



# education

---

Department:  
Education  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**NATIONAL  
SENIOR CERTIFICATE**

**GRADE 12**

**ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE P3**

**NOVEMBER 2009**

**MEMORANDUM**

**MARKS: 100**

**This memorandum consists of 7 pages.**

**INFORMATION FOR THE MARKER**

In assessing a candidate's work, the following aspects, among others, drawn from the assessment rubric, must be borne in mind:

- The overall effect of planning, drafting, proofreading and editing of the work on the final text produced
- Awareness of writing for a specific purpose, audience and context – as well as register, style and tone – especially in SECTIONS B and C
- Grammar, spelling and punctuation
- Language structures, including an awareness of critical language
- Choice of words and idiomatic language
- Sentence construction
- Paragraphing
- Interpretation of the topic that will be reflected in the overall content: the introduction, development of ideas and the conclusion

**SUGGESTED APPROACH TO MARKING****SECTION A: ESSAY**

Refer to SECTION A: Rubric for Assessing an Essay found on page 5 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT AND PLANNING	30
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	15
STRUCTURE	5
TOTAL	50

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT AND PLANNING.
2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.
3. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for STRUCTURE.

**SECTION B: LONGER TRANSACTIONAL TEXT**

Refer to SECTION B: Rubric for Assessing Longer Transactional Texts found on page 6 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT	18
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	12
TOTAL	30

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT.
2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.

**SECTION C: SHORTER TRANSACTIONAL/REFERENTIAL/INFORMATIONAL TEXT**

Refer to SECTION C: Rubric for Assessing Shorter Transactional/Referential/Transactional Texts found on page 7 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT	12
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	8
TOTAL	20

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT.
  2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.
- Various formats of transactional/referential/informational texts have been taught/are in current practice. Therefore, this has to be considered when assessing the format.
  - Give credit for appropriateness of format.
  - Look for a logical approach in all writing.

**SECTION A: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING AN ESSAY – HOME LANGUAGE (50 marks)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100%</b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79%</b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69%</b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59%</b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49%</b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39%</b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29%</b>
<b>CONTENT &amp; PLANNING (30 MARKS)</b>	<b><u>24 – 30</u></b> -Content outstanding, highly original. -Ideas thought-provoking, mature. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable essay.	<b><u>21 – 23½</u></b> -Content meritorious, original. -Ideas imaginative, interesting. - Planning and/or drafting has produced a well-crafted and presentable essay.	<b><u>18 – 20½</u></b> -Content sound, reasonably coherent. -Ideas interesting, convincing. - Planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and good essay.	<b><u>15 – 17½</u></b> -Content appropriate, adequately coherent. -Ideas interesting, adequately original. - Planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactory, presentable essay.	<b><u>12 – 14½</u></b> -Content mediocre, ordinary. Gaps in coherence. -Ideas mostly relevant. Limited originality. - Planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent essay.	<b><u>9 – 11½</u></b> -Content not always clear, lacks coherence. -Few ideas, often repetitive. -Inadequate for Home Language level despite planning/drafting. Essay not well presented.	<b><u>0 – 8½</u></b> -Content largely irrelevant. No coherence. -Ideas tedious, repetitive. -Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented essay.
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING (15 MARKS)</b>	<b><u>12 – 15</u></b> -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation effectively used. -Uses highly appropriate figurative language. -Choice of words exceptional, mature. -Style, tone, register highly suited to topic. -Virtually error-free following proofreading and editing.	<b><u>10½ – 11½</u></b> -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation correct; able to use figurative language. -Choice of words varied and creative. -Style, tone, register appropriately suited to topic. -Largely error-free following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>9 – 10</u></b> -Critical awareness of language evident. -Language and punctuation mostly correct. -Choice of words suited to text. -Style, tone, register suited to topic. -Mostly error-free following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>7½ – 8½</u></b> -Some awareness of impact of language. -Language simplistic, punctuation adequate. -Choice of words adequate. -Style, tone, register generally consistent with topic requirements. -Still contains a few errors following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>6 – 7</u></b> -Limited critical language awareness. -Language mediocre, punctuation often inaccurately used. -Choice of words basic. -Style, tone register lacking in coherence. -Contains several errors following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>4½ – 5½</u></b> -Language and punctuation flawed. -Choice of words limited. -Style, tone, register inappropriate. -Error-ridden despite proofreading, editing.	<b><u>0 – 4</u></b> -Language and punctuation seriously flawed. -Choice of words inappropriate. -Style, tone, register flawed in all aspects. -Error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing.
<b>STRUCTURE (5 MARKS)</b>	<b><u>4 – 5</u></b> -Coherent development of topic. Vivid, exceptional detail. -Sentences, paragraphs brilliantly constructed. -Length in accordance with requirements of topic.	<b><u>3½</u></b> -Logical development of details. Coherent. -Sentences, paragraphs logical, varied. -Length correct.	<b><u>3</u></b> -Several relevant details developed. -Sentences, paragraphs well constructed. -Length correct.	<b><u>2½</u></b> -Some points, necessary details developed. -Sentences, paragraphing might be faulty in places but essay still makes sense. -Length almost correct.	<b><u>2</u></b> -Most necessary points evident. -Sentences, paragraphs faulty but essay still makes sense. -Length – too long/short.	<b><u>1½</u></b> -Sometimes off topic but general line of thought can be followed. -Sentences, paragraphs constructed at an elementary level. -Length – too long/short.	<b><u>0 – 1</u></b> -Off topic. -Sentences, paragraphs muddled, inconsistent. Length – far too long/short.

**SECTION B: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING LONGER TRANSACTIONAL TEXT – HOME LANGUAGE (30 marks)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100%</b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79%</b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69%</b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59%</b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49%</b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39%</b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29%</b>
	<b><u>14½ – 18</u></b>	<b><u>13 – 14</u></b>	<b><u>11 – 12½</u></b>	<b><u>9 – 10½</u></b>	<b><u>7½ – 8½</u></b>	<b><u>5½ – 7</u></b>	<b><u>0 – 5</u></b>
<b>CONTENT, PLANNING &amp; FORMAT  (18 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Extensive specialised knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – maintains rigorous focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Total coherence in content and ideas, highly elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable text.</li> <li>-Highly appropriate format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Very good knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – maintains focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Coherent in content and ideas, very well elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a well-crafted and presentable text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format very well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fair knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Writing – maintains focus, with minor digressions.</li> <li>-Mostly coherent in content and ideas, elaborated and most details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and very good text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adequate knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses but does not impede overall meaning.</li> <li>-Adequately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented text.</li> <li>-Has applied an adequate idea of requirements of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Moderate knowledge of requirements of text. Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning vague in places.</li> <li>-Moderately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent text.</li> <li>-Has a moderate idea of requirements of format – some critical oversights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Elementary knowledge of requirements of text. Response to writing task reveals a limited focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Not always coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate for Home Language level despite planning and/or drafting. Text not well presented.</li> <li>-Has vaguely applied necessary rules of format – some critical oversights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No knowledge of requirements of text. Response to writing task reveals a limited focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Not coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented text.</li> <li>-Has not applied necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>
	<b><u>10 – 12</u></b>	<b><u>8½ – 9½</u></b>	<b><u>7½ – 8</u></b>	<b><u>6 – 7</u></b>	<b><u>5 – 5½</u></b>	<b><u>4 – 4½</u></b>	<b><u>0 – 3½</u></b>
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING  (12 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grammatically accurate and brilliantly constructed.</li> <li>-Vocabulary highly appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register highly appropriate.</li> <li>-Virtually error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Very well constructed and accurate.</li> <li>-Vocabulary very appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Suitable style, tone, register considering demands of task.</li> <li>-Largely error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Well constructed and easy to read.</li> <li>-Vocabulary appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register mostly appropriate.</li> <li>-Mostly error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary adequate for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register fairly appropriate.</li> <li>-A few errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length almost correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Basically constructed. Several errors.</li> <li>-Vocabulary limited and not very suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Lapses in style, tone and register.</li> <li>-Several errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poorly constructed and difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires some remediation and not suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register inappropriate.</li> <li>-Error-ridden despite proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poorly constructed and very difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires serious remediation and not suitable for purpose.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register do not correspond with topic</li> <li>-Error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – far too long/short.</li> </ul>

**SECTION C: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING SHORTER TRANSACTIONAL/REFERENTIAL/INFORMATIONAL TEXT – HOME LANGUAGE (20 marks)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100%</b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79%</b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69%</b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59%</b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49%</b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39%</b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29%</b>
	<b><u>10 – 12</u></b>	<b><u>8½ – 9½</u></b>	<b><u>7½ – 8</u></b>	<b><u>6 – 7</u></b>	<b><u>5 – 5½</u></b>	<b><u>4 – 4½</u></b>	<b><u>0 – 3½</u></b>
<b>CONTENT, PLANNING &amp; FORMAT  (12 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Extensive specialised knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Exhibits a profound awareness of wider contexts in writing.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – learner maintains rigorous focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Total coherence in content and ideas, highly elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable text.</li> <li>-Has produced a highly appropriate format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Very good knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Exhibits a broad awareness of wider contexts in writing.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – learner maintains focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Text is coherent in content and ideas, very well elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a well crafted and presentable text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format very well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fair knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Exhibits a general awareness of wider contexts in writing tasks.</li> <li>-Writing – learner maintains focus, with minor digressions.</li> <li>-Text is mostly coherent in content and ideas, elaborated and most details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and very good text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adequate knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Exhibits some awareness of wider context in writing tasks</li> <li>Writing – learner digresses but does not impede overall meaning.</li> <li>-Text adequately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented text.</li> <li>-Has applied an adequate idea of requirements of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Moderate knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus.</li> <li>-Exhibits rather limited knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks.</li> <li>-Writing – learner digresses, meaning vague in places.</li> <li>-Text moderately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent text.</li> <li>-Has a moderate idea of requirements of format – some critical oversights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Elementary knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>Response to writing task reveals a limited focus.</li> <li>-Exhibits a limited knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks.</li> <li>-Writing – learner digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Text not always coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate planning/ drafting. Poorly presented text.</li> <li>-Has not applied necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Exhibits no knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks.</li> <li>-Writing – learner digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Text not coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate planning/ drafting. Poorly presented text.</li> <li>-Has not applied necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>
	<b><u>6½ – 8</u></b>	<b><u>6</u></b>	<b><u>5 – 5½</u></b>	<b><u>4 – 4½</u></b>	<b><u>3½</u></b>	<b><u>2½ – 3</u></b>	<b><u>0 – 2</u></b>
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING  (8 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text grammatically accurate and brilliantly constructed.</li> <li>- Vocabulary is highly appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register highly appropriate.</li> <li>-Text virtually error free following proofreading.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text very well constructed and accurate.</li> <li>-Vocabulary very appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Suitable style, tone and register considering demands of task.</li> <li>-Text largely error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text well constructed and easy to read.</li> <li>-Vocabulary appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register mostly appropriate.</li> <li>-Text mostly error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary adequate for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register fairly appropriate.</li> <li>-Text still contains few errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length almost correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text is basically constructed. Several errors.</li> <li>-Vocabulary limited and not very suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Lapses in style, tone and register.</li> <li>-Text contains several errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text is poorly constructed and difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires some remediation and not suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register inappropriate.</li> <li>-Text error-ridden despite proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Text is poorly constructed and very difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires serious remediation and not suitable for purpose.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register do not correspond with topic.</li> <li>-Text error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – far too long/short.</li> </ul>