VCE English Language 2024–2028

Assessment Criteria & Expected Qualities

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 debate about language
* write clearly organised responses with controlled and effective use of language appropriate to the task.

Expected qualities for the mark range – Section A

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Expected Qualities** |
| high | * Demonstrates detailed knowledge of the text, supported by relevant examples/evidence
* Uses appropriate and effective metalanguage
* Includes consistent use of features of written discourse
 |
| medium | * Demonstrates sound knowledge of the text, supported by some examples/evidence
* Uses relevant metalanguage
* Includes some features of written discourse
 |
| low | * Demonstrates limited knowledge of the text, and includes few examples
* Uses little to no metalanguage
* Includes few features of written discourse
 |

Expected qualities for the mark range – Section B

| **Mark** | **Expected Qualities** |
| --- | --- |
| 14–15 | * Demonstrates confident and detailed analysis of the language, with sophisticated discussion of a range of stylistic and discourse features of the text
* Shows excellent understanding of the purpose, tenor and register of the text and of the influence of contextual factors on the language used
* Includes highly relevant examples and evidence from the text to support the analysis
* Includes highly appropriate and effective use of metalinguistic tools in commenting on the features and functions of language used
* Includes tightly structured commentary, with controlled and effective use of the features of written discourse
 |
| 12–13 | * Demonstrates detailed analysis of the language, with discussion of a range of stylistic and discourse features of the text
* Shows very good understanding of the purpose, tenor and register of the text and of the influence of contextual factors on the language used
* Includes relevant examples and evidence from the text to support the analysis
* Demonstrates assured use of metalinguistic tools in commenting on the features and functions of language used
* Includes clearly organised commentary, with controlled use of the features of written discourse
 |
| 10–11 | * Demonstrates good analysis of the language, discussing several stylistic and discourse features of the text
* Shows sound understanding of the purpose, tenor 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
* Displays a mostly accurate analysis of language and ideas in metalinguistic terms
* Indicates an ability to utilise appropriate features of written discourse in the overall structure of commentary.
 |
| 8–9 | * Demonstrates some analysis of the language features of the text and some understanding of the purpose, tenor and register of the text and the influence of contextual factors on the language used
* Illustrates some points with examples and evidence from the text
* Uses metalanguage sporadically and not always accurately, and analysis is not sustained throughout response
* Demonstrates inconsistent use of features of written discourse
 |
| 6–7 | * Demonstrates limited analysis of the language features in the text. Ideas are general, superficial and/or repetitive
* Demonstrates a limited understanding of the purpose, tenor and register of the text and the influence of contextual factors on the language used
* Provides few supporting examples or evidence
* Uses little or no metalanguage, and is descriptive rather than analytical
* Uses some features of written discourse, but not consistently
 |
| 4–5 | * Provides basic discussion of some language features but without understanding of the purpose, tenor and register and other contextual factors of the text
* Makes two or three points but without supporting examples or evidence
* Includes descriptive ideas, not expressed in metalanguage
* Demonstrates poorly structured writing, with few features of written discourse evident.
 |
| 0–3 | * Shows little understanding of the task
* Includes one or two loosely related ideas, but these are not developed and lack evidence and examples
* Demonstrates 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 | * Demonstrates 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
* Displays highly relevant use of evidence and examples from contemporary discussions and debate, including reference to the stimulus material
* Includes excellent analysis, using highly appropriate and effective metalanguage
* Creates a tightly structured essay characterised by assured use of the features of written discourse
 |
| 12–13 | * Demonstrates very good understanding of the topic, with broadly ranging ideas about the social contexts of language use
* Displays relevant use of evidence and examples from contemporary sociolinguistic discussions and debate, including reference to the stimulus material
* Provides very good analysis, with appropriate and effective use of metalanguage
* Creates a well-structured essay characterised by assured use of the features of written discourse
 |
| 10–11 | * Demonstrates good understanding of the topic, making 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
* Includes analysis of ideas, mostly expressed accurately with metalanguage
* Indicates ability to utilise appropriate features of written discourse in the essay’s overall structure.
 |
| 8–9 | * Demonstrates some understanding of the topic, with some points illustrated by examples and evidence from contemporary sociolinguistic discussion and debate, and some reference to the stimulus material provided
* Provides limited analysis throughout response and metalanguage is used sporadically and/or inaccurately
* Shows mostly consistent use of features of written discourse
 |
| 6–7 | * Demonstrates limited understanding of the topic, with ideas that are general, superficial and/or repetitive
* Includes few supporting examples or evidence
* Creates a descriptive rather than analytical essay, with little or no use of metalanguage
* Includes some features of written discourse, but they are not used consistently
 |
| 4–5 | * Demonstrates very limited understanding of the topic, with two or three points about language use and limited or no supporting examples
* Creates a descriptive response with limited or no use of metalanguage
* Shows poorly structured writing, containing few features of written discourse
 |
| 0–3 | * Demonstrates little or no understanding of the topic
* Includes one or two ideas loosely related to the topic, but these are not developed and lack evidence and examples
* Shows poorly structured writing, with minimal evidence of appropriate features of written discourse
 |