



**MARKING NOTES  
REMARQUES POUR LA NOTATION  
NOTAS PARA LA CORRECCIÓN**

**May / mai / mayo 2013**

**ENGLISH / ANGLAIS / INGLÉS A:  
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE /  
LANGUE ET LITTÉRATURE /  
LENGUA Y LITERATURA**

**Higher Level  
Niveau Supérieur  
Nivel Superior**

**Paper / Épreuve / Prueba 1**

*These marking notes are **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*They are the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.*

These notes to examiners are intended only as guidelines to assist marking. They are not offered as an exhaustive and fixed set of responses or approaches to which all answers must rigidly adhere. Good ideas or angles not offered here should be acknowledged and rewarded as appropriate. Similarly, answers which do not include all the ideas or approaches suggested here should be rewarded appropriately.

## SECTION A

Both texts are about the Imperial War Museum in London. The first is a review of a visit to the museum on the international website, Trip Advisor, the second is a guide in London's *Time Out* encouraging local people to visit it.

An adequate to good analysis will:

- identify the different text types and their purposes commenting on some of the formal characteristics of each, including the ways in which the reader is addressed
- identify the different target audiences and their contexts; compare some of the ways in which both texts anticipate both the needs and the reactions of these audiences (such as the ways in which practical advice is given or the different uses of language and register)
- comment on the structure and layout of the guide, including the purpose and effect of the illustrations; comment on some of the features of the webpage layout such as symbols and rankings and some of the formal features of its text (use of quotation marks, parenthetical comments)
- comment on some of the differences of focus and tone between the two texts, for example the emphasis in the guide on the spectacular and the quirky, on the “feel good” experience of doing something “cultural”, in the review on practical advice for the visitor and, above all on what can be learned (from exhibitions, documents, newsreels, *etc.*).

A good to excellent analysis may also:

- explore the contrast between the prescriptive flying visit the guide has in mind and the review's advice that is a flexible compromise between the leisurely and the expeditious
- contrast the assumptions the guide makes about the visitor's limited previous knowledge of the museum's subject matter (as evidenced by the clichés, the stereotypes and the references to popular culture) with the tourist's interest in history and his/her experience of similar museums
- analyse in more depth the different approaches to visiting the same museum which could include comment on the contrast between some of the following: trivialisation, parochialism and morbidity in the guide, subjectivity, compassion and internationalism in the review
- offer a concluding assessment of the effectiveness of the texts as guides to visiting the museum.

## SECTION B

The speakers in both these texts, a first person narrative by the Pakistani author, Mohsin Hamid and a speech by a former British Foreign Secretary, express pride in their respective countries.

An adequate to good analysis will:

- comment on some of the similarities between the texts (such as both being types of speeches) as well as identifying some of the differences between them in terms of audience, context and purpose
- compare and contrast what the speakers have to say about their respective peoples and some of the ways in which they are proud of their countries
- notice that food is a common element in both texts and make some comment on what chicken tikka in particular represents for each speaker
- comment on some of the other differences of focus: for example the politician's emphasis on the historical, the socio-economic, the conceptual and the celebratory in contrast with the physical – even sensual – and more overtly emotional and imagistic discourse of the narrator
- comment on the ways in which the speakers address their audiences, which could include observations about tone, register and the use of pronouns. Suggest some contextual reasons for these differences.

A good to excellent analysis may also:

- explore more fully the purposes of the speech in relation to the target audience in London and to what is implied about the interlocutor of the literary passage whose words are not reported
  - analyse in more depth the similarities and differences between the speakers' views of their respective countries' pasts and presents
  - contrast the politician's views of inclusiveness and shared values with the narrator's view of exclusiveness and difference
  - comment more fully on the similarities and differences between the rhetorical strategies of the two speakers and explore their impact on the reader
  - comment further on the references to food and its significance for the two speakers as a component of national identity
  - draw attention to some of the ironies that derive from the pairing of these two texts.
-