NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
MAY 2021

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.

IEB Copyright © 2021

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

QUESTION 1 CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS

1.1 Give a detailed explanation of how Allan became an expert on explosives.

- **Allan, at the age of 10 started working as an errand boy at a Nitroglycerine company.**
- **(They needed the money because his father had left for Russia and they had no income.)**
- **He learnt how to work with explosives and by the age of 13 could mix chemicals to make his own explosives.**
- **(He experimented with chemicals freely in the gravel pit behind their house; he gained valuable experience.)**

Marker's discretion: doesn't have to include all the above facts, but a holistic explanation as to how Allan became an expert on explosives.

1.2 What were the recent life events that Allan chose to omit when he applied for the position of ignition specialist?

- **He blew up his own house.**
- **The police caught him and kept him locked up in jail for one night for 'negligent destruction'.**

1.3 'I am going to like it here,' thought Allan.
The above line reveals certain of Allan's characteristic traits. Name one of Allan's characteristics that becomes evident through this statement and clearly explain its relevance in the context of the novel through referencing.
Marker's discretion. Possible response:
gratitude/ optimistic/ positive/ non-judgemental
Allan is satisfied with very little in life. He takes whatever comes his way in a positive manner and does not demand many luxuries. When he works for politicians across the world, he only asks for a place to sleep, food and vodka, e.g. when he agrees to blow up bridges in Spain. Also, Allan never questioned the American Embassy when they didn't pay him a salary for 13 years.
1 mark = characteristic trait; 1 mark = explaining the characteristic trait; 2 marks = through referencing from the novel.

1.4 Explain why Allan comes to the conclusion that Professor Lundborg 'must have been frightened by a black man when he was a child.'
When he sees and meets a black man for the first time (on his journey to Spain) he loses interest as beside the colour of their skin, he finds them no different to white people.
1 mark = introducing his interaction with a black man; 1 mark = the conclusion he comes to about black people.

1.5 Name two reasons why Allan decided to go to Spain with his friend, Estebán.
He was curious to meet a black man.
He had never been overseas; only read about the countries outside of Sweden.

1.6 'What did his friend Allan have in mind for the future?'
Justify why the above line could be considered ironic. Refer to at least one event from the novel to substantiate your answer.
Allan never planned his future; he did not ponder over any plan for a long time. E.g. he had no specific plan after he blew up his home and left on his bicycle. / When he and Julius met Benny they just went in a northerly direction without a specific plan. See other examples – marker's discretion.

QUESTION 2 PARAGRAPH: PERSONAL RESPONSE

Do you think that Chief Inspector Aronsson's investigation may have been influenced by the fact that Allan Karlsson was so old?

Write a paragraph of **180 words** in which you share your thoughts on this question by referring to specific incidents in which the police may have let Allan off the hook or underestimated him, because of his old age.

Content – a mark for relevant content, well-reasoned statements and examples linked to the brief and the novel.	10 marks
Clear stance and overall convincing voice	2 marks
Language/style/register is appropriate	3 marks

Learner's own opinion/stance should be clearly expressed. Allow for both sides. Then, supporting detail must be provided based on, but not limited to, the text.

Possible response/content <u>for</u> Chief Inspector Aronsson's investigation being influenced by the fact that Allan Karlsson was so old:

- When Aronsson went to Ronny Hulth's (ticket seller at bus station) house, he left soon after there was no answer. He would have searched more thoroughly for Hulth, had he thought the case was serious. He describes Allan as a geriatric and therefore does not believe the case to be too serious.
- When he searched the old building at Byringe station, he disregarded some important information like the water pools in the kitchen and focused more on the slippers he found. This is probably because he thought an old man can't do much harm or get very far.
- He also seems to be quite relaxed about the case as he is in no rush; he stops to buy a hotdog.
- When receiving a tip about Allan being seen in a silver Mercedes, Aronsson disregards this tip; the story seems too ridiculous to involve such an old man.
- When the dog, Kicki's handler indicated that there had been a corpse in the trolley, Inspector Aronnson's first thought is that the *Never Again* member killed Allan; he does not suspect Allan of any crimes.

IEB Copyright © 2021

Possible response/content <u>against</u> Chief Inspector Aronsson's investigation being influenced by the fact that Allan Karlsson was so old:

- Aronsson followed normal investigation procedures by going to the ticket seller, Ronny Hulth's home. He did not have a search warrant or reason to enter his house without permission and therefore waited for the next morning to question him.
- He then followed the next logical clue by visiting Byringe station and also questioned many of the citizens of that area. He followed up on all the clues given to him, namely by going to the foundry where three men were seen by a local farmer. At this stage he did not disregard Allan's involvement in solving the case; he was simply gathering evidence. This is good investigative procedure.
- He also visits the village of Aker where he questions the workers at the foundry.
- When arriving at his hotel in Plevna, he took time to reflect on the case, based on all the evidence he had received.
- "So the question was, had the two old men, Karlsson and Jonsson, somehow managed to overpower the young and strong Never Again member and throw him into a ditch?" When reflecting upon the case, Chief Inspector Aronsson does not rule out Allan's involvement, even though he sees it as "An incredible but not impossible idea."
- He even takes the time to revisit Aker village, taking a dog along to check whether a scent cannot be found.

QUESTION 3 DIALOGUE

Write down the conversation between Benny and his brother, Bosse when they meet for the first time after 30 years.

The conversation should include the following:
1. Benny's professional student career and the inheritance from their uncle.
2. Benny telling Bosse about his new friends.

Content – a mark for relevant and creative content linked to the question.	7 marks
Dialogue Format and occasional, meaningful gesture in present tense.	2 marks
Conversational style	1 mark

Expected content: NB No preamble of greetings and musings

1. Benny's professional student career and the inheritance from their uncle.
    - Benny tells Bosse that he felt that his older brother bossed him around too much when they were younger.
    - Benny felt that he didn't want to become a welder and he wasn't any good at it.
    - Benny went on to study numerous courses, but never completed any of them.
    - 30 years later, the inheritance money was finished and that's when Benny opened up the hotdog stand.
    - Bosse, after not receiving any more inheritance money tried various business opportunities.

IEB Copyright © 2021

2. Benny telling Bosse about his new friends.
   - Benny tells Bosse how Allan and Julius bought hotdogs from him and then also bought his silver Mercedes for 100 000 crowns, as well as offering him the job of chauffeur.
   - Shortly afterwards, they meet Gunilla, 'The Beauty' asking for board and lodging as they wanted to avoid being seen. She lives alone on a farm. Benny falls in love with Gunilla, nicknaming her 'The Beauty'.
   - When Allan's disappearance makes news headlines, The Beauty thinks it is no longer safe for them on her farm and that is when they decide to leave.
   - Since none of the members have close family where they can hide, Benny decides to call his brother and besides he now has enough money to pay him back his part of the inheritance.

QUESTION 4 ESSAY WITH GUIDELINES

After having read the above extract, write an essay of **250 words** in which you discuss and explore how Allan Karlsson said 'yes' to life.

Marker's discretion; please allow for any relevant content from his life before he turned 100. Expected responses may include:

Paragraph 1: Use the stimulus of saying 'yes' to life for your introduction.
- Echo question and relate to the topic above; saying 'yes' to life.
  Saying 'yes' to life can mean taking a risk in the direction of opening oneself up to new adventures; creating your own excitement.

Paragraph 2: Discuss his decision to climb out of the window and the bus ride.
- When Allan awoke the next morning not being dead, he had a sudden idea of climbing out of the window of his room on the ground floor; he decided not to be like a caged animal abiding by the strict rules of the Old Age Home, but rather to take control of his own life by doing what he wants to do.
- The fact that he was brave enough to take a bus ride with no clear plan, shows us that he went looking for excitement – saying 'yes' to life.

Paragraph 3: Discuss his friendships and interest in people.
- He immediately trusts and befriends Julius Jonsson, sharing his story of the suitcase honestly. Because he was trusting, he enjoyed good friendships and loyalty which led to an exciting life outside of the home. E.g. befriending Benny, staying on the farm with The Beauty, helping to reunite the brothers, Benny and Bosse, inviting Inspector Aronsson on holiday with them. He listened to all their stories.

Paragraph 4: Discuss his outlook of 'It is what it is'.
- He enjoyed his life fully and did not hold onto guilt feelings: Bolt and Bucket's death, the fact that they misled the police and fabricated a story that was not true. The fact that his new friends all seem to have 'sketchy' backgrounds does not make him judge them – 'It is what it is'.
- Allan is able to enjoy his holiday without worrying about any past events; a clear indication to saying 'yes' to what is left of his life.

IEB Copyright © 2021

Paragraph 5: Conclusion as to why these experiences can be seen as 'yes' to life.
Saying 'yes' to life is all about finding the good/fun in your own life and the attitude with which you approach this. Allan was very brave to find his own adventure at 100 years old.

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

IEB Copyright © 2021

QUESTION 4 ESSAY WITH GUIDELINES

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR LITERARY ESSAY

	%	CONTENT = 15			STYLE = 5	
LEVEL	***%***	***MARK /15***	***CLASSIFICATION***	***CRITERIA***	***MARK /5***	***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.** • 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	• 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.** • 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.** • 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	• 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".** • 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	• 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.** • 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	• 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.** • 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	• 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.** • 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: • 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.** • 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: • 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.** • Serious errors of understanding of the question and/or the text. • Complete misinterpretation of topic. • Vague attempt to produce a response.	0.5	• Barely intelligible.

IEB Copyright © 2021

SECTION B TRANSACTIONAL WRITING

QUESTION 5 LONGER TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: LETTER OF APOLOGY

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

		PURPOSE	LANGUAGE AND FORMAT
LEVEL	**MARK**	**DESCRIPTOR**	**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 take into account 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 take into account 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.

IEB Copyright © 2021

QUESTION 6 SHORT TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: INSTRUCTIONS

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 may, 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 take into account 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 takes into account 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

IEB Copyright © 2021