

**MARK SCHEME 8
REPORT WRITING**

Day: Tuesday

Responses *might* use the following ideas:

A1: describe the events leading to Selkirk being left alone on the island and the ship setting sail
In **search of treasure** (det. pirates, October 1703) [dev. sense of adventure]

Order to sail onwards (det. near/past/from a remote island, South Seas) [dev. Stradling captain / in charge]

Crew advised by Selkirk to refuse / said ship would sink (det. ship infested with woodworm, leaked) [dev. was unseaworthy, they would drown]

Physical fight between Stradling and Selkirk (det. Stradling mocked, Selkirk hit him)
Stradling **left Selkirk on an island** to perish (det. remote, belongings unloaded from the ship; punishment for inciting mutiny) [dev. worried others might agree with Selkirk]
Selkirk **begged for forgiveness** (det. in water pleading) [dev. Selkirk desperate]

A2: explain how Selkirk managed to survive for so long alone **and** how his feelings changed
Had his **belongings** (det. sea chest, spare clothes, bedding, gun with ammunition) [dev. comfort / protection]

Found **food** / edible resources of the island (det. fish, pimentos, watercress) [dev. could eat well and stay healthy / strong]

Stayed active (det. stopped him getting depressed) [dev. came to appreciate what he did have, accepted his fate]

Built a shelter (det. glade, steep climb, wooded mountains) [dev. offered protection from elements / attack / good view to keep a lookout for rescue]

Fresh water available (det. fast, clear stream) [dev. avoid disease / could wash and drink safely]

He was **resourceful** (det. grilled fish in embers of fire, used pimentos to flavour food, gathered supplies) [dev. instinct to survive, logical/ pragmatic approach]

He learnt to **appreciate the beauty** of the place / was no longer afraid (det. hummingbirds, fragile ferns) [dev. lost his fear of the wild / learnt to appreciate the beauty]

A3: suggest how far those involved in the events could be blamed.

Selkirk was not to blame (for the most part)

Right about the ship (det. off Peruvian coast, one month later, it sank) [dev. allowed him to survive]

Selkirk's **anger** / physical violence (det. using fists) [dev. had a short temper, (easily) provoked, passionate defence]

Selkirk **spoke to crew not captain** / disobeyed the captain (det. he was a crew member) [dev. knew he was undermining him, concern for others, brave]

Stradling to blame (mitigated to an extent)

refused to listen / ignored Selkirk's warning (det. justified as the ship was leaking and it sank a month later) [dev. greedy / arrogant / self-centred]

Stradling **showed no mercy** / wanted to punish / felt justified (det. said he wanted Selkirk to die there, ignored his begging and promises to obey him) [dev. vindictive / bully; example for the others]

Stradling **did not care for the lives of his crew members** (det. only 31 of them survived) [dev. made sure he was safely on a life raft; captain did not go down with his ship, responsible for what happened]

Role as captain (incompetent / pirate) (det. ship not well-maintained) [dev. irresponsible,

feared mutiny]

Crew partially to blame

Other members of the crew **did not support** or consider Selkirk's warning despite evidence (det. boat was leaking) [dev. put finding treasure before their own safety , didn't respect Selkirk's opinion, frightened of the captain]

Crew members **reacted without compassion** (det. actively pushed Selkirk back from small boats as he tried to get on board) [dev. took some pleasure in his punishment, afraid of Stradling]

The discriminator is the development of the writer's opinions and use of the evidence to create an interesting newspaper report, as this requires candidates to draw inferences. Ideas and opinions must be derived from the passage, developing the implications.

Marking Criteria for Question 1

Table A, Reading:

Use the following table to give a mark out of 15 for Reading.

Band 1: 13–15	The response reveals a thorough reading of the passage. Developed ideas are sustained and well related to the passage. A wide range of ideas is applied. There is supporting detail throughout, which is well integrated into the response, contributing to a strong sense of purpose and approach. All three bullets are well covered. A consistent and convincing voice is used.
Band 2: 10–12	The response demonstrates a competent reading of the passage. A good range of ideas is evident. Some ideas are developed, but the ability to sustain them may not be consistent. There is frequent, helpful supporting detail, contributing to a clear sense of purpose. All three bullets are covered. An appropriate voice is used.
Band 3: 7–9	The passage has been read reasonably well. A range of straightforward ideas is offered. Opportunities for development are rarely taken. Supporting detail is present but there may be some mechanical use of the passage. There is uneven focus on the bullets. The voice is plain.
Band 4: 4–6	There is some evidence of general understanding of the main ideas, although the response may be thin or in places lack focus on the passage or the question. Some brief, straightforward reference to the passage is made. There may be some reliance on lifting from the text. One of the bullets may not be addressed. The voice might be inappropriate.
Band 5: 1–3	The response is either very general , with little reference to the passage, or a reproduction of sections of the original. Content is either insubstantial or unselective. There is little realisation of the need to modify material from the passage.
Band 6: 0	There is little or no relevance to the question or to the passage.

Table B, Writing: Structure and order, style of language Use the following table to give a mark out of 10 for Writing.

9–10 •	Effective register for audience and purpose. • The language of the response sounds convincing and consistently appropriate. • Ideas are firmly expressed in a wide range of effective and/or interesting language. • Structure and sequence are sound throughout. • Spelling, punctuation and grammar almost always accurate.
7–8	Some awareness of an appropriate register for audience and purpose. •

	Language is mostly fluent and there is clarity of expression. • There is a sufficient range of vocabulary to express ideas with subtlety and precision. • The response is mainly well structured and well sequenced. • Spelling, punctuation and grammar generally accurate.
5-6	Language is clear but comparatively plain and/or factual, expressing little opinion. • Ideas are rarely extended, but explanations are adequate. • Some sections are quite well sequenced but there may be flaws in structure. • Minor, but more frequent, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3-4	There may be some awkwardness of expression and some inconsistency of style. • Language is too limited to express shades of meaning. • There is structural weakness and there may be some copying from the text. • Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-2	Expression and structure lack clarity. • Language is weak and undeveloped. • There is very little attempt to explain ideas. • There may be frequent copying from the original. • Persistent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar impede communication
0	The response cannot be understood