

**Department of Languages, Cultural
Studies and Applied Linguistics (LanCSAL)**

**June 2018 Exam
(SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINATION)**



MODULE:	Linguistics 3A (LIN3AA3/LIN3A11)
PAPER 1:	Text Editing Theory
EXAMINERS:	Mrs JE Viviers Dr A Lourens [US]
DATE:	JULY
MARKS:	100
TIME:	2 hours

INSTRUCTIONS : QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED IN EXAM BOOKS.

REQUIREMENTS : THIS IS NOT AN OPEN BOOK EXAM.

INSTRUCTIONS AND NOTES TO CANDIDATES:

1. Answer any **TWO** questions.
2. Provide appropriate and relevant examples throughout.
3. Essays will be marked according to the assessment grid provided on page three of this exam paper.

Question 1

Drawing on the work of Mossop (2007), write an **essay** in which you argue why text editing is still necessary in this day and age, and why human editors cannot be completely replaced by computers. Remember to include a definition of what text editing is and the profile of the text editor. **(50)**

OR

Question 2

Renkema's CCC model "has considerable potential as an objective tool for evaluating text quality and improving texts" (Carstens, Van de Poel & Linnegar, 2012: 36).

Give a detailed exposition of the CCC model, focusing on the ways in which this model assists editors to make judgements about the quality and effectiveness of a text and to make decisions about possible remedial intervention.

(50)

OR

Question 3

Van de Poel, Carstens and Linnegar (2012: 90) introduce a number of design facets and these "are facets of the delicate balancing act of document design".

Write an essay on the principles of document design, by focusing in particular on the design facets outlined by these authors. Include fitting examples throughout your essay. **(50)**

Essays will be marked according to the assessment grid below:

Marks	Guidelines / Exposition
75+	Good insight in problem/topic; original approach; comprehensive information; systematic and coherent exposition and integration; conclusions adequately motivated and substantiated.
70-75	Well focused; relevant and adequate information and detail; good integration.
65-70	Clear focus; relevant and adequate information; satisfactory discussion; reasonable insight throughout discussion.
60-65	Reasonably focused; relevant and adequate information at times but not throughout discussion.
55-60	At times focused on question/problem; relevant information; attention to main points but with limited detail.
50-55	Poor focus; main points provided but insufficient information.
-50	Question insufficiently discussed; information inadequate, very little insight.