



2012 English

Intermediate 1 Writing Folio

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2012

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Intermediate 1 Folio Marking Instructions

The following Marking Instructions relate specifically to the marking of Folios of Writing and augment but do not replace the General Marking Instructions which have to be followed by all markers.

Some general guidelines

- Assessment must be holistic. It is not possible to see a piece of writing in “subsets” such as Content, Structure, Expression, etc. In every piece of writing there will be strengths and weaknesses; assessment should focus as far as possible on the strengths, taking account of weaknesses only when they significantly detract from the overall achievement.
- Categories are not grades. Assumptions about final grades or association of final grades with particular categories should not be allowed to influence the assessment.
- Quality of expression should not be confused with “Technical Accuracy”, which is limited to matters of spelling, punctuation and grammar. A piece of writing characterised by clumsy expression is likely to be self-penalising, but should not automatically fail for this alone.
- In the Descriptors, terms such as “sound”, “adequate”, “effective”, “sophisticated” and even “some”, can never be defined with precision, and their application can be made only after reference to exemplification. Detailed exemplification is given each year to those appointed to mark the Folio, and is disseminated to the profession by such means as the Understanding Standards website, Professional Development Workshops, Development Visits.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

1 Procedure

- At the end of each piece of writing, indicate the category (in Roman numerals) and the mark out of 25.
- Enter the total into the “Total Mark” box. [Please ensure that only the total mark goes in this box.]

2 Comments on scripts

Absolutely no words (or codes/abbreviations such as “Sp”, “Gr”, “Rel?”, “!!!”, “??” etc) should be written on a candidate’s folio submission. This instruction applies to all subjects and all levels. You may, however, use ticks, crosses and lines within an answer to help clarify your marking, and this is essential in order to indicate weaknesses in Technical Accuracy.

3 PA Referrals

For details of how to make a referral to the Principal Assessor, see page 4 of *General Marking Instructions*. If you refer a piece of writing to the PA, for whatever reason, you must have allocated it a provisional mark. You should explain on the PA Referral form the reason for the referral and, if appropriate, the thinking behind the provisional mark awarded.

4 Word Limits

If a piece of writing (other than poetry) is stated on the Flyleaf as being, or clearly is, below the minimum number of words for Intermediate 1 (300 words), the highest possible mark is 11.

If the number of words entered on the Flyleaf indicates that a piece exceeds the limit for Intermediate 1 (800 words) but is less than 1000 words, mark the piece in the usual way, without penalty.

If the number of words entered on the Flyleaf is clearly incorrect and a piece appears to exceed the limit for Intermediate 1 (800 words) but appears to be less than 1000 words, mark the piece in the usual way, without penalty.

If the number of words has not been entered on the Flyleaf, but a piece appears to exceed the limit for Intermediate 1 (800 words) and appears to be less than 1000 words, mark the piece in the usual way, without penalty.

If the number of words has not been entered on the Flyleaf, but a piece is clearly within the limit for Intermediate 1 (800 words), mark the piece in the usual way. There is no need to take any further action.

Only refer a piece of writing to the Principal Assessor if it clearly exceeds 1000 words.

5 Acknowledgement of sources

Candidates are asked to acknowledge sources, but Markers at this level should not be unduly demanding in this area. Failure to tick an appropriate box on the Flyleaf need not lead to any action and the absence of specific source details at the end of a piece can be overlooked if the text of the writing refers directly or indirectly to research or further reading. Submissions should be marked in the normal way, without any penalty, unless serious issues arise, in which case you should assign an appropriate mark and then refer the Folio to the Principal Assessor.

6 Plagiarism

If you can confirm plagiarism in a piece of writing and can provide appropriate evidence, you should assign a mark in the usual way, without penalty, and then enclose a brief note of explanation on a separate sheet of paper. Complete the remaining Folios from the centre and write “**Special Attention (M)**” clearly on the front of the packet in red ink. (See page 5 of *General Marking Instructions*.) Please do not refer such Folios to the Principal Assessor.

7 “Automatic” PA Referrals

When you encounter in your marking any of the following types of writing, please mark them in the usual way and then refer the Folio to the Principal Assessor:

- poetry
- drama
- work written in Scots

The purpose of these referrals is to allow the Principal Assessor to determine the number of such types being submitted from year to year, and to access material for possible exemplification.

THE MARKING PROCESS

1 Judging against the Performance Criteria

Each piece of writing should first be read to establish whether it achieves success in all the Performance Criteria below, including the standards for technical accuracy (see 2 below).

Content

Content is mainly relevant and appropriate for purpose and audience; there is an attempt to develop a number of ideas/points of information.

Structure

There is a degree of organisation of content and a straightforward structure which is in the main appropriate for purpose, audience and genre.

Expression

Some use of basic techniques relevant to the genre, mainly accurate choice of words and some variety of sentence structures indicate an attempt to adopt an appropriate tone and convey a point of view.

2 Confirming Technical Accuracy

A piece of writing which does not satisfy the requirement to be “mainly accurate” cannot pass. If, however, technical accuracy is deemed “mainly accurate”, then there are no penalties or deductions for any errors.

Mainly accurate

Although a few errors may be present, spelling, vocabulary and sentence structures will be sufficiently accurate to convey the candidate’s meaning at first reading.

3 Assigning a Category and Mark

Each piece of writing should then be assigned to the appropriate category as outlined in the Broad Descriptors, supported by reference to the Detailed Descriptors.

(a) Broad Descriptors

Pieces of writing which **pass** (ie meet the minimum requirements of the Performance Criteria) should be assigned to one of four categories as follows:

Category	Mark(s)	Broad descriptor
I	25	Outstanding
II	21 or 23	Very sound
III	17 or 19	Comfortably achieves all Performance Criteria
IV	13 or 15	Just succeeds in achieving the Performance Criteria

Pieces of writing which **fail** to meet the minimum requirements of one or more than one Performance Criterion should be assigned to one of two categories as follows:

Category	Mark(s)	Broad descriptor
V	11 or 9	Fails to achieve one or more than one Performance Criterion and/or to achieve consistent technical accuracy
VI*	7 or 5**	Serious shortcomings

In Categories II – VI, the choice of which mark to award should be determined by the level of certainty with which the piece of writing has been assigned to the category.

* Pieces of writing in this category will be extremely rare. It should be used only in cases of extreme thinness or serious weaknesses in expression and/or technical accuracy.

** Marks below 5 can, in exceptional circumstances be awarded, for example to a piece of writing which is of extreme brevity, perhaps just a few lines.

(b) Detailed descriptors

In order to avoid excessive length in these descriptors, Argumentative, Persuasive and Report have been treated generically as “Discursive”. To assist Markers, some key statements about the three types are given on page 10.

Category I (25 marks):

This will be, for work at Intermediate 1 level, an impressive and wholly relevant piece of writing in which the content is well selected. The structure is appropriate and content is sensibly organised. Expression is confident. Word choice is mostly appropriate and there is some variation in sentence structures. Techniques associated with the genre are used competently.

Imaginative writing in this category will be characterised by a sense that the writer has a basic knowledge and understanding of the genre and is attempting to exploit some of its conventions; the writing is consistently competent.

Personal/Reflective writing in this category will be characterised by a clear sense of appropriate reflection; a sense of the writer’s personality is communicated; the writing is consistently competent.

Discursive writing in this category will, as appropriate to the specific genre and purpose, be characterised by a secure understanding of the ideas/issues; the line of thought is clear with evidence of some development; the writing is consistently competent.

Category II (21 or 23 marks):

This will be, for work at Intermediate 1 level, a sound, relevant piece of writing in which the content is sensibly selected. The structure is appropriate and content is clearly organised. Expression is competent. Word choice is mostly appropriate and there is some variation in sentence structures. Techniques associated with the genre are used appropriately.

Imaginative writing in this category will be characterised by a sense that the writer has a basic knowledge and understanding of the genre and is attempting to exploit some of its conventions; the writing is mostly competent.

Personal/Reflective writing in this category will be characterised by a sense of appropriate reflection; a sense of the writer’s personality is communicated; the writing is mostly competent.

Discursive writing in this category will, as appropriate to the specific genre and purpose, be characterised by a secure understanding of the ideas/issues; the line of thought is clear; the writing is mostly competent.

Category III (17 or 19 marks):

A relevant piece of writing in which the structure is appropriate and content is organised. Expression is competent. Word choice is mostly appropriate and sentence structures are mostly accurate. Some techniques associated with the genre are used.

Imaginative writing in this category will be characterised by a sense that the writer has a basic knowledge of the genre and is following its principal conventions in a recognisable way; the writing is mainly competent.

Personal/Reflective writing in this category will be characterised by some appropriate reflection; some sense of the writer's personality is communicated; the writing is mainly competent.

Discursive writing in this category will, as appropriate to the specific genre and purpose, be characterised by an understanding of the ideas/issues; the line of thought is mostly clear; the writing is mainly competent.

Category IV (13 or 15 marks):

A mostly relevant piece of writing with evidence of some appropriate structure. Expression is mostly competent. Word choice is reasonably appropriate and sentence structures are reasonably accurate. At least one technique associated with the genre is used.

Imaginative writing in this category will be characterised by a sense that the writer has a basic knowledge of the genre and is making some attempt to follow its more basic conventions; the writing is, for the most part, acceptable.

Personal/Reflective writing in this category will be characterised by minimal reflection; little sense of the writer's personality is communicated; the writing is, for the most part, acceptable.

Discursive writing in this category will, as appropriate to the specific genre and purpose, be characterised by a basic understanding of the ideas/issues; a line of thought is discernible; the writing is, for the most part, acceptable.

Category V (11 or 9 marks):

A piece of writing will fall into this category for a variety of reasons: it fails to achieve consistent technical accuracy; the structure is not sufficiently organised to carry the writer's ideas clearly; the language is mundane and unvaried, the content is simply too thin.

Imaginative writing in this category will be characterised by one or more of the following: inappropriate use of the genre, failure to communicate satisfactorily, inappropriate language, overall thinness of content.

Personal/Reflective writing in this category will be characterised by one or more of the following: absence of any reflection or sense of the writer's personality, failure to communicate satisfactorily, inappropriate language, overall thinness of content.

Discursive writing in this category will be characterised by one or more of the following: evidence that ideas/issues are not understood, a confused line of thought, serious weaknesses in structure, highly inappropriate language or tone, failure to follow the stated remit, overall thinness of content.

“Discursive” writing: key statements from the Arrangements document for Intermediate 1:

Argumentative Writing:

Argumentative writing will treat a topic or issue in a way which presents a line of argument, dealing with two or more varying viewpoints.

The main requirements of the **argumentative** essay are that it will:

- communicate a line of argument
- present two sides of an argument (or more, if applicable)
- attempt to convey an argumentative tone which is measured, reasonable and yet carries personal conviction
- attempt to communicate to the reader a sense that the writer has a clear line of thought which leads to a reasonable conclusion
- make use of argumentative techniques such as comparison, contrast, proof, disproof.

Persuasive Writing:

Persuasive writing will persuade to a purpose or point of view (for example, to sell a product, or influence opinion/belief), usually concerning itself with a single topic or issue.

The main requirements of the **persuasive** essay are that it will:

- carry a sense of conviction, commitment or belief by use of tone
- attempt to use persuasive techniques, such as assertion, statement of need, plea, use of ‘emotive’ words.

Report:

The report must contain a relevant selection of basic information drawn from at least two sources. In order to meet the requirements of the performance criteria, material drawn from sources must be recast and paraphrased appropriately for purpose. The report must achieve a specified purpose. The writer’s point of view and tone will depend on the nature of the purpose.

The writing should have clear structure and should be presented in a logical order. Where the convention of headings is used there will be obvious separation of the constituent sets of information to match the headings.

Diagrams, tables, charts and graphs may be included if appropriate to the chosen form. Headings, appendices, bibliographies and a lettering or numbering system to separate the constituent sections may also be used

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]