NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINATION – MARCH 2018

# 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.**

---

IEB Copyright © 2018

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: SHAKESPEARE: THE MINI ESSAY (30 MARKS)**

- Mind map may be used by candidate in planning but **no marks** are awarded for planning.
- Length of response (including quotations): **approximately 450 words** in length.
- Markers will stop marking essays at 500 words. In this instance the **conclusion (provided that it is succinct)** will be considered.
- **Penalty for excessive word length:** Candidate's essay will move to one level lower.
- **A word count at the end of the essay is required.**
- **The rubric is not a checklist (tick box) but should be considered as a guide when evaluating the mini-essay.**
- **Half marks may be awarded.**

| Level | % | 30 | ASSESSMENT (Knowledge, Argument, Thinking, Structure) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7++** | **100** | **30** | **FULL MARK ESSAY**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**EXCEPTIONAL**<br>**Highly eloquent response; exhibits academic rigour; strong individual voice; confident knowledge of text.** |
| | | | • **The essay that is awarded full marks has greater depth and scope than a level 7.**<br>• **Candidate displays an exceptional ability to develop an argument that is academically superior.**<br>• **Resonates a sophisticated tackling of the topic.**<br>• **Quotations integrated with exceptional ability.**<br>• **Quotations and substantiation build an argument that is logically flawless and which exceeds expectations.**<br>• **The style of the essay is fluid and elevated.**<br>• **The essay is error-free.** |
| **7+** | **99–90** | **29**<br>**28**<br>**27** | **DISTINGUISHED/IMPRESSIVE**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**EXCEPTIONAL/ELEVATED**<br><br>**An impressive and distinguished essay; succinct; selects information to build an argument with sophistication; has depth of knowledge; dips into the text with confidence**; **consistent question focus.** |
| | | | • **Quotations** enhance a tightly constructed argument.<br>• **Analytical concepts** developed with **precision**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **confidence and distinction**.<br>• Candidate displays a **thorough and impressive, in-depth knowledge** of the text, perhaps even drawing on moments of the text that distinguish the candidate's **superior, refined knowledge and understanding**.<br>• **Exceptional ability** to select information to develop a **succinct, carefully crafted** argument.<br>• **Impressive/exceptional evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **impressive individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an arresting argument**.<br>• **Impressively integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence.<br>• Maintains **consistent focus** without deviating from the central concern(s) of the question.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct exceptionally critical, relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, impressive line of logical progression**.<br>• **Exceptionally lucid and logical**.<br>• **Thorough development** of mini-essay structure; **succinct; focused introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Excellent transitions** between paragraphs, which enhance the development of the argument.<br>• Writing reflects **an impressive command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation**.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in an **elevated manner**.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED THE REQUIRED WORD LENGTH (WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7** | **89–80** | **26**<br>**25**<br>**24** | **COMMENDABLE/EXCELLENT**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**SOPHISTICATED/HIGHLY DEVELOPED**<br>**A sophisticated and perceptive essay that is commendable and well structured; substantiation from text enhances argument (which requires minor polish for a level 7+).** |
| | | | • Argument is **thoroughly developed**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **sophistication**.<br>• Candidate displays a **thorough, accurate and confident knowledge of the text**.<br>• **Insightful** understanding of the play.<br>• **Excellent ability** to select information to develop a **succinct** argument, which is **clearly focused and perceptive**.<br>• **Commendable evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **sophisticated individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **a highly developed argument**.<br>• **Commendably integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence, although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Maintains **consistent focus** without deviating from the central concern(s) of the question.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct critical, relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, sophisticated line of logical progression**.<br>• **Lucid and focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Commendable development** of mini-essay structure; **succinct; focused introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Excellent transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **an impressive command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation, although there may be minor stylistic flaws**.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in a **commendable manner**.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED THE REQUIRED WORD LENGTH (WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |
| **6** | **79–70** | **23**<br>**22**<br>**21** | **COMPETENT/GOOD TO VERY GOOD**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**SKILFUL/PROFICIENT**<br>**An above average response; proficient and skilful; competent and focused; accurate; sound argument; logical; dips into the text skilfully; minor lapses.** |
| | | | • Argument is **developed competently** and may have minor lapses.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **conviction OR part** of the topic has been addressed with **depth and sophistication** (suggesting that if **all aspects** of the question had been tackled this essay could have been awarded a 7 or 7+).<br>• Candidate displays a **competent, accurate knowledge of the text** although there may be minor gaps that do not impact on the strength of the argument.<br>• **Proficient** understanding of the play.<br>• **Skilful ability** to select information to develop an argument, which is **mostly focused and competent. The argument in instances could have been developed further**.<br>• **Skilful evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **competent individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an argument with skill**. There may be minor lapses, which could have been enhanced with further development.<br>• **Integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence **skilfully/proficiently,** although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, proficient line of logical progression**.<br>• **Lucid and focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Competent development** of mini essay structure; **succinct; focused introduction and conclusion**. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • **Skilful transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **a competent command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation although there may be minor stylistic flaws**./An essay in this category may be one where the candidate displays an ability to develop an argument that is **highly commendable and distinguished** (which would result in a level 7 or 7+) but is hindered by major stylistic flaws.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in a **skilful manner**.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |
| **5** | **69–60** | **20**<br>**19**<br>**18** | **ACCEPTABLE/SUFFICIENT**<br>**(Multistructural Level)**<br><br>**SATISFACTORY/ADEQUATE**<br>**An acceptable, satisfactory essay that has broadly tackled the question. An essay that "does the job"; answers all aspects of the topic or part of the topic tackled well; broad and general in places but voice in evidence; accurate.** |
| | | **AVERAGE = 20** | • Argument is **developed in an adequate manner** and may have **minor lapses/some generalisations**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed **adequately, although these may be understood only in part OR part** of the topic has been addressed **competently,** suggesting that if **all aspects** of the question had been tackled this essay could have been awarded a 6.<br>• Candidate displays **adequate knowledge of the text,** although there may be minor gaps that do not impact on the argument.<br>• **Considerable** understanding of the play – there must be a sense that the play **has been read and understood in broad, general terms**.<br>• **Adequate/sporadic ability** to select information to develop an argument, which is **satisfactory and competent. The argument in instances requires further enhancement and development**.<br>• **Some/sporadic evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **adequate individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an argument sufficiently**. There may be minor lapses, which could have been enhanced with further development/the argument is **not fully sustained/developed** throughout.<br>• **Evidence of** specific textual references/evidence that is **adequate/acceptable,** although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct adequate connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a satisfactory progression**.<br>• **Generally focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Adequate development** of mini essay structure; **satisfactory introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Adequate transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **a satisfactory command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation, although there may be minor stylistic flaws**./An essay in this category may be one where the candidate displays an ability to develop an argument that is **competent** (which would result in a level 6) but is hindered by major stylistic flaws.<br>• Essay **signposted generally,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question in a satisfactory manner.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in an **adequate/satisfactory manner.**<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (EXCESSIVE WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **4** | **59–50** | **17**<br>**16**<br>**15** | **MARGINAL/BASIC**<br>**(Unistructural Level)**<br><br>**SKETCHY/BELOW AVERAGE/UNDEVELOPED**<br>A **basic, undeveloped** essay that **attempts to engage** with the question albeit **limited and/or unsuccessfully in parts; has glimmer(s) of analysis; does not always dip into the text; padded with narrative; slight evidence of voice.** |
| | | | • An **attempt to develop an argument,** although it might be lacking relevance in parts/**sweeping generalisations/narrow or inaccurate in parts**.<br>• **Simplistic interpretation/partly accurate understanding/narrow interpretation** of the topic/**vague** reference to the topic.<br>• Candidate displays **simplistic/flawed knowledge of the text** and the argument is drawn **simplistically**. **There may be glimmers of analysis and engagement.**<br>• **Broad, general** understanding of the play – there must be a sense that the play **has been understood in broad, general terms/comments show thought, but are not tied to the topic**.<br>• **An attempt** to develop an argument, which **may be successful in parts/unconvincing argument, which lacks substantiation or development. There may be some substantiation used without flair.**<br>• **Slight evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **sporadic/inconsistent individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **simplistically**. There may be lapses which could have been enhanced with further development/the argument is **not fully sustained/developed**.<br>• Essay is **padded with intermittent narrative and occasional argument**.<br>• Textual reference is **unconvincing at times and may be either inaccurate or flawed**.<br>• Candidate is able to make an **inconsistent attempt to use some basic transition words or phrases, resulting in a superficial progression on the whole**.<br>• **Marginally focused** with a sense that logical development could have enhanced this essay.<br>• **Introduction and conclusion** are simplistic and may not point to an arguable position.<br>• Writing is **simple, unadorned**/reflects **an inconsistent and limited awareness of register/inconsistent grammar, spelling and paragraphing**.<br>• Essay lacks signposting throughout/limited, superficial signposting.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question **in a simple, basic manner albeit unimpressively and with limited success**.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (EXCESSIVE WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |
| **3** | **49–40** | **14**<br>**13**<br>**12** | **SIMPLISTIC/SUPERFICIAL/INADEQUATE**<br>**(Unistructural Level)**<br><br>**UNSOPHISTICATED/ONE-DIMENSIONAL/LIMITED**<br>**A simplistic, superficial/flawed essay that struggles to engage with the question; evidence that text has been read; thin voice; narrative; just meets pass mark.** |
| | | **PASS = 12** | • A **weak** response but still worthy of a pass.<br>• **Inability** to sustain a personal opinion.<br>• A **flawed argument or no argument at all/provides a simple answer to the question.**<br>• Essay **lacks clear and logical development of ideas**.<br>• Candidate displays a **simplistic knowledge of the text** and there are gaps in understanding and/or interpretation.<br>• **There will be areas in the essay that are problematic or illogical.**<br>• **Not much** evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument.<br>• Little or no substantiation or referencing/flawed substantiation or referencing.<br>• **Critical thinking skills used superficially, if at all.**<br>• **Reliance on narrative.**<br>• **Absent or ineffective transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Essay **not signposted/signposted inadequately**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **flawed**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation.<br>• **Does not transfer** knowledge of the question and if it does, it will do so with lapses.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (EXCESSIVE WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2** | **39–30** | **11**<br>**10**<br>**9** | **POOR/MUDDLED/VAGUE**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**TENUOUS/UNFOCUSED/INACCURATE**<br>A **tenuous, poor** essay; **muddled and vague and/or inaccurate; no evidence that text has been read; not worthy of a pass.** |
| | | | • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic.<br>• Essay **lacks coherence**.<br>• **Inability** to state a personal opinion.<br>• **Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused.**<br>• Candidate displays **poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text**.<br>• **The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus.**<br>• Little/no/flawed substantiation.<br>• Paragraph links **problematic**.<br>• **Reliance on narrative.**<br>• Essay **not signposted**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed/missing,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **marred by errors, although these will not impede understanding**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (EXCESSIVE WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |
| **1** | **29–20** | **8**<br>**7** | **EXTREMELY WEAK/FEEBLE**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**INEPT/UNSKILLED**<br>**An extremely weak essay; a feeble attempt to engage with the text at times.** |
| | | | • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic.<br>• **Inability** to state a personal opinion.<br>• **Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused.**<br>• Candidate displays **poor/incomplete/flawed/no knowledge of the text**.<br>• **The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus.**<br>• Little/no/flawed substantiation.<br>• Paragraph links **problematic**.<br>• **Reliance on narrative.**<br>• Essay **not signposted**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed/missing,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **marred by errors, which will impede understanding**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language and punctuation.<br>**THIS ESSAY MAY NOT EXCEED 500 WORDS (EXCESSIVE WORD LENGTH PENALTY).** |
| **1** | **19–0** | **6**<br>**5**<br>**4**<br>**3**<br>**2**<br>**1**<br>**0** | **INCOMPETENT**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**LACKING ABILITY/INEFFECTUAL**<br>A **totally incompetent essay that displays no link to the text or the question**. |
| | | | • This piece will not meet the requirements of the task on any level.<br>• Vague, irrelevant, flawed.<br>• Inappropriate response to the topic. |

**[30]**

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: NOVELS: LITERATURE ESSAY (30 MARKS)**

- Mind map may be used by candidate in planning but **no marks** are awarded for planning.
- Length of response: **approximately 600 words**. This is a suggested length as the cohesiveness and development of the essay will take precedence over the length. There is **no penalty** for length other than the development of the argument in the essay itself.
- **A word count at the end of the essay is NOT required.**
- **The rubric is not a check-list (tick-box) but should be considered as a guide when evaluating the Literary Essay.**
- **Half marks may be awarded.**

| Level | % | 30 | ASSESSMENT (Knowledge, Argument, Thinking, Structure) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7++** | **100** | **30** | **FULL MARK ESSAY**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**EXCEPTIONAL**<br>**Highly eloquent response; exhibits academic rigour; strong individual voice; confident knowledge of text.** |
| | | | • **The essay that is awarded full marks has greater depth and scope than a level 7.**<br>• **Candidate displays an exceptional ability to develop an argument that is academically superior.**<br>• **Resonates a sophisticated tackling of the topic.**<br>• **Quotations integrated with exceptional ability.**<br>• **Quotations and substantiation build an argument that is logically flawless and which exceeds expectations.**<br>• **The style of the essay is fluid and elevated.**<br>• **The essay is error-free.** |
| **7+** | **99–90** | **29**<br>**28**<br>**27** | **DISTINGUISHED/IMPRESSIVE**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**EXCEPTIONAL/ELEVATED**<br><br>**An impressive and distinguished essay; succinct; selects information to build an argument with sophistication; has depth of knowledge; dips into the text with confidence; consistent question focus.** |
| | | | • **Quotations** enhance a tightly constructed argument.<br>• **Analytical concepts** developed with **precision**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **confidence and distinction**.<br>• Candidate displays a **thorough and impressive, in-depth knowledge** of the text, perhaps even drawing on moments of the text that distinguish the candidate's **superior, refined knowledge and understanding**.<br>• **Exceptional ability** to select information to develop a **succinct, carefully crafted** argument.<br>• **Impressive/exceptional evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **impressive individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an arresting argument**.<br>• **Impressively integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence.<br>• Maintains **consistent focus** without deviating from the central concern(s) of the question.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct exceptionally critical, relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, impressive line of logical progression**.<br>• **Exceptionally lucid and logical**.<br>• **Thorough development** of literary essay structure; **focused introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Excellent transitions** between paragraphs, which enhance the development of the argument.<br>• Writing reflects **an impressive command of register, spelling, diction, language and punctuation**.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in an **elevated manner**. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7** | **89–80** | **26**<br>**25**<br>**24** | **COMMENDABLE/EXCELLENT**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**SOPHISTICATED/HIGHLY DEVELOPED**<br>**A sophisticated and perceptive essay that is commendable and well structured; substantiation from text enhances argument (which requires minor polish for a level 7+).** |
| | | | • Argument is **thoroughly developed**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **sophistication**.<br>• Candidate displays a **thorough, accurate and confident knowledge of the text**.<br>• **Insightful** understanding of the novel.<br>• **Excellent ability** to select information to develop a **succinct** argument, which is **clearly focused and perceptive**.<br>• **Commendable evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **sophisticated individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **a highly developed argument**.<br>• **Commendably integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence, although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Maintains **consistent focus** without deviating from the central concern(s) of the question.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct critical, relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, sophisticated line of logical progression**.<br>• **Lucid and focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Commendable development** of literary structure; **focused introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Excellent transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **an impressive command of register, spelling, diction, language and punctuation, although there may be minor stylistic flaws**.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in a **commendable manner**. |
| **6** | **79–70** | **23**<br>**22**<br>**21** | **COMPETENT/GOOD TO VERY GOOD**<br>**(Extended Abstract Level)**<br><br>**SKILFUL/PROFICIENT**<br>**An above average response; proficient and skilful; competent and focused; accurate; sound argument; logical; dips into the text skilfully; minor lapses.** |
| | | | • Argument is **developed competently** and may have minor lapses.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed with **conviction OR part** of the topic has been addressed with **depth and sophistication** (suggesting that if **all aspects** of the question had been tackled this essay could have been awarded a 7 or 7+).<br>• Candidate displays a **competent, accurate knowledge of the text,** although there may be minor gaps that do not impact on the strength of the argument.<br>• **Proficient** understanding of the novel.<br>• **Skilful ability** to select information to develop an argument, which is **mostly focused and competent. The argument in instances could have been developed further**.<br>• **Skilful evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **competent individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an argument with skill**. There may be minor lapses, which could have been enhanced with further development.<br>• **Integrates and elaborates** on specific textual references/evidence **skilfully/ proficiently,** although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct relevant and consistent connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a convincing, proficient line of logical progression**.<br>• **Lucid and focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Competent development** of literary essay structure; **focused introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Skilful transition** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **a competent command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation, although there may be minor stylistic flaws./**An essay in this category may be one where the candidate displays an ability to develop an argument that is **highly commendable and distinguished** (which would result in a level 7 or 7+) but is hindered by major stylistic flaws.<br>• Essay **signposted throughout,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question with a commendable degree of confidence.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in a **skilful manner**. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **5** | **69–60** | **20**<br>**19**<br>**18** | **ACCEPTABLE/SUFFICIENT**<br>**(Multistructural Level)**<br><br>**SATISFACTORY/ADEQUATE**<br>**An acceptable, satisfactory essay that has broadly tackled the question. An essay that "does the job"; answers all aspects of the topic or part of the topic tackled well; broad and general in places but voice in evidence; accurate.** |
| | | **AVERAGE = 20** | • Argument is **developed in an adequate manner** and may have **minor lapses/some generalisations**.<br>• **All aspects** of the topic have been addressed **adequately, although these may be understood only in part OR part** of the topic has been addressed **competently,** suggesting that if **all aspects** of the question had been tackled this essay could have been awarded a 6.<br>• Candidate displays **adequate knowledge of the text,** although there may be minor gaps that do not impact on the argument.<br>• **Considerable** understanding of the novel – there must be a sense that the text **has been read and understood in broad, general terms**.<br>• **Adequate/sporadic ability** to select information to develop an argument, which is **satisfactory and competent. The argument in instances requires further enhancement and development**.<br>• **Some/sporadic evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **adequate individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **an argument sufficiently.** There may be minor lapses, which could have been enhanced with further development/the argument is **not fully sustained/developed** throughout.<br>• **Evidence of** specific textual references/evidence that is **adequate/acceptable,** although at times these could have been used with greater effect.<br>• Candidate is able to **construct adequate connections** between topic question and argument, displaying **a satisfactory progression**.<br>• **Generally focused,** although there may be a sense that further logical development could have enhanced this essay further.<br>• **Adequate development** of literary essay structure; **satisfactory introduction and conclusion**.<br>• **Adequate transition** between paragraphs.<br>• Writing reflects **a satisfactory command of register, spelling, diction, language and punctuation, although there may be minor stylistic flaws**./An essay in this category may be one where the candidate displays an ability to develop an argument that is **competent** (which would result in a level 6) but is hindered by major stylistic flaws.<br>• Essay **signposted generally,** indicating that the candidate has engaged with the question in a satisfactory manner.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question in an **adequate/satisfactory manner**. |
| **4** | **59–50** | **17**<br>**16**<br>**15** | **MARGINAL/BASIC**<br>**(Unistructural Level)**<br><br>**SKETCHY/BELOW AVERAGE/UNDEVELOPED**<br>A **basic, undeveloped** essay that **attempts to engage** with the question albeit **limited and/or unsuccessfully in parts; has glimmer(s) of analysis; does not always dip into the text; padded with narrative; slight evidence of voice**. |
| | | | • An **attempt to develop an argument,** although it might be lacking relevance in parts/**sweeping generalisations/narrow or inaccurate in parts**.<br>• **Simplistic interpretation/partly accurate understanding/narrow interpretation** of the topic/**vague** reference to the topic.<br>• Candidate displays **simplistic/flawed knowledge of the text** and the argument is drawn **simplistically. There may be glimmers of analysis and engagement**.<br>• **Broad, general** understanding of the text – there must be a sense that the text **has been understood in broad, general terms/comments show thought, but are not tied to the topic**.<br>• **An attempt** to develop an argument, which **may be successful in parts/unconvincing argument, which lacks substantiation or development. There may be some substantiation used without flair**.<br>• **Slight evidence** of candidate's original voice.<br>• Demonstrates **sporadic/inconsistent individual thought and understanding** through analysing and developing **simplistically**. There may be lapses which could have been enhanced with further development/the argument is **not fully sustained/developed**.<br>• Essay is **padded with intermittent narrative and occasional argument**.<br>• Textual reference is **unconvincing at times and may be either inaccurate or flawed**.<br>• Candidate is able to make an **inconsistent attempt to use some basic transition words or phrases, resulting in a superficial progression on the whole**. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • **Marginally focused** with a sense that logical development could have enhanced this essay.<br>• **Introduction and conclusion** are simplistic and may not point to an arguable position.<br>• Writing is **simple, unadorned**/reflects **an inconsistent and limited awareness of register/inconsistent grammar, spelling and paragraphing**.<br>• Essay lacks signposting throughout/limited, superficial signposting.<br>• **Transfers** knowledge of the question **in a simple, basic manner albeit unimpressively and with limited success**. |
| **3** | **49–40** | **14**<br>**13**<br>**12** | **SIMPLISTIC/SUPERFICIAL/INADEQUATE**<br>**(Unistructural Level)**<br><br>**UNSOPHISTICATED/ONE-DIMENSIONAL/LIMITED**<br>**A simplistic, superficial/flawed essay that struggles to engage with the question; evidence that text has been read; thin voice; narrative; just meets pass mark.** |
| | | **PASS = 12** | • A **weak** response but still worthy of a pass.<br>• **Inability** to sustain a personal opinion.<br>• A **flawed argument or no argument at all/provides a simple answer to the question**.<br>• Essay **lacks clear and logical development of ideas**.<br>• Candidate displays a **simplistic knowledge of the text** and there are gaps in understanding and/or interpretation.<br>• **There will be areas in the essay that are problematic or illogical**.<br>• **Not much** evidence of candidate's original voice – inability to sustain or develop an argument.<br>• Little or no substantiation or referencing/flawed substantiation or referencing.<br>• **Critical thinking skills used superficially, if at all**.<br>• **Reliance on narrative.**<br>• **Absent or ineffective transitions** between paragraphs.<br>• Essay **not signposted/signposted inadequately**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **flawed**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language and punctuation.<br>• **Does not transfer** knowledge of the question and if it does, it will do so with lapses. |
| **2** | **39–30** | **11**<br>**10**<br>**9** | **POOR/MUDDLED/VAGUE**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**TENUOUS/UNFOCUSED/INACCURATE**<br>A **tenuous, poor** essay; **muddled and vague and/or inaccurate; no evidence that text has been read; not worthy of a pass.** |
| | | | • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic.<br>• Essay **lacks coherence.**<br>• **Inability** to state a personal opinion.<br>• **Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused.**<br>• Candidate displays **poor/incomplete/flawed knowledge of the text**.<br>• **The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus.**<br>• Little/no/flawed substantiation.<br>• Paragraph links **problematic**.<br>• **Reliance on narrative**.<br>• Essay **not signposted**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed/missing,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **marred by errors, although these do not impede understanding**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation. |
| **1** | **29–20** | **8**<br>**7** | **EXTREMELY WEAK/FEEBLE**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**INEPT/UNSKILLED**<br>**An extremely weak essay; a feeble attempt to engage with the text at times.** |
| | | | • A weak, flawed response, which might be completely off topic.<br>• **Inability** to state a personal opinion.<br>• **Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused.**<br>• Candidate displays **poor/incomplete/flawed/no knowledge of the text.**<br>• **The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus.**<br>• Little/no/flawed substantiation.<br>• Paragraph links **problematic**.<br>• **Reliance on narrative.**<br>• Essay **not signposted**.<br>• Introduction and/or conclusion **flawed/missing,** with further development and synthesis required.<br>• Writing is **marred by errors which will impede understanding**.<br>• **Weak** command of spelling, language, diction and punctuation. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | **19–0** | **6**<br>**5**<br>**4**<br>**3**<br>**2**<br>**1**<br>**0** | **INCOMPETENT**<br>**(Prestructural Level)**<br><br>**LACKING ABILITY/INEFFECTUAL**<br>A **totally incompetent essay that displays no link to the text or the question.**<br>• This piece will not meet the requirements of the task on any level.<br>• Vague, irrelevant, flawed.<br>• Inappropriate response to the topic. |

**[30]**

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: TRANSACTIONAL WRITING**
**(20 MARKS = 10 + 10)**

- This rubric serves **to guide** the marking process.
- Markers should be aware that the mark for the **PURPOSE AND CONTENT** element need not correspond with the mark for **LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**. A candidate may, for example, achieve a level 7 for **PURPOSE AND CONTENT**, and a level 5 for **LANGUAGE AND REGISTER** (7 + 5 = 12).
- An approximate length of **250 words** is a recommended guide but this is not prescriptive. Candidates should be encouraged to write a text that is fully developed to meet the requirements of the assessment rubric.
- Candidates need **NOT** write a word count at the end of their writing.
- Half marks may be awarded.

| Level | Mark | PURPOSE, AUDIENCE AND CONTENT | LANGUAGE AND REGISTER |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Specific purpose of task; response to the requirements of question; manner in which the structure and content responds to purpose and audience; individual voice.** | **The ability to use the mechanics of language; the ability to manipulate language conventions to suit the purpose of question; the use of appropriate register to match purpose and audience.** |
| **7+** | **10**<br>**9** | **AN IMPRESSIVE SCINTILLATING RESPONSE**<br>**Purpose of task is fully met; specific format of task (varied, flexible) adhered**. Sophisticated cognisance of audience; writing suggests that this is a piece of work that is **significant**, has **depth and breadth**, **impressive detail**. Ideas developed fully. Organisation of thoughts is **impressive and superior**, resulting in writing that is **compelling and striking**. Individual voice. **Highly original. Supplied text is used only as stimulus.** | **IMPRESSIVE COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>**Impressive** use of language conventions; **elegance** of style; tone and mood appropriate to the task; **plays confidently** with language usage; **thoroughly engaging**. Virtually **error free**. Diction is highly sophisticated. |
| **7** | **8½**<br>**8** | **A LIVELY, ORIGINAL RESPONSE**<br>Writing provides **comprehensive insight, understanding and reflective thought** by building a **focused response to the purpose and audience**. A **cohesive viewpoint has been developed throughout, resulting in a strong, consistent voice. Original, sincere and creative. Shows clear** development and **commendable depth of argument**. A clear, **mature personal style**. Skilfully adapts to different audiences, purposes and contexts. **The supplied text is used only as stimulus with no cutting and pasting into the transactional piece.** | **EXCELLENT COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>**Highly sophisticated use of language conventions** and excellent understanding of register required for the task. **Language is precise and engaging,** with notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose. Effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency. Writing reflects author's unique personality through carefully selected diction and register, rendering a piece **that comes to life**. |
| **6** | **7½**<br>**7** | **A GOOD TO VERY GOOD (ABOVE AVERAGE) RESPONSE**<br>Writing, on the whole, provides consistent focus, understanding and thought. Glimmers of a focused response but lacks consistency, which could have resulted in the writing being awarded a level 7. Evidence of personal style and voice, although depth and development compromised in places/development and depth in evidence but personal style lacking or compromised. **The supplied text is used generally as stimulus - limited cutting and pasting integrated/moulded with own ideas**. | **A GOOD TO VERY GOOD COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Competent and at times, impressive use of language. Very good understanding of register to suit the purpose of the task. Language is fluent and original with evident awareness of audience and purpose. Incorporates varied sentence patterns that reveal an awareness of different syntactic structures. May employ liveliness, sincerity or humour when appropriate; the writing at times may be too casual/personal/formal to the demands of the question. Errors do not impede readability. Some editing is needed. |

IEB Copyright © 2018

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **5** | **6½**<br>**6**<br><br>Average: 6 ½ | **AN ADEQUATE (AVERAGE) RESPONSE**<br>An ordinary, predictable response that broadly meets the requirements of the task. An awareness of audience and purpose, although not always convincing/consistent. Makes an attempt to respond sincerely albeit unconvincing in places. Evidence of personal voice in places, although some areas jar with the question requirements. Content suggests that ideas could have been developed further. **The supplied text is used as stimulus on occasion – cutting and pasting integrated/moulded with own ideas.** | **AN ADEQUATE COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Use of appropriate language and register, although not always consistently applied. Makes some attempt to include different sentence patterns but with awkward or uneven success. Occasional errors that detract from the writing fluency in places. In places errors may impede readability. The purpose, audience and register have been understood in places. Writing is ordinary. |
| **4** | **5½**<br>**5** | **A LIMITED (BELOW AVERAGE) RESPONSE**<br>Ideas in the paragraphs may be inconsistently organised. Glimmers of originality, despite limited success in taking into account different audiences and purposes. Superficial response. Limited personal style. Development of ideas is limited/partial and requires further elaboration; compromised development. Personal voice is limited. **Over-reliance on supplied text, which hinders personal response in places**. | **A LIMITED COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Register suggests limited awareness of audience and purpose. Limited range of syntactic structures. Uses words that are colourless and flat. Language may be repetitious. Errors begin to impede readability. Editing required for clarity of ideas. Register not consistent with question's demands. |
| **3** | **4½**<br>**4** | **AN INADEQUATE, COMPROMISED RESPONSE**<br>Ideas have in instances been compromised by insufficient depth, development and organisation. The purpose of the task has been tackled unsuccessfully. Vague in places. An inconsistent or incomplete attempt. Glimmer of personal voice, albeit unconvincing. **The writing is compromised and lacks focus and direction. Over-reliance on supplied text, which hinders personal response**. | **AN INADEQUATE COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Language is flawed and unsuitable for audience or purpose. Language patterns flawed, images stereotyped. Errors severely impede readability; extensive editing required. Vague, confused sentences. Register inappropriate for the task. |
| **2** | **3½**<br>**3** | **A POOR, MUDDLED RESPONSE**<br>Little or no originality. Individual ideas lacking. No development and focus. Cohesion required. No personal style. Reveals no awareness of the purpose of the task. Voice is flat and unconvincing/no voice. **Relies solely on supplied text**. | **A POOR COMMAND OF LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Very flawed product. Erroneous. Demonstrates lack of control of language conventions, exhibiting frequent errors, which impedes understanding. |
| **1** | **2½**<br>**2**<br>**1** | **AN INCOHERENT RESPONSE**<br>No evidence of originality or cohesion; no attention to purpose, context. Development lacking. A completely flawed response/does not address the question. | **INCOHERENT/INAPPROPRIATE LANGUAGE AND REGISTER**<br>Incoherent language/inappropriate language. Preponderance of errors of style. Illogical. |

**[20 × 2 = 40]**

**Total: 100 marks**

IEB Copyright © 2018