

**English A: Language & Literature – Paper 1 Assessment Criteria HL**

<p><b>Criterion A: Understanding and comparison of the texts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent does the analysis show the similarities and differences between the texts?</li> <li>• To what extent does the analysis show an understanding of the texts, their type and purpose, and their possible contexts (for example, cultural, temporal, relation to audience)?</li> <li>• Are the comments supported by well-chosen references to the texts?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Criterion B: Understanding of the use and effects of stylistic features</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent does the comparative analysis show awareness of how stylistic features of the texts, such as language, structure, tone, technique and style, are used to construct meaning?</li> <li>• To what extent does the comparative analysis show appreciation of the effects of stylistic features (including the features of visual texts) on the reader?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Criterion C: Organization and development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well organized and coherent is the comparative analysis?</li> <li>• How balanced is the comparative analysis? (“Balance” here means equal treatment of the two texts.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Criterion D: Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear, varied and accurate is the language?</li> <li>• How appropriate is the choice of register, style and terminology? (“Register” refers, in this context, to the student’s use of elements such as vocabulary, tone, sentence structure and terminology appropriate to the task.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>0</b> <i>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</i></p>	<p><b>0</b> <i>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</i></p>	<p><b>0</b> <i>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</i></p>	<p><b>0</b> <i>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</i></p>
<p><b>1</b> There is little understanding of the context and purpose of the texts and their similarities or differences; summary predominates and observations are rarely supported by references to the texts.</p>	<p><b>1</b> There is little awareness of the use of stylistic features and little or no illustration of their effects on the reader.</p>	<p><b>1</b> Little organization is apparent, with no sense of balance and very little development; considerable emphasis is placed on one text to the detriment of the other.</p>	<p><b>1</b> Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.</p>
<p><b>2</b> There is some understanding of the context and purpose of the texts, and the similarities or differences between them; observations are generally supported by references to the texts.</p>	<p><b>2</b> There is some awareness of the use of stylistic features, with a few references illustrating their effects on the reader.</p>	<p><b>2</b> Some organization is apparent. There is little sense of balance and some development; although both texts are addressed, the treatment of one is superficial.</p>	<p><b>2</b> Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.</p>
<p><b>3</b> There is adequate understanding of the texts, their possible context and purpose, and the similarities and differences between them; comments are included, as well as observations that are generally supported by references to the texts.</p>	<p><b>3</b> There is adequate awareness of the use of stylistic features and understanding of their effects on the reader.</p>	<p><b>3</b> The comparative analysis is organized and structured in a generally coherent way. There is a sense of balance and adequate development.</p>	<p><b>3</b> Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.</p>
<p><b>4</b> There is good understanding of the texts, their context and purpose, and the similarities and differences between them; comments are mostly supported by well-chosen references to the texts</p>	<p><b>4</b> There is good awareness and illustration of the use of stylistic features and detailed understanding of their effects on the reader.</p>	<p><b>4</b> The comparative analysis is well organized and balanced. The structure is mostly coherent and there is a good sense of development.</p>	<p><b>4</b> Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.</p>
<p><b>5</b> There is excellent understanding of the texts, their context and purpose, and the similarities and differences between them; comments are fully supported by well-chosen references to the texts.</p>	<p><b>5</b> There is excellent awareness of the use of stylistic features, with very good understanding of their effects on the reader.</p>	<p><b>5</b> The comparative analysis is well balanced and effectively organized, with a coherent and effective structure and development.</p>	<p><b>5</b> Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>