



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
NOVEMBER 2013

ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE: PAPER II

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 3 hours

100 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.

SECTION A**QUESTION 1****SHAKESPEARE MINI ESSAY (5 + 25)**

This rubric serves to guide the marking process. Markers should be aware that the mark for the one page plan need not correspond with the mark for the essay. A candidate may, for example, achieve a 5 for the plan, but only a level 5 for the essay. (5 + 16 = 21)

CANDIDATES SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THEY WILL BE PENALISED FOR EXCEEDING LENGTH REQUIREMENTS AND AN ESSAY OVER 500 WORDS WILL ONLY BE MARKED UP TO 500 WORDS.

- The scope of the mini essay requires candidates to think about concerns and issues that evolve out of the selected text. Detailed knowledge of the text and an engagement with the richness of the issues required.
- Candidates will be required to show a **one page plan**.
- The response to the question requires a succinct essay where the candidate is called upon to select pertinent information to the question and produce a tightly structured discussion on the given topic. **PERTINENT referencing to the text is required.**
- Candidates are to supply a word count at the end of the essay.

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: SHAKESPEARE MINI ESSAY-PLANNING (Total 5)

<p>COMMENDABLE/ EXCELLENT (Extended Abstract level)</p> <p>SOPHISTICATED/HIGHLY DEVELOPED</p>	<p>COMPETENT/ GOOD (Relational Level)</p> <p>SKILFUL/PROFICIENT</p>	<p>ACCEPTABLE/ SUFFICIENT (Multistructural Level)</p> <p>SATISFACTORY/ ADEQUATE</p>	<p>INADEQUATE/ MARGINAL (Unistructural)</p> <p>SUPERFICIAL/SKETCHY</p>	<p>POOR /INAPPROPRIATE (Prestructural)</p> <p>LIMITED/MUDDLED</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sophisticated plan that provides complete question focus. Logical structure. • Key words of question unpacked with sophistication. • Importance of ideas indicated as a development of an argument. • Planning shows complex, high order thinking about the meaningful relationships between ideas, the text(s) and the question. Links are highly developed. • Information is presented clearly and allows for a sophisticated, high level of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A skilful plan that highlights the question focus. One or two ideas could have been developed further. • Key words of question unpacked skilfully and with clarity. Importance of ideas indicated although not always developed fully. • Planning shows proficient/skilful thinking about the meaningful relationships between ideas, the text(s) and the question. • Information is presented with clarity and allows for a proficient/skilful level of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate plan that lacks depth and detail: plan merely covers the basics. General links satisfactorily established. Not always clearly focused on question. • Key words of question adequately although not comprehensively unpacked. • Planning shows definite thinking about relationships between ideas, text(s) and the question but these are only satisfactorily done. • Information is presented adequately and displays a satisfactory level of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial structure lacking focus, depth and organisation. Needs development of structure and unpacking details in each paragraph. • Key words of question have not been unpacked. Importance of ideas is superficial and not very distinctive. • Planning shows some superficial thinking (although superficial) about relationships, text(s) and the question. • Information is presented but evidence of superficial, sketchy understanding of the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited structure. Poor organisation and thought. Lacks development. Usually single words. • Key words of question have not been unpacked; muddled thoughts. • No differentiation between ideas. Thinking process is limited/muddled. Little or no link to the relationships and the question. • Information is limited/muddled (insufficient information is given). • Difficult to see a mind at work.
<p>5</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>

Adapted from University of Minnesota Concept Map Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: SHAKESPEARE MINI ESSAY (Total: 25)

Level	%	25	ASSESSMENT(Knowledge, Argument, Thinking, Structure)
7+	90 – 100	25 24 23 22½	<p>A sophisticated, well structured essay that exceeds expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure mirrors the plan. • Argument is thoroughly developed and does not exceed 450 words. • Candidate displays a thorough and confident knowledge of the text. • Insightful understanding of the play. • Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clearly focused and extremely well supported and substantiated. • Uses all of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play – Synthesising information – Formulating conclusion to the argument • Sophisticated clarity of thought; logical. • Essay signposted throughout indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Sophisticated referencing that supports the argument. • Introduction and conclusion succinct and focused. • Writing reflects a sophisticated style with a high degree of competence. • Excellent command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a high degree of effectiveness.
7	80 – 89	22 21 20	<p>A perceptive, well structured essay that is commendable (which requires minor polish for a level 7+).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure mirrors the plan • Argument is thoroughly developed and does not exceed 450 words. • Candidate displays a thorough and confident knowledge of the text. • Insightful understanding of the play. • Evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clearly focused, perceptive and well supported and substantiated. • Uses all of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed further: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play – Synthesising information – Formulating conclusion to the argument • Perceptive referencing that supports the argument • Excellent clarity of thought; logical: there might be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further. • Essay signposted throughout indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion succinct and focused. • Writing reflects a superior style with a high degree of competence, although there may be minor occasional flaws. • Excellent command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a high degree of effectiveness.
6	70 – 79	19 18	<p>A proficient, skilful essay that is competent and focused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure mirrors the plan although there may be minor lapses. • Argument is developed competently and does not exceed 500 words. • Candidate displays a competent knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps • Considerable understanding of the play. • Skilful evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clear, focused and substantiated. • Uses most of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed further for a level 7:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Skilful referencing that supports the argument. • Considerable clarity of thought; considerably logical. • Essay signposted mostly indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion good and considerably competent and focused with perhaps minor development and synthesis. • Writing reflects a considerably competent style, fluent although there may be minor stylistic flaws needed for a level 7. • Good command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a considerable effectiveness.
5	60 – 69	17 16 15	<p>An acceptable, satisfactory essay that has broadly tackled the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure mostly mirrors the plan and there may be lapses. • Argument is developed in an adequate manner although there may be some generalisations. • Candidate displays an adequate knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps. • Considerable understanding of the play. • Some evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is not fully sustained or developed throughout. • Substantiation used without flair. • Uses some of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed and extended for a level 6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Referencing that supports the argument. • Mostly clear and logical. • Essay signposted mostly indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question on the whole. • Introduction and conclusion mostly satisfactory and adequate with perhaps further development and synthesis required. • Writing is straightforward and reflects an adequate style; fluent although there may be minor stylistic flaws. • Adequate command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question adequately.
4	50 – 59	14 13	<p>A basic, somewhat flawed essay that attempts to engage with the question albeit limited and/or unsuccessfully in parts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan. • An attempt to develop an argument although it might be lacking in relevance in parts or there may be some generalisations; it may be narrow or inaccurate in parts. • Candidate displays a basic knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps. • Basic, broad understanding of the play. • Slight evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is not fully sustained or developed throughout. • Some substantiation used without flair. • Attempts to use a few of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Referencing that supports the argument. • Clear and logical although at times inconsistent.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay signposted occasionally indicating that the candidate has attempted to engage with the question on the whole although not fully successful. • Introduction and conclusion simplistically drawn with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is simple and unadorned although there may be stylistic flaws. • Flawed command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question in a simple, basic manner albeit unimpressively and with limited success.
3	40 – 49	12 11 10	<p>A simplistic, superficial essay that struggles to engage with the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan in parts. • A weak response, but still worthy of passing. • Inability to sustain a personal opinion. • A flawed argument or no argument at all/provides a simple answer to the question. • Candidate displays a simplistic knowledge of the text and there may be minor gaps. • There will be areas in the essay which are problematic or illogical. • Not much evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument. • Little or no substantiation or referencing. • Critical thinking skills used superficially, if at all. • Paragraph links at times inconsistent. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is flawed. • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Does not transfers knowledge of the question and if it does, it will do so with lapses.
2	30 – 39	9 8	<p>A tenuous, poor essay that is muddled and vague.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure might not mirror that of the plan in parts. • A weak, flawed response, which is muddled and vague. • Inability to state a personal opinion. • A flawed argument or no argument at all/fails to answer the question; difficult to identify any distinct argument. • Candidate displays a poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text. • The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus. • No evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument. • Little/no/flawed substantiation. • Paragraph links at times inconsistent/lacking. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is flawed, unrefined and hinders meaning. • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation.
1	20 – 29	7 6 5 4	<p>An extremely weak essay that displays a feeble attempt to engage with the text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure will probably not mirror the plan. • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic. • Inability to state a personal opinion. • Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused. • Candidate displays a poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text. • The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus. • Little/no/flawed substantiation. • Paragraph links problematic. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed/missing with further development and

			synthesis required. • Writing is marred with errors . • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation.
1	0 – 19	3 2 1 0	A totally incompetent essay. • This piece will not meet the requirements of the task on any level. • Vague, irrelevant, flawed. • Inappropriate response to the topic.

NOVELS

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: LITERATURE ESSAY (Total 30)

Level	%	30	ASSESSMENT(Knowledge, Argument, Thinking, Structure)
7+	100	30	<p>An exemplary essay that displays a superior mind at work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A highly sophisticated response. • Argument is developed and woven into a sophisticated discussion. • Candidate displays an exemplary and confident knowledge of the text and uses the references with sophistication. • Insightful understanding of the text and may offer an innovative/controversial response. • Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clearly focused and extremely well supported and substantiated. • Uses all of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process with sophistication: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Highly sophisticated clarity of thought; logical. • Essay signposted throughout indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion succinct and focused. • Writing reflects an elevated, sophisticated style with a high degree of competence. • Excellent command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a commendable sophistication: the marker must feel that nothing more could have been added to improve this response.
7+	92 – 99	29 28 27	<p>A sophisticated, well structured essay that exceeds expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of mature, thought-provoking, sophisticated reasoning. • Argument is developed with sophistication and conviction. • Candidate displays a thorough and confident knowledge of the text. • Sophisticated referencing. • Insightful and astute understanding of the text. • Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clearly focused and extremely well supported and substantiated. • Uses all of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Sophisticated clarity of thought; logical. • Essay signposted throughout indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion succinct and focused. • Writing reflects a sophisticated style with a high degree of competence. • Excellent command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a high degree of effectiveness.
7	80 – 89	26 25 24	<p>A superior, well structured essay that is commendable (which requires minor polish for a level 7+).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An impressive essay that is constructed with flair. • Argument is thoroughly developed with refinement. • Candidate displays a thorough and confident knowledge of the text. • Insightful, perceptive understanding of the text. • Sophisticated referencing that supports the argument. • Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clearly

			<p>focused and well supported and substantiated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Uses all of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed further: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Excellent clarity of thought; logical: there might be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay to be exemplary. • Essay signposted throughout indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion succinct and focused. • Writing reflects a superior style with a high degree of competence, although there may be minor occasional flaws. • Excellent command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a high degree of effectiveness.
6	70 – 79	23 22 21	<p>A proficient, skilful essay that is competent and focused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sensitively argued essay with a clear stance. • Argument is developed competently. • Candidate displays a competent knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps. • Considerable understanding of the text. • Skilful referencing that supports the argument • Skilful evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is clear, focused and substantiated with great care. • Uses most of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed further for a level 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Considerable clarity of thought; considerably logical. • Essay signposted mostly indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question. • Introduction and conclusion very good and considerably competent and focused with perhaps minor development and synthesis. • Writing reflects a considerably competent style, fluent although there may be minor stylistic flaws needed for a level 7. • Very good command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question with a considerable effectiveness.
5	60 – 69	20 19 18	<p>An acceptable, satisfactory essay that has broadly tackled the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay addresses the issue of the question in a plain, direct manner. • Argument is developed in an adequate manner although there may be some generalisations. • Candidate displays an adequate knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps. • Considerable understanding of the text. • Referencing that supports the argument. • Some evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is not fully sustained or developed throughout. • Substantiation used without flair. • Uses some of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed and extended for a level 6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Mostly clear and logical.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay signposted mostly indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question on the whole. • Introduction and conclusion mostly satisfactory and adequate with perhaps further development and synthesis required. • Writing is straightforward and reflects an adequate style; fluent although there may be minor stylistic flaws. • Adequate command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question adequately.
4	50 – 59	17 16 15	<p>A basic, somewhat flawed essay that attempts to engage with the question albeit limited and/or unsuccessfully in parts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An attempt to develop an argument although it might be lacking in relevance in parts; there may be some generalisations; it may be narrow or inaccurate in parts. • Candidate displays a basic knowledge of the text although there may be minor gaps. • Basic, broad understanding of the text. • Referencing that mostly supports the argument. • Slight evidence of candidate's original voice – the argument is not fully sustained or developed throughout. • Some substantiation used without flair. • An attempt to use a few of the following critical thinking skills in the inquiry process although there is a sense that some of the critical thinking skills could have been developed and extended or concluded with greater effect for a level 5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Selecting information to develop an argument. – Analysing and interpreting information selected from the play. – Synthesising information. – Formulating conclusion to the argument. • Clear and logical although at times inconsistent. • Essay signposted occasionally indicating that the candidate has attempted to engage with the question on the whole although not fully successful. • Introduction and conclusion simplistically drawn with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is simple and unadorned although there may be stylistic flaws. • Flawed command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Transfers knowledge of the question in a simple, basic manner albeit unimpressively and with limited success.
3	40 – 49	14 13 12	<p>A simplistic, superficial essay that struggles to engage with the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A weak response, but still worthy of passing. • Inability to sustain a personal opinion. • A flawed argument or no argument at all/provides a simple answer to the question. • Candidate displays a simplistic knowledge of the text and there may be minor gaps. • Referencing that supports the argument. • There will be areas in the essay which are problematic or illogical. • Not much evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument. • Little or no substantiation. • Critical thinking skills used superficially if at all. • Paragraph links at times inconsistent. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is flawed. • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation. • Does not transfer knowledge of the question and if it does, it will do so with lapses.
2	30 – 39	11 10 9	<p>A tenuous, poor essay that is muddled and vague.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A weak, flawed response, which is muddled and vague. • Inability to state a personal opinion.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A flawed argument or no argument at all/fails to answer the question; difficult to identify any distinct argument. • Candidate displays a poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text. • The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus. • No evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument. • Little/no/flawed substantiation. • Paragraph links at times inconsistent/lacking. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is flawed, unrefined and hinders meaning. • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation.
1	20 – 29	8 7	<p>An extremely weak essay that displays a feeble attempt to engage with the text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay structure will probably not mirror the plan. • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic. • Inability to state a personal opinion. • Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused. • Candidate displays a poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text. • The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus. • Little/no/flawed substantiation. • Paragraph links problematic. • Reliance on narrative. • Essay not signposted. • Introduction and/or conclusion flawed/missing with further development and synthesis required. • Writing is marred with errors. • Weak command of spelling, language and punctuation.
1	0 – 19	6 – 0	<p>A totally incompetent essay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This piece will not meet the requirements of the task on any level. • Vague, irrelevant, flawed. • Inappropriate response to the topic.

SECTION B TRANSACTIONAL WRITING**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: (10 + 10)**

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	10 9 8	The candidate can write original and coherent texts, skilfully adapting to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts. A clear, mature personal style and voice is evident. Candidates make an intelligent statement that is original.	Highly sophisticated use of language conventions and excellent understanding of register required. Sophisticated and carefully constructed syntax.
6	7.5 7	The candidate is able to write original and coherent texts, can adapt to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts although not completely sustained. There is evidence of 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 some flaws. Very few grammar or spelling errors. Format mostly correct.
5	6.5 6	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 requirements. There is limited evidence of personal style and voice. An average response.	Average response; pedestrian, but not seriously flawed. Mostly accurate use of language conventions and sound understanding of register. Minor errors. Format mostly correct.
4	5.5 5	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; little or no personal voice.	The candidate tries to apply conventions, but the product is flawed. Marred with errors. An attempt at correct format, but one or two errors. Limited understanding of appropriate register.
3	4.5 4	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.
2	3.5 3	Limited originality and inadequate attention to purpose, context and format. Generally no personal style. Poor response; flawed. Candidate may have misunderstood the demands of the question.	Very flawed product. Marred with errors. No understanding of appropriate register. Some attempt at format albeit incorrect.
1	2.5 3	Little or no evidence of originality or cohesion; no attention to purpose, context or format. A completely flawed response.	No evidence of language conventions; inability to use correct register; communication marred; short or rambling. No idea of format.