



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION  
MAY 2024

**ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE: PAPER I**  
**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.**

---

**The Marking Guidelines are to be used in conjunction with the Generic Descriptors.**

**QUESTION 1            COMPREHENSION**

1.1     The writer has presented his credentials to the reader, positioning himself as knowledgeable and an authority on this subject. He has tempered this formality, however, with the informal register of 'postdoc', making himself approachable to the reader, too.

*[Award 1 mark for the register and 1 mark for the writer's position in relation to the reader.]*

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

1.2     The writer has used the compound adjectives, 'first-ever' and 'oldest-known'. Both these superlative adjectives establish the writer's attitude of admiration or awe of Africa's 'vast historical record'.

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

1.3 While 'Third World' has come to refer to 'impoverished countries', it was initially used to signal its outsider status – neither capitalist- nor communist-aligned and, by implication, without consequence or importance, therefore implying a lack of economic identity and a separation from the major world powers at the time. Candidates might argue that 'Third World' is a more appropriate label because, in paragraph 2, the writer mentions that the 'continent's cultural complexity and diversity is well known' – the opposite of developing. On the other hand, although 'developing countries' might be a 'better choice', because the label suggests that these countries are not yet developed – they are still in a stage of growth or infancy, in comparison with the 'developed' world, and have not yet caught up with them. Needing to 'develop better health care systems', etc. is only a euphemism for poverty and a lack of success. Furthermore, 'some people [who] still refuse to believe ...' would certainly label these countries as 'developing' – incomplete and incapable of designing or building 'ancient masterpieces'.

Both labels imply inferiority and therefore both labels feed into the refusal to believe that Africans or anyone from the 'developing world' could achieve feats of art or architecture, as mentioned in paragraphs 2–3 which discuss the 'developed' world's inability to credit Africans with creating 'ancient masterpieces' despite evidence to the contrary, such as its 'vast historical record'. The implication of either label is that Africa, compared to the First World, is lacking – a belief that the writer disputes with 'real evidence'.

*[For full marks, the full connotations of both labels must be explained and clearly linked to both perspectives on African archaeology as presented in paragraphs 2–3, before making a judgement on the aptness of either label.]*

A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.	
Marks	Skills
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li><b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li><b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li><b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li><b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to address aspects of the question but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

1.4 Paragraph 4 consists of a series of questions addressing the points made in the previous paragraph (3). The questions in paragraph 4 are not rhetorical, as the writer takes great care to answer these questions and explain his viewpoint clearly and emphatically to the reader: 'Actually, there *is* great harm' in paragraph 5. This technique furthers the writer's intention to educate his readers on the pitfalls of the racist views of pseudo-scientists, who go on to do great harm by 'vandalising ancient artefacts' and perpetuating racism.

*[For full marks, candidates must identify the purpose of the questions in relation to the writer's intention to educate the reader and justify that the questions are not rhetorical.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

1.5 'pseudo' might be defined as false/fake/not genuine.

1.6 Paragraphs 7 and 8 juxtapose the design and creation of impressive structures by Africans (paragraph 7) and Europeans (paragraph 8). Although these are two different continents, the writer stresses, through repetition, the similarities in age ('ancient African tribes' and 'medieval Europeans') and materials ('ropes, sticks and wood'). He points out that despite these similarities, pseudo-archaeologists (conspiracy theorists/pseudo-scientists) refuse to accept the evidence that both Africans and Europeans could design and build magnificent structures, furthering his argument that it is racism that fuels these misguided beliefs.

*[For full marks, the juxtaposition of the continents and people's beliefs must be pointed out alongside the similarities as mentioned by the writer and how they link to the writer's argument that 'pseudo-archaeologists' are racist and undermine science.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

1.7 The writer compares colonialism to a 'rotting corpse'. This implies that, although colonialism is a thing of the past (dead – a 'corpse'), its odious effects are still lingering ('rotting'). The repulsive imagery highlights the writer's condemnation of colonialism.

*[For full marks, candidates must explore the aspects of the metaphor and link these to the writer's attitude towards racism.]*

A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.	
Marks	Skills
2	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and accurate.</li> </ul>
1½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is partially complete and accurate.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
1–0	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes only one half of the required response or is inaccurate.</li> </ul>

1.8 Paragraphs 6 and 11 contrast how social media can be a platform for both education and false information. In paragraph 6, scientists 'published a communique' to educate readers and discredit 'pseudo-scientific research'. However, as seen in paragraph 11, social media may also be used by 'conspiracy junkies... to share their theories'. The effectiveness of social media is clearly dependent on its audience – both kinds of information are available, but it is up to the reader to find the facts.

*[For full marks, reference must be made to the two types of information available on social media (from scientists and 'conspiracy junkies') and a conclusion drawn as to the effectiveness of social media's ability to educate.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

- 1.9 In 'Ozymandias', the sculptor has rendered a true rendition of the king's character: his 'wrinkled lip and sneer of cold command'. Here, the artist has created a monument that has stood for generations and from which we can derive a sense of history and knowledge of the ancient world. The poet who comments on the ruined sculpture and the transient nature of power through juxtaposing the irony of the king's boast ('Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!') with his description of the desolate statue 'boundless and bare' has used his art to offer a philosophical/social/political commentary.

In paragraphs 12–14, the writer reminds scientists of their 'vital role' and 'clear duty' to share their findings, which are rooted in fact/truth/science. They should encourage social understanding and instil pride in people who, through pseudo-archaeology, have been taught that they and their history are worthless, still in a developing phase. The writer notes their responsibility to share their findings in a way that 'engages ordinary people'. This is perhaps the crucial point, as, for example, social media might make this knowledge more accessible. In both the poem and the relevant paragraphs in TEXT 1, art and the science of archaeology reassure us that there is 'living proof of ancient society's ingenuity'.

*[For full marks, candidates must:*

- *make explicit reference to both the poem and paragraphs 12–14 of TEXT 1.*
- *show a clear understanding of the purpose of the sculptor and poet as described in the poem, and the role of the scientist in paragraphs 12–14 of TEXT 1.*
- *show how each of these purposes works collectively to educate on history and society.*
- *show an understanding of how this education can reach 'ordinary people' as mentioned in paragraph 13 of TEXT 1.]*

<b>A 5-mark question requires extended abstract thinking and the response should demonstrate understanding, application, analysis, complex inference and/or synthesis, evaluation, or appreciation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
5	<p>The excellent response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>complete and detailed</b>, making specific reference to more than one element of the required text(s).</li> <li>• <b>makes insightful links</b> between the question and the text(s).</li> <li>• <b>provides evidence</b> that understanding can be transferred to a new context.</li> <li>• <b>integrates all elements, making connections and demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
4½–4	<p>The very good response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>makes specific reference</b> to the required text(s).</li> <li>• makes <b>accurate links</b> between the question and the text(s).</li> <li>• provides evidence that <b>understanding</b> can be <b>applied to familiar contexts</b>.</li> <li>• <b>integrates the key elements, making connections and demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½–3	<p>The average response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• refers to the required text(s) in a <b>general</b> way without addressing all aspects.</li> <li>• makes simple, <b>underdeveloped links</b> between the question and the text(s).</li> <li>• could be complete, without the required references or evidence.</li> <li>• <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the whole determined (does not clarify/establish the significance of the whole).</li> </ul>
2½–2	<p>The incomplete response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• refers to the text(s) in a <b>general</b> way.</li> <li>• is <b>inaccurate or simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• demonstrates <b>concrete thinking</b> and an <b>incomplete understanding</b> of the elements.</li> </ul>
1½	<p>The very partial response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>refers to the text(s)</b>.</li> <li>• does not answer the question because of a <b>lack of understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	<p>The inadequate response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attempts to deal with <b>only one</b> aspect of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>• displays <b>very limited/no understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

**QUESTION 2 SUMMARY**

Global marking, giving credit for concise and coherent sentences expressed in the candidate's own words.

Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average	Very Weak
10	8	6½	5	3
9	7½	6	4½	2
8½	7	5½	4	1

**Very Good: (10–8½)**

- Candidates producing a very good summary, **which has adhered to all instructions**, will demonstrate that they can successfully select relevant information from the different parts of the texts.
- Candidates will expertly synthesise that information to suit the new context and fulfil the specific requirements of the summary task.
- **The register will be consistently appropriate to a short, persuasive speech**, and the summary will stand alone as a successful, cohesive text.
- Expression will be excellent and will demonstrate a mastery of the language.
- Full and coherent sentences will be used resulting in a well-crafted, stylistically superior text.
- A summary in this category that exceeds the word limit can be awarded a maximum of 8½ marks.

**Good: (8–7)**

- A candidate producing a good summary will be able to discern which aspects of the texts are relevant and will be able to synthesise these and convey them in his/her own words.
- **The summary will successfully meet most of the requirements specified in the instructions.**
- **Candidates will use the appropriate register for a short persuasive speech**, and this will be well sustained throughout the summary.
- The expression in such summaries will demonstrate clarity that is not evident in the average summary.
- Full and coherent sentences will be used and will be well sustained throughout the summary.
- A summary in this category that exceeds the word limit can be awarded a maximum of 7 marks.

**Average: (6½–5½)**

- A candidate producing an average summary will demonstrate an ability to discern which aspects of the texts are relevant and will be able to put these into his/her own words most of the time.
- **The summary might not take into consideration the most important requirements specified in the instructions.**
- There may be instances of lifting or lapses that display faulty selection, the incorrect emphasis, or difficulty with synthesis.
- **The register will mostly be appropriate for a short persuasive speech**, although minor lapses may occur.
- Expression will be merely competent and there may be lapses in the construction of full sentences.
- A summary in this category that exceeds the word limit can be awarded a maximum of 5½ marks.

**Below Average: (5–4)**

- A candidate producing a below average summary will demonstrate an ability – some of the time – to discern which parts of the texts are relevant but may not be able to put this into his/her own words effectively.
- In some instances, large sections of the original texts will be lifted and reproduced.
- **It is likely that the register will not be appropriate for a short persuasive speech or that the new text will meet the requirements of the task.**
- Expression is likely to be flawed but will not impede understanding.
- A summary in this category that exceeds the word limit can be awarded a maximum of 4 marks.

**Very Weak: (3–1)**

- Summaries in this category will show extremely limited – if any – understanding of the texts.
- This will be evident through an inability to select appropriate parts of the texts to summarise or through excessive cutting and pasting.
- **Register will not be appropriate for a short persuasive speech.**
- Expression is likely to be poor, impeding understanding.

**NOTE:**

- 'Penalise' from 94 words by moving the mark to the bottom of the category (see descriptors). Write words from the descriptor to indicate your thinking.
- Stop reading at 100 words.
- Subtract 1 mark:  
– if no word count is provided, **OR** if an inexcusably inaccurate word count has been provided.

**QUESTION 3 SEEN POETRY**

3.1.1 The sibilant 's' in 'silent', 'stand', 'cigarettes', and 'sense', creates a sinister effect and enhances the eerie, ominous mood. The paradoxical image of a crowd, a large group of people, whom one expects to be noisy but who are completely silent and are 'idle', against the backdrop of 'falling light' further enhances this sense of menace/foreboding.

(Candidates might also note the effect of weariness created by the transferred epithet, of men 'who stand behind dull cigarettes'.)

*[For full marks, candidates must identify how the mood is introduced by the use of images and sound devices.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

3.1.2 The speaker's sympathy lies with the poor and unemployed. The negative simile compares the unemployed with people who have work. The speaker's cynical, bitterly ironic judgement is expressed through the contrast of 'no work' with 'better men' and 'much pay'. This highlights the disparity in opportunity and the suggestion that those with work are 'better' than the men who are unemployed.

*[For full marks, the comparison and contrast in the (negative) simile must be explained and linked to the speaker's sympathy with the unemployed men.]*

*[1½ marks may be awarded for a well-considered, literal interpretation of the simile, showing the speaker's sympathy not to lie with the unemployed men.]*

A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.	
Marks	Skills
2	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and accurate.</li> </ul>
1½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is partially complete and accurate.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
1–0	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes only one half of the required response or is inaccurate.</li> </ul>

3.2.1 The Sad Clown Paradox states that 'people who are exceptionally funny' or 'entertainers' often suffer from 'mental health conditions, such as anxiety and depression'. In the poem, the speaker adopts rather verbose, even 'highfalootin' diction to narrate the story of Uncle Sol in a meandering, often absurd manner – the speaker explains that Uncle Sol took up farming by using unnecessarily rambling sentences such as 'indulged in that possibly most inexcusable ... luxury that is or to wit farming'. The run-on lines mimic this loquaciousness as there are no natural pauses or stops, caused by the lack of punctuation, to guide the reader in immediately establishing meaning. The (darkly) humorous manner in which Uncle Sol's burial is portrayed physically in the gradual shortening of lines 32–38 and the brackets symbolising a grave ('and down went/my Uncle/Sol and started a worm farm'), echoes the speaker's dark humour. While the speaker's optimism ('nobody loses all the time'), does not necessarily point to depression or anxiety, it is combined with the morbid subject matter of suicide. Similarly, Uncle Sol, who is an excellent entertainer who 'should have gone/ into vaudeville' and was so popular in life that he was given a 'scrumptious not to mention splendiferous funeral' and the attendees 'all cried like the Missouri', died by 'drowning himself in the watertank'. Both the speaker and Uncle Sol may be said to adhere to the Sad Clown Paradox as explained in the extract.

*[For full marks, candidates must successfully link the extract to the specific requirements of the question and provide evidence from the poem.]*

A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.	
Marks	Skills
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li><b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li><b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li><b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li><b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>attempts to address aspects of the question</b> but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>attempts to deal with only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

3.2.2 Lines 35–37, '(and down went/my Uncle/Sol', become progressively shorter, mimicking the disappearance of the coffin.

**OR**

The brackets around lines 35–38 mimics Uncle Sol's enclosure in his grave.

**OR**

The isolation of the last line suggests the final, heroic fulfilment of Uncle Sol's dream of being a successful farmer, ironically in his death.

*[For full marks, candidates must show an understanding of the typography of these lines and offer a valid interpretation.]*

*[Credit valid, alternative responses.]*

A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.	
Marks	Skills
2	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>complete and accurate</b>.</li> </ul>
1½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>partially complete and accurate</b>.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b>.</li> </ul>

- 3.3 In 'Moving through the silent crowd' the speaker, through his observation of the 'men who idle in the road', comments on the unemployment and poverty following the economic crisis (the Great Depression in this case), where society's most vulnerable, the poor, suffer its brunt. He is sympathetic to their plight – he is 'haunted' by them and is critical of the class disparity which presents those with employment as 'better'. However, there is a distance between the speaker and the 'silent crowd' – he is only a witness who is 'moving through'. He presents himself as an outsider through his use of pronouns ('I' and 'they') and shows his lack of understanding through his 'jealous[y]' of their 'weeping hours'. Thus, while the speaker has an emotional response to the issue, he is very much presented as a commentator removed from the actual situation, allowing the reader to adopt his perspective and view the social issue through a sympathetic lens.

On the other hand, in 'nobody loses all the time', the speaker is specifically narrating the story of his Uncle Sol's tragic life of failure which ended in suicide and, through his folksy, anecdotal style, also offers an exploration of failure and how it is defined by society. His use of possessive adjectives ('my') reinforces the speaker's personal involvement. Although an emotional distance may be said to have been created by the speaker humorously euphemising his uncle's death – he 'imitated the skunks in a subtle manner' and 'started a worm farm', the speaker provides personal details of Uncle Sol, who was a talented entertainer and could sing 'McCann he was a diver' and was so beloved that he was provided with a 'scrumptious not to mention splendiferous funeral' where everyone, the speaker included, 'cried like the Missouri'. Because the speaker describes a tragic event so close to him, the reader might miss the social commentary that underlies this personal story.

*[Candidates may argue that either poem is more effective as a social commentary. However, for full marks, candidates must show a clear understanding, supported by an examination of each poem, of how the speakers' different emotional perspectives create a different kind of social commentary before making a judgement on which poem is more effective.]*

<b>A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li>• <b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>• demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li>• <b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>• is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li>• <b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li>• <b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>• indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attempts to address aspects of the question but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>• displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

**QUESTION 4 UNSEEN POETRY**

4.1 4.1.1 The poet has used personification to show that this is an old word – it has 'old parents'. The age of the word (it is old and its parents are old) gives the word a history and a definite identity, effectively showing the speaker's respect of the word's significance/gravitas.

*[Identifying the figure of speech (personification) is not necessary to achieve full marks; however, it is necessary to note the depiction of the word's age and link it to the weightiness/importance/significance/gravitas/respect that the speaker feels toward the word.]*

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

4.1.2 The speaker uses his hands as tools or 'resources' that help him heal himself when he feels 'blue'. His hands help him to connect with himself ('my hair'), his environment ('tables' and 'flowers') and loved ones ('the faces of people I love').

*[For full marks, candidates must link the speaker's use of his hands to aspects of the definition that focus on 'equipment ... techniques ... resources' (although this does not have to be explicit) which help him in his self-connection/self-identity/self-healing.]*

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

4.2 Stanza 1 is presented as a story that is narrated personally to the reader. The blend of simple language and sophisticated theme suggests that this is a poem suitable for nostalgic adults, rather than children. The simplicity of the opening sentence, 'I heard a big word once' seems packaged as a typical storytelling device for children. The speaker offers a careful but simple explanation of the word: 'It means things like ...' and then goes on to give examples which would make sense to children. The descriptive and simplified method of explaining what doctors do ('they feel your chest for things that don't quite fit') and the use of personal pronouns (I/you) also create an educational note for a story that contains a lesson/teachable moment. The speaker describes his heart as his 'favourite ... red, because it is inside [him], beating' and he describes his name as a song. This figurative language implies a magical quality, which is appealing to children. However, the theme of finding connection and self-knowledge through language is somewhat sophisticated and might resonate far more with adult readers.

(Candidates might argue that the sophistication of the theme might be irrelevant in the poem's appropriateness for children, as many children's stories do have sophisticated themes and children absorb these naturally through the simplicity and 'magic' of the stories.)

*[For full marks, candidates must note the story-telling style, coupled with simple but figurative language. Additionally, the theme must be mentioned and a judgement reached as to its appropriateness for children.]*

A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.	
Marks	Skills
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li><b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li><b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li><b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li><b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to address aspects of the question but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

4.3 The two stanzas mirror each other in structure. Both consist of eleven lines, both begin with references to 'hear[ing] words', both contain references to parents and the colour red, and both end with references to 'sing[ing]'. Stanza 1 focuses wholly on the speaker's internal, personal experience and identity – this is specifically noticeable with the use of the first-person singular pronoun, 'I' while explaining to the reader the significance of his 'armamentarium' and finding joy in himself. His 'favourite is red, because it is inside [him]', specifically, and when he said his name, 'it sang'. On the other hand, stanza 2 focuses on the speaker's parents and the role his heritage plays in solidifying his sense of self. His mother 'read books' and his father told 'stories of his childhood' to the speaker, which helped to shape him and once again find joy in the 'red within' – his sense of self.

*[For full marks, candidates must show how the stanzas mirror each other and then discuss how the two stanzas link the speaker's identity/sense of self/inner reality and heritage.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

4.4 In 'Red Songs' the speaker explores the 'big word' he has learned (armamentarium) which helps him in connecting with his world, his loved ones and his identity. Upon hearing this 'big word', he studies it and applies it to himself. The knowledge leads to him having 'learned' his name – his identity. He speaks of childhood stories read and told by his parents. Being exposed to the language with which his parents have gifted him has allowed him to 'sing' as a poet and bring joy and love to himself, especially when he is feeling 'blue'. The process of hearing, applying, and learning words leads to his triumphant realisation that his self-knowledge has led to the joy he feels in his name and his relationship with himself. This is why when he says his name, 'it sang'. 'Red Songs' effectively portrays how the knowledge and deeper understanding of words and stories leads to strong personal relationships, with the speaker's heritage, parents, and self.

On the other hand, 'For Oom Piet' focuses less on the meaning of words and more on the importance of merely sharing them. In 'For Oom Piet', the speaker is gifted with Oom Piet's words and she finds solace in them, not because they are profound – the words themselves are trite ('*Foeitog*' and 'I don't hope so') but his 'low, murmuring tones' bring healing in the same way he does for 'lame horses and bilious dogs'. Language is never explicit and, in this poem, it is not the words that matter: Oom Piet 'guessed'. It is the mere fact of talking that allows a relationship between Oom Piet and the speaker to blossom and for the speaker to feel a 'sense of rescue, something being saved'.

*[For full marks, candidates must make explicit reference to both poems and note the link between language and human relationships.]*

A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.	
Marks	Skills
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li><b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li><b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li><b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li><b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to address aspects of the question but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

**QUESTION 5 VISUAL AND CRITICAL LITERACY**

5.1 The visual details depict a hand grenade made of balloons. The verbal details state that killing is a 'game'. Thus, the seemingly harmless balloon toy is a metaphor for children ('child-soldiers') who are introduced to real, lethal weapons without fully understanding their power to kill.

*[For full marks, candidates must refer to both verbal and visual aspects of TEXT 5A and explain the metaphor.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

5.2 5.2.1 Children are portrayed as gullible and naïve or innocent and vulnerable. They are 'easy to convince'.

*[For full marks, candidates must show how children are portrayed and quote to support their responses.]*

A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.	
Marks	Skills
2	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and accurate.</li> </ul>
1½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is partially complete and accurate.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete and mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
1–0	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes only one half of the required response or is inaccurate.</li> </ul>

5.2.2 The sentence contains a comma splice error/two independent clauses cannot be joined by a comma.

**AND**

Help stop the exploitation of child soldiers. Text 'GUNS25 £2' to 70070.

**OR**

Help stop the exploitation of child soldiers; text 'GUNS25 £2' to 70070.

*[The comma should be replaced by either a semicolon or a full stop. Candidates may also construct a logical compound or complex sentence.]*

*[[Award 1 mark for the correction and 1 mark for the explanation.]*

5.3 The image of a girl as a child soldier is superimposed in black-and-white over her colourful dancer's costume. In the black-and-white portrait her face is sombre and instead of holding her hand gracefully in a dancer's pose (like the other hand depicted in colour) this hand is forming a military salute. The lack of colour reinforces the line that she does not want to be a child soldier.

*[For full marks, the use of colour and the visual positioning (layout) of the girl's soldier-identity over her dance identity must be noted and explained and linked to the verbal details.]*

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

- 5.4 5.4.1 'recruitment' is a noun. (1)  
 'recruiting' is a gerund **OR** a verb acting as a noun (1)

*[Candidates may be awarded ½ mark for identifying 'recruiting' as a verb.]*

5.4.2 Sentence A is an imperative sentence directed at the reader. It is a call to action. It is clear in its intention and gives the reader agency/responsibility. The reader is given the responsibility to assist the campaign in its intention to stop child recruitment. Therefore, Sentence A is far more impactful than Sentence B, which is a statement removed from the reader.

**OR**

Sentence B contains a warning – it is against the law – and contains the threat of punishment, whereas Sentence A is a vague command – who should stop child recruitment and how? Therefore, Sentence B is more impactful in the context of the campaign's intention to stop child recruitment – the seriousness of the offence and its dire consequences are clearly explained.

A 3-mark question that requires multi-structural thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, inferential comprehension of implied and figurative meanings.	
Marks	Skills
3	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engages with all aspects of the question and provides the required evidence.</li> <li>indicates a clear understanding of the significance of each element.</li> </ul>
2½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is multi-structural, but not integrated.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is convincing but incomplete.</li> <li>provides evidence if required.</li> </ul>
2	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is either one-dimensional, without sufficient evidence, or is superficial and general.</li> <li>does not provide enough relevant justification.</li> <li>demonstrates that the candidate understands the issue.</li> </ul>
1½	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demonstrates a flawed or incomplete understanding of what has been asked.</li> <li>indicates an understanding of the text.</li> <li>attempts to use the text(s) to answer the question but reasoning is concrete or simplistic.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicates only partial/limited/no understanding of this aspect of the text(s).</li> </ul>

5.5 TEXT 5A's logo is simple and stark, and has used contrast in its diction, colour and font. The oxymoron, 'war child' highlights the unnaturalness of such a concept – this is reinforced by the contrasting childlike scribble of 'child' directly under and separated by a red line from 'WAR' in capital letters. The difference in font highlights the imbalanced power relationship. The impact of the logo is further cemented by the serious black background with the white lettering and red lines denoting violence.

TEXT 5B's logo is more detailed and the contrasts tell a story through the use of visual aids. The childlike drawing of a sad child is pictured with a red crayon, with which a cross has been drawn over the assault rifle, showing the child's desire to 'stop child recruitment'. The contrast of a child with a gun creates a powerful appeal as a call to action is included both visually and verbally, although the colours are less stark.

*[For full marks, candidates must make explicit reference to the visual and verbal details of both logos and their use of contrast with regards to at least two aspects (font/colour/layout).]*

A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.	
Marks	Skills
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li><b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li><b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li><b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li><b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to address aspects of the question but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

5.6 Kids, especially boys, are naturally drawn to this type of play. (1)  
 The commas demarcate the parenthesis in the sentence. (1)

*[Award 1 mark for the correction and 1 mark for the explanation.]*

- 5.7 Visually, a boy is holding a toy (nerf) gun, which is quite harmless as its shape and colourfulness do not resemble a lethal weapon. The boy holding the toy gun is not depicted as a stereotypically aggressive or violent child: he wears glasses and is staring at his toy in wonderment/contemplation/concentration/bemusement. The visual image of a boy with his toy gun is a positive and innocent depiction.

However, some of the verbal reasons/benefits might be problematic:

'It symbolises power, leadership, authority, strength, & control.' This statement is incongruent with the image of the timid boy holding his gun. Furthermore, while leadership, authority, and strength have positive connotations of aspirations for a child, power and control have negative connotations which, alongside the subject of guns, may take on a sinister meaning. The incongruity of the shy boy and the assertive diction might also be problematic as the suggestion is that playing with guns will allow the boy to be more authoritative or powerful.

'Kids especially boys are naturally drawn to this type of play.' This statement seems logical in the context of the visual, as it is an image of a boy holding a toy gun. However, the gender-specific connotations associated with 'boys [who] are naturally drawn to this type of play', would suggest a masculine/rambunctious/aggressive behaviour associated with boys. The 'benefits' would suggest that boys can express their naturally masculine attributes in harmless play. On the other hand, this does associate boys with negative stereotypes to do with 'power' and 'control'.

'It's more hands-off than other types of aggressive play.' Literally, this is true, as toy guns provide a barrier between bodies at play. On the other hand, the symbolic connotations of guns are inherently aggressive. This statement supports the visual image of the boy who is not depicted as aggressive or forceful.

*[For full marks, candidates must show an understanding of the ironies/complexities embedded in the listed 'benefits' provided. Additionally, candidates must engage explicitly with the visual details of the text and link these to the verbal details.]*

*[Award full marks for a discussion of any TWO of the 3 sentences provided.]*

<b>A 4-mark question that requires relational thinking demonstrates understanding, application, analysis, complex inference or synthesis. This answer could require evaluation or appreciation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
4	The excellent response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is complete, <b>addressing all aspects of the question</b> and drawing them together accurately.</li> <li>• <b>links</b> all the ideas and provides the required <b>evidence</b>.</li> <li>• demonstrates <b>understanding</b> applied to familiar contexts.</li> <li>• <b>integrates all elements</b>, making connections and <b>demonstrating a clear understanding</b> of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
3½	The good response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• shows that the <b>significance of each element is understood</b>, but an aspect of the answer is <b>not clearly explained</b>.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addresses each element <b>but does not successfully link them</b>.</li> <li>• is <b>not entirely convincing</b> and/or does not convey a clear understanding of how the parts contribute to the whole.</li> </ul>
2½	The average response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>multi-structural</b> but addresses the elements in an <b>incomplete or flawed</b> way.</li> <li>• <b>does not link elements</b> or <b>does not demonstrate an understanding</b> of the significance of the elements.</li> <li>• <b>omits or misunderstands</b> a key element.</li> </ul>
2	The incomplete response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>one-dimensional</b>, omitting more than one element.</li> <li>• indicates a <b>flawed understanding</b> of the question and/or the text.</li> </ul>
1½	The very partial response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>attempts to address aspects of the question</b> but indicates only <b>partial understanding</b>.</li> </ul>
1–0	The inadequate response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attempts to deal with <b>only one aspect</b> of the question but does so very poorly.</li> <li>• displays <b>very limited understanding</b>.</li> </ul>

**QUESTION 6 LANGUAGE**

6.1 6.1.1 Antidotes are used as vaccinations or cures for illness or poisoning. The reader is meant to infer that cheating is like a disease or pandemic.

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

6.1.2 'crises' is the plural form of 'crisis'.

6.2 The dash introduces an afterthought/explanation/further information/reason (not parenthesis) to elaborate on the importance of keeping 'yourself fed and well rested'.

<b>A 2-mark question that requires uni-structural thinking. Demonstrates understanding and application, literal comprehension, and reorganisation.</b>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>Skills</b>
2	The excellent response: • is <b>complete and accurate</b> .
1½	The good response: • is <b>partially complete and accurate</b> . <b>OR</b> • is <b>complete and mostly accurate</b> .
1–0	The incomplete response: • includes only <b>one half of the required response or is inaccurate</b> .

6.3 The correct use of the apostrophe is in the second sentence (others') because it indicates plural possession.

*[Both aspects of the answer (correct choice and reason) are necessary for the full mark.]*

6.4 'A drawing of eyes (mounted over a collection box at a corporate coffee bar)'

6.5 The pronouns in this sentence do not agree.

Any of the following corrections is acceptable:

- 'One likes to see oneself in a positive light.'
- 'You like to see yourself in a positive light.'
- 'We like to see ourselves in a positive light.'

*[Award one mark for the explanation and one mark for the correction.]*

6.6 The italics are used to indicate that this is the title of a novel.

**Total: 100 marks**