

Paper 1 HL examiner's comments coversheet

Subject name: English A: language and literature

Sample name: Example B

Text 1	
Criterion A	Mark: 3/5
Examiner's comments:	
<p>The response only shows some understanding of the literal meaning of the text. The candidate has identified some aspects relevant to the tasks and the text but remains on a superficial level of understanding. Occasionally, the candidate supports his/her ideas with appropriate references but too often states claims that are not supporting the ideas but mentioned in isolation, especially in the second half of the guided textual analysis.</p>	
Criterion B	Mark: 3/5
Examiner's comments:	
<p>The candidate demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis of textual features or authorial choices. That said, while there is a breadth of aspects such as repetition, symbolism and tone, these aspects are rarely identified correctly. Often, there is a mere statement of the aspect without evaluating the effect. So, while the candidate seems to be equipped with the right tools to analyse the website, he/she doesn't use them effectively and certainly not with a clear point of entry.</p>	
Criterion C	Mark: 3/5
Examiner's comments:	
<p>The response has a clear introduction and conclusion; the body is clearly structured into paragraphs. Overall, this is "adequately organized" but rarely "coherent". The obvious organizational structure does not contribute to a cohesive or concise response. There is a lack of transition and therefore only a weak argument unfolds. There is little focus, already mentioned in "A", but the structure also shows a rather ad-hoc organization without a clear sense of purpose for each of the paragraphs.</p>	
Criterion D	Mark: 4/5
Examiner's comments:	
<p>The language generally shows a consistently appropriate register and style, and the candidate is able to clearly express their ideas. While there are some weaknesses in the use of punctuation, this is not enough to take off marks, as there is a "good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction". The candidate uses some terminology that is necessary for an effective analysis of a website even though at times they paraphrase or stay vague (e.g. target audience "people in general").</p>	
General commentary	
<p>The candidate obviously put effort and care into this guided textual analysis, but the essential aspect of paper 1—the focus—is lacking.</p> <p>Overall, there is the impression that the candidate is following the structure and aspects of the old language A: language and literature course; therefore, this is a good example to show the difference in tasks. The candidate only mentions the suggested point of entry in the introduction but does not use it as a springboard to explore the text nor to create a guided textual analysis.</p>	

Text 2	
Criterion A	Mark: 2/5
Examiner's comments:	
The response demonstrates some understanding of the literal meaning of the text but is not going beyond the visible surface. The candidate remains on a superficial level of analysis that does not show any critical thinking or reflection of the comic strip presented. There is no focus on the suggested point of entry; there are hardly any references used in the response.	
Criterion B	Mark: 2/5
Examiner's comments:	
The response demonstrates only some appropriate analysis of textual features or authorial choices. Some of the aspects mentioned are appropriate, referring to panels and a climax; these aspects are often used incorrectly. There is no evaluation of the effect. The candidate seems to have a limited command of tools to analyse a comic strip and/or to analyse humour.	
Criterion C	Mark: 2/5
Examiner's comments:	
There is only some organization apparent and little focus in the analysis.	
Criterion D	Mark: 3/5
Examiner's comments:	
The powers of expression are adequate and show some clear and carefully chosen language. That said, there is very little use of effective terminology necessary to analyse a comic strip successfully; there is hardly anything beyond "panel" or "black and white".	
General commentary	
The candidate clearly ran out of time, didn't plan the response properly and leaves the impression that this was not a guided textual analysis but rather some ideas of a first impression. This is therefore a good example to demonstrate the importance of time management.	