

# **General Certificate of Education**

# **English Language and Literature**6721

Specification A

NTA5 Texts and Audience

# **Mark Scheme**

2008 examination - January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 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.

#### Marking notations for English Language and Literature

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

#### **Points that are correct:**

 $\sqrt{\text{(tick)}}$ : to indicate a positive point (but not rhythmical ticks)

straight underline/

vertical line at side: to indicate a good passage

expl: candidate explains Question 13b pr: Section A

**Errors**:

BE: basic error

mistakes: ringed or marked with S Question 13a

punctuation error: ringed or marked with a P x (cross): to indicate a point is wrong

squiggly

underline: for poor/wrong idea

#### **Marginal annotation:**

#### For Section A

lpt: language point

att: point made about attitudes/values

eg?: lacks example

EWM: engages with meaning

ft: faulty term

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

#### For Question 13a

gr: grammatical error voc: vocabulary error exp: flaw in expression

adap: candidate adapts source text invent: candidate invents material

#### For Question 13b

aud: point made about audience purp: point made about purpose con: point made about context

comp: comparative point form: point made about form voc: vocabulary point made gr: grammatical point made imag: point made about imagery phon: point made about phonology

coh: point made about cohesion struc: point made about structure syn: point made about syntax cont: point made about content eg?: lack of example given

ft: faulty term

EWM: engages with meaning

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

These notations in no way supersede the marginal comments made by examiners, and you should seek to make meaningful but economic comments to show how your marks have been arrived at.

### **MARKING GRID - Section A**

		AO4 (25 marks) Understanding the ways language shapes meaning in different contexts.	AO5 (25 marks) Identifying and considering the ways attitudes and values are conveyed.
Band 5	24 – 25	<ul> <li>sophisticated analysis of the language of the extract <u>and</u> text in order to explore the question</li> <li>insightful demonstration of how language shapes meaning</li> <li>thorough overview</li> <li>entirely relevant response</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>detailed analysis of the range of methods used to convey attitudes and values</li> <li>relevant understanding of dramatic techniques used</li> <li>skilful interpretation of how language is used</li> <li>analytical comments</li> </ul>
21 – 25	21 – 23	<ul> <li>perceptive analysis of the language of the extract <u>and</u> text in order to explore the question</li> <li>skilful grasp of how language can shape meaning</li> <li>sound overview</li> <li>thoroughly relevant response</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>makes range of references to how and where attitudes and values are conveyed</li> <li>detailed reference to the text</li> <li>clear understanding of different ways attitudes/values are conveyed by the dramatist</li> <li>mostly analytical comments</li> </ul>
	18 – 20	<ul> <li>secure engagement with the language of the extract and text in order to explore the question</li> <li>confident grasp of how language can shape meaning</li> <li>explores a range of contexts</li> <li>clear sense of overview</li> <li>relevant response.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>relevant and accurate comment on how and where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>some detailed exploration of the text</li> <li>mostly analytical as well as descriptive comments, but shows a good range of reference.</li> </ul>
Band 4 16 – 20	16 – 17	<ul> <li>grapples with the language of the extract or the text in order to explore the question</li> <li>some clear engagement with how language shapes meaning</li> <li>sustains a clear line of argument</li> <li>explores at least two contexts in detail</li> <li>relevant response</li> <li>overview provided</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>evident understanding of how attitudes/values conveyed in the text</li> <li>appropriate reference to some relevant parts of the text</li> <li>descriptive and analytical comments</li> <li>a range of relevant ideas</li> </ul>
Band 3 11 – 15	14 – 15	<ul> <li>some exploration of the language of the extract or the text in order to explore the question</li> <li>some relevant awareness of how language shapes meaning but under-developed</li> <li>consideration of at least two contexts</li> <li>accurate and generally relevant response</li> <li>some overview</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>can identify a number of attitudes/values found in the text</li> <li>some awareness of how and where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>mostly descriptive comments – analysis emerging</li> </ul>

	11 – 13	<ul> <li>possibly patchy relevance/response to question</li> <li>generalised/isolated/unfocused comment on language of either text or extract</li> <li>beginnings of understanding of how language can shape meaning, but comments lack depth</li> <li>some comment on at least two relevant aspects of language</li> <li>may feature spot</li> <li>ideas mostly simple/ unsophisticated but accurate</li> <li>limited overview</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>general or broad awareness of where attitudes/values are conveyed</li> <li>adequate, if limited, comment</li> <li>mostly descriptive comments</li> <li>ideas mostly simple / unsophisticated but accurate</li> </ul>
Band 2 6 – 10	8 – 10	<ul> <li>possibly a largely narrative response</li> <li>general awareness of the writer's techniques but on the level of assertion and/or generalisation</li> <li>one aspect of language referred to possibly in general terms</li> <li>possibly only occasional relevance</li> <li>some flaws in understanding may be evident</li> <li>no real sense of overview</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>simple/oblique comments on attitudes/values</li> <li>probably lacking textual evidence</li> <li>unsupported assertions</li> <li>possibly a number of irrelevant ideas about attitudes and values</li> </ul>
	6 – 7	<ul> <li>superficial understanding of language and context</li> <li>simplistic ideas</li> <li>flaws in understanding are likely to be evident</li> <li>possibly largely irrelevant</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>very limited grasp of how attitudes/values conveyed</li> <li>some explanation may be attempted</li> <li>possibly mostly irrelevant ideas about attitudes and values</li> </ul>
Band 1 0 – 5	4 – 5	<ul> <li>very limited ideas about how language shapes meaning</li> <li>may identify a feature of language but unable to comment on effect of this</li> <li>likely to be irrelevant or reveal very serious misinterpretation throughout</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>possibly no comment or only brief passing reference to attitudes/values</li> <li>possibly many erroneous comments on attitudes and values</li> </ul>
	0 – 3	little or no understanding shown of the text, question or language	no comments/wholly erroneous comments on a/v

1. *Hamlet*. How does Shakespeare portray doubt and indecision, here **and** elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Hamlet's self-criticism
- extract imagery
- extract comparison between himself and Fortinbras
- extract contradictions within the soliloguy
- extract final decision to act
- · Hamlet's other soliloquies
- Hamlet torn between revenge and conscience.

2. *Hamlet*. Explore Shakespeare's presentation of Polonius, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Polonius' attitude towards deception and Laertes
- extract Polonius' use of questions
- extract Polonius' use of direct speech
- extract Polonius' use of imagery
- Polonius' self-importance
- Polonius the spy
- pedantic.

3. **Twelfth Night**. Explore the role and presentation of Sir Andrew, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Sir Andrew misunderstands 'accost'
- extract Sir Andrew manipulated by Sir Toby
- extract Sir Andrew's use of interrogatives
- extract and elsewhere Sir Andrew's lack of intelligence
- Sir Andrew's relationship with Sir Toby
- Sir Andrew's 'duel' with Viola.

4. **Twelfth Night**. How does Shakespeare explore the idea of madness, here **and** elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract language relating to madness
- extract Malvolio pushed towards insanity
- extract Feste's deliberately 'insane' references
- many references to madness in the play
- events appear 'mad'/irrational
- · Olivia thinks Malvolio mad
- the madness of love.

5. King Lear. How does Shakespeare present Cordelia, here and elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Cordelia's asides and reluctance to speak
- extract contrast with Regan
- extract Cordelia's honesty
- extract balanced nature of her longer speech
- Cordelia's genuine concern for her father
- her honesty and integrity
- her death.

6. *King Lear*. Examine Shakespeare's presentation of nature, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract description of the storm
- extract storm as metaphor for Lear's state of mind
- extract Lear's second person address to nature
- Lear's preoccupation with what is 'natural'
- · different views on human nature
- undermining of the 'natural order'.

7. **The Winter's Tale**. Examine the role and presentation of the shepherds, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract shepherd's views on life
- extract shepherds uneducated
- extract Clown's 'comic' description
- extract use of prose
- · shepherds represent honesty and simplicity
- shepherds contrast with Leontes and Polixenes
- shepherds comic role
- shepherd's role in saving Perdita.

8. **The Winter's Tale**. How does Shakespeare explore ideas about friendship, here **and** elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Hermione's banter with Polixenes
- extract prisoner/guest image
- extract references to Polixenes and Leontes as boys
- extract language of friendship
- · jealousy between friends
- · Paulina's friendship with Leontes
- · friendship among the shepherds.

9. **Doctor Faustus**. How are Faustus's attitudes towards damnation presented, here **and** elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Faustus' awareness that he is damned
- extract Faustus' regret
- extract Faustus' use of exclamations and interrogatives
- extract Faustus' use of invocation
- Faustus' earlier lack of concern/disbelief
- Faustus' later fear
- belief and idea of damnation linked.

10. **Doctor Faustus**. Explore the role and presentation of Mephastophilis, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Mephastophilis' control of Faustus
- extract Mephastophilis' use of directives
- · extract and elsewhere Mephastophilis as messenger of Lucifer
- Mephastophilis on stage for much of the play
- Mephastophilis' role as tempter
- · relationship between Faustus and Mephastophilis
- some sympathy for Mephastophilis?

11. *The Rover*. Examine Behn's presentation of the relationship between the cavaliers, here **and** elsewhere in the play.

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract friendly exchanges
- extract share similar attitudes towards women
- extract sense of unity use of 'we'
- support for each other elsewhere in the play
- · enjoyment of each other's company
- exiles.

12. *The Rover*. How does Behn convey attitudes towards arranged marriage, here **and** elsewhere in the play?

Assessment Objectives tested on this question: AO4 (25 marks), AO5 (25 marks). Question total 50 marks

Candidates *could* include some of the ideas listed in their answers. These are provided as an indication of suitable content and it is not expected that candidates will include all of these ideas. Examiners should be alert to other, acceptable ideas.

- extract Hellena's negative description
- extract Pedro's attitude
- extract Hellena's strong-willed defiance
- Angellica's view that wives and prostitutes have much in common
- disguise 'frees' women from constraints
- Hellena chooses marriage to Willmore
- · Belville 'claims' Florinda.

#### 13a: Practical writing

In the Indicative Content section for Band 5 and top Band 4 are specific key elements of the original texts, some of which should be included in order to meet the requirements of the task. This 'key content' will be finalised at the pre-standardisation meeting.

		AO6 (25 marks x 2) (Style/Accuracy)	Indicative Content/Skills
Band 5 (21 – 25)	24 – 25	<ul> <li>expression precise and wholly appropriate</li> <li>subtlety of effect</li> <li>cohesive writing that works</li> <li>audience completely engaged</li> <li>stylish</li> <li>rare errors</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>all aspects of task addressed</li> <li>skilful adaptation of material from both texts</li> <li>style is wholly appropriate and convincing for audience and purpose</li> <li>skilfully contextualised</li> <li>Key content: *(see p.21)</li> </ul>
	21 – 23	<ul> <li>sustained use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>confidently meets requirements of task</li> <li>firm control of accuracy</li> <li>confident style</li> <li>rare errors</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>effective writing</li> <li>effective use of information from both texts</li> <li>successfully contextualised</li> <li>Key content: *(see p.21)</li> </ul>
Band 4 (16 – 20)	18 – 20	<ul> <li>effective use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>fulfils requirements of task</li> <li>mostly technically accurate</li> <li>secure style</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>convincing</li> <li>ability to produce and handle an appropriate form</li> <li>appropriate use of information from both texts</li> <li>material clearly adapted for new context</li> <li>Key content: *(see p.21)</li> </ul>
	16 – 17	<ul> <li>successful use of appropriate style for audience and purpose</li> <li>sound approach to task</li> <li>underlying technical control</li> <li>logical organisation of ideas</li> <li>some slips</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>clear awareness of audience and purpose</li> <li>sound style, but may be slightly inconsistent</li> <li>information mostly appropriate         <ul> <li>any lapses very minor</li> <li>sound focus on task</li> <li>sound adaptation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Band 3 (11 – 15)	14 – 15	<ul> <li>clear attempt to use appropriate style for audience or purpose although some lapses</li> <li>expression clear and generally controlled</li> <li>some technical flaws</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>awareness of audience and form</li> <li>generally sound focus on task</li> <li>appropriate content with some gaps</li> <li>may be some relatively minor invention of information</li> <li>reader will have some engagement</li> <li>mostly appropriate for audience/purpose</li> </ul>
	11 – 13	<ul> <li>shaping evident and some awareness of appropriate style for audience or purpose but patchy</li> <li>expression may lack flexibility or accuracy</li> <li>a number of technical flaws but limited basic error</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>approach may not be entirely appropriate for audience/purpose</li> <li>information from texts may not be well adapted or totally accurate</li> <li>may invent some information rather than re-cast</li> <li>patchy sense of context</li> <li>possibly limited info from texts/brief response</li> </ul>
Band 2 (6 – 10)	8 – 10	<ul> <li>style/approach not especially convincing, although some attempt to shape for audience or purpose</li> <li>likely to be a range of flaws in expression</li> <li>likely to be frequent technical errors</li> <li>limited sense of context</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>likely to be some noticeable misjudgements about audience/purpose</li> <li>likely to reveal some misreading/misunderstanding of original text(s)</li> <li>may invent a good deal of material</li> <li>possibly some unadapted lifting</li> <li>not well contextualised</li> </ul>
	6 – 7	<ul> <li>style not secure for audience/purpose</li> <li>likely to be simplistic in language or approach</li> <li>likely to have intrusive errors</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>comments limited and general</li> <li>probably unadapted lifting</li> <li>likely to reveal major misreading/misunderstanding</li> </ul>
Band 1 (1 – 5)	4 – 5	<ul> <li>occasional awareness of audience/purpose glimpsed</li> <li>intrusive basic errors</li> <li>highly simplistic</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>very limited awareness of audience or purpose</li> <li>basic misjudgements of form</li> <li>very limited use of information from texts</li> </ul>
	1 – 3	<ul> <li>frequent weaknesses in expression</li> <li>major technical flaws</li> <li>entirely inappropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>no sense of form or shaping of material for audience/purpose</li> <li>totally unfocused</li> </ul>

#### \* Sixteen areas for key content

- a. we hear but we don't always listen
- b. listening is an active process
- c. conversation ends when one person stops listening / a good conversationalist spends more time listening

#### Problems:

- d. not noticing how the speaker feels / not noticing context
- e. becoming distracted / hear only what we want to / limited listening
- f. put off by context or speaker
- g. preparing what to say rather than listening / only concerned about own views
- h. not looking as if we're listening
- i. pretending to listen but not

#### How to improve listening skills:

- j. reflect back what has been said
- k. give verbal/ non-verbal feedback
- I. maintain attention
- m. remove distractions
- n. empathise
- o. delay evaluation until you've fully understood what's said
- p. do radio news exercise

#### 16 available points

24 – 25 marks: at least 10 points 21 – 23 marks: at least 9 points 18 – 20 marks: at least 8 points

## 13b - Commentary through analysis

		AO1(25 marks) (knowledge/ terminology/ analysis of language)	AO4(25 marks) (context/comparison/ language choices)	Indicative skills/content
Band 5	24 – 25	<ul> <li>searching and confident literary/linguistic analysis</li> <li>wholly accurate use of appropriate terminology/concepts</li> </ul>	skilful comparison showing thorough understanding of context(s)	<ul> <li>explores languages and engages closely with meaning</li> <li>insight shown into a range of features</li> </ul>
(21 – 25)	21 – 23	<ul> <li>largely accurate use of appropriate terminology/concepts</li> <li>sustained and cogent argument</li> <li>clear and detailed</li> </ul>	detailed and confident comparison showing understanding of how form, style and vocabulary shape meaning     uses examples from both texts	<ul> <li>framework for analysis skilfully employed</li> <li>grapples with meaning</li> <li>confidently and accurately expressed</li> <li>uses a range of examples from both texts, clearly analysed</li> </ul>
Band 4 (16 – 20)	18 – 20	<ul> <li>coherent/illuminating analysis of distinctive language features</li> <li>well sustained argument using a range of literary/linguistic terms/concepts</li> <li>accurate use of framework terms</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>close focus on both texts</li> <li>confident analysis and comparison</li> <li>clear awareness of contextual variation</li> <li>clear comments on key areas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>engages with meaning and draws thoughtful conclusions</li> <li>identifies p.o.s and ss accurately</li> <li>points will be well made</li> <li>close focus on some details</li> </ul>
	16 – 17	<ul> <li>describes significant language features</li> <li>some exploratory analysis</li> <li>framework terms used mostly accurately</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>clear and competent comparison</li> <li>sound awareness of contextual variation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>shows engagement with the texts</li> <li>points mostly well made</li> <li>p.o.s and ss mostly accurately identified</li> </ul>

	14 – 15	<ul> <li>analysis emerging but not sustained</li> <li>literary/linguistic framework used fairly accurately</li> <li>analysis lacks depth</li> <li>distinguishes between some details</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>makes some valid comparisons</li> <li>some understanding of contextual variation but not fully explored</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>explanation evident</li> <li>own text analysed and compared to other text</li> <li>a number of features commented on but gaps</li> <li>some apt examples but also some imprecise/general comments</li> <li>possibly list-like</li> </ul>
Band 3 (11 – 15)	11 – 13	<ul> <li>lacks precise linguistic/literary terminology</li> <li>makes mostly general points about language and style</li> <li>limited ability to deal with complex ideas</li> <li>analysis underdeveloped</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>comparisons made but mostly on a general level</li> <li>some limited comment on context</li> <li>likely to focus more on content than on language</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>tends to refer vaguely to language levels and appeal to/impact on audience rather than analysing specific details</li> <li>identifies features mostly accurately but makes some errors and leaves points half made</li> <li>lack of precision and limited number of examples</li> <li>may feature spot</li> <li>possibly focuses more on content than style</li> </ul>
Band 2 (6 – 10)	8 – 10	<ul> <li>awareness of basic characteristics of specific genre</li> <li>simple points made about language</li> <li>partial use of framework(s)</li> <li>some misunderstanding evident</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>limited comparisons made</li> <li>partially sees how context influences language use</li> <li>some general comment on techniques</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>tends to make very vague comments</li> <li>comments are broad and general with few examples</li> <li>ideas fairly accurate but some misunderstanding/err or may be evident</li> <li>possibly focus on design/layout/graph/content</li> </ul>
	6 – 7	<ul> <li>rare language choices commented on</li> <li>response to surface features</li> <li>minimal use of framework(s)/terminology</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>very limited comparisons made</li> <li>superficial/simplistic ideas on language use in relation to context</li> <li>vague awareness of audience/aim</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>simplistic understanding and exploration of one area</li> <li>very few, if any, examples</li> <li>some errors of explanation</li> </ul>

	4 – 5	<ul> <li>no analytical insight</li> <li>misreadings/ misunderstandings evident</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>probably no comparisons made</li> <li>very limited or no awareness of context</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>partial purely descriptive comments</li> <li>intrusive errors</li> </ul>
Band 1 (1 – 5)	1 – 3	<ul> <li>no literary/linguistic insight shown</li> <li>many errors/</li> <li>misreadings/</li> <li>misunderstandings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>very limited/no ideas on how language shapes meaning</li> <li>no comparisons made</li> <li>no awareness shown of how context and language shape meaning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>major         misunderstandings of         text and task</li> <li>commentary is not         explanatory</li> <li>frequent major         weaknesses in         expression</li> </ul>

p.o.s = parts of speech ss = sentence structures