



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
NOVEMBER 2011

ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE: PAPER II

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 3 hours

100 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.

SECTION A LITERATURE**QUESTION 1****SHAKESPEARE MINI-ESSAY (10 + 20)****ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

This rubric serves to guide the marking process. Markers should be aware that the mark for the planning and structure element need not correspond with the mark for 'engaging with text'. A candidate may, for example, achieve a level 7 for 'planning and structure', but only a level 5 for 'engaging with text'. (e.g. 8 + 11 = 19).

CANDIDATES SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THEY WILL BE PENALISED FOR EXCEEDING LENGTH REQUIREMENTS:

- Length requirements (350 – 400 words) are part of the challenge. Essays that are too short will penalise themselves in any case because the response will, in all likelihood, be superficial or will have failed to engage thoughtfully with the required area of debate.
- Essays that are too long must be penalised substantially. A suggestion: over 450 words (can only receive a maximum of 70%); over 500 words (can only receive a maximum of 65%); over 600 words (can only receive a maximum of 60%).
- If there is no planning page, the candidate may receive no more than 60%.
- If candidates only tell the story and do not engage with the question, they may receive no more than 30%. If the majority of the essay is narrative, is relatively well written and there is some attempt to respond to the question, they could attain up to 50%. (We would imagine that a competent 'old' standard grade candidate would be somewhere in this bracket.)
- A candidate must receive less than 40% (i.e. fail) if it is clear that they do not know the given text. These mini-essays will demonstrate a lack of structure and/or a completely unsuccessful attempt to answer the question.
- Candidates whose responses rely on film versions of the prescribed texts must be severely penalised.

LEVEL	MARK	PLANNING AND STRUCTURE	ENGAGING WITH TEXT
7	90 – 100	9 – 10	18 – 20
		Extreme clarity of organisation and thought. Completely focused on the question. Highly sophisticated. Paragraphing order – entirely logical. Links between plan and essay are totally clear. Totally relevant and pertinent quotations are included. Structure of plan mirrors that of essay. Sophisticated integration and synthesis between question, 'extra' text (visual) and text. The plan is so detailed and complete that the essay itself is almost unnecessary.	Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice – the ability to assert and justify personal opinions convincingly. Superb flair in interpretation and expression. Almost/Perfect tone, style and diction. Thorough, astute knowledge of text which enables candidate to select or omit relevant information. Makes use of a 'sparkling' style. Extreme clarity and logic of thought. Quotations are interwoven seamlessly into the response. Essay structure mirrors that of the plan. Highly sophisticated and superior language skills. Candidate shows an ability to extract, omit and synthesise information.
		At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that this candidate presented an almost perfect piece. The plan and the essay mirror one another. Quotations were included as an integral part of the piece. There should be a sense that the candidate could have done very little in order to improve the piece.	

7	80 – 89	8 – 8.5	16 – 17.5
		<p>Excellent clarity of organisation and thought. Excellent focus on the question. Extremely logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are extremely clear. Extremely good choice made of quotations. Excellent structure linking plan and essay. Excellent integration between question and texts. The plan is extremely detailed and complete. It is clear that this is a superior piece.</p>	<p>Evidence of candidate's original voice – the ability to assert and justify personal opinions convincingly. Flair in interpretation and expression. Excellent tone, style and diction. Thorough, detailed knowledge of text which enables candidate to select or omit relevant information. Makes use of a style that is sophisticated. Excellent clarity and logic of thought. Quotations are interwoven with great skill into the response. Essay structure mirrors that of the plan. Superior language skills. Candidate shows an ability to extract, omit and synthesise information.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must have the sense that this is a superior candidate who has an excellent grasp of the text(s) as well as the skills required to complete the task. There should, however, be a sense that the candidate needed just a little more polish, flair or sophistication in order to achieve close to or full marks. There may be minor flaws in expression, or a sense that some quotes could have been more thoughtfully integrated.</p>	
6	75 – 79	7.5	15.5
		<p>Very good clarity of organisation and thought. Very good focus on the question. Logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are clear. Very good choice made of quotations. Very good structure linking plan and essay. Very good integration between question and texts. The plan is detailed and complete. It is clear that this is a very good piece of planning which just lacks that 'sparkle' needed for a Level 7.</p>	<p>Evidence of the candidate's original voice – some ability to assert and justify personal opinions – consistent engagement with the question. Some flair in interpretation and expression. Very good tone, style and diction. Thorough knowledge of text which enables candidate to select or omit relevant information. Makes use of a style that is elevated but lacks the 'sparkle' needed for a Level 7. Clear and logical – fluent and reasonable. Quotations are used well, but without flair. Essay structure mirrors that of the plan. Very good language skills. Candidate shows an ability to extract, omit and synthesise information.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response the marker must have the sense that with a little more polish, this candidate could achieve a Level 7. There could be slight problems with expression, style or language usage or perhaps a gap in content knowledge, but there are quotations and references to the texts and it is clear that this candidate is highly competent. The essay will be extremely well written, but the 'sparkle' needed to lift it to a Level 7 is missing.</p>	

6	70 – 74	7	14 – 15
		<p>Very good clarity of organisation and thought. Might be slightly off topic in one or two places. Very good focus on the question but there will be areas where depth is needed. Logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay will be clear. Good choice made of quotations. There might be a mis-quote or paraphrasing, but it is clear that the candidate has a thorough knowledge of the text. Very good structure linking plan and essay. Very good integration between question and texts. The plan is detailed and complete. It is clear that this is a very good piece of planning.</p>	<p>Evidence of the candidate's original voice – an ability to introduce and sustain a personal opinion, accompanied by a sound knowledge of the text. Some flair in interpretation and expression, but very little 'sparkle'. Very good tone, style and diction. Very good knowledge of text which mostly enables the candidate to select or omit relevant information. Makes use of a style that is good, but plain. Clear and logical – fluent and reasonable. Some quotations or references, mostly used well, but without flair. May be evidence of mis-quoting or incorrect interpretation of some quotations. Essay structure mostly mirrors that of the plan. Very good language skills. Candidate mostly shows the ability to extract, omit and synthesise information.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate is very competent across most fields – expression, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning will be mostly straightforward and simple, but there is a clear argument that is well supported and referenced – if at times indirectly – to all of the texts referred to in the question.</p>	
5	60 – 69	6 – 6.5	12 – 13.5
		<p>Good clarity of organisation and thought. Might be slightly off topic in places. Good, if pedestrian focus on the question. There will be areas where depth is needed. Mostly logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are mostly clear. Few quotations. There might be a mis-quote or paraphrasing, but it is clear that the candidate has a working knowledge of the text. Good structure linking plan and essay. Some integration between question and texts. The plan is complete and mostly clear. There might be a lack of reference to each of the texts referred to in the question here, or integration with the 'extra' text might be limited or flawed.</p>	<p>Some evidence of the candidate's original voice, which might be sustained. Some ability to introduce, but perhaps not sustain a personal opinion, accompanied by a sound knowledge of the text. Slight flair in interpretation and expression, but pedestrian in style. Average tone, style and diction. Good knowledge of text which mostly enables the candidate to select or omit relevant information. Mostly clear and logical – fluent and reasonable. Some quotations or references, used without flair. May be evidence of mis-quoting or incorrect interpretation of some quotations. Essay structure mostly mirrors that of the plan. Good, plain use of language.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate is competent across most fields – expression, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning will be straightforward and simple, the style will be pedestrian, but there will still be a clear argument that is mostly supported and referenced to the texts referred to in the question. The response will be solid, but unimpressive. The marker will get the sense that the essay has 'done the job' but in an uninspiring manner. The plan may need to be re-worked in some areas.</p>	

4	50 – 59	5 – 5.5	10 – 11.5
		<p>Some organisation and thought but there will be evidence of uncertainty when evaluating and synthesising information. Mostly pedestrian focus on the question. Depth is needed. Some logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are tenuous. Very few quotations. There might be incorrect references to the text. Linking between plan and essay might be problematic. Integration between question and texts is lacking. The plan might be partially complete and might not be totally clear. There will probably be a lack of reference to each of the texts referred to in the question here, or integration with the 'extra' text will be limited or flawed.</p>	<p>Slight evidence of the candidate's original voice, which will not be sustained. Slight ability to introduce, but probably not sustain a personal opinion. A basic knowledge of the text. Very little flair in interpretation and expression. Tone, style and/or diction might be flawed. Basic knowledge of text which allows the candidate to select or omit relevant information. Mostly clear and logical. Will probably be areas that are problematic. Almost no quotations or direct references. May be evidence of mis-quoting or incorrect interpretation of some quotations. Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan. Plain perhaps flawed use of language.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate is not completely competent across all fields – there will be problems with expression, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning will be straightforward and simple and perhaps flawed in places. The style will be plain; however, there will still be a clear argument albeit one that lacks support and references to the texts referred to in the question. The response will be unimpressive and the marker may need to infer meaning at times.</p>	
3	40 – 49	4 – 4.5	8 – 9.5
		<p>Some organisation and thought but there will be evidence of uncertainty when evaluating and synthesising information. Pedestrian focus on the question. Very little depth or insight. Little evidence of logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are very tenuous. Quotations are not used or incorrect. There might be incorrect references to the text. Linking between plan and essay will be problematic. Poor integration between question and texts. The plan might be partially complete or poorly structured. There will be a lack of reference to each of the texts referred to in the question, or integration with the 'extra' text will be limited or flawed.</p>	<p>Not much evidence of the candidate's original voice. Inability to sustain a personal opinion. A very basic (simplistic) knowledge of the text. Little flair in interpretation and expression. Tone, style and/or diction will probably be flawed. Very basic knowledge of text which causes problems in the selection or omission of relevant information. Provides a simple 'answer' to the question. Will be areas that are problematic. No quotations or direct references. Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan. Plain, probably flawed use of language.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate is not completely competent with this skill – there will be problems with expression, planning, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning will be straightforward and simple and probably flawed in places. The integration between plan and essay might be flawed or non-existent. The style will be plain; however, there will still be the semblance of an argument – even if it lacks support and references to the texts referred to in the question. The response will be a superficial 'answer' to the question, but still worthy of achieving a pass.</p>	

2	3 – 3	3 – 3.5	6 – 7.5
		<p>Poor organisation and thought. There will be evidence of uncertainty and difficulty when evaluating and synthesising information. Poor focus on the question. Little evidence of logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are flawed. Quotations are not used or incorrect. Few, if any, references to the text. Linking between plan and essay will be problematic. Little integration between question and texts. Plan will probably be partially complete or poorly structured. There will be a lack of reference to each of the texts referred to in the question, or integration with the 'extra' text will be non-existent or flawed.</p>	<p>No evidence of the candidate's original voice. A flawed, incomplete knowledge of the text. No flair in interpretation and expression. Tone, style and/or diction are flawed. Poor knowledge of text which hampers the building of an argument. Fails to answer the question. No quotations or direct references. Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan. Mostly flawed use of language. Word count will probably be problematic.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate has difficulty with this skill – there are problems with expression, planning, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning are flawed. The style will be flawed and there will be little evidence of an argument. The response will not be worthy of receiving a pass.</p>	
1	0 – 29	0 – 2.5	0 – 5.5
		<p>Extremely poor organisation and thought. Little to no evidence of evaluating and synthesising information. Extremely poor focus on the question. Very little evidence of logical structure and paragraphing. Links between plan and essay are few and extremely flawed. Almost no references to the text. Almost no linking between plan and essay. No integration between question and texts. Plan will be partially complete or non-existent, or extremely poorly structured. There will be no reference to any of the texts referred to in the question, or integration with the 'extra' text will be non-existent.</p>	<p>No evidence of the candidate's original voice. Response might be completely off topic. Extremely flawed, incomplete knowledge of the text. Interpretation and expression are problematic. Tone, style and/or diction are extremely flawed. No real knowledge of text Fails to answer the question. No quotations or direct references. Essay structure will probably not mirror that of the plan. Mostly flawed use of language. Word count will probably be problematic.</p>
		<p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have the sense that this candidate has great difficulty with this skill – there are problems with expression, planning, knowledge of text and integration of ideas. The writing and planning are extremely flawed. There is no evidence of an argument. The response will not be worthy of receiving anything close to a pass.</p>	

[30]

SECTION A NOVEL

LITERARY ESSAY MARKING GUIDELINES

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	%	MARK
7	<p>A highly superior/sophisticated response. Argument is most carefully structured. Takes a definite stance that is supported closely from the text. Argument is not linear in terms of its referencing to the text. May adopt a different/controversial/highly innovative/original stance which deviates from the 'norm', but which is closely referenced and carefully supported. Includes at least 6 highly relevant quotations. Elevated, sophisticated, formal style/register. Only one or two small language/style errors. Integrates topic, personal opinion (voice), textual references and quotations seamlessly. Superior knowledge and manipulation of text, insightful observations that link clearly to the construction of a masterful argument. Demonstrates an ability to extrapolate/synthesise information in a global fashion from the text. Excellent introduction and conclusion.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that there was nothing more that the candidate could have 'said'/'added'/'done' to improve the piece.</p>	100	<p><i>(½ marks are allowed)</i></p> <p>30</p>
7	<p>Highly superior response that has 'sparkle'. Evidence of mature, thought provoking, sophisticated reasoning. Clear voice/personal opinion. Stance taken and argued with conviction/insight. Non-linear, integrated argument using many varied aspects of the text. A thorough knowledge and deep understanding of the issues/themes. Structure is elevated. Uses at least 5 quotations intelligently to support the stance/argument. One or two grammar/style issues, but generally, of a superior standard. Superior introduction and conclusion.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have a sense that, with a slight improvement of one aspect – a point omitted, a slight grammar/style correction, the essay would achieve full marks.</p>	90 – 99	<p>29 28 27</p>
7	<p>Very impressive. Elevated reasoning – evidence of an excellent argument, well-supported with reference to the text. Should use a couple of carefully integrated quotations with much close referencing to the text. The candidate's voice must be apparent. Structure, style and language usage must be superior, although there may be slight errors. Impressive introduction and conclusion.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must have a sense that the candidate is highly capable; that there is an intelligent understanding of the topic; and that the candidate is able to use his/her knowledge of the text to construct an original, reasoned response to the question with flair and insight.</p>	80 – 89	<p>26 25 24</p>

<p>6</p>	<p>Very good argument – sensitive and interesting – with a clear stance that is well supported with reference to the text. Quotations need not be used. Lacks the 'flashes of brilliance', 'sparkle', insight or maturity of thought/reasoning that would lift it to a Level 7. Textual references have been chosen carefully, but not used in a particularly insightful/mature manner. Clear, ordered structure. Very good introduction and conclusion.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that this candidate really understands the issues in the text and can use these insights to build a well-reasoned argument, but that the 'spark' which signifies a Level 7 is missing. Style is important and language usage must be good.</p>	<p>70 – 79</p>	<p>23 22 21</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>An essay that 'does the job', 'answers the question', 'addresses the issue' in a plain, direct, 'ordinary' way. A solid argument is established, a stance is taken and relevant, if uninspiring, facts are used to support it. The structure is adequate. Style and grammar are used effectively – there will probably be a number of errors. Introduction and/or conclusion might only be one or two sentences.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have a sense that the candidate has read the text, understood the question and answered it in a plain, unsophisticated manner. Parts of the response may become narrative, but there will be an attempt made to take a stance and 'argue' an issue. There still has to be a basic structure and adherence to language and style, but content is more important.</p>	<p>60 – 69</p>	<p>20 19 18</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>An essay that attempts to answer the question or build an argument, and succeeds in parts. Content knowledge might be flawed or muddled in places, or the response might be mostly narrative. The candidate shows that he/she has read the text and understands some of the basic issues. Simple, clear language – will probably be quite flawed, but the response can be understood. There is a 'sense' of what the candidate is attempting to say.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have a sense that this candidate is not academically strong, but that there is a working knowledge of the text which is able to be used in order to write a basic, if flawed, 'answer' to a question.</p>	<p>50 – 59</p>	<p>17 16 15</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>A weak response, but still worthy of passing. Probably almost entirely narrative with muddled and flawed use of language. The candidate displays a superficial knowledge of the text and is largely unable to support/reference in order to build an argument. Some references may be unrelated to the text, or flawed.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker should have a sense that the piece is poor in terms of its language/style and structure, but not weak enough to fail. The essay will be 'thin' in terms of its references to the text and relevance to the topic. There must be some basic references to the text in order for the candidate to achieve 12.</p>	<p>40 – 49</p>	<p>14 13 12</p>

2	<p>A very weak response. Totally narrative with many errors. Almost no attempt made to build an argument or answer the question. The response might be short. Structure will be problematic and there might be textual inconsistencies. Some candidates might write a response giving a personal opinion of an aspect of the topic which makes very few references to the text. The response might take the form of a 'lecture' or a 'sermon' based largely on personal opinion. Such responses, depending on language usage, should be assessed according to their relevance to the topic.</p> <p>At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the candidate has made a very feeble attempt to engage with the topic. There must be a sense that the text has either not been read or not properly understood. Language use will contribute to the difficulty in attempting to assess the piece.</p>	30 – 39	11 10 9
1	<p>A totally incompetent piece. Language use will be muddled and inarticulate. Response will be short and have almost no relevance to the topic or the issues. There will be many textual inconsistencies (if there are references) and the piece will probably be based on personal opinion.</p>	0 – 29	8 7
1	<p>This piece will not meet the requirements of the task on any level. It will probably be vague and irrelevant and extremely brief. The piece might even offer a brief 'creative' and completely inappropriate response to the topic.</p>		6 – 0

[30]

60 marks

SECTION B TRANSACTIONAL**TRANSACTIONAL WRITING (10 + 10 = 20)****ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

This rubric serves to guide the marking process. Markers should be aware that the mark for the **PURPOSE** element need not correspond with the mark for 'language and format'. A candidate may, for example, achieve a level 7 for 'purpose', but only a level 5 for 'language and format'. (e.g. 8 + 6 = 14).

		PURPOSE	LANGUAGE AND FORMAT
LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR	DESCRIPTOR
7		The candidate can write original and coherent texts, skillfully adapting to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts. A clear, mature personal style and voice is evident. Candidate makes an intelligent statement that is original.	Highly competent use of language conventions and excellent understanding of register required. Practically error-free grammar and/or spelling and format correct.
<p>100% (10) – At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that there is nothing more the candidate could have done to improve the piece. Excellence and mature thinking have been sustained throughout.</p> <p>80 – 90% – (8 – 9) – At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that, with the exception of minor inconsistencies in format, content/spelling/style, the piece would achieve full marks.</p>			
6		The candidate is able to write original texts and can adapt to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, although this is not completely sustained. There is evidence of a personal style and voice and a thorough engagement with the question, although some depth may be lacking.	Competent, at times impressive, use of language conventions. Very good understanding of register, although there may be minor flaws. Very few grammar or spelling errors. Format mostly correct.
<p>70 – 79% (7,5 – 7) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the candidate is very capable and has a thorough understanding of the question and its requirements in terms of format, content and writing style. Some flair is apparent, but excellence is not sustained in all aspects throughout.</p>			
5		The candidate is able to write with some degree of originality and attempts to adapt to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, although some areas jar with the question's requirements. There is limited evidence of a personal style and voice. This is an average response.	Average response. Pedestrian, but not seriously flawed. Mostly accurate use of language conventions and sound understanding of register. Some spelling and grammar errors but these do not interfere with meaning. Format mostly correct.
<p>60 – 69% (6 – 6,5) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the question has been engaged with awareness and answered adequately, albeit without flair, sparkle or a strong personal voice. The answer 'does the job'. There may be distinct grammar errors, but these do not interfere with the candidate's voice.</p>			
4		The candidate is generally able to write with some originality and tries to take into account different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, although this is not entirely successful. Limited personal style is evident. Very little personal voice.	The candidate tries to apply conventions, but the product is flawed. Grammar and spelling errors may interfere with meaning. An attempt at correct format, but one or two errors. Limited understanding of appropriate register.
<p>50 – 59% (5 – 5,5) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the question has been answered and understood in a superficial way. There are gaps in both the content and style of the answer; it is dull and pedestrian. It may be short, unfocused or rambling.</p>			

3	An attempt is made to produce original texts which take into account different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, but this is not always done correctly. Style is sometimes unoriginal and involves 'borrowing' from other work.	Flawed product which only vaguely follows format. Poor spelling and grammar. Meaning is not always clear. Register is usually at odds with the demands of the task.
40 – 49% (4 – 4, 5) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that, although the answer is thin and flawed in many aspects and barely passworthy, there is an attempt to use the required format and to answer the question.		
2	Limited originality and inadequate attention to purpose, context and format. Generally no personal style. A poor response, flawed. Candidate may have misunderstood the demands of the question.	Very flawed product. Spelling and grammar rules barely applied. No understanding shown of appropriate register. Some attempt at format, but usually incorrect.
30 – 39% (3 – 3, 5) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the candidate has virtually no understanding of the question and what it requires.		
1	Little evidence of originality or cohesion of any kind. No attention to purpose, context or format. A completely flawed answer.	No evidence of language conventions being applied. Inability to use correct register. Communication marred. No idea of format. Spelling very poor. Often very short or rambling.
0 – 29% (0 – 2, 5) At the end of assessing such a response, the marker must feel that the candidate is unable to answer the question and the answer is inappropriate and unintelligible. These candidates may also have run out of time and, therefore, may have produced incomplete, partial pieces.		

40 marks

Total: 100 marks