

Rubrics for Paper 1: Essay (50 marks)

Use of English (20 marks)

Marks	Descriptors
<p>Band 1 18-20</p>	<p>Excellent linguistic ability with very few errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. Varied sentence structures and wide-ranging vocabulary. Use of felicitous/appropriate expression is apparent and/or the choice of vocabulary is sophisticated and consistently appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Organisation of ideas is extremely well handled with a lucid introduction and conclusion; paragraphing is coherent, making use of a range of linking devices. The answer concludes effectively, framed in precise and convincing language.</p> <p>Overall, the answer demonstrates a confident ‘personal voice’ with assured control and range of expression throughout. Some errors may occur, but these are few and do not impede meaning in any way. Ideas are communicated with confidence and conviction.</p>
<p>Band 2 15-17</p>	<p>Good to very good linguistic ability with some evidence of variety of sentence structure and vocabulary. Felicitous/appropriate expression may be apparent but to a limited degree. Meaning will be clear throughout, although there may be minor errors of different types.</p> <p>Organisation of ideas is good to very good, with an effective introduction and conclusion; effective paragraphing and some variety of linking devices. Structure is clear throughout, if lacking the subtlety and effectiveness of Band 1.</p> <p>Overall, the answer is well controlled and expressed with some evidence of breadth of structure and vocabulary. The degree of technical accuracy will determine the mark within the Band, but errors will be relatively minor and the quality of vocabulary also indicate the placing of the script within the parameters of the Band. There is a cogent overall structure. Response is secure throughout and more than generally competent (Band 3), but lacking the quality and assurance of Band 1.</p>
<p>Band 3 12-14</p>	<p>Linguistic ability is generally sound. Use of language may be ‘safe’ or more ambitious but flawed. Errors of various types may be frequent, but meaning is not impeded. Vocabulary and sentence structure are adequate for the task, if rather simple and repetitive.</p> <p>Organisation of ideas is reasonably clear throughout, but the introduction and conclusion may be short or laboured. Paragraphing and linking devices may be basic or repetitive, but are evident.</p> <p>Overall, the answer is characterised by a general level of competence. There may be some ambition, but errors detract from the overall clarity of expression. Answers awarded low Band 3 will lack consistent clarity as a result of frequent errors and unsure or laboured expression. Ideas can still be discerned without the examiner having to construe meaning.</p>

<p>Band 4 7-11</p>	<p>Linguistic ability is generally insecure, with constant errors of various types; meaning breaks down to varying degrees, thus determining the placement in the Band. Punctuation and sentence demarcation are inconsistent; basic grammatical errors, such as tense, number, subject/verb agreements are apparent. Vocabulary is simplistic or incorrectly used.</p> <p>Organisation of ideas is weak. Introductory and/or concluding paragraphs are muddled and lacking in precision and focus. Paragraph linking is very basic or haphazard in much of the script.</p> <p>Overall, the answer is characterised by general faults of expression, including spelling or grammar or punctuation. Not all of these may be present, but the meaning is not securely communicated. The degree to which this occurs will determine the mark awarded within the Band. Some re-reading may be required by the examiner, but ideas can then be deduced.</p>
<p>Band 5 1-6</p>	<p>Linguistic ability is very weak with few sentences showing control or accuracy, to the extent that meaning is barely conveyed. Basic errors occur constantly and consist of weak spelling, punctuation and grammar. Vocabulary is very limited or insecure.</p> <p>Organisation of ideas struggles for clarity with paragraphs lacking clarity, focus or coherence. Any introduction and conclusion will be very basic.</p> <p>Overall, the answer is characterised by heavy incidence of errors, resulting in severe breakdown of meaning. The examiner may need to re-read the answer (perhaps more than once) in order to understand any essential line of thought, but no ideas may be deduced.</p>
<p>0</p>	<p>Nothing in the answer meets any of the criteria.</p>

Content (30 marks)

Marks	Descriptors
<p>Band 1 26-30</p>	<p>An original and insightful response with perceptive ideas and a balanced discussion which reflects thorough evaluation of the issues contained within the question.</p> <p>Fully appropriate and wide-ranging use of illustration which is clearly linked to the point/idea being expounded. Examples are likely to be original, possibly making use of contemporary or recent developments.</p> <p>Fully relevant, addressing the requirements of the question throughout.</p> <p>Overall, the answer is fully engaging, showing personal insight and possibly originality of thought and argument. Illustration is apt throughout and used to illustrate and enhance both individual points and the overall quality of the argument.</p>
<p>Band 2 21-25</p>	<p><u>BAND 2A (24-25)</u></p> <p>Thoughtful response which is consistently argued, showing a balanced discussion which reflects depth of evaluation and awareness of the issues raised by the question.</p> <p><u>Consistent apt use of illustration</u> which may lack originality, but clearly supports the argument, <u>with all points being effectively linked to the ideas being conveyed.</u></p> <p><u>MAINLY relevant</u>, addressing the requirements of the question throughout.</p> <p>Overall, the answer shows sustained clarity of relevant and detailed discussion, to varying degrees, with appropriate illustration being used to support the ideas being put forward. <u>Examples are wide-ranging and detailed (includes the local and global contexts that extend beyond personal observations/environment).</u></p> <hr/> <p><u>BAND 2B (21-23)</u></p> <p>Thoughtful response which is MEANINGFULLY argued, showing SOME BALANCE which reflects depth of evaluation and awareness of the issues raised by the question.</p> <p><u>Mostly apt use of illustration</u> which clearly supports the argument, <u>with most points being effectively linked to the ideas being conveyed.</u></p> <p>MAINLY relevant, addressing the requirements of the question throughout.</p> <p>Overall, the answer shows sustained clarity of relevant and detailed discussion, to varying degrees, with appropriate illustration being used to support the ideas being put forward. <u>Examples are mostly relevant and detailed.</u></p>

<p>Band 3</p> <p>15-20</p>	<p>BAND 3A (18-20)</p> <p>An adequate response which shows an awareness of the issues being raised, albeit in a relatively restricted manner. <i>Balance is evident although it may be awkwardly handled.</i></p> <p><i>Moderate use of illustration</i>, relying on standard material with some reference to the points being made. <i>Factually accurate examples are given but may not be sufficiently detailed.</i></p> <p><i>Moderately relevant</i>, sufficiently addressing the demands of the question.</p> <p>Overall, the answer demonstrates varying degrees of competence but <i>demonstrates consistent relevance and use of illustration.</i></p>
	<p>BAND 3B (15-17)</p> <p>An adequate response which shows an awareness of the issues being raised, albeit in a relatively restricted manner. <i>Balance is somewhat evident and awkwardly handled.</i></p> <p><i>Some use of illustration</i>, possibly relying on standard material with some reference to the points being made. <i>Factually accurate examples for the most part.</i></p> <p><i>Somewhat relevant</i>, mostly addressing the demands of the question.</p> <p>Overall, the answer demonstrates varying degrees of competence. <i>There is a focus on the question, but illustration and explanation are not always relevant or well-developed.</i></p>
<p>Band 4</p> <p>8-14</p>	<p>A limited response with some awareness of the issues contained in the question, possibly lacking a coherent argument in addressing these issues. Ideas may be fragmentary or vague.</p> <p>Use of illustration is very limited with little or no development in relation to the points being made. Knowledge is quite restricted or standard references may be used with little evidence of understanding.</p> <p>Some evidence of relevance which addresses a limited range of points raised by the question.</p> <p>Overall, the answer lacks sustained or detailed clarity of argument and relevance to the question. Illustration is basic and lacking development. If an argument or some illustration is attempted, but cogency is uneven, award marks of 10-12. If a coherent argument or developed illustration is absent, award marks of 7-9.</p>
<p>Band 5</p> <p>1-7</p>	<p>A very weak response which largely fails to address the demands of the question.</p> <p>There is no clear use of illustration. Examples may be obscure or non-existent.</p> <p>Relevance is barely apparent. Ideas are totally lacking in coherence.</p> <p>Overall, the answer struggles to achieve any coherent discussion; illustration is totally lacking or fails to achieve any clarity in constructing any cogent line of discussion.</p>
<p>0</p>	<p>Nothing in the answer meets any of the criteria.</p>