

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

**MARK SCHEME for the June 2006 question paper**

**8004 GENERAL PAPER**  
**8004/01, 02, 03 Papers 1-3**  
**Maximum raw mark 100**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the Report on the Examination for this session.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2006 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS LEVEL – June 2006	8004

### USE OF ENGLISH (maximum 20 marks)

All mistakes must be underlined and the nature of the error clearly shown in the right hand margin:

- S = spelling
- P = punctuation
- G = grammar
- E = clumsy or awkward expression.

When a mistake is repeated, please underline it in the text.

#### Refer to the Use of English criteria table.

Examiners should match the overall quality of the English with one of the six general descriptors (ranging from 'very poor' to 'excellent') as the first stage of the Use of English assessment. The quality statements which are typically found within each band should help in placing the mark for English at the appropriate place within the identified range. The statement of error incidence within each band will further assist. The criteria should be used with some flexibility; Examiners should look for a best fit.

### CONTENT (maximum 30 MARKS)

Marking should be based on scope, choice, relevance of material; maturity of thought; perception, reasoning power – again a flexible approach is advised.

In the left hand margin, each valid point must be noted. Repetition ('rep.') and irrelevance ('irr.') must also be noted.

#### Refer to the Content criteria table.

Examiners should make an initial general quality judgement using one of the five descriptors, (bearing in mind photocopies of scripts discussed at the Co-ordination meeting). This overall judgement should then be refined within the identified band to arrive at the mark the essay merits. Please note that although the characteristics of each band are typical of work within that range, they are neither inclusive nor exclusive but are for guidance only.

**USE OF ENGLISH CRITERIA TABLE**

	Marks	
<b>Band 1</b> (‘excellent’)	<b>18 – 20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fully operational command of English</li> <li>• (near) native fluency</li> <li>• authentic idioms and expressions</li> <li>• (near) faultless grammar</li> <li>• appropriate and ambitious vocabulary</li> <li>• excellent spelling</li> <li>• correct punctuation</li> <li>• <b>very low error frequency</b></li> </ul>
<b>Band 2</b> (‘good-very good’)	<b>14 – 17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effective command of English</li> <li>• good use of idioms and expressions</li> <li>• reasonably fluent</li> <li>• few grammatical inaccuracies</li> <li>• good range of relevant and perhaps ambitious vocabulary</li> <li>• good spelling</li> <li>• few punctuation errors</li> <li>• <b>low error frequency.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Band 3</b> (‘average’)	<b>10 – 13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reasonable command of English; meaning is not in doubt</li> <li>• generally appropriate use of idioms and expressions</li> <li>• some fluency</li> <li>• some grammatical errors but an acceptable standard overall.</li> <li>• fair (possibly limited) range of vocabulary</li> <li>• sound spelling with few lapses</li> <li>• some careless punctuation</li> <li>• <b>average error frequency</b></li> </ul>
<b>Band 4</b> (‘below average’)	<b>6 – 9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inconsistent command of English</li> <li>• hesitant fluency</li> <li>• meaning mostly clear</li> <li>• some inappropriate idioms and expressions</li> <li>• regular grammatical errors</li> <li>• limited vocabulary</li> <li>• some spelling and punctuation errors</li> <li>• <b>above average error frequency</b></li> </ul>
<b>Band 5</b> (‘weak’)	<b>3 – 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• poor command of English</li> <li>• poor fluency</li> <li>• often incorrect use of idioms and expressions</li> <li>• meaning often breaks down or lacks clarity</li> <li>• insecure grammar – frequent rudimentary errors</li> <li>• limited and sometimes inappropriate vocabulary</li> <li>• frequent spelling and punctuation mistakes</li> <li>• <b>high error frequency</b></li> </ul>
<b>Band 6</b> (‘very weak’)	<b>0 – 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• virtually every line with (many) errors</li> <li>• no real functional command of English</li> <li>• no fluency</li> <li>• often incomprehensible use of idioms and expressions</li> <li>• very poor grammar</li> <li>• full of basic error</li> <li>• very poor range of vocabulary</li> <li>• meaning often unclear / incomprehensible</li> <li>• no effective communication</li> <li>• very frequent errors in spelling and punctuation</li> <li>• <b>extremely high error frequency</b></li> </ul>

### CONTENT CRITERIA TABLE

<b>Band 1</b> <b>'excellent'</b>	<b>26 – 30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ample material; totally relevant, interesting, perceptive, with evidence of originality</li> <li>• thoughtful illustration using local/regional/national/ international examples</li> <li>• coherent discussion, displaying balance, sensitivity, awareness and maturity of approach</li> </ul>
<b>Band 2</b> <b>'good-very good'</b>	<b>20 – 25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ample material; totally (or near totally) relevant, perceptive but not as original or as well illustrated as answers in Band 1</li> <li>• sound balance; well structured</li> <li>• good knowledge of topic demonstrated</li> </ul>
<b>Band 3</b> <b>'average'</b>	<b>13 – 19</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ample, competent, workmanlike, if predictable subject matter</li> <li>• little flair</li> <li>• balance perhaps not ideal but shows fair knowledge and generally sticks to the question</li> </ul>
<b>Band 4</b> <b>'below average'</b>	<b>7 – 12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not bereft of sense and reasoning, but content is predictable/ dull</li> <li>• ideas vague and/or lacking sustained development</li> <li>• may be attempting to modify a prepared essay to fit the question without real success</li> <li>• largely relevant but some (short) digressions</li> <li>• not much apt illustration</li> <li>• unconvincing balance</li> </ul>
<b>Band 5</b> <b>'weak'</b>	<b>3 – 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• vague, confused ideas, inadequate content;</li> <li>• more significantly digressive than a Band 4 answer</li> <li>• limited relevance; little or no use of examples</li> <li>• poor knowledge of topic</li> <li>• question largely misunderstood.</li> </ul>
<b>Band 6</b> <b>'very weak'</b>	<b>0-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• very vague, confused ideas</li> <li>• content is largely or completely irrelevant to the task; no relevant examples</li> <li>• very little or no knowledge shown of the topic</li> <li>• question has been completely misunderstood</li> </ul>