ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE: PAPER II

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 3 hours   100 marks

The marking guide is a working document prepared for use by teachers as they assess the Grade 11 externally set examinations.

There may be different interpretations of the marking guidelines but the teacher should keep as closely as possible to the suggested way of assessing. When in doubt, a teacher should check with another member of the cluster or with the relevant Assessment Specialist.

SECTION A   Shakespeare - Othello

Planning and Structure

LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR
7	8 - 10	Consistently excellent. Clear links to planning and organisation around topic. Highly competent, even sophisticated, organisation and planning.
6	7 - 7,5	Often very good structure. Impressive use of planning. Reader assisted by thoughtfulness in planning. Quality not completely consistent.
5	6 - 6,5	Generally sound structure. Generally coherent with evidence of organised ideas.
4	5 - 5,5	Some evidence of a developing structure. Paragraphing jumbled. No evidence of topic sentences.
3	4 - 4,5	Occasionally incoherent. Limited/poor evidence of planning. Occasionally rambled.
2	3 - 3,5	No paragraphs, but clearer suggestion of ideas. Virtually no evidence of planning.
1	0 - 2,5	No planning. No attempt at structure. Nonsensical link of ideas.

Engaging with Text

LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR
7	16 - 20	Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice and clear flair. Hugely effective selection and omission of information. Intelligent knowledge of text. Crisp and clear ability to evaluate and synthesise.
6	14 - 15,5	Very good response. Ability to sustain argument and good knowledge of text. Shows evidence of being able to extract information and engage with question. Lacks flair.
5	12 - 13,5	Average attempt at answering question and engaging with text - although flaws in engaging. Solid, but unimpressive. Sound knowledge of text.
4	10 - 11,5	Glimmers of insight. Some attempt to maintain argument. Padded with narrative. Not cohesive. Engages with text on a relatively superficial level.
3	8 - 9,5	Repetitive/superficial. Often narrative. Inability to argue competently, but limited engaging with text.
2	6 - 7,5	Muddled/Vague answer to question. Does not generally appear to understand the question's demands or the text.
1	0 - 5,5	Inability to answer question. No attempt to work with text or question.

30 marks

SECTION B   Short Stories and Essays

Planning and Structure

LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR
7	8 -10	Consistently excellent. Clear links to planning and organisation around topic. Highly competent, even sophisticated, organisation and planning.
6	7 -7,5	Often very good structure. Impressive use of planning. Reader assisted by thoughtfulness in planning. Quality not completely consistent.
5	6 - 6,5	Generally sound structure. Generally coherent with evidence of organised ideas.
4	5 - 5,5	Some evidence of a developing structure. Paragraphing jumbled. No evidence of topic sentences.
3	4 - 4,5	Occasionally incoherent. Limited/poor evidence of planning. Occasionally rambled.
2	3 - 3,5	No paragraphs, but clearer suggestion of ideas. Virtually no evidence of planning.
1	0 - 2,5	No planning. No attempt at structure. Nonsensical link of ideas.

Engaging with Text

LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR
7	16 - 20	Sophisticated evidence of candidate's original voice and clear flair. Hugely effective selection and omission of information. Intelligent knowledge of text. Crisp and clear ability to evaluate and synthesise.
6	14 - 15,5	Very good response. Ability to sustain argument and good knowledge of text. Shows evidence of being able to extract information and engage with question. Lacks flair.
5	12- 13,5	Average attempt at answering question and engaging with text - although flaws in engaging. Solid, but unimpressive. Sound knowledge of text.
4	10 - 11,5	Glimmers of insight. Some attempt to maintain argument. Padded with narrative. Not cohesive. Engages with text on a relatively superficial level.
3	8 - 9,5	Repetitive/superficial. Often narrative. Inability to argue competently, but limited engaging with text.
2	6 - 7,5	Muddled/Vague answer to question. Does not generally appear to understand the question's demands or the text.
1	0 - 5,5	Inability to answer question. No attempt to work with text or question.

30 marks

SECTION C   Transactional

Purpose

LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR
7	12 -15	The candidate can write original and coherent texts, skilfully adapting to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts. A clear personal style is evident. Candidate makes an intelligent statement that is original.
6	10,5 - 11,5	The candidate is able to write original texts and can adapt to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, although this is not always sustained. There is evidence of a personal style and a thoughtful engagement with the question.
5	9 -10	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. This is an average response.
4	7,5 - 8,5	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 generally not always done successfully. Limited personal style is evident.
3	6 - 7	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 often relies on 'borrowing' from other work.
2	4,5 - 5,5	Limited originality and inadequate attention to purpose, context and format. Generally no personal style. A poor response. Flawed.
1	0 - 4	Little evidence of originality or cohesion of any kind. No attention to purpose, context or format. A completely flawed answer.

Language

Mark	DESCRIPTOR
5	Highly competent use of language conventions and excellent understanding of register required.
4	Competent, at times impressive, use of language conventions.
3	Average response. Pedestrian, but not seriously flawed. Mostly accurate use of language conventions.
2	The candidate tried to apply conventions, but the product is flawed.
1	No evidence of language conventions being applied. Inability to use correct register. Communication marred.

40 marks