

Scholarship

2013 Assessment Report

English

COMMENTARY

Candidates had opportunities to fully engage with topics and did so. Candidates chose from amongst the whole range of topics provided. Candidates showed a good command of language and academic writing and the ability to read and respond critically.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- engaged fully with the statement, manipulated topic, took a stance whereby the argument was fully developed around the topic, supported with apposite and appropriate comment and references
- wrote in an articulate and confident manner with zest and verve
- confidently employed vocabulary and syntax which demonstrated high levels of engagement and understanding
- melded materials and synthesised, instead of listing and offered a multiplicity of texts/ examples
- read widely and were able to express their points of view with sophisticated articulation
- referenced academic and critical works
- focused their discussion on specific points, especially in Section A
- showed high levels of independent personal response, not necessarily orthodox
- engaged with the statement keeping to a sophisticated central discussion
- synthesised information and response
- structured fluent discussion which moved from reference/quote to applied readings/analysis
- sustained the ability to write well across the whole paper
- constructed succinct responses.

Section A

- Dealt with both content and crafting of the two texts in a focussed and balanced discussion
- explored both passages with perceptive analysis, receptive to nuance and author's intention
- applied their knowledge of crafting methods in a relevant and productive way to draw out the purpose or ideas of writers
- produced a response which was independent, insightful and creative.

Section B

- Focused their response on the statement and the stance
- responded with a clear and accurate understanding of the genre
- developed and supported a cogent and effective thesis
- demonstrated the ability to reconsider, rework and even refresh learned materials and familiar texts, so that materials were brought cogently and judiciously to support chosen topic.

Section C

- Focused their response on the statement and their stance
- were able to demonstrate an independence of thought
- combined breadth and depth in their discussion
- sustained their discussion in a perceptive and engaging way.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- engaged with topic – established a stance around statement discussed
- offered examples that went beyond stating
- substantiated arguments with references from texts which were suitable to the stance established
- synthesised responses
- wrote a response which included critical analysis
- engaged with the statement in their response
- structured discussions with supporting and relevant reference
- showed personal insight and independent thought
- formed strong, well-supported conclusions about texts
- wrote succinctly.

Section A

- Discussed in Section A the how and why of language and purpose to a reasonable extent – that went beyond naming, as well as discussing vocabulary with a degree of intelligence
- were able to make reference to purpose, techniques and meaning in the given extracts
- compared elements of the texts and were able to discuss similarities and differences.

Section B

- Responded to the statements
- took time to wrestle with the statement and understand it in their terms rather than assuming that the meanings were given
- used their understandings and experience of texts and genres to shape developed and linked discussion
- were accurate in their discussion of genre.

Section C

- Responded to the statements
- recognised with a degree of discrimination the thrust of the statement, producing relevant and fluent discussion
- included textual evidence fluently, selecting details rather than summarising.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- related information – they **told** and did not **show engagement** with statement
- relied on regurgitating pre-prepared essays on topics in past papers, often with a highly contrived twist in the opening paragraphs
- wrote in a pedestrian and limited manner
- stated points which were not followed through
- established a stance and then didn't refer to it throughout
- left their argument to the conclusion
- tacked-on statement about the topic at the end of the paragraph/essay
- provided level three responses on some aspects of the statements, thereby not showing evidence of synthesised responses
- lacked a sense of personal voice or ownership of argument
- lacked a clear command of their chosen texts and readings.

Section A

- Stated the range of techniques in Section A, but offered no analysis
- were too focused on spotting effects or their absence
- did not develop and structure a coherent discussion
- were inaccurate in knowledge and identification of language features.

Section B

- Pieced together passages of pre-worked materials rather than adapting/responding to the given statement
- included extraneous reference, detail or quotation which did not pertain to the chosen statement
- relied on particular studied/prepared "past-essay" areas of a text or texts, producing generic genre related discussions
- inaccurately identified genre.

Section C

- Retained 'pocketed' discussion of individual texts or authors without blending their readings/responses in a relevant discussion
- failed to engage with the statement.