid scant attention to the focal poem, most were able to engage with the black humour of being “mixed to human jam” by The Great Leveller. Candidates were spoiled for choice when selecting further examples of Hardy’s presentation of death, but the other poems in which the dead speak (‘Friends Beyond’, ‘Channel Firing’ and ‘Voices from Things Growing in a Churchyard’) produced particularly effective comparisons. Poems about Emma Hardy’s death again featured frequently, while some candidates explored the ways Hardy presents ideas about his own demise in ‘My Spirit Will Not Haunt the Mound’ and ‘Afterwards’.

Successful candidates:

- confidently explored the ways that Hardy presents death
- had a secure understanding of ‘The Levelled Churchyard’ and made other relevant choices
- made valid connections between the poems and attitudes to death in Hardy’s time.

Less successful candidates:

- were unable to appreciate the humour of ‘The Levelled Churchyard’
- wrote simple, mostly narrative accounts of their chosen poems
- paid little attention to Hardy’s language and style.

### ***A Choice of Christina Rossetti’s Verse***

The June 2005 examination saw the last full outing for this original LTA3 text (although one set of re-sit questions will be available in January 2006): it has remained a steady favourite with a small group of loyal centres until the end. Those planning to maintain a focus on Victorian women poets once Elizabeth Jennings’ anthology has disappeared from the specification may wish to consider the Brontë collection which will be examined in this unit from 2006.

### **Question 17**

This was by far the more popular Rossetti question and most candidates who attempted it were able to identify a variety of ways in which women’s concerns feature in Rossetti’s poetry. There were some enjoyable feminist critiques of ‘Goblin Market’: a poem which emphasises the vulnerability of women (“Twilight is not good for maidens”) in a world run by men (while women “fetched the honey, milked the cows, aired and set rights the house, kneaded cakes of whitest wheat”). ‘A Triad’ was also a popular choice, showing Rossetti’s frustration with the limited choices women were offered by nineteenth century society: the three options are “all short of life” and even the respectable role of wife is “sluggish”. ‘Long Barren’ and ‘Cousin Kate’ (who is a man’s “plaything”) were also regular features in the answers of candidates who claimed the poet as a feminist pioneer.

Successful candidates:

- explored the poetry with confidence and insight
- made effective choices of poems that were relevant to this question
- paid close attention to Rossetti’s language and style.

Less successful candidates:

- had difficulty in selecting appropriate poems to fit the question
- wrote simple, narrative accounts of their chosen poems
- struggled to engage with Rossetti’s language and style.

**Question 18**

This was not a popular question, attempted by only a very small proportion of the candidates. Nevertheless, it produced some engaged answers which explored the likely reasons for Rossetti's popularity with the Victorian reading public. Weaker candidates often tended to make assertive claims without any supporting textual evidence from the poems or else they used the question as an opportunity to unload biographical material of little relevance: centres are advised to discourage both of these approaches in future.

Successful candidates:

- explored the two focal poems with confidence and insight
- analysed Rossetti's language and style in these poems
- integrated nineteenth century contextual material in a relevant manner.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote general contextual answers which did little with the actual poetry
- produced simple accounts of the two poems
- paid no attention to Rossetti's use of language and style.

**High Windows**

The hope was expressed, in last summer's LTA3 report, that *High Windows* would prove a popular and successful replacement for *The Whitsun Weddings*. Examiners this summer were unanimous in reporting that Larkin's final collection has attracted as many candidates (if not more) than his penultimate volume. Once again, Larkin's poetry has produced an impressive range of responses from the nation's seventeen year olds, despite the apparent remoteness of "the curmudgeonly persona he loved to adopt" (as one candidate so delightfully expressed it). Examiners were particularly pleased with the way many candidates explored the variety of Larkin's style and form in this collection, while even the least successful had at least a basic grasp of the poems which they selected for their answers. The two questions were fairly equal in terms of their popularity with candidates.

**Question 19**

The words which provided the starting point for this question are actually the Principal Examiner's, but one candidate flatteringly suggested that "they sound as if they were written by Larkin himself". This was a very successful question which produced a wide range of independent, thoughtful responses as engaged candidates strove to tease out the themes of the collection. Nature, change, old age and death were the most frequently identified themes; most candidates were able to provide plenty of textual evidence for Larkin's preoccupation with such matters. Some candidates felt that the term "random" was too harsh ("variety" was often cited as a more appropriate label) but others were in full agreement (many felt that the poems' sequence appears to be haphazard and one candidate wrote: "I feel he can't make up his mind what to focus on."). Some argued for "scrapbook" using subtle evidence from the collection's textual history: two of the poems were written to order (commissioned by the Department of the Environment and The Poem of the Month Club), while Larkin himself admitted, as many pointed out, that 'Show Saturday' was a late filler to "add bulk and roughage" and that the three poems which form 'Livings' "haven't any connection". Some candidates carefully balanced their responses by arguing in favour of coherent themes while acknowledging that Larkin's wide range of poetic forms created the *impression* of a scrapbook.

Successful candidates:

- produced relevant, balanced answers which addressed all the question's keywords
- debated and evaluated the given view in a thoughtful, independent manner
- analysed Larkin's poetic techniques.

Less successful candidates:

- struggled to engage with the ideas expressed in the question’s keywords
- wrote accurately about their chosen poems but did not directly address the question of “How far do you agree with this view of *High Windows*?”
- showed little awareness of Larkin’s language and style.

### **Question 20**

‘Sad Steps’ is perhaps not the most obvious choice for the collection’s key poem but this seemed to contribute to the success of Question 20: candidates were forced to consider their views afresh and to evaluate the importance of this poem. The perennial Larkin themes of nature and ageing were frequently identified as the key components of ‘Sad Steps’, enabling candidates to make interesting connections with poems such as ‘The Trees’, ‘Going, Going’, ‘High Windows’ and ‘Annus Mirabilis’. Many candidates explored the poem’s rich mixture of language in a perceptive manner: some sensitively traced Larkin’s Sir Philip Sidney references, others relished the opportunity to follow the trail of “piss” across the collection. Some candidates reflected on the effects Larkin creates by placing a poem about the moon next to ‘Solar’ (interestingly, a popular choice for the previous question’s pro-random lobby!), while the poet’s use of a window motif here was often the starting point for answers which developed an overview of the whole collection. Confident candidates sometimes argued against the idea of ‘Sad Steps’ as the key to the collection: ‘High Windows’ itself was the most frequently nominated alternative.

Successful candidates:

- explored the focal poem with confidence and insight
- made perceptive connections between the focal poem and the rest of the collection
- produced a balanced argument in response to the view that the poem is “the key to the whole collection”.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote general answers which asserted, but could not justify, their agreement with the given view
- produced simple accounts of the focal poem
- were unable to connect ‘Sad Steps’ to the rest of Larkin’s poetry.

### **Safe As Houses**

This summer’s paper was U. A. Fanthorpe’s last full appearance on LTA3, although there will be a final re-sit opportunity next January. Sadly, *Safe as Houses* remained a minority choice to the very end and examiners were still at something of a loss to explain how this varied and stimulating collection failed to attract the attention from centres it deserved. It is to be hoped that this text’s replacement for 2006, Seamus Heaney’s *Beowulf*, will prove a more popular choice. As in previous years, those fortunate enough to have studied *Safe as Houses* often responded in a thoughtful and original manner.

### **Question 21**

This was by far the more popular *Safe as Houses* question and most of those who attempted it were able to identify poems in which Fanthorpe gives a voice to the silent or the ignored. Cats were a common choice here – at the return of Odysseus and in the manger – as were the more obscure figures of history and literature (William Tyndale, Norah Helmer’s children) and, perhaps most effectively of all, Degas’ *Repassouse*. On the other hand, many argued, Fanthorpe seems to be using her own voice at certain points in the collection: candidates successfully explored the poetry’s apparently autobiographical elements (‘Reading between’, ‘Sirensong’) and its personal tones (‘Atlas’).

Successful candidates:

- began by focusing on poems which offer a voice to the silent or the ignored
- used other poems to produce a balanced debate

- analysed Fanthorpe's language and style in the poems they had chosen.

Less successful candidates:

- struggled to engage with the question's keywords
- wrote simple accounts of the cat poems but were unable to provide a counter-argument
- paid little attention to the effects created by Fanthorpe's language.

### **Question 22**

This was not a popular question. Many of those who attempted it appeared to have only the flimsiest awareness of the focal poem and were unable to connect 'Queening It' to Fanthorpe's major themes or to other poems in *Safe as Houses*. A few, more confident, candidates relished the opportunity to explore the poet's ideas that "inside every man" there's a burning desire to dress up in drag and that men are only really interested in "brazen" women who display "colossal cleavage" - the sort they'll dress up as, given half a chance!

Successful candidates:

- had a secure understanding of 'Queening It'
- produced a balanced debate, in which they acknowledged that the poem's off-beat, eccentric approach might indeed make it "the key to the whole collection"
- explored Fanthorpe's language and style, while making connections to other relevant poems.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple or erroneous accounts of the focal poem
- failed to engage with the ways that 'Queening It' is typical of Fanthorpe's writing
- struggled to establish links to other poems in the collection.

### **The World's Wife**

Once again, *The World's Wife* proved highly popular: more centres study this text than any other on the paper. As last year, examiners were impressed by the enthusiasm and engagement with which many candidates approach Duffy's poetry, but there are also notes of caution to be sounded. There is a worrying tendency for weaker candidates to ignore the keywords in the Duffy questions: these candidates often cling to the mistaken belief that all these questions require is that they rattle off a few assertive "proofs" that Duffy is a militant feminist lesbian and the examiners will be satisfied. Obviously, this is not the truth of the matter: to answer these questions successfully, candidates need to be open-minded and to create balanced, thoughtful responses which apply careful consideration to the opinions offered for debate. Examiners were also concerned that intrusive, and often irrelevant, biographical material (such as lengthy character assassinations of Adrian Henri) prevented candidates from meeting the Assessment Objectives when writing about *The World's Wife*: centres should advise their candidates against taking this approach.

### **Question 23**

This was the more popular Duffy question, although, once again, weaker candidates often used it as an excuse to wheel out a pre-written, general answer on attitudes to men in the whole collection. Nevertheless, the question yielded a wealth of thoughtful and perceptive responses in which candidates were able to provide persuasive evidence for both sides of the argument. 'Mrs Aesop', 'Mrs Sisyphus' and 'Mrs Faust' were the most popular choices to show Duffy's lack of sympathy, with the men in 'Little Red Cap' and 'The Devil's Wife' also making regular appearances. In arguing against the given view, candidates often found traces of sympathy in 'Mrs Midas', 'from Mrs Tiresias' and 'Delilah'. However, it was 'Anne Hathaway' which provided the most frequent alternative: here, as many noted, Duffy's treatment of the man goes far beyond the sympathetic, as it also does in 'Pilate's Wife'. As one candidate

so neatly put it: “Duffy only sympathises with men who have proved themselves worthy to her – men like Shakespeare and Jesus.”

Successful candidates:

- evaluated Duffy’s attitudes to the men in her poems
- explored and analysed Duffy’s poetic techniques
- answered the question of “How far do you agree?” by developing a balanced debate which applied the keywords to a variety of poems.

Less successful candidates:

- wrote simple accounts of their chosen poems but ignored the question of “How far do you agree?”
- simply agreed with the given view and did not offer any alternatives or counter-arguments
- only engaged with the keyword “sympathy” in an assertive manner or ignored it altogether.

### **Question 24**

Although it was the less popular option, this question produced a significant number of engaged and thoughtful responses. Candidates frequently displayed a secure knowledge and understanding of the focal poem, ranging across *The World’s Wife* to establish links and to evaluate the “key to the whole collection” idea. Many saw ‘Mrs Beast’ as a manifesto for the whole collection (“These myths...these legends, fairytales, I’ll put them straight”) or perhaps, given its penultimate position in the sequence, a summary of all that has gone before. The responses revealed particular interest in the “line of ghosts” behind the poem’s poker players: as one candidate remarked, “Duffy name-drops lots of well-known figures who have been famously damaged by their relationships with unsuitable men.” As with the responses to the other modern poets, less successful candidates sometimes showed a sound knowledge of the focal poem but failed to refer to any other poems in the collection: centres should emphasise the importance of making the relevant links when preparing their candidates for this examination.

Successful candidates:

- had a secure understanding of ‘Mrs Beast’ and of Duffy’s techniques
- were able to connect the poem to others in *The World’s Wife*, using it as the starting point for an exploration of the collection’s key themes
- focused on the keywords “To what extent do you agree?” as part of a balanced debate.

Less successful candidates:

- were unable to engage with the idea that ‘Mrs Beast’ is the collection’s key poem
- showed little awareness of Duffy’s poetic techniques
- struggled to make links between ‘Mrs Beast’ and other poems in the collection.

## LTA4 Texts in Time

### General

Examiners saw some very good answers to the questions on this paper and felt that the overall standard of work was impressive. Candidates showed themselves aware of the need to structure arguments and there was a high standard of close textual reference and analysis.

Centres have clearly trained their candidates to recognise the importance of addressing the dominant assessment objectives:

- considering different interpretations of texts as well as their own informed personal response in each question in Section A
- evaluating the significance of the chosen contextual focus of the text in each question in Section B

Successful candidates also:

- know the texts really well and are able to summon references and short quotations in response to whatever aspect of the text is required by the question
- have learnt the skill of planning and writing a coherent, well-focused answer, structuring and sustaining an argument and linking paragraphs effectively
- keep the question in mind throughout the answer
- write accurately and legibly

Less successful candidates:

- do not know their texts
- do not plan their answers
- fail to produce a balanced discussion in Section A or focus on appropriate context in Section B
- neglect the focus of the question
- write illegibly
- express themselves weakly and, often, too casually

By far the most popular texts studied were *Othello* and *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*. The most popular questions were Questions 2 and 17.

This is the last summer examination for the following texts:

*The Merchant of Venice: William Shakespeare*

*Volpone: Ben Jonson*

*Women Romantic Poets 1785-1832*

*The Prelude Books 1 & 2: William Wordsworth*

*Selected Poems: John Keats*

(There will be a final re-sit opportunity on these texts in January 2006).

The new texts which come on to the paper from January 2006 are:

*The Winter's Tale: William Shakespeare*

*The Alchemist: Ben Jonson*

*The Prelude Books 9 & 10: William Wordsworth*

*Don Juan (Cantos 1-4): Lord Byron*

To turn to a consideration of each question in turn:

## Section A

In this section, examiners expect candidates to consider the different interpretations of texts given in the question as well as to offer their own informed, independent opinions. The best answers did make it clear that they understood these works as drama.

### *Othello*

Question Two was the more popular question on this text.

#### *Question 1*

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the two interpretations of the **willow scene** as well as contributing their own opinion
- saw the purpose of the scene in relation to structure and genre
- analysed the language and the contrasts in detail
- in response to the first view often displayed a sensitive understanding of how Desdemona's situation at this point in the play is revealed, and of the relationship between the two women
- in response to the second view tended to focus on the structure of the play in terms of the contrasting mood at this point and the creation of suspense or release of tension before the climax of Act 5
- were able to summon up a great amount of detail to illustrate **moving**
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both interpretations of the **willow scene** fully
- tended to narrate the scene noting broad differences between the women
- tended to ignore the song
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 2*

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the two views of the presentation of **Othello** as well as offering their own informed response
- understood both **self-deluding** and **tragic**
- recognised that their response to the two views depended on their interpretation of the role of Iago and whether he caused Othello to fall, or whether he was merely the catalyst, bringing out Othello's dormant insecurities hidden beneath his self-aggrandising stories
- did not neglect the **stories** aspect of the question, offering alternative interpretations
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views of the presentation of **Othello** fully
- simply wrote a character study of Othello with little reference to the actual question



- treated Othello as though he were a real character – “It is not Othello’s fault he was cast as lead in a tragedy”.
- noted but failed to explore that the “stories” are Iago’s but are accepted by Othello, who thus “deludes himself”
- could often explain how Othello is deluded, but struggled with Othello’s own responsibility
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Measure for Measure*

#### *Question 3*

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the two assertions about **Isabella** as well as offering their own informed response
- explored how, by accident or design, Isabella’s attractions could be used to further her cause – or cause her peril
- were able to use their experience of recent productions and actresses’ interpretations to good effect
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both assertions about **Isabella** fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 4*

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the two views about **Lucio’s** role as well as offering their own informed response
- considered Shakespeare’s use of the character as a dramatic device
- saw the connections between the two views and were able to explore some of the ambiguities in the play with subtlety
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views of **Lucio’s** role fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *The Merchant of Venice*

#### *Question 5*

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the differences in the two views on **genre** as well as offering their own informed response

- showed understanding of the genre and made good use of its various elements, seeing how even Antonio’s melancholy is part of the tradition
- ranged widely and analysed in depth
- did consider Act 5 and its happy ending
- often shaped their answers around particular characters or scenes
- seemed particularly interested in different interpretations over time
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views on **genre** fully
- treated comedy on the level of actions being seen as “funny”
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Question 6**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views on **justice and mercy** as well as offering their own informed response
- probed the contrast between the two views in detail
- analysed the significance of the language in the play
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views fully
- were obviously confused about **mercy and justice**
- did not seem to have thought very much about the complexities of the play
- were tempted to ignore the dramatic aspects and focus on the plot and character
- had difficulty focusing on the relevant scenes
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Edward II**

#### **Question 7**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about the **nature of the play** as well as offering their own informed response
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about the **nature of the play** fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Question 8**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about the presentation of **Queen Isabella** as well as offering their own informed response
- looked at structure and dramatic effects of scenes in detail, with close analysis of language
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about **Queen Isabella** fully
- offered no more than character studies
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### ***The Duchess of Malfi***

### **Question 9**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about the **strengths and weaknesses** of the play as well as offering their own response
- defined in detail the nature of the genre of the play and its influence on plot, structure and characterisation
- commented effectively on the dramatic effects of the interplay of a range of characters
- demonstrated a good range of views
- showed that they had considered the structure of the play as well as the genre of revenge tragedy
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about **strengths and weaknesses** fully
- launched into a series of character studies
- tended to assert
- found some difficulty in balancing and addressing the four separate threads in the views
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Question 10**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about **Webster's purpose** as well as offering their own response
- explored the sex and violence and its part in delivering moral comment on the society depicted
- engaged with the moral element, showing their recognition of the little mottoes Webster gives to his characters at crucial points
- offered ideas about Webster's purpose such as the promotion of women's rights
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about **Webster's purpose** fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Volpone*

#### **Question 11**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about the presentation of **Celia and Bonario** as well as offering their own response
- demonstrated engagement with the form of the play itself, considering Jonson's wider purposes and how these two fitted into the picture
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about the presentation of **Celia and Bonario** fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### **Question 12**

Successful candidates:

- demonstrated mature understanding of the views about the **pace** of the play as well as offering their own responses
- explored the genre of the play
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- failed to explore both views about the **pace** of the play fully
- offered only general reference to the text in support of the views or tended to assert
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### **Section B**

In this section examiners expect candidates to demonstrate that they can evaluate the influence of the contexts that have shaped the poetry they have studied.

#### ***Women Romantic Poets 1785-1832***

#### **Question 13**

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of the **women's quality of life**
- chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of the **women's quality of life**
- had some difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- offered only general reference to the text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### **Question 14**

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of **feeling admiration for those who live in poverty**
- chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **feeling admiration for those who live in poverty**
- had some difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- offered only general reference to the text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### **The Prelude, Books 1 and 2**

#### **Question 15**

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of **belief that God works through Nature**
- chose appropriate passages to illustrate their answers, including Wordsworth's reflections and not just the incidents in the "spots of time"
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **belief that God works through Nature**
- tended to write about Nature but to neglect God
- had some difficulty selecting appropriate passages
- adopted a narrative approach
- offered only general reference to the text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### **Question 16**

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of **ideas about the ideal childhood**
- chose appropriate passages to illustrate their answers, often with detailed analysis of the use of language
- skilfully related the autobiographical elements of the poem to **ideal childhood** as well as referring to philosophical passages

- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **ideas about the ideal childhood**
- neglected **ideal**
- had some difficulty selecting appropriate passages
- offered only general reference to text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*

#### *Question 17*

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of **Blake’s own religious beliefs**
- were able to separate his views on organised religion from his own beliefs
- had clearly looked at his other writings as well as influences such as Swedenborg and used this knowledge to good effect in writing about poems such as *The Tyger*
- saw the ambiguities of the poems, acknowledging the problems of interpretation of certain poems
- chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **Blake’s own religious beliefs**, finding his own beliefs too obscure
- tended to concentrate on Blake’s views on organised religion rather than on his own beliefs
- had difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- offered only general reference to text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 18*

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the significance of the context of **Blake as Romantic poet**
- ranged through many features of the poems, citing nature, oppression, equality, imagination, simplicity, individualism
- chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- included a discussion of style
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **Blake as Romantic poet**
- had clearly never considered the “Romantic” aspects of Blake’s poetry
- had difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- sometimes thought **Romantic** meant romance à la Mills and Boon
- offered only general reference to text

- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

### *Selected Poems*

#### *Question 19*

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the context of **Keats' desire to escape from reality**
- enjoyed delving into the various means of escape as explored by Keats – mythology, medieval, drugs, imagination, for example
- chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **Keats' desire to escape from reality**
- had difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- tended to write about anything they knew about Keats, offering biographical, philosophical and technical information
- trotted out prepared answers on “medieval”
- offered only general reference to the text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

#### *Question 20*

Successful candidates:

- offered confident evaluations of the context of **Keats' fascination with sex and romance**
- differentiated between sex and romance and chose appropriate poems to illustrate their answers
- showed secure knowledge and understanding of the text, using quotation and/or close reference effectively
- wrote coherently and succinctly

Less successful candidates:

- showed limited understanding of the context of **Keats' fascination with sex and romance**
- had difficulty selecting appropriate poems
- offered only general reference to the text
- had difficulty expressing themselves clearly and accurately

## LA5C Literary Connections (Coursework)

Moderators read many enjoyable and stimulating essays this year. There was a wide range of challenging tasks with some fascinating approaches to both old and new texts. Much of the advice offered in previous years has now become established practice and most centres appear confident in both task-setting and assessment. Rather than repeat the guidance that will be issued to all centres in the autumn term, this report will concentrate mainly on those aspects which have caused concern this year.

### Text choices and task setting

The variety of carefully-framed tasks was a feature of comments by a number of moderators this summer. Focusing on precise aspects of the texts and addressing the assessment objectives is a real help to candidates at all levels; it is pleasing to report that very few centres now submit titles without explicit reference to comparison, the dominant assessment objective for this unit. Increasingly centres are having the confidence to negotiate tasks with students, which invariably leads to more engaged and interesting responses. Last year's standardisation booklet included a long list of such tasks; this year's booklet will contain over sixty text pairings which have proved successful and which will, it is hoped, encourage teachers to share further suggestions in consortium meetings. One important advantage of coursework is the opportunity to match students with appropriate texts; able students can confidently handle complex and demanding works such as *The Waves* and *Ulysses* when these would cause problems for less gifted candidates.

There continue, however, to be a significant number of centres which teach the same texts to all students. Whilst this can have its advantages, such an approach (especially if the number of assignments is limited) does run the risk that all candidates will produce similar work, particularly disadvantaging those capable of higher achievement if they had been able to respond to a task that really engaged their interest. In the worst cases, moderators report seeing the same extracts selected for comment in several essays – a feature that prevents students having ownership of their work. A half-way house to completely independent study is to teach one text and allow students to select, with guidance, the text for comparison. One moderator commented with some feeling about a pair of texts that is feeling rather tired by now: 'If I never see another essay on *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-four* it won't be too soon, whereas those students who placed either text beside *Oryx and Crake* produced fresh and original writing.'

Another area where moderators report candidates sometimes have problems is the understandably popular choice of texts on the First World War. This provides valuable preparation for the synoptic paper but runs the risk that students will concentrate on the 'experience' or 'effects' of war rather than exploring how the writers have *presented* those experiences. It helps if the texts are chosen carefully – rather than two novels written in the same period, there is more opportunity for fruitful comparison when the texts are distinguished from each other in some way, such as a novel and a play, or texts separated by time. Even when this is this case, students need to be guided to refer explicitly to these differences – too often, for example, there was a failure to acknowledge that *Journey's End* is a play.

### Good examples

These are a few of the many successful tasks seen this year. In some cases they make interesting connections between familiar and less common texts – and all ensure that the focus on literary features is prominent in the wording.

- Compare how Ted Hughes in *Birthday Letters* and Emily Brontë in *Wuthering Heights* express intensity and passion.
- A comparison of the relationship between language and truth in Brian Friel's *Translations* and Seamus Deane's *Reading in the Dark*.



- Compare the effect of the narrative perspectives used by Faulks in *Birdsong* and McEwan in *Atonement*.
- Compare how both Atkinson in *Behind the Scenes at the Museum* and Ishiguro in *The Remains of the Day* create narrators who are on journeys of self-discovery.
- Compare and contrast the presentation of a puritan society in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* and Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*.

Teachers are reminded of the importance of submitting titles to moderators in good time; problems with this unit often begin when students commence work on unauthorised tasks or amend their task after it has been approved.

### **Addressing the assessment objectives**

It is pleasing to report that most work submitted for moderation demonstrates that candidates and teachers are fully aware of the need to address the assessment objectives for this unit. When candidates do not achieve as well as expected, these are the most common reasons:

- A failure to compare properly – as this is the dominant assessment objective, work that does not compare the texts, or pays scant attention to one of the two texts, is likely to be placed in Band 1. Conversely, candidates who wish to obtain the highest marks need to learn how to weave comparison into every paragraph, making telling use of short quotations and references.
- A failure to differentiate between the chosen texts – even when candidates can identify similarities, they sometimes fail to see the importance of commenting on the differences as well, especially when the works are from different genres.
- Lack of detailed comment on language, form and structure – this will result in a Band 2 mark even if the candidate demonstrates a knowledge of the content of the texts that might otherwise suggest Band 3. Students often concentrate on *what* the authors have to say rather than *how* they say it, when the emphasis should be on literary techniques and not merely on content and character. One moderator commented: 'there is often a deafness to tone, particularly in comedy and satire,' and another pointed out 'there is a difference between describing and explaining on the one hand and analysing and exploring on the other'. Essays which lead with AO3 and make explicit references to the authors help students focus on this important assessment objective.
- Poor written expression – as in all other units in this Specification, AO1 is important and essays littered with errors are likely to be given Band 1 or low Band 2 marks. We expect that candidates will take advantage of the opportunity of coursework to check and redraft their essays; teachers should advise those who propose to submit careless work to prepare a better copy first. If the moderator is likely to have difficulty with the handwriting, the essay should be re-written legibly or, if possible, word-processed.

### **Assessment**

Moderators report few disagreements with centre assessments this year. Much of the work is well-annotated and demonstrates punctilious internal moderation – making the moderation task straightforward. When problems occurred they were likely to be caused by:

- Over-rewarding work that failed to address the assessment objectives, however conscientious it might have been in other respects – as outlined in the section above.
- Ignoring obvious flaws such as poor expression, excessive narration or short work.
- Failure to justify the mark awarded, especially in the higher bands. Moderators look for evidence for

the mark given in the teachers' comments, both on the work and on the record forms. When work has little or no annotation, or the marking is merely ticks or simple references to assessment objectives by number, it is difficult to identify the reasons for the mark.

### **Administration**

We were grateful for the many centres which submitted work early and for the vast majority whose paperwork was exemplary. As in previous years, however, there are still a few centres or candidates who cause problems by:

- Failing to provide a bibliography and word count.
- Not stapling or tagging essays – pages should also be numbered and in the right order (plastic sleeves are not a substitute for fastening work properly).
- Failing to check the record forms, especially to sign the teacher's section, or to ensure the Centre Declaration Form is complete. Whilst some moderators report that all these items were correct this year, others reported an increased number of missing items

## LA5W Literary Connections (Written)

### General

Senior examining personnel reported that this was a fair and appropriately challenging paper and that they had marked some excellent answers to all of the questions which had been attempted. The introduction of the new 2005 texts *Riddley Walker*, *A Clockwork Orange*, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* attracted many candidates who had evidently enjoyed and benefited from their studies.

Successful candidates:

- (as ever) understood the **comparative** nature of Unit 5
- planned carefully and effectively
- made good use of their time
- were fully engaged with the language used by the writers of their texts and the very best candidates started with a comparison of style before moving on to a comparison of themes
- kept the keywords of questions at the heart of their answers
- could use carefully selected and apposite, integrated quotation with skill
- were able to move from the literal surface of their texts into an analysis of the more subtle underpinning ideas
- were able to define terms before proceeding to construct an argument reliant upon those terms
- considered writers' attitudes so as to be able to offer a coherent, reasoned and informed response
- were fluent and engaged when considering the various contexts of their set texts
- read with sensitivity and explored skilfully
- were able to make well-balanced, well-controlled, analytical observations about how language shapes meaning
- could spell, punctuate and use correct English grammar
- could signpost their way around texts leaving the examiner in no doubt that they were familiar with whole texts and were aware of the delicate twists and turns within those texts

Less successful candidates:

- did not compare and contrast
- demonstrated poor formal control of English
- sadly still did not know the difference between *woman* and *women*
- could not punctuate titles correctly
- in answers to the direct textual comparison questions (1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11) frequently offered a résumé of one extract followed by a résumé of the other
- had no idea of how to signpost their way around their texts showing little or no understanding of such issues as narrative order, plot development and character development
- did not engage the style of the writers and frequently got bogged down in writing about what they imagined to be the important themes in a text
- wrote irrelevantly
- did not plan their answers at all or occasionally "over-planned" by writing notes of such detail that they were longer than the essays which followed them
- thought that writers were "trying to put messages across"
- did not present an argument when requested to do so
- could not use quotation, integrated or otherwise
- generalised and made vague assertions
- wrote imbalanced answers, spending an inappropriately large proportion of time on one text at the expense of the other

- wrote answers that led many senior and assistant examiners to form the impression that texts had been learned essentially as separate entities with little time being spent on comparison
- ignored or were not aware of literary contexts
- ignored the specifics of questions by not concentrating on key words and phrases
- brought received ideas about texts into the examination room and did not allow the specifics of the question to determine the specifics of the answer
- did not convince the examiner that they understood that characters in fiction are constructs
- knew that they needed to write about language and style but were unable to do so with control, understanding or direction

### **Option 1: History in Literature**

This option attracted relatively few candidates whose enthusiasm demonstrated that the rewards of studying *Hawksmoor* and *Sacred Hunger* made the effort worthwhile.

#### ***Question 1***

Successful candidates:

- kept the comparative nature of the task at the heart of their answer
- were able to demonstrate that both extracts explored some of the complex relationships between men who had differing philosophical and moral views
- offered interesting analyses about the roles of morality and belief in both extracts and were able to offer pertinent arguments about the presentation of Thurso, Barton and Paris in *Sacred Hunger* and of Dyer, Wren and Nat in *Hawksmoor*
- charted how both writers created tension and suspense
- wrote with enthusiasm about writers’ style
- made sense of the exploration in both extracts of dining and debating and found interesting things to write about avarice, ambition, Reason, fear and “Phrenzies”...

Less successful candidates:

- told the story and relayed plot and themes
- did not compare and contrast
- wrote the same sorts of weak answers mentioned in the general introduction

#### ***Question 2***

Successful candidates:

- were confident and assured in their exploration of the importance and presentation of Time in both novels
- kept comparison central to their answer
- saw characters as constructs designed by writers to relay themes, ideas and philosophy to the reader
- explored the skills of the writers at work
- were confident when exploring the underpinning ideas of both set texts which deal with the importance of Time in different ways

Less successful candidates:

- struggled with the idea of Time and could not make their answers relevant
- were generalised and assertive
- wanted to write character sketches of major characters in both novels especially Dyer in *Hawksmoor*

- wrote the same sort of weak answers mentioned in the general introduction

### **Option 2: A Woman's Struggle**

This was a very popular option this year as in previous years. *A Woman's Struggle* attracted the greatest number of unsuccessful candidates, though there was evidence of excellence too.

#### **Question 3**

Successful candidates:

- placed the extracts within the overarching structure of both novels
- kept the comparative nature of the task at the heart of their answer
- engaged the language of both extracts and were able to use telling detail which linked both extracts
- wrote interestingly about such things as sewing, missionaries, religion, education, philosophy and friendship in both extracts and in the wider novels
- found fascinating things to write about the connections of Elsie Norris' beliefs and those of the Olinka
- saw how the episodes further establish Celie and Jeanette as characters who are changing and developing, though acknowledged that Celie was coming to the end of her journey whereas Jeanette was taking the first steps beyond home and the influence of her mother
- made interesting observations about alienation, prejudice and "fitting in"
- could distinguish Jeanette Winterson the novelist and the literary construct Jeanette in the novel

Less successful candidates:

- made assertions (as less successful candidates over the years have done) about such things as *patriarchy, feminism, womanism, sisterhood, bildungsroman...*
- offloaded partially-understood notes
- forgot to compare and contrast
- ignored the request to write about style
- were often very long-winded and rather formless
- did not see the humour in the Jeanette Winterson extract
- referred to critics whom they did not understand or for whose opinions they could not find a sensible use
- struggled with signposting, especially in *The Color Purple*
- did not link their texts
- thought that *The Color Purple* is set in South America

#### **Question 4**

(this was the most popular question on the paper)

Successful candidates:

- were able to break the question down into its component parts and address all the key words and phrases with rigour
- clearly understood the nature of the comparative task
- presented a discriminatory, differentiated argument
- addressed the key word "all" with intelligence
- explored how characters developed and changed throughout the course of the novels by tying character development into the specifics of the question
- were able to signpost their way around the novels
- were aware of the writers at work

Less successful candidates:

- ignored key words and phrases from the question, especially the expressions “dismal nonentities” and “self-important windbags”
- could not spell the words “nonentity” and “monstrous” and offered a variety of strange alternatives
- were unable to jettison prepared answers about Celie and Jeanette and wrote about them no matter what
- concentrated solely on “monsters” and “victims”
- did not use textual evidence
- believed that “Winnet Stonejar” was an anagram of “Jeanette Winterson”, thereby showing that they had never put this particular hypothesis to the test
- were assertive

### **Option 3: Visions of the Future**

(this was an option of medium popularity attracting more candidates than Options 1 and 5 but fewer than Options 2 and 4)

There was some excellent work on these two texts. The language of *Riddley Walker* and *A Clockwork Orange* fascinated the best candidates and interested even the weakest.

### **Question 5**

Successful candidates:

- kept comparison at the heart of their response
- placed the extracts within the overarching structure of both novels
- understood authorial intent
- had an analysis of language as a central feature of their answer
- made excellent use of the obvious links on offer: the cinema screening in *A Clockwork Orange* and the Punch and Pooty show in *Riddley Walker* leading to fascinating explorations of such things as myth, Free Will, consequences, knowledge, individualism, violence, intelligence, behaviour modification, allegory, social responsibility...
- understood the different narrative techniques of their set texts

Less successful candidates:

- fell into generalisation and assertion about the genre Visions of the Future
- described what happened in the extracts without comparing and contrasting them
- wrote the sort of answers referred to in the general introduction

### **Question 6**

(this question attracted the highest proportion of answers from band 4 candidates)

Successful candidates:

- compared and contrasted Alex and Riddley throughout their entire answer and showed engagement, understanding and enjoyment of the novels
- showed a clear appreciation of the writers at work
- kept their answer firmly focused on the key word *presentation* and understood that characters in novels are the created artefacts of writers who are using them as vehicles of communication to the careful reader
- wrote with genuine engagement about, for example, quest literature and identified Alex and especially Riddley as characters who in different ways are both engaged in a search for some sort of “truth” and

who are both used by other characters in quests which the two protagonists do not always fully understand

- were able to convey their evident enthusiasm for their set texts
- wrote with intelligence about the language given to the protagonists by the authors and showed clearly that they understood that language is the map of a character's mind

Less successful candidates:

- did not address the keyword *presentation*
- wrote character studies of Alex and Riddley, discussed them separately or believed that they did not change and develop as the novels progressed
- did not convince the examiner that they understood that characters in fiction are constructs
- were unable to write convincingly about style
- often believed that Riddley was not intelligent or he was some kind of buffoon
- occasionally were unable to appreciate the language used by Riddley (often referred to as *Riddleyspeak*) and Alex's *nadsat*
- sometimes relied more on Stanley Kubrick's film version of *A Clockwork Orange* than on Anthony Burgess' genuine article

#### **Option 4: Perspectives on 19<sup>th</sup> Century England**

There were many good answers on this popular option and senior examining personnel reported that there was already much evidence of excellent teaching and learning taking place in enthusiastic centres.

#### ***Question 7***

Successful candidates:

- responded in an intelligent and astute manner to the extracts and to the wider novels
- kept a comparison of the extracts at the heart of their answer
- wrote intelligently about the importance of the meetings of Tess and Angel and Sarah and Charles in both extracts
- were clearly aware of the significance of the extracts in terms of the plot development of both novels
- started with the language of the extracts and worked their way out towards the novels' wider themes
- wrote intelligently about such things as nature, education, pathetic fallacy, omens, equality, fatalism, natural selection, dominance, freedom, choice, lies, power in sexual relationships...the extracts gave the most able candidates a great deal of raw material with which to work

Less successful candidates:

- forgot to compare and contrast the extracts
- fell into generalisation, assertion or narrative
- off-loaded centre-prepared notes and paid no attention to the specifics of the question
- sometimes wanted to write essays about the Victorian novel in general terms
- wrote the sort of weak answers referred to in the general introduction

### **Question 8**

(this was the second most popular question on the paper attracting almost as many candidates as Question 4)

Successful candidates:

- kept their answer firmly focused around the key words and understood that Charles and Angel are constructs
- paid due attention to the facts that Hardy is a genuine Victorian commenting on his own society from within and that Fowles is a modern novelist re-creating a Victorian world for his fiction
- kept the comparative nature of the question at the heart of their answers
- showed a clear understanding of the writers at work
- discriminated with style and knowledge selecting the most useful quotation as examples of their argument
- could signpost their way around two long novels by explaining what happened to Charles and Angel at what stage in the texts

Less successful candidates:

- did not address the keywords or did so in an unbalanced way by writing at length about one key word at the expense of the other
- wrote character sketches of Charles and Angel of the kind available in A Level crib notes and revision guides, discussed the characters separately or believed that they did not change and develop as the novels progressed
- fell into narrative or generalised
- crammed in as many alleged similarities as they could think of thus making Charles and Angel appear as more or less the same character
- asserted that Angel and Charles were from the same social class
- referred to Charles and Angel as “love interests”
- did not compare and contrast

### **Option 5: Reflections**

(This was a minority option on the paper attracting only marginally more candidates than Option 1)

### **Question 9**

Successful candidates:

- analysed style with as much rigour as they analysed subject matter
- kept comparison and contrast at the heart of their response
- made the link between the struggle of the dragon-flies for “paradise” and Prue’s own struggle for happiness and found interesting comparisons with Flora’s struggle to improve the lives of the inhabitants of Cold Comfort Farm
- understood that the plot was coming to an end in *Cold Comfort Farm* but the relationship between Prue and Kester was beginning to bloom in *Precious Bane*
- had prepared themselves for the examination by analysing Gibbons’ style of literary pastiche
- were alive to the rich resonances of language in both texts and found interesting things to say about love, secrets, pathos, humour, questions, laughter...

Less successful candidates:

- were heavily reliant on narrative and on explaining the background to the novels
- wrote about one extract then the other without really engaging a comparative analysis



- offered much in the way of biography, especially of Mary Webb
- got lost in subject matter and failed to engage style
- could not contextualise the novels and so were confused by both
- were not alive to the language of the texts
- were sometimes incoherent

### **Question 10**

Successful candidates:

- were able to compare and contrast with skill and discrimination all the way through their answers
- showed a clear understanding of the writers at work
- understood “humour” and “pathos”
- kept their answers firmly focused on the key word *presentation*
- were comfortable in constructing an argument
- found useful and interesting things to say about narrative voice
- in band 4 were entertainingly able to demonstrate that had it not been for the pathos of *Precious Bane* there would be very little in the way of humour in *Cold Comfort Farm*

Less successful candidates:

- did not address the keyword *presentation*
- were over-reliant on centre-inspired notes especially about Mary Webb’s life
- did not convince the examiner that they understood that characters in fiction are constructs
- re-worked narrative
- wrote the sort of weak answers mentioned in the general introduction

### **Option 6: Humorous Writing**

(this was an option of medium popularity, attracting about the same number of candidates as Option 3, more candidates than Options 1 and 5 but fewer than Options 2 and 4)

### **Question 11**

Successful candidates:

- wrote with enthusiasm and understanding about the many explicit links between the extracts: military incompetence, enmity within alleged alliances, lying, paradoxes, obsessions, suffering, stupidity, lists, weaklings, bureaucracy, “lunatics, incompetents, fools and idiots”...
- compared and contrasted throughout their answer
- responded in an astute manner to the extracts and to the wider novels
- started with the language of the extracts and worked their way out towards the novels’ wider themes
- understood authorial intent
- were not afraid to analyse and explore the different narrative voices and perspectives used by de Bernières in the extract from *Captain Corelli’s Mandolin*

Less successful candidates:

- did not understand how the genre operates
- wrote about one extract then the other without really engaging a comparative analysis
- found the novels unwieldy
- got bogged down in unsuccessful attempts to describe subject matter and failed to engage style
- could not place the extracts within the novels as a whole so missed significant details

- asserted and found it difficult to use text
- ignored the different narrative voices in the extract from *Captain Corelli’s Mandolin*

### ***Question 12***

Successful candidates:

- addressed the key phrase “equal measure” with success and discrimination
- understood the terms “hilarious” and “tragic” and how hilarity and tragedy were interwoven in the novels
- analysed the style of the writers at work
- considered complexities and set up a thesis at an early stage in their answers
- could signpost their way around two weighty novels with skill and purpose
- were always aware of the comparative nature of the question

Less successful candidates:

- had no real idea about the meaning of the word “tragedy” and many of the weakest could not even spell it
- gave themselves too narrow a focus
- tried to present an oversimplified argument
- found it difficult to steer their way around the novels and so could not present the most helpful evidence
- gave lists of funny and tragic events with no focus on the comparative nature of the task
- were frequently baffled by the narrative complexity of *Catch-22*

## LTA6 Reading for Meaning

### General

The paper worked well and we saw a good deal of work of the highest standard. Candidates had clearly been trained, for the most part, in how to answer the questions, acknowledging and writing to the dominant assessment objective in each part.

Candidates approached the paper in a variety of ways and employed a stunning array of wider reading to demonstrate “typicality”.

In Question 1(a), even the weakest candidates could make meaning from their readings of the Tennyson, and in 1(b) the extracts proved accessible to all. Better students always start with the meaning, purpose, subject matter, theme of the extract, rather than picking a feature with no sense of the whole, as the weaker candidates do.

### Question 1(a)

Successful candidates:

- **compared** the poems throughout their answers, exploring Tennyson’s Victorian poem with sympathetic insight and analysing Owen’s subversion of the traditional funeral symbols
- compared the funeral ceremonies systematically and thoughtfully in a way that enabled them to assess **moving** and **effective**
- analysed the contrasting structures of the poems and linked them to the making of meaning
- analysed interesting detail: “London’s central roar” and the last three lines of Stanza V in the Tennyson: and “holy glimmers of goodbyes” and “the tenderness of patient minds” in the Owen
- moved between the two poems with confidence, making effective use of text and integrating their quotations
- acknowledged the public qualities of the language in the Tennyson, commenting on the importance of imperatives
- made the **debate** central to their answers, focusing on **how far you agree**

Less successful candidates:

- failed to establish a working **comparison**
- understood the thrust of the Tennyson poem but had real difficulties with the Owen where familiarity seemed to work against them
- failed to probe the way the Owen poem works, assuming that it would be “realistic, gritty, angry, protesting, full of half-rhymes, negative” and letting these assertions take the place of analysis
- did not note the shift in tone between the octave and sestet of the Owen, or ignored the sestet completely
- lacked appropriate critical vocabulary – “Tennyson decided to go with the ‘all over the top approach’”; “Wellington gets the works”
- neglected the **debate**, or addressed it only in a final paragraph

### Question 1(b)

Successful candidates:

- established an overview of the **connections and comparisons** between the three extracts in terms of significant issues and themes as a way of prefacing and organising their answer
- did not forget to compare the examination texts rather than simply linking them to wider reading
- made links to their **wide reading** so as to establish **typicality**
- considered **language, form and structure**
- addressed the writers’ **thoughts and feelings about war**
- explored the significance of the **time of composition and the gender of the writer**

- produced some well-informed writing on the Home-Front, women's writing, loss, and shifting perspectives

Less successful candidates:

- failed to establish convincing **connections and comparisons**
- neglected **wider reading**, thus failing to establish **typicality**
- sometimes offered too much wide reading and neglected the analysis and comparison of the extracts
- made sweeping assertions about women's roles in the war
- asserted that Brittain crafted her letters, completely lacked spontaneity, and that her social class resulted in complex sentences
- found it difficult to decide whether Brittain was pro- or anti-war
- asserted that Whelan's play was a satire in the same way as *Blackadder*
- tended to ignore the text of Tynan's poem and concentrated on *who* was dead, linking her for unconvincing reasons with Brooke and Pope
- did not analyse the extracts
- omitted the exploration of **the writers' thoughts and feelings**, or the impact of **the time of composition or the gender of the writer**

## Mark Range and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
LTA1	20	20	10.6	4.2
LA2C	20	20	13.5	3.7
LA2W	20	20	11.3	4.0
LTA3	40	40	22.0	7.4
LTA4	40	40	22.6	8.1
LA5C	20	20	14.4	3.6
LA5W	20	20	11.2	3.5
LTA6	40	40	22.2	7.8

For units which contain only one component, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

### LTA1 (26943 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	20	15	13	11	9	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LA2C (24400 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	20	16	13	11	9	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LA2W (4284 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	20	15	13	11	9	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LTA3 (29201 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	40	28	24	20	16	12
Uniform Boundary Mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

### LTA4 (18939 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	40	28	24	20	16	13
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LA5C (17407 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	20	16	13	11	9	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LA5W (2207 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	20	15	13	11	9	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### LTA6 (20449 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	40	30	26	22	18	14
Uniform Boundary Mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

## Advanced Subsidiary award

Provisional statistics for the award (24879 candidates)

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	16.9	36.5	61.4	83.5	95.4

## Advanced award

Provisional statistics for the award (20782 candidates)

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	21.5	45.0	71.3	90.8	98.4

## Definitions

**Boundary Mark:** the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

**Mean Mark:** is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

**Standard Deviation:** a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

**Uniform Mark:** a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A is always 80% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50% and grade E is 40%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and the uniform marks for the units which count towards the AS or A-level qualification are added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.