

VCE English Language

2016–2020

Written examination – End of year

Assessment criteria

Examination responses will be assessed on the extent to which they demonstrate the ability to:

- use metalanguage to describe and analyse structures, features and functions of language in a range of contexts
- explain and analyse linguistic features of written and spoken English in a range of registers
- understand and analyse relationships between language and identities in society
- identify and analyse differing attitudes to varieties of Australian English
- draw on contemporary discussions and debates about language
- write clearly organised responses with controlled and effective use of language appropriate to the task.

Assessors mark holistically, relating student performance to the published criteria and ranking students over the full range of marks available. Determination of the mark is assisted by descriptors of 'Expected qualities for the mark range'; these have been written to reflect the level of achievement expected at a particular mark or mark range. The descriptors are only a general guide: they do not necessarily match precisely the performance of an individual response. Both the criteria and the descriptors are fully explored and directly related to the range of student responses during the assessor training process.

Expected qualities for the mark range – Section A

Range	Expected qualities
high	Demonstrates detailed knowledge and is supported by relevant examples/evidence from the text. Metalanguage is used appropriately and effectively. Features of written discourse are consistently used.
medium	Demonstrates sound knowledge and is supported by some examples/evidence from the text. The metalanguage used is relevant. Features of written discourse are mostly evident.
low	Demonstrates limited knowledge and contains few examples from the text. The use of metalanguage is limited or absent. Few features of written discourse are evident.

Expected qualities for the mark range – Section B

Mark	Expected qualities
14–15	Confident and detailed analysis of the language, with sophisticated discussion of a range of stylistic and discourse features of the text. Excellent understanding of the social purpose and register of the text and of the influence of contextual factors on the language used. Highly relevant examples and evidence from the text to support the analysis. Highly appropriate and effective use of metalinguistic tools in commenting on the features and functions of language used. Tightly structured commentary with controlled and effective use of the features of written discourse.
12–13	Detailed analysis of the language, with discussion of a range of stylistic and discourse features of the text. Very good understanding of the social purpose and register of the text and of the influence of contextual factors on the language used. Relevant examples and evidence from the text to support the analysis. Assured use of metalinguistic tools in commenting on the features and functions of language used. Clearly organised commentary with controlled use of the features of written discourse.
10–11	Good analysis of the language, discussing several stylistic and discourse features of the text. Sound understanding of the social purpose and register of the text and the influence of contextual factors on the language used. Provides examples and evidence from the text to support the discussion. Analysis of language and ideas is mostly expressed accurately in metalinguistic terms. Overall structure of commentary indicates an ability to utilise appropriate features of written discourse.
8–9	Some analysis of the language features of the text and some understanding of the social purpose and register of the text and the influence of contextual factors on the language used. Some points illustrated with examples and evidence drawn from the text. Analysis not sustained throughout response and metalanguage used sporadically and not always accurately. Features of written discourse not consistently present.
6–7	Limited analysis of the language in the text. Ideas are general, superficial and/or repetitive. Demonstrates a limited understanding of the social purpose and register of the text and the influence of contextual factors on the language used. Few supporting examples or evidence. Descriptive rather than analytical with little or no use of metalanguage. Some features of written discourse evident but not used consistently.
4–5	Basic discussion of some language features but without understanding of the social purpose, register and other contextual factors of the text. Two or three points made but without supporting examples or evidence. Ideas are descriptive and not expressed in metalanguage. Poorly structured writing with few features of written discourse evident.
0–3	Little understanding of the task. One or two ideas loosely related but not developed and lacking evidence and examples. Poorly structured writing with minimal evidence of appropriate features of written discourse.

Expected qualities for the mark range – Section C

Mark	Expected qualities
14–15	Confident and detailed examination of the topic, with sophisticated discussion of the social contexts of language use and depth and breadth of sociolinguistic knowledge as appropriate to the topic. Highly relevant use of evidence and examples from contemporary discussions and debate, including reference to the stimulus material. Excellent analysis using metalinguistic tools highly appropriately and effectively. Tightly structured essay characterised by assured use of the features of written discourse.
12–13	Very good understanding of the topic, with broadly ranging ideas about the social contexts of language use. Relevant use of evidence and examples from contemporary sociolinguistic discussions and debate, including reference to the stimulus material. Very good analysis with appropriate and effective use of metalinguistic tools. Well-structured essay characterised by assured use of the features of written discourse.
10–11	Good understanding of the topic with several points about the social contexts of language use, mostly supported by examples or evidence drawn from contemporary sociolinguistic discussion and debate. Includes some reference to the provided stimulus material. Analysis of ideas mostly expressed accurately in metalinguistic terms. Overall structure of essay indicates ability to utilise appropriate features of written discourse.
8–9	Some understanding of the topic, with some points illustrated by examples and evidence from contemporary sociolinguistic discussion and debate and some reference to the provided stimulus material. Limited analysis throughout response and metalanguage used sporadically and/or inaccurately. Mostly consistent use of features of written discourse.
6–7	Limited understanding of the topic, with ideas that are general, superficial and/or repetitive. Few supporting examples or evidence. Descriptive rather than analytical with little or no use of metalanguage. Some features of written discourse evident but not used consistently.
4–5	Very limited understanding of the topic with two or three points about language use and with limited or no supporting examples. Descriptive response with limited or no use of metalanguage. Poorly structured writing with few features of written discourse evident.
0–3	Little or no understanding of the topic. One or two ideas loosely related to the topic but not developed and lacking evidence and examples. Poorly structured writing with minimal evidence of appropriate features of written discourse.