NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
MAY 2022

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 © 2022

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 Karlson and Yury Borisovich Popov met and became friends.

Popov approached Allan outside his hotel where Allan was sitting on a park bench. Popov told Allan that his employer wanted to offer him a job.
Allan immediately liked Popov and thought he was a friendly man.
They then drove to a small village by the coast where they got into a submarine.
Popov revealed that he was a physicist who worked for the Russian government and that they wanted Allan to work on their nuclear programme (to develop an atom bomb).
They then enjoyed too much vodka together.
2 marks = content about how they met
2 marks = content about how they became friends; enjoyed each other's company. (4)

1.2 What gave Allan the idea that Yury Popov would be attending the opera in Moscow?

He remembered Popov singing songs from the opera *Turandot* on the night they travelled together in the submarine. (1) When the same opera was performed in the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow, he assumed that Popov would not pass an opportunity by to see the opera. (1) (2)

1.3 Why did Allan need to be discreet about his meeting with Popov?

At the time, he was a spy for the American government (1) and Popov was working for the Russian government. (1) It would cause political tension. (2)

1.4 Briefly explain why Popov assumed that Allan was dead.

Upon meeting Stalin, Allan offended him by expressing political connections and outlooks that Stalin strongly condemned. Allan further insulted Stalin by suggesting he shave off his moustache to which Stalin sentenced him to 30 years' imprisonment in a correction camp in Vladivostok, close to Siberia where the temperatures are extremely cold. Popov knew that the conditions in these camps were harsh and after not hearing from Allan after the meeting with Stalin, he thought that Allan must be dead.
2 marks = explaining what happened during Allan's meeting with Stalin.
1 mark = explaining where Stalin sent Allan.
1 mark = linking content to Popov's conclusion that Allan must be dead. (4)

1.5 How do the Popovs' lives change after this meeting with Allan?

His wife motivated him to take the position as a spy for the American Government as she wanted to leave Russia where they were living behind barbed wire. She knew they were near their retirement age and looked forward to retiring in America where they could watch operas

IEB Copyright © 2022

more often. Yury thought that his wife had made many sacrifices over the years and therefore accepted the job for her sake.
Any 3 facts that clearly explain how their lives changed. (3)
[15]

QUESTION 2 PARAGRAPH: PERSONAL RESPONSE

'I don't think I have ever read a book where the title so sums up what the book is all about.'

(Title: *The Hundred-Year-Old Man Who Climbed Out of the Window and Disappeared*)

[Review by Robin Webster]

Express your opinion about the statement above in a paragraph of about **180 words**.

Discuss the following key words from the title by referring to what they represent in the novel as a whole.
- Hundred
- Window
- Disappeared

Content – a mark out of 10 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 the three words from the title and the themes/ symbols that they represent.

Possible response/content:
Hundred: It's never too late to start living
- **Had Allan not escaped from the old-age home on his 100th birthday, he would never have had the great adventures that the money in the stolen suitcase allowed him to have.**
- **He would also still be alone and not have met all the good friends that he made, i.e., Julius Jonsson, Benny, The Beauty.**
- **His age is also what made people underestimate him, such as Bolt who trusted him with his suitcase full of money and the police who thought that it would be easy to find Allan.**
- **Therefore, the word 'hundred' plays a key role in the novel and many of Allan's adventures are because of his age.**

Window: A symbol of freedom
The window represents freedom and a new life for Allan. He was bored with his life at the old-age home and when he went to bed on the eve of his 100th birthday, he thought he was going to die. He did not die that night and awoke the next morning. He then decided to escape and start living again. The window represents his 'ticket' to a new, adventurous life.

IEB Copyright © 2022

Disappeared: Not involving yourself with anyone

Although Allan made new friends after escaping from the old-age home, he did not really have anyone to which he had to answer or who would miss him. It was simply because he was so old that people were interested in his disappearance. The word 'disappeared' also ties in with Allan's attitude throughout his life where he never got involved with politics, never chose sides and never got involved in any arguments.

[15]

QUESTION 3 DIALOGUE

Allan and his friends have finally made it to Bali!

One day, while Pike Gerdin is lying on a deckchair enjoying a red parasol drink, Inspector Aronsson starts asking Pike about the Never Again gang.

Write down the conversation between Inspector Aronsson and Pike Gerdin where Pike tells Aronsson:

- How the gang originated.
- Who the members of the gang were.
- What plans he had for the gang.

Content – a mark out of 7 for relevant and creative content linked to the question.	7 marks
Dialogue format, occasional, meaningful gesture in present tense and conversational style.	3 marks

Expected content: NB No preamble of greetings and musings

How the gang originated

- **Per Gerdin (The Boss) had always been involved in petty crime and fraud, i.e., he avoided paying tax and he lied about the origin of his products.**
- **When he landed up in prison, he started the gang, Never Again, hoping 'never again' to be imprisoned.**

Who the members of the gang were?

- **The Never Again gang consisted of The Boss, Bolt and Bucket, who were not very smart.**
- **The fourth member was a Venezuelan man, nicknamed Caracas (his home country's capital).**

What plans he had for the gang

- **The Boss wanted to recruit 50 convicts to his gang.**
- **He wanted the Never Again gang to specialise in robbery, narcotics and extortion.**
- **However, he became the laughingstock of the prison, because of a letter from his mother, which resulted in his gang still only being four members.**

[10]

IEB Copyright © 2022

QUESTION 4 ESSAY WITH GUIDELINES

In an essay of approximately **250 words**, discuss Allan Karlsson's role as Herbert and Amanda Einstein's mentor and how he added to their successes.

Marker's discretion; please allow for any relevant content that shows Allan's guidance and involvement in Herbert and Amanda Einstein's lives.

Responses may include:

Paragraph 1: Use the stimulus of mentorship for your introduction.
Echo question and relate to topic.

Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4: Discuss how Allan accepted Herbert Einstein, helped to give him purpose in life and aided Amanda to become a powerful politician.

- Herbert Einstein is an illegitimate child and knows that he lacks intelligence. He has never been accepted by anyone and his greatest wish is to die, until he meets Allan. Allan treats him with respect and does not judge him for his life's wish of wanting to die.

- He even helps Herbert to stay alive by doing his work in the camp where they are imprisoned, with the only rule being that Herbert is not allowed to complain. Allan also trusts Herbert enough to make him part of his plan to escape from Vladivostok. He does not desert Herbert when they escape; they stay together, and Allan even shares the money, which ensures a holiday in Bali.

- Herbert finds love in Bali and marries Amanda Einstein. For the first time life is good and he doesn't want to die anymore. Allan helps Amanda to become a powerful politician by using his money to bribe her way into politics. Furthermore, he helps Amanda by being her interpreter in Paris. She has no idea how to be an ambassador, but through Allan's translations she is able to fool people.

Paragraph 5: Conclusion. Say why these experiences can be seen as mentoring.
Allan stays loyal to the Einsteins to the end, where they end up being very successful, rich and respected.

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

[20]

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.

[20]

60 marks

IEB Copyright © 2022

SECTION B TRANSACTIONAL WRITING

QUESTION 5 LONGER TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: EMAIL

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 can, 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 consider 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 consider 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.

[30]

IEB Copyright © 2022

QUESTION 6 SHORT TRANSACTIONAL PIECE: COMMENTARY

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 can, 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 consider 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 considers 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.

[10]

40 marks

Total: 100 marks

IEB Copyright © 2022