



GRADE 12 EXAMINATION  
NOVEMBER 2011

## ADVANCED PROGRAMME ENGLISH

### MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 3 hours

300 marks

---

**These marking guidelines were used as the basis for the official IEB marking session. They were prepared for use by examiners and sub-examiners, all of whom were required to attend a rigorous standardisation meeting to ensure that the guidelines were consistently and fairly interpreted and applied in the marking of candidates' scripts.**

**At standardisation meetings, decisions are taken regarding the allocation of marks in the interests of fairness to all candidates in the context of an entirely summative assessment.**

**The IEB will not enter into any discussions or correspondence about any marking guidelines. It is acknowledged that there may be different views about some matters of emphasis or detail in the guidelines, and different interpretations of the application thereof. Hence, the specific mark allocations have been omitted.**

---

Level	Descriptor
7+	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>90 – 100</b></p> <p>The response can be characterised as <b>intriguing, profoundly thoughtful, extraordinary</b>. It displays <b>sustained sophisticated reasoning and thinking</b>. The candidate's <b>insight into the prescribed texts is superb</b>. The candidate's <b>capacity to integrate a range of texts in a coherent way is seamless and exceptionally well-articulated</b>. The argument is <b>highly intelligent</b> and makes a <b>substantial impact</b> on the marker. The response <b>displays exceptional breadth and depth of interpretation of the texts</b> which the candidate has studied, and the candidate has <b>used the issues raised in the texts to articulate his/her response to the question most convincingly</b>. The candidate's <b>personal voice is scintillating</b> and <b>his/her perspective is candid</b>. The style of writing is <b>exceptionally engaging</b>; it is a privilege to read such an essay.</p>
7-	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>80 – 89</b></p> <p>The response is <b>gripping, creatively thoughtful, often extraordinary</b>. It displays <b>lucid reasoning and thinking</b>. The candidate's <b>insight into the prescribed texts is distinctive</b>. The candidate has been <b>most successful in integrating a range of texts in a coherent and sustained manner</b>. The argument is <b>memorable and intelligent</b>, and it <b>makes an impact</b>. The response <b>displays breadth and depth of interpretation of the texts</b> which the candidate has studied and <b>uses the issues raised in the texts to discuss his/her response to the question very successfully</b>. The candidate's <b>personal voice is powerful</b>. The style of writing is <b>engaging</b>; it is a pleasure to read.</p>
6	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>70 – 79</b></p> <p>The response is <b>effective, thoughtful, and generally very good</b>. It is <b>underpinned by clear reasoning and thinking</b>, although some lapses may occur. <b>Insight into prescribed texts is impressive</b>. The candidate is <b>able to integrate a range of texts in his/her response, and the references are clear and relevant</b>. The argument is <b>logical and thought-provoking</b>. The learner <b>displays sufficient breadth and depth of interpretation of the texts</b> which he/she has studied and <b>has used the issues raised in the texts to reflect his/her understanding of the question</b>. The candidate's <b>personal voice is clearly evident</b>. The style of writing is <b>effective</b>; the candidate's response reads fluently.</p>
5	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>60 – 69</b></p> <p>The response is <b>thoughtful and cogent</b>. There is <b>solid reasoning and thinking</b>, although this is not always sustained. <b>Insight into prescribed texts is good</b>. The candidate is able to <b>use an integration of texts in his/her response, and the references are mostly relevant</b>. The argument is <b>generally clear and appropriate</b>. While there is <b>evidence of some breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding</b>, such qualities are <b>not always consistent</b>, and there are <b>a number of lapses which detract from the overall quality</b>. The candidate's <b>personal voice is in evidence</b>. The style of writing is <b>generally good</b>; it reads with an acceptable fluency, although there are stylistically weak areas.</p>
4	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>50 – 59</b></p> <p>The response is <b>merely adequate</b>. The <b>reasoning and thinking displayed in the response are only mediocre</b>, and reasoning and thought are <b>not always sustained or clear</b>. <b>Insight into prescribed texts is often lacking in depth and sufficient understanding</b>. The argument is <b>not always logical, successful, or focused</b>. The <b>breadth of knowledge and the depth of knowledge are lacking in sufficiency, and are, at times, inaccurate</b>. The candidate's <b>personal voice is not effectively present</b>. The style of writing is <b>adequate</b>; however, there are stylistically weak areas.</p>

3	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>40 – 49</b></p> <p>The response is <b>weak</b>. The <b>reasoning and thinking are flawed and lack logic</b>. <b>Insight into the prescribed texts is weak</b> and the candidate's <b>understanding is superficial</b>. The argument is <b>not sustained and often deviates from the topic</b>. The candidate's response <b>does not illustrate either breadth OR depth of knowledge</b>. There are <b>a number of inaccuracies in relation to textual reference</b>, and these inaccuracies have a negative impact on the candidate's response. The candidate's response displays <b>superficial evidence of a personal voice</b>. The <b>style of writing is flawed</b> and is characterised by obvious weakness in basic language structures.</p>
1 – 2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0 – 39</b></p> <p>The response is <b>mostly unintelligible</b>. The <b>quality of reasoning and thinking is wholly inadequate</b> and the candidate's <b>response displays minimal understanding of the prescribed texts</b>. The argument is <b>very fragmented</b> and there is <b>almost no focus on the topic</b>. The <b>response is so limited</b> that there is <b>no evidence of breadth or depth</b> or, indeed, anything other than the most basic textual reference. There is <b>no evidence of a personal voice</b> in the candidate's response. The <b>style of writing is completely inadequate</b>.</p>