

2010 CHIEF MARKER PUBLICATION REPORT ON MARKING

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION

1. The report on marking is a comprehensive report that will serve the following three objectives:
 - a) Provide an evaluation of the question paper and marking guideline.
 - b) Provide an in-depth analysis of the nature of learner responses, which will facilitate feedback to teaching and learning.
2. This report must be completed by the **CHIEF MARKER in conjunction with the senior markers.**
3. The report must be completed in detail and single word responses will not be accepted.
4. Where additional space may be required, use a separate page which must be appended to this report.
5. The final report must be approved and signed by the Head of Examinations in the province.
6. The report must be submitted to the responsible WCED official at the marking centre.

SUBJECT	ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE	
PAPER	1	
GRADE		DURATION OF PAPER : 2 HOURS
PROVINCE	WESTERN CAPE	
CHIEF MARKER	NAME: U. D. SINGH CONTACT DETAILS: PRIVATE BAG X3, TOKAI, 7966 CELL: 0832601699 EMAIL: malasing@gmail.com	

PART ONE: EVALUATION OF QUESTION PAPER AND MARKING GUIDELINE

2. COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. (SEE PART TWO QUESTION 1 AND 2 OF THIS DOCUMENT)

Question 1: Open-ended questions lent themselves to candidates' confused random word selection and rambling, rather than succinct answers. In some instances the length of candidates' responses did not correlate with the mark awarded for the question. Some candidates wrote half a page in response to a 2-mark question. The number of marks allocated for a question was not always justified by the answers expected in the memo. More guidance needs to be given regarding the marking of 3/4-mark questions.

Question 1.1. should have been placed after Q1.9 as it asked candidate to comment on the whole of Text A. Some candidates answered this question by merely referring to the title, and thus lost marks.

Avoid use of double negatives in wording of question as it confuses the candidate. E.g. Q 1.5.2.

Text C: The character with gold medals in the cartoon is Michael Johnson, not Michael Jordan as stated in the question paper. Such inaccuracies should be avoided.

N. B. Instruction should be put in that own words must be used and that lifting from the text will be penalised.

Question 2: The summary question could give candidate clearer instructions/ more guidance. There should be a change to a point-form summary as it is far more practical. The points in the memo were somewhat repetitive and the fact that candidates could choose any 7 of 9 points meant that it was easy to allocate too many repeated marks. The text also contained too much repetition and overlap. Only 1 mark deducted for incorrect format and summaries that were too long is too little. Some candidates rewrote entire passage and simply lost 1 mark for word count and a maximum of 2 marks for quoting.

Question 3: On the whole the question was accessible to all candidates. Q 3.4. Avoid use of double negatives in wording of question as it confuses the candidate. More need to include questions on figurative language/style/irony.

Question 4: candidates found it difficult to understand the term 'satire' (Q 3.1). Q4.2. Candidates should have been asked to explain how expression/body language was shown, rather than merely expecting candidates to give the emotion.

Question 5: Only 10 marks for grammar in the whole paper was inadequate. This question was poorly answered and showed a distinct lack of teaching of technical grammar by many centres.

PART TWO: ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATES' RESPONSE TEMPLATE (for completing part 3)

This section of the instrument will provide valuable feedback to the teaching and learning in the classroom. In order to assist the CHIEF MARKER with the analysis of learner responses, the chief marker must analyze, per question, a random sample of 100 scripts. This entails recording the responses (i.e. marks obtained) by candidates from these 100 scripts on a per question basis. From the analysis, a brief explanation must be provided per question, either:

- (a) Explaining why the question was poorly answered together with suggestions for improvement, or.
- (b) Describe any noteworthy observation relating to the responses of candidates.

It is expected that a comment will be provided for each question. (on a separate sheet). The chief marker must also held discussion meetings with the marking team.

Please use a separate sheet for each question

QUESTION 1
1. General comment on the performance of candidates. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?
Too much lifting from text, often without any understanding being shown, especially in weak centres.
Question 1 (Comprehension) : Random sample of 100 scripts – 48.33% There were many questions where a personal response was required. The candidate was required to justify his or her response and this is a skill that teachers need to teach their candidates. As these questions were often allocated three marks – candidates who gave unsubstantiated answers stood to lose a considerable number of marks. Chunk quoting was widespread, with candidates showing no understanding of the questions or the texts.
Question 2 (Summary) : Random sample of 100 scripts – 53% Summarising skills appear to be neglected. Candidates generally find it difficult to write a coherent paragraph. There was widespread lifting of chunks of text straight from the original. Many candidates were unable to identify the main ideas or topic sentences in the text and thus lost marks for content. Paragraphs were often not written in complete sentences. Poor expression also permeated many candidates' responses.
Question 3 (Advertising): Random sample of 100 scripts – 50.2% Advertising techniques (AIDA principles) need to be taught. Candidates were also required to justify their responses and this was also lacking in many answers
Question 4 (Other aspects of the media): Random sample of 100 scripts – 47.6% Knowledge of visual literacy techniques was lacking in many centres. Candidates must be exposed to a variety of texts in this genre, e.g. film posters, stills, cartoons. They need to be taught how to interpret visual texts and be able to justify their responses.
Question 5 (Textual editing) : Random sample of 100 scripts – 35.2% Teaching of technical aspects of language seems to be largely ignored in many centres, with candidates scoring poorly in this question. Basic grammar skills were lacking. Concord, syntax, direct and reported speech, punctuation, verb tenses, etc. need to be taught. Teachers need to teach the rules of grammar and how they are applied in context.
2. Why question was poorly answered: Also provide specific examples: See part one question 2.
3. Provide suggestion for improvement in relation to the following :
(i) Learning and teaching
Very poor reading of and response to graphs (Question 4). More practice should be given. More focus on grammar and the principles of advertising techniques.
All questions showed evidence that not enough attention is given in most schools to teaching comprehension and language skills. Too much time is spent during the Matric year on completing the literature syllabus instead of reinforcing the skills required to answer Paper 1. This is serious as these errors then filter through to Papers 2 and 3.

(ii) Support
Clearer guidelines should be given to schools with regard to the following:
A language pack that is educator and learner friendly, including tips on answering this paper
4. Describe any observations relating to responses of candidates: e.g. positive, negative, outstanding etc.
Many candidates write in capital letters with no full stops between sentences.
Chunk-lifting from texts.
Length of response does not correlate with marks allocate.
5. Any other comments useful to teachers, subject advisors
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More time be given to teaching the above skills.• Workshops for teachers on above aspects to be organised by subject advisers.