



GRADE 12 EXAMINATION
NOVEMBER 2014

ADVANCED PROGRAMME ENGLISH

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 3 hours

300 marks

These marking guidelines are prepared for use by examiners and sub-examiners, all of whom are required to attend a standardisation meeting to ensure that the guidelines are consistently interpreted and applied in the marking of candidates' scripts.

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. It is also recognised that, without the benefit of attendance at a standardisation meeting, there may be different interpretations of the application of the marking guidelines.

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

4	<p style="text-align: center;">50 – 59</p> <p>The response is merely adequate. The reasoning and thinking displayed in the response are only mediocre, and reasoning and thought are not always sustained or clear. Insight into prescribed texts is lacking in depth and sufficient understanding. The argument is not always logical, successful, or focused. The breadth of knowledge and the depth of knowledge are lacking in sufficiency, and are, at times, inaccurate. The candidate's personal voice is not effectively present. The style of writing is adequate; however, there are stylistically weak areas. Quotations are not used effectively or virtually not at all. Structure/paragraphing is often poor.</p>
3	<p style="text-align: center;">40 – 49</p> <p>The response is weak. The reasoning and thinking are flawed and lack logic. Insight into the prescribed texts is weak and the candidate's understanding is superficial. The argument is not sustained and often deviates from the topic. The candidate's response does not illustrate either breadth OR depth of knowledge. There are a number of inaccuracies in relation to textual reference, and these inaccuracies have a negative impact on the candidate's response. The candidate's response displays superficial evidence of a personal voice. The style of writing is flawed and is characterised by obvious weakness in basic language structures. The candidate does not know the texts well enough to draw on them directly. Structure/paragraphing is poor.</p>
1 – 2	<p style="text-align: center;">0 – 39</p> <p>The response is mostly unintelligible. The quality of reasoning and thinking is wholly inadequate and the candidate's response displays minimal understanding of the prescribed texts. The argument is fragmented and there is almost no focus on the topic. The response is so limited that there is no evidence of breadth or depth or, indeed, anything other than the most basic textual reference. There is no evidence of a personal voice in the candidate's response. The style of writing is completely inadequate. The candidate does not have sufficient knowledge of the texts to draw on them in any direct way. Structure/paragraphing is, generally, non-existent.</p>