



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

May / mai / mayo 2010

ENGLISH / ANGLAIS / INGLÉS A2

**Standard Level
Niveau Moyen
Nivel Medio**

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 authorisation of IB Cardiff.*

Standard Level, paper 1

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 not be so heavily penalized as to distort appreciation of individuality.

SECTION A

This question invites candidates to compare extracts from a promotional website and a newspaper article.

A barely satisfactory comparative commentary may:

- note that both texts are about the death of pets and, more specifically, about the ways that pet owners memorialize their deceased pets
- call attention to the different genres, one a promotional website and the other a newspaper article
- call attention to one or two stylistic devices in each text: for example, repetition, the use of second person, and the use of adjectives in text 1; technical language, quotation and numbers in text 2.

A better comparative commentary may:

- discuss key stylistic devices in more detail, perhaps comparing the use of very emotive language in text 1 with the emphasis on numbers, facts and procedures in text 2
- be more specific about the shared subject, noting differences in the way that the authors respond to people's desire to memorialize their pets
- discuss the promotional elements of text 1, recognizing that it is designed to appeal to grieving pet owners
- comment on the tone of each text, noting that the tone of text 1 is persistently emotive and sympathetic ("we understand" and "we feel a profound sense of grief"), while text 2 is somewhat arch or derisive ("freeze-dried Pekinese")
- note that the serenity and graciousness evoked in text 1 ("warm, inviting setting") is in contrast to the "crude technology" detailed in text 2
- consider what the headings reveal about the texts, noting that the sub-heading in text 1 dignifies the idea of the pet as a "best friend" whereas the heading in text 2 is less emotive and less serious (perhaps even comic).

The best comparative commentaries may:

- discuss the effects of various stylistic devices, for example, repetition, the use of second person, and the use of adjectives in text 1; technical language, quotation and numbers in text 2
- consider that the pet owner quoted in text 2 echoes some of the language used by the authors of text 1; *e.g.* “how hard it is to say goodbye” (text 1) and “I couldn’t let him go” (text 2), “perpetuate” (text 1) and “preserve him” (text 2)
- contrast the cool, often clinical, and often derisive tone of text 2 with the persistently sympathetic tone in text 1
- contrast the evocation of restfulness and serenity in text 1 with the—arguably—violent or “crude” process in text 2 (“gutted”, “dipped,” “shot,” and “posed”)
- note that text 1 emphasizes “tastefulness” while text 2 suggests that there is something tasteless about freeze-drying a pet (“pink tongue sticking out”)
- note that text 2 emphasizes cost; although text 1 does not mention cost, it appears to be addressed to people willing to spend significant sums to ensure that their pet will be memorialized in an exclusive setting.

SECTION B

This question invites candidates to compare an extract from a magazine article and a poem.

A barely satisfactory comparative commentary may:

- note that both texts are about pelicans
- call attention to the different genres, one a magazine article and the other a poem
- call attention to one or two stylistic features of each text: for example, the use of simile, allusion, quotation, and rhetorical question in text 3; the use of first person plural, rhyme, repetition, rhythm, and neologisms/nonsense words in text 4.

A better comparative commentary may:

- be more specific about the shared theme, noting that only text 4 is presented from the pelicans' perspective
- discuss the stylistic features in more detail
- discuss generic differences in more detail
- note that both texts celebrate pelicans, recognizing that they evoke joy in text 3 and are joyous in text 4
- note that both authors represent pelicans as funny-looking and ungainly: in text 3 the pelican has “clown feet and a beak like a shovel”; in text 4 the pelicans “snort” and are seen “stamping [their] feet with a flumpy sound”
- note the comic elements of both texts.

The best comparative commentaries may:

- consider how a comic effect is established in each text, *e.g.* the use of simile in text 3 and the use of nonsense words and phrases in text 4
 - discuss the use and the effect of the first-person plural in each text
 - consider what the title reveals about the subject matter of each text, noting the double-meaning of “Chorus” in text 4 (“Chorus” describes both the pelicans and the refrain within their poem/song)
 - consider the relationship between rhyme and rhythm or cadence in text 4
 - note that both texts celebrate the pelicans' surprising grace in a variety of ways, including references to dance (“aerial ballet” in text 3 and “wing to wing we dance around” in text 4)
 - note that the rhetorical question at the end of text 3 attempts to establish a connection (“empathy”) between reader and subject.
-