

ENGLISH FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE: PAPER II

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 2½ 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 **LITERATURE:** *The Hundred-Year-Old Man Who Climbed Out of the Window and Disappeared* – Jonas Jonasson

QUESTION 1 **CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS**

- 1.1 Allan and Herbert managed to escape from the prison camp in Vladivostok by setting the whole camp on fire. They made their way to a hill southwest of Vladivostok, deciding to walk to North Korea. While walking on the main road, they noticed a military car. They sneaked up to the vehicle, took the gun and pistol and instructed the Marshal (Marshal Meretskoy) and his aide to take off their clothes. Herbert changed into the Marshal's uniform – this is how he became a Soviet marshal.

Any 3 facts that clearly explain the events that led to Herbert becoming a 'Soviet marshal'.

- 1.2 Allan Karlsson was not one to plan too far ahead, e.g., after meeting Estebán he decides to go to Spain with him, not knowing what he will do there or how he will make a living.

Or

Allan approached life optimistically, believing that things would work out for the best, 'Things are what they are and whatever will be, will be.' e.g., when flying to Bali, he believed that things would work out and that he would get himself and all his friends through passport control.

Allow for alternatives: 2 marks = identifying Allan's way of approaching life using the prompt; 2 marks = any relevant example.

- 1.3 Marker's discretion; please allow for any relevant content that illustrate Allan's statement.

Responses may include:

Introduction:

Understanding the figurative meaning of Allan's statement.

Figurative meaning: having the right connections, enables you to get yourself out of tricky situations/opportunities and because of this Allan has met great world leaders and is invited to fancy restaurants and gets to enjoy expensive meals.

Body:

- General Franco organises for Allan to go back to Sweden, after Allan saves his life.
- Allan solves the atom bomb problem and then meets the Vice President Truman, who later helps to identify Allan when he is at the American embassy in Tehran, and he helps him to get a passport and fly back to Sweden.
- Mao Tse Tung organises for Allan to go on holiday to Bali and ensures that Allan and Herbert have enough spending money to enjoy their holiday.
- When Allan Karlsson and Yury Popov arrive in Leningrad, a limousine picks them up to take them to Moscow where they are to have dinner with Stalin, the most important man in Russia (leader of the Soviet Union). Only the best is good enough for Allan, whose knowledge the Russians are after. On the way to Moscow, Allan complains that he is hungry. It is no effort for the limousine to make a stop in a small town to cater to his needs. Yury tells Allan that they will be having dinner with Stalin to which Allan replies, '... that he was looking forward to it.' Yury wonders whether Allan is referring to the dinner or to meeting Stalin. Allan's reply of, 'You have to eat to live.' suggests that he knows that he will only be served the best food and drink and he looks forward to this. Allan goes into detail, listing all the food served at the

dinner party and he points out that only the 'important' people around the table are allowed to eat. The interpreter is given nothing to eat or drink.

- 'Comrade Stalin was not stingy when it came to food. There was salmon roe and herring and salted cucumbers and meat salad and grilled vegetables and borsht and pelmeni and blini and lamb cutlets and pierogi with ice cream. There was wine of various colours and of course vodka. And even more vodka.' (Chapter 16)
- The dinner with Stalin, Yury and Marshal Beria is in complete contrast to the food he receives when locked up in one of the cells of the secret police where he receives a loaf of bread, thirty grams of sugar and three warm meals (vegetable soup) every day.

Content – a mark out of 6 for relevant content linked to the question:	
• Understanding the figurative meaning of Allan's statement	2 marks
• Two references from the novel that illustrate the meaning of Allan's statement.	4 marks
Language and style; appropriate register; good linkage	2 marks

QUESTION 2 PARAGRAPH: PERSONAL RESPONSE

Content – a mark out of 10 for relevant content, well-reasoned statements and examples linked to the brief and the novel.	10 marks
Language/style/clear stance and overall convincing voice.	5 marks

Learner's own opinion/stance should be clearly expressed. Allow for both sides. Then, supporting detail must be provided.

Possible response/content for Allan and his friends being innocent.

- Both Allan and Julius are old which excuses the fact that they forgot to switch off the freezer and therefore accidentally killed Bolt. Knowing that the police will probably not believe their story, is possibly the reason for them not reporting Bolt's death.
- Allan uses Sonya to kill Bucket as he wants to protect himself and his friends; Bucket had a gun and could just as well have killed one of them.

Possible response/content for Allan and his friends not being innocent.

- Allan takes Bolt's suitcase intentionally which makes it stealing.
- Both Allan and Julius are not too concerned about the fact that they forgot to switch off the freezer which causes Bolt's death. If it were an honest mistake, they would have gone to the police. Instead, they choose to get rid of the body – this clearly indicates that they act like criminals.
- After opening the suitcase and finding the 50 million crowns, they should have gone to the police, but they chose not to, but rather to share and use the money.
- After Allan and Julius tell Benny and The Beauty about their crimes and the money that they will now share, both Benny and The Beauty do not go to the police. This makes them just as guilty.
- When Allan instructs Sonya to sit, he knows that this will kill Bucket and after having killed Bucket, he and his friends dispose of the body by placing it in the boot of a car, instead of going to the police.
- Allan and his friends also have no problem bribing the airport staff to land in Bali and to get them into Indonesia without passports.

QUESTION 3 DIALOGUE

Expected content: NB No preamble of greetings and musings

- After meeting Estebán at the factory where they worked together as ignition specialists, Allan accepts his invitation to travel to Spain. Allan's main motivation for this is the hope to see a black man.
- Estebán joins the military forces as soon as they arrive in Spain but is killed before even firing one shot. The result is Allan offering his services to the military forces in exchange for food and good alcoholic drinks and on the condition that he wears civilian clothing.
- His job is to blow up bridges during the Spanish war.
- Toward the end of the war, he plants a bomb and as General Franco and his soldiers want to cross the bridge, he warns them to get away from the bridge which saves their lives.
- General Franco is extremely grateful toward Allan and invites him to dinner: paella and something to drink.
- The next morning the war was over, General Franco becomes the leader of Spain and offers Allan a job, which he declines – he wants to go back to Sweden.

Content – a mark out of 7 for relevant and creative content linked to the question.	7 marks
Dialogue format, occasional, meaningful gesture in present tense and conversational style.	3 marks

QUESTION 4 ESSAY WITH GUIDELINES

Marker's discretion; please allow for any relevant content that shows how Allan lives his life by his mother's philosophy.

Responses may include:

Paragraph 1: Use the stimulus of Allan's mother's philosophy on life for your introduction: 'Things are what they are, and whatever will be will be.'

Echo question and relate to topic: Allan accepts life as it comes and does not get angry or excited about any of his experiences.

Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4: Discuss how Allan lived his life true to his mother's philosophy by referencing events from either the modern storyline or the historical storyline, or a combination of the two.

- When Allan's mother dies, he accepts it and simply continues with his life as before: he stays up to date with current events by reading the newspaper and uses his inheritance money to start his own dynamite company. He is only 15 years old but does not mourn the fact that he is now all alone with no social life. Instead, he works hard to improve his knowledge on explosives and to make his company successful.
- After Allan insults Stalin and is sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment in Vladivostok, he accepts his fate and only worries about having food to eat, a place to sleep and something to drink. He does not make a fuss about the fact that he is sentenced unfairly or that he now has to perform hard labour and deal with the 'slow-witted' Herbert or the fact that he is not given any alcohol to drink.
- When Allan returns to Sweden, after having helped America solve the atom bomb problem, the Swedish Prime Minister personally welcomes Allan back in Sweden. He wants Allan to work with the head of atomic energy, Dr Sigvard Eklund. Upon questioning Allan, Eklund is shocked to find out Allan has only 3 years' formal education and that his job was to serve coffee/tea to the scientists and researchers. Eklund clearly looks down on Allan and does not see him of any value; Allan accepts this and is quite happy to go back to leading a quiet life.

Paragraph 5: In your conclusion, draw the different aspects of the essay together and provide a general conclusion.

Content – a mark out of 15 for relevant content for each of the paragraph topics provided.	15 marks
Paragraph structure; suitable title; appropriate register; use of language conventions.	5 marks

***See rubric on page 6 to mark this question.**

QUESTION 4 ESSAY WITH GUIDELINES

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR LITERARY ESSAY

LEVEL	%	CONTENT = 15			MARK /5	STYLE = 5	
		MARK /15	CLASSIFICATION	CRITERIA		CRITERIA	
7	100 97 93 90	15 14.5 14 13.5	Outstanding	An impressive and distinguished essay that is succinct and stands out above the rest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough and impressive, in-depth knowledge of the text. Exemplary understanding: can reproduce relevant facts insightfully within the question. Every point relevant to the topic. Thorough literary appreciation: understands, enjoys, can evaluate. 	5 4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned, structured, well-considered argument with effective linkage and excellent cohesion. Logical progression of argument. Lucid, eloquent. Original expression. Excellent control of tone. Textual substantiation of every comment. Excellent vocabulary and language structures. Formal language usage. Grammatically correct. Third person. Present tense. 	
	87 83 80	13 12.5 12	Excellent Distinctive	A perceptive essay that is commendable and well-structured. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough, accurate and confident knowledge of the text. Mature understanding: integrates and elaborates textual references insightfully. Maintains consistent focus. Literary appreciation is evident. 	4		
6	77 73 70	11.5 11 10.5	Very good	A skilful, competent essay that is focused. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good, accurate knowledge of the text. Very good understanding: argument is developed logically; may have minor lapses. Relevant textual references – these could have been used with greater effect. Good appreciation of the text. 	3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned, structured argument with good linkage. Clear expression, coherent. Control of tone. Textual substantiation of comments. Very good vocabulary and language structures. Formal language usage. Grammatically correct. Third person. Present tense. 	
5	67 63 60	10 9.5 9	Good Average/ Satisfactory	An essay that 'does the job'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate knowledge of text. Satisfactory understanding: argument is developed in an adequate manner and most points relate to topic. Mostly relevant textual references; some generalisations. Some appreciation of text. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate linkage to show logical progression, sound introduction and conclusion. Plain expression. Most comments supported by appropriate substantiation. Some duplication of comment. Satisfactory vocabulary and language structures. Predominantly formal language. Third person. Odd fluctuations from present tense. 	
4	57 53 50	8.5 8 7.5	Less than satisfactory	An undeveloped essay that attempts to engage with the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable knowledge of the text. Simplistic understanding of question: argument is partly developed; narrow interpretation and vague reference to the topic. Attempts to answer given question; vague textual references. 	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction and conclusion, some linkage to show progression. Pedestrian expression. Partial support of comment with textual substantiation. Simple vocabulary and language structures. Predominantly formal language. Predominantly third person. Fluctuations from present tense. 	
3	47 43 40	7 6.5 6	Adequate	A simplistic essay that struggles to engage with the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited understanding of the text. Errors of understanding of question and/or content, muddled. Little or no referencing/ flawed referencing. Only hints at topic. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of planning, poorly structured. Weak introduction and conclusion. Haphazard, disjointed, rambling, very poor linkage. Some distracting errors with textual substantiation. Weak vocabulary and sentence structures. Use of colloquialisms, contractions. Limited textual substantiation. 	
2	37 33 30	5.5 5 4.5	Passable but inadequate	A poor essay that is muddled, vague and/or inaccurate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsatisfactory knowledge of the text. A weak, flawed response, which might be off topic. Very few if any links of textual referencing to the question. Difficult to identify any distinct argument; unfocused. 	1.5	Defective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unstructured, sloppily written. requiring marked effort to understand. paragraph links problematic. serious vocabulary and sentence structure errors. poor textual substantiation. 	
1	27 23 20	4 3.5 3	Erroneous	An extremely weak essay; at times displays a feeble attempt to engage with the text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor/incomplete/flawed/no knowledge of the text. The essay is vague, muddled and lacks focus. No links of textual referencing to the question. 	1	Defective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unstructured, sloppily written. requiring marked effort to understand. no linkage. serious vocabulary and sentence structure errors. disjointed textual substantiation. 	
	17 13 10 7 3	2.5 2 1.5 1 0.5	Incompetent	A totally incompetent essay; displays no link to the text or the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious errors of understanding of the question and/or the text. Complete misinterpretation of topic. Vague attempt to produce a response. 	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barely intelligible. 	

SECTION B TRANSACTIONAL WRITING

QUESTION 5 LONGER TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: SPEECH

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 can, for example, achieve a level 7 for '**PURPOSE**', but only a level 5 for '**LANGUAGE AND FORMAT**' (e.g., 13 + 9 = 22).

LEVEL	MARK	PURPOSE DESCRIPTOR	LANGUAGE AND FORMAT DESCRIPTOR
		12–15	12–15
7	30 29 28 27 26 25 24	The candidate can write original and coherent texts, skilfully adapting to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts. A mature personal style is evident. Candidate makes an intelligent statement.	Excellent use of language conventions, mature vocabulary and use of register is displayed. Excellent evidence of editing enhances the overall expression of the candidate's viewpoint. All elements of the format are correct.
		10.5–11.5	10.5–11.5
6	23 22 21	The candidate is able to write original and coherent texts, can adapt to different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts although this is not completely sustained. There is evidence of a personal style and a thorough engagement with the question, although some depth may be lacking in places.	Competent, at times impressive use of language conventions and vocabulary. Very good understanding of register, although there may be occasions where this is not fully sustained. Very few grammar or spelling errors. There may be minor errors in the format.
		9–10	9–10
5	20 19 18	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. An average response.	Average response; pedestrian, but not seriously flawed. Mostly accurate use of vocabulary; language conventions and sound understanding of register. Minor errors. Format mostly correct.
		7.5–8.5	7.5–8.5
4	17 16 15	The candidate is generally able to write with some originality and tries to consider different audiences, purposes, formats and contexts, although this is not entirely successful. Limited personal style is evident.	The candidate tries to apply conventions, but the product is flawed and has a number of language and punctuation errors. An attempt at employing the correct format has been made, but one or two errors are evident. There is limited understanding of appropriate register.
		6–7	6–7
3	14 13 12	An attempt is made to produce original texts which consider 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.
		4–5.5	4–5.5
2	11 10 9 8	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 language, punctuation and vocabulary errors. No understanding of appropriate register. Some attempt at format albeit incorrect.
		0–3.5	0–3.5
1	7 6 5 4 3 0–2	Little or no evidence of engagement with the question 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.

QUESTION 6 SHORT TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: COMMENTARY

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 can, for example, achieve a level 7 for '**PURPOSE**', but only a level 5 for '**LANGUAGE AND FORMAT**' (e.g., 4 + 3 = 7).

		PURPOSE	LANGUAGE AND FORMAT
LEVEL	MARK	DESCRIPTOR	DESCRIPTOR
		4–5	4–5
7	10 9 8	Candidate can produce an original and coherent short text, skilfully adapting to different audiences. Candidate makes an intelligent statement.	Excellent use of language conventions, mature vocabulary and use of register displayed. Excellent evidence of editing enhances the overall expression of the candidate's message.
		3,5	3,5
6	7	Candidate is able to produce an original short text, although this is not always sustained. There is evidence of a personal style and engagement with the question.	Competent, at times impressive use of language conventions and vocabulary. Very good understanding of register, although not always sustained. Very few grammar or spelling errors.
		2,5–3	2,5–3
5	6 5	Candidate attempts to adapt to different audiences and contexts, although some areas jar with question requirements. An average response.	Pedestrian but not seriously flawed. Mostly accurate use of vocabulary and language conventions. Minor errors.
		1,5–2	1,5–2
4	4 3	Candidate tries to consider different audiences, purposes and contexts, although this is not entirely successful.	Candidate tries to apply conventions, but there are a number of language and punctuation errors. There is limited understanding of appropriate register.
		1	1
3	2	An attempt is made to produce an original text which considers different audiences, purposes and contexts, but this is not always done correctly.	Flawed product with poor spelling and grammar. Meaning is not always clear. Register usually at odds with the demands of the task.
		0,5	0,5
2	1	Inadequate attention to purpose and context. Poor response; flawed. Candidate may have misunderstood the demands of the question.	Very flawed product marred with language, punctuation and vocabulary errors. No understanding of appropriate register.
		0	0
1	0	No evidence of engagement with the question. No attention to purpose or context. A completely flawed response.	No evidence of language conventions. Inability to use correct register. Communication marred.

Total: 100 marks