



## EXAMINERS' REPORT ON 2001 TERTIARY ENTRANCE EXAMINATION

### SUBJECT: ENGLISH

#### STATISTICS

Year	Number Who Sat	Non-Examination Candidates	Did Not Sit
2001	7965	226	479
2000	8019	290	634
1999	7748	271	629

The Examiners' Report is written by the Chief Examiner (or another Examiner on her/his behalf) to comment on matters relating to the Tertiary Entrance Examination in their subject. The opinions and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the Chief Examiner and not necessarily representative of or endorsed by the Curriculum Council.

The Marking Guide provided at the end of this report was prepared for markers and may have been substantially amplified by discussion held in the pre-marking meetings. It is not intended as a set of model answers, and is not exhaustive as regards alternative answers. Some of the answers are less than perfect, but represent a standard of response that examiners deemed sufficient to earn full marks. Teachers who use this guide should do so with its original purpose in mind.

#### **SUMMARY/ABSTRACT**

The 2001 TEE English paper was endorsed by markers in their reports as a paper that was accessible to students, fair, closely related to the syllabus and an assessment instrument that allowed for discrimination between students. The questions in the paper this year functioned particularly well in preventing students from presenting prepared essays and fewer students than in previous years attempted to answer a question that had appeared on an earlier paper. There was also a pleasing reduction in the number of penalties that were applied for the use of incorrect texts and an increased proportion of more carefully planned and often shorter essays.

The texts provided for Comprehension and the questions in each of the three sections of the paper covered a range of concepts and genres and, once again, the variation in command or directive words in each section provided candidates with a broad range of approaches by which they could demonstrate their understandings of the syllabus. Some markers noted once again that, while candidates know their texts very well, some focus on this knowledge of their texts at the expense of showing their understanding of the syllabus concepts through using the texts as supporting evidence. Also, there was some evidence that candidates need to become more discerning in terms of selecting which questions are open to challenge, along with using personal voice more judiciously to promote the central argument of the essay in relation to the keywords of the questions.

Once again, in both the Print and Non-Print sections a wide range of texts was apparent, and the candidates' genuine engagement with the subject was particularly evident in the Non-Print section. Markers commented positively on the level of expression while signalling the need for teachers and students to continue to work at skills related to directly tackling the specific requirements of the questions. Weaknesses in the area of narrative were evident in responses to all three sections of the paper, and aspects of narrative appear to need closer attention in the classroom. Candidates are becoming increasingly confident with discussions of aspects of personal context but further work on culture, history and society would be beneficial.

A revision of the syllabus to include the term "representation" is a strong recommendation from both markers and examiners. A concern expressed during informal discussions between markers is the possibility that the syllabus and the examination may stagnate in the years before the implementation of the recommendations of the Post Compulsory Review and that the English Syllabus Committee should be encouraged to continually re-examine and where necessary revise the syllabus and the examination format.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

### From the markers

- “It was a fair paper with enough innovation to discriminate and enough that was recognizable to make it fair for any student who knew the syllabus.”
- “The personal voice was not well used by some candidates. It was often used to express purely subjective views that were not linked to the construction of meaning. This may have resulted from a shallow reading of *Good Answers 2001* with candidates choosing to ignore the recommendation that they had to work hard at the course to effectively employ a convincing voice.”
- “Teachers should be congratulated because, in terms of candidates’ understandings of texts and text conventions, the answers revealed evidence of sound teaching. Now it is time to move a step further. This is also an examination in written expression and lively, engaging thinking and writing is something to which candidates should aspire.”
- “There seems to be a view, given the evidence of the responses, that it is a close knowledge of the content of a specific text which is required. It would be good to reiterate the idea to both teachers and students that with the English course our focus should be a broader understanding of the working of language and meaning in particular genres and patterns, of which a particular text is an example. It is also important that students have some notion of a view of the world to set one’s thoughts against.”

### Advice for teachers

Comments from markers:

- “Remind candidates that preparing just one text for each section of the paper is a recipe for disaster.”
- “Teach students that a text doesn’t have to be humorous to be entertaining.”
- “Knowledge of texts over understanding of concepts seemed to be the dominant feature of too many responses. Teachers need to reverse this trend by reminding students to focus more closely on concepts.”
- “In relation to context, students need scaffolding to help them get past first base about who they are, and then how that relates to what they read (and view) and how meaning is made.”
- “Teachers need to keep working on context. There is not a lot of understanding by students of how they have certain values and attitudes before coming to a text.”
- “Question 2 Comprehension, Question 4 Non-Print, Question 5 Print and to some extent also Question 3, showed that candidates often do not understand the basic elements of narrative such as characterisation, setting, point of view and plot. Whether this is a reflection of reading habits or an area we as teachers have taken for granted, this must be addressed in the classroom.”
- “Congratulations to teachers on preparing and encouraging candidates to write on drama texts. Congratulations also on using recent films that indicated high candidate engagement with non-print texts. The quality of written expression in many essays was encouraging. Can we encourage teachers to give more attention to narrative, particularly by resurrecting the classroom practice of close reading of short fiction extracts?” This will be dealt with more fully in *Good Answers 2002*.
- “When teaching stage drama, teachers need to do some homework on engaging their students with the concept of audience and performance.”
- “Teachers should encourage students to explore their personal reactions to a text to enable them to write successfully on the concept of intertextuality rather than having the concept artificially introduced by being given two similar texts.”
- “Teachers should be reminded not to use current affairs programmes for documentary film. This is a quite separate genre covered by the Year 11 English Syllabus.”
- “What a relief to see *Anna’s Story* and *Deveson* almost gone; perhaps it is time to give *Painted Babies*, *Manhood* and *No Sugar* a rest. I was worried by the re-appearance of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*; it needs a longer rest, just like *Educating Rita*.”
- “Please liberate us from the tedium of *Painted Babies*; it became rather like listening to Vorgan poetry in this exam.”
- “Further work in the classroom is needed in working out which questions are open, which questions are closed and how much room there is to resist the instructions of a particular question.”
- “Intertextuality is not about comparing in very limited ways two texts that have a shared theme or issue. It is about looking for patterns of language, archetypal narratives, generic features, stylistic devices, conventions and the like. It is about the prior knowledge of these that we bring to each new text we encounter, and also how the construction of each text is influenced by the texts preceding it. Teachers need to be reminded of this so that the narrow understandings of intertextuality demonstrated by many candidates in Question 3 of the Print Comment do not appear again.” Intertextuality will be dealt with more fully in *Good Answers 2002*.

## Advice to candidates

Comments from markers:

- “Voice is good, but not colloquial chit-chat that is not directly related to developing the argument in relation to particular aspects of a question. Don’t use personal voice as a means of avoiding supporting evidence from texts and a demonstration of your understanding of concepts. We want it all.”
- “Two things for candidates to think about: compelling can be engaging; something doesn’t have to be funny to be entertaining.”
- “Be passionate about a topic but don’t lose control of clear, continual focus on the question.”
- “Don’t take the easy way out. Write about more than one text and the reward will be a response that more convincingly shows your understandings of concepts. However, don’t do this by simply throwing in a reference in the penultimate paragraph.”
- “An essay is similar to a work of art – a drawing that has been made from life has a freshness and vitality about it that cannot be achieved by copying another’s work or style. The same principle applies to an essay. A dry and inappropriate prepared essay is easy to spot and not marked favourably. It may seem like a good idea to rote learn an essay you (or someone else) got a good mark for, but it is a shortcut that is guaranteed to backfire on you. There is no substitute for originality. However, originality is not being trite, glib or flippant in an effort to try to mask a lack of knowledge of concepts or your texts or the Year 12 English syllabus expectations. Markers value your opinions especially if they are authentic and informed.”
- “Whatever you do, don’t sit the exam intending to rewrite an essay you’ve previously written. You may think the question is close enough, but it is the degree to which your essay answers the specific question asked that will determine your mark, not its length or the number of techniques you discuss.”
- “Don’t be afraid to refer to other relevant texts with which you are familiar – even if they have not been studied in an English course. It is your ability to discuss the nature of the genre that is often examined, not your detailed knowledge of only one text.”
- “Don’t assert that a writer of fiction uses selection of detail as a technique. To select implies omission, and therefore a separate existence beyond the writer’s imagination.”
- “We know when you are trying to adapt a pre-learned essay to a new question. It doesn’t work.”
- “Juxtaposition is the noun, juxtapose is the verb. Please learn how to use the terminology.”
- “Unless your teacher confirms that you know how to use them correctly, remove the terms bias, biased and unbiased from your vocabulary.”
- “Candidates, here are some phrases that should never be used: ‘the writer uses language as a technique’, ‘the texts both utilize diction’, ‘we as the reader’, ‘in this essay I will ...’, ‘this use of certain techniques highlights particular values’.”
- “When responding to the Comprehension section, develop a thesis by thinking about the question and your response to the material, then plan and write an interesting, stimulating opening which actually says something. The vast majority of responses (or so it seemed) to Question 1 of the 2001 Comprehension section began ‘Passage 1 and Passage 2 are both feature articles which use techniques to persuade the reader to agree with them.’ That is not engagement with the question, that is dull stating of the question from a very limited stance.”
- “Techniques are not an end; they are a means so treat them as such. Being able to identify or list them is low-level thinking; it is description at best. You need to learn and be able to write about what is being done with the techniques you identify, what the writing is about and how the techniques are part of the manipulation, not that they are being used, but more importantly how and why they are being used. You need to be able to discuss how all the parts of a text are working together.”
- “Spend some time perfecting the art of weaving that short, well-chosen quote into your sentence. It’s much more effective (and less time consuming once you develop the art) than having a big clunker of a quote that says so much that it says nothing in particular.”
- “A sentence like ‘By using convincing characterisation and an introspective point of view the writer encourages me to share Aljaz’s disgust and sorrow at the possibility that the river might be dammed’ is much more effective than ‘By using certain techniques the writer is able to encourage the reader to adopt particular attitudes about the river’.”
- “Use the correct text type or be penalised. We do check.”

## COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS/QUESTIONS

### Section One: Written Comprehension

Markers indicated that the two equally weighted questions this year reflected the syllabus closely and that the two topical feature articles were accessible for candidates and of an appropriate length. Candidates engaged strongly and often passionately with the two articles. Engagement with the third passage was not as strong and unfortunately many candidates treated the novel extract as a third feature article, approaching the analysis of the Flanagan text in the same way that they approached the articles by Winton and Hay.

Two serious concerns arose during the marking of responses to *Question 1*. Firstly, many candidates did not read the information provided by examiners. The statement above Passage Two, “this is a feature article which was written in response to Passage One”, was ignored by many candidates. This information provided an important context for the reading of the passages and the construction of a response to the question. A second concern was that many candidates wrote two mini-essays on the two articles instead of giving attention to the command word “Compare”. This was a question where identification of the keywords was essential. The strongest essays dealt with all the keywords succinctly and directly in relation to both passages while the weaker essays tended to only acknowledge only some of the keywords, or wrote largely about one passage (usually the Winton article) without any real discussion of the second passage or any comparison of the ways in which the articles work. Some candidates, unfortunately, were so caught up in a passionate discussion of the environment that they failed to deal with attitudes to the environmental management. Candidates need some clarification of the roles of the writer and the layout editor in composing and publishing a feature article as too many saw Winton and Hay as solely responsible for everything from the selection of the font to the choice of titles and the placement of illustrations. Candidates generally responded confidently and more often than not effectively and convincingly to this question.

In dealing with *Question 2*, many candidates seemed unable to discuss the generic and narrative elements of the text with any degree of sophistication. A number of candidates misunderstood the content, thinking, for example, that Cockroach was an insect or that the Franklin River had been destroyed. Others only referred to isolated parts of the text, failing to see how it functioned as a whole and not coming to terms with the question. Candidates frequently commented on the relationship between man and nature but many did not comment on how it was presented through such things as characterisation, narrative structure, descriptive, figurative and emotive language, setting and repetition which position readers to respond. The complexity of the relationship provided ample material for the stronger candidates, and there were meaningful discussions of techniques, representations and responses. As with the first two passages, reading the information supplied by the examiners about the text would have helped many candidates.

### **Section Two: Print Comment**

*Question 1* was attempted by twelve percent of candidates. The question foregrounded reading theory that candidates should be aware of and gave them the opportunity to discuss their personal responses to reading they have done. It provided candidates with an opportunity to make connections between feature articles, wider reading and viewing and their own life experiences. Some candidates read the question quite narrowly with a limited understanding of personal context and explored two articles in terms of how contextual factors such as age and gender influenced their reading practices, or used ‘opinion’ as a synonym for context. Others simply wrote about their responses to particular articles without drawing adequate connections to the keywords of the question. Some of the strongest responses came from candidates who constructed quite sophisticated and engaging answers that looked at a target audience (not just themselves) along with recognising that they are a product of a time and place that shapes their world view.

Twenty-three percent of candidates wrote on *Question 2*, but a disturbing proportion reversed the question and discussed how the reading of one part of an expository text can enhance the knowledge of the text as a whole. The question was quite clearly worded, with both the statement and the instruction pointing in the same direction, but many candidates (possibly those whose knowledge of a text was limited to one part) refused to deal with the question provided. Other weak responses were general discussions about a number of sections with occasional attempts to draw them together and explain their complementary nature. The stronger responses were well written and many clearly articulated how a particular part of a text maintained the premise, philosophy, central contention, underlying values, etc, of the whole text and how this contributed to a sense of cohesion and an enhancement of reading and understanding.

*Question 3* was attempted by only nine percent of candidates, many of who looked only at similarities between two short stories in a very limited way. For some candidates the question appeared to be very simple and the need to demonstrate some of the key concepts of the syllabus to do with intertextuality, generic conventions and reading practices did not influence their discussions. Some of the weakest essays outlined the content of two related short stories, simply asserting that their understanding had been improved, as opposed to influenced. Others found it difficult to get past plot summaries, character descriptions or the comparison of themes and issues. Stronger candidates were able to show how reading of other texts enhanced their reading of a given text particularly with reference to generic conventions and narrative patterns.

The twenty-one percent of candidates that wrote on *Question 4* mainly did so quite well, with the lower scoring essays often being those that wrote only about themes with little or no discussion of how performance aspects contributed to the presentation of those themes. It was certainly not necessary for students to have seen a performance of the play discussed to respond well, but students did need to be aware that the frequently mentioned ‘stage directions’ indicate what and how things are done on stage, rather than seeing stage directions of themselves as a particular performance technique as was argued by some students. Some candidates asserted that a play needs

to be seen and looked mainly at actions and actors and then ran out of material and fell into the trap of retelling. The stronger responses, and there were many, outlined what they understood “performance aspects” to mean, provided clear and varied examples and carefully linked the given aspects to the themes or issues. These essays often referred to how characters (actors) can make physical use of the stage, how movement from one part of the stage to another can be by characters and sometimes by audience, how spaces on a stage are important to performance, how lighting, costume, sound effects, delivery, props and so on contribute to the making of meaning.

**Question 5** was the most popular topic for this section of the paper, with thirty-five percent of candidates choosing it. Many candidates focused on the notion of how reading the ending of a novel first tends to spoil enjoyment but often this limited understanding of the question produced rather banal responses that argued the readers would lose interest in reading if the suspense of the ending was removed. Some candidates, however, were able to be a little more creative with this restricted approach when referring to novels with complex structures or novels that employed flashback techniques. Unfortunately, many candidates seemed determined to write on their novel no matter what the question, and their responses usually resorted to retelling the plot or discussing problems associated with reading only the last chapter of a novel. The best responses came from candidates who had carefully unpacked the question and gave close attention to all keywords, examining the opening assertion in the light of the question that followed, often linking narrative structure to meaning.

### **Section Three: Non-print Comment**

**Question 1** drew responses from twenty-two percent of candidates who often reflected on the relationships that exist between non-print texts and ideology. This question also provided candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate their understandings of values and attitudes in relation to the Year 12 syllabus generally.

Unfortunately, some candidates made trite comments such as “it is true that documentaries attempt to change society’s values whereas ...” and then poured out prepared answers on one documentary and one feature film. Some of the better essays dealt with the two forms of non-print texts as social comment, while for others the question opened up a range of possibilities linked to a variety of positions.

Twenty percent of candidates selected **Question 2** for this section and, as one marker noted, “this question pointed to an area of neglect in the teaching of documentaries; that the entertainment value of the documentary is never addressed compared to the issues or the techniques of construction.” As another marker pointed out, it is unfortunate that “some candidates tried to make their documentary fit absurdly. For example, one candidate argued that seeing chickens hanging by their feet with their throats slit when still alive was very entertaining. To get away with this, more definition and more discussion of the key terms and of target audience (or themselves – a macabre sense of humour) were essential.” Stronger essays, along with giving appropriate attention to serious issues, discussed the nature of engagement and entertainment, describing how particular methods of construction and techniques work together, while weaker essays often consisted of a rewrite of a previously written essay about techniques used within a particular documentary with occasional assertions that these helped to make the text more engaging.

Many markers commented that the majority of the eighteen percent of candidates who responded to **Question 3** did so with freshness and understanding. It was a question that opened up genuine engagement and lively responses. One marker expressed the view of many with the remark “candidates wrote in an engaging way, and were able to construct equally strong arguments for either case. Many identified the use of archetypal narratives in feature films while others balanced these with the use of innovative special effects and the exploration of new issues. Others made connections with films from previous eras as well as acknowledging Hollywood formulae.” Another marker noted that this was “a great question that produced the highest quality responses.” Unfortunately, some candidates simply agreed with the proposition in the opening paragraph and then delivered a blow by blow account of their chosen text, occasionally pointing out how the ideas or techniques discussed were not particularly new.

**Question 4**, attempted by nineteen percent, was the question that seemed to draw the highest proportion of prepared answers. Candidates often wrote about a wide range of positioning devices within a particular documentary and simply labelled these techniques as “elements of narrative”. Many students did not indicate an understanding of narrative. Almost as many did not come to terms with structure. Fortunately, some students acknowledged that narrative has something to do with a notion of a tale being presented, of storytelling using narrative elements, but as one marker commented “the significance of the word ‘narrative’ seemed to elude most”. Another marker noted that “The phrase ‘elements of narrative’ was ignored by most candidates; ‘structure’ was attempted; ‘seeing the world’ was addressed reasonably well, but of the five non-print questions this one tended to be the one most widely used to deliver a rehearsed answer that did not adequately address the clear concerns of the question.”

**Question 5** attracted twenty-one percent of candidates who wrote with varying degrees of success on the relationships that exist between structure and meanings. Some of the better answers argued effectively against the proposition, presenting convincing arguments such as the beginning of a feature film being one of its least significant parts, while others supported the assertion and constructed sophisticated responses related to aspects such as closure, conflict, values and traditional narrative structure. One marker noted that this was “a great

question, which candidates, I think, actually enjoyed responding to. Candidates actually read and addressed the specific wording of the question.” Weaker essays often concentrated on long-winded descriptions of beginning and ending, with scant reference, other than assertion, to the question. Some wrote about the relationship with the viewer or between characters rather than the relationships viewers are encouraged to make between the opening and closing scenes. One marker wrote “it would be nice to see candidates use appropriate terminology (e.g. exposition, development, resolution, closure) in responding to a question like this.”

### ***ISSUES FOR THE SYLLABUS COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER***

- continue to encourage schools to go beyond narrow definitions of intertextuality
- draw the attention of schools to the concerns of markers regarding the lack of understanding of narrative by candidates
- remind schools of the notice from the Curriculum Council that feature articles will not be directly examined in the Print Comment section of the paper, but that feature articles should continue to be used in the classroom and that they can be used in the Comprehension section of the examination
- include the words “represent” and “representations” in the syllabus

Thanks to all markers and examiners for their professional, dedicated approach to all facets of the marking process, and for their detailed feedback in marker reports, which once again forms the basis of this report. Special thanks to Dr Jane Southwell, who has concluded her term as a member of the Examining Panel, for her efforts, diligence, guidance and perseverance during her years as an examiner, and more recently as Chief Examiner. Particular thanks also to Mr Rod Quin and Mr John Newman for their advice, encouragement and words of wisdom before, during and after the examination period.

Paul Whitla  
December 2001

### **2001 Examining Panel**

Chief Examiner: Dr Jane Southwell  
Deputy: Ms Barbara Harris  
Third Member: Mr Robert Stevenson

Chief Marker: Dr Paul Whitla

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

### TEE English 2001 – Draft Marking Criteria

*These marking guidelines are subject to validation, amendment and addition as a result of the trial marking sessions.*

#### General Marking Principles

##### Points to keep in mind with all questions

- TEE Marking is a **ranking** exercise. This has two consequences. First, we must use the full range of marks. Second, we must avoid using cut-offs based on limited criteria. Rather, answers are to be marked and discriminated according to **the extent** to which they meet the criteria.
- Answers should be marked on both the quality of their content and the quality of their expression. However, we should not award half the marks for one and half for the other. Exceptional expression can compensate for fairly ordinary content and vice versa.
- Please look for what to REWARD. Avoid the “penalty mentality” with spelling, expression, quotes, etc. Remember that this is a TERTIARY ENTRANCE examination, so we are not simply making judgements about “functional literacy” but also about “critical literacy”. We are looking to reward students who can develop an argument, sustain a point of view, use evidence from text/s to give weight to a point, employ means of communication to shape our own responses; engage effectively with a question; and so much more ...

##### Written expression

The key elements in assessing written expression are:

- structure - the presentation of a central argument and clear organisation of ideas
- fluency and expression
- mastery of vocabulary, and especially mastery of key syllabus terms
- mastery of the conventions of English, but minor spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors due to exam pressure should not be unduly penalised
- voice - in regard to voice, there is no requirement on candidates to write in a highly formal or impersonal manner or to avoid the first and second person. Colloquial and/or personal responses are acceptable if effectively presented. Indeed they can often be some of the very best answers.

##### Content

- A key criteria in assessing content is **engagement with the topic** as opposed to the reproduction of memorised information about a text. The questions examine understanding of concepts. Answers should be assessed according to the extent to which knowledge of texts is used to support arguments **in relation to the topic**.
- Answers which make use of personal experiences, values and responses to support or explain arguments are not to be penalised. These may help to strengthen answers. All questions allow for such responses.

##### Penalties

In ALL cases - if you impose a penalty in any section, please place an asterisk next to your mark on the marks sheet and add a note explaining the reason for the penalty on the marks sheet or a post-it note, as all penalised essays will be reviewed at the conclusion of the marking process in the interests of fairness and consistency.

#### Section One: Comprehension

"This section of the examination assesses your ability to read and understand texts, to comment on their meanings and effects, and to explain how they achieve these effects."

Having browsed through a wide selection of essays in response to this section, expect ‘my own context’ to appear in either or both answers. Please do not penalise but do not positively award. **The majority of discussion should be on the passages in relation to the questions.** Please do not set in your mind when marking this section an ‘agenda’ or checklist.

##### Specific Questions

**Question 1:** Compare the ways in which the feature articles (**passage 1 and passage 2**) work to persuade readers to accept particular attitudes to the environmental management of Ningaloo Reef. **(20 marks)**

“Compare the ways” gives a clear direction which should strongly influence our ranking of essays in response to this question. Many students have used a “half-and-half” approach, with an introduction that signals both texts, a couple of paragraphs on the other text and then a conclusion that ties (varying degrees) the passages together. Some others use this approach but also make a few attempts at comparison in the body of the essay. Others use ongoing comparison of various aspects (e.g. ways, arguments, presentation, techniques, writer context, etc).

In responding to the question in the context of the comprehension section we could expect that students will demonstrate to some extent:

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

- an understanding of the information and also to some extent the backgrounds and consequent sentiments of the writers provided in both passages 1 and 2
- an awareness that these feature articles are rhetorical pieces of writing which function both to inform and to persuade readers
- possibly an awareness of the significance that the passages reveal a selection (i.e. by the newspaper - thus debate in the public arena)
- a knowledge of the techniques used to achieve these aims such as the structuring of the argument, i.e. of each (compare/contrast) selection of persuasive detail, particular choices of language and the overall layout of the articles

Some other points:

- There will be many ‘A whereas B’ summaries-as-comparisons that actually imply an understanding. Do not expect fully developed comparative treatments to be the dominant mode in your bundles.
- Expect plenty of sentiment. Of course, such sentiment can and should, to some extent, be read sympathetically as evidence of understanding and recognition but it is not a total substitute for the closer attention stronger candidates will give to keywords.
- Expect ‘the environment’ as a general concept rather than ‘environmental management’ – again, stronger students will hopefully notice the distinction implied in the question.
- As those who marked “children who **steal**” will recall, the least capable students often resort to fonts, bold print, captions, bylines and so on as a kind of evasion of the writing itself. The question does not invite this – not explicitly, anyway. All such discussion should be directed at the keywords to be effective.
- Students should not be penalised if they do not comment on the detail of the photographs.
- The most capable candidates will hopefully show how the photographs, headlines, subheadings and information about each writer have been presented along with how various rhetorical or persuasive techniques have been used in order to position readers to adopt a particular attitude to the environmental management.

After all of that, in under 40 minutes in two pages or so candidates will find it difficult to cover any/all of this in detail – some might give very detailed attention to a narrow range, others broader coverage to a wider range.

**Question 2:** Discuss how passage 3 presents the relationship between human beings and the natural environment, and positions readers to respond in particular ways. (20 marks)

This is an extract from a novel and thus requires students to identification of some of the narrative techniques and/or other methods which represent a ‘**relationship** between human beings and the natural environment’. This question also requires students to show how these techniques are used to ‘**position** readers in **particular ways**’, that is, to maybe sympathise with or maybe dislike certain characters or to identify a particular attitude to the environment expressed by the writer through the characters and their experiences. Candidates may or may not make comparisons with passages 1 and 2 in order to illustrate their points further but essentially they should be presenting us with a close reading of passage 3 to effectively deal with the question. Some essays have used wider reading and/or passages 1/2 very effectively to inform the discussion, but more have simply tacked on wider reference, I suspect, to fill some space on the page as the wider reference in these cases does not add to the quality of the discussion in relation to the question.

Expect various readings of Aljaz’s function. Some have read him as an out-and-out villain, others as a developer! The protagonist-representation here is quite sophisticated; therefore:

- Expect broad-brush ‘people’ for ‘relationships between human beings and the environment ...’ without a particular focus on Aljaz or other representations. This is also fairly appropriate. A matter of degree, not failure.
- Expect a single focus, for techniques, on some of the ‘checklist’ stuff:

Suspense	Conflict
Description/mood	Point-of-view (difficult for candidates)
Dialogue	Lots of ‘repetition’ (of ‘drown’ and ‘hated’)
The short sentence	

None of the above is a deficiency if connected in some way to functioning to manipulate reader responses.

As with question 1, keep in mind that if students adhere to the recommended 80 minutes for the section, they would not have time for a very detailed analysis in around 2 pages or less than 40 minutes.

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

### Section Two: Print Comment

*[While reading around 300 essays for this section I formed the impression that overall essays in this section seem briefer this year – hopefully, students have heeded the comments made in last year’s Chief Examiner’s Report and planned more carefully and not simply rattled off everything they know about their text/s.]*

All questions to be marked out of 30.

**Question 1:** “When we read a feature article, our own context as readers is just as important as the content of the feature article itself in producing the meanings we make from the text.” To what extent do you agree with this claim? Refer to **two feature articles** to support your argument.

*[Just over 10% of students appear to have attempted this question]*

Students are asked ‘to what extent they agree with’ the statement and thus, are required to make a judgement and evaluate the evidence. The direction of the question is equally on reading context and the content of the article, but better answers might hopefully focus their discussion through the meanings that may be made through reading practices. “Just as important” adds a further invitation to students to adopt an evaluative approach to their responses. There is no requirement in the question for students to adopt an ongoing comparative approach in terms of weaving the two texts together, but this may be an effective means of dealing with the question for some students. Some students will focus almost entirely on content (especially summary), others almost entirely on context; these responses will not address the question as effectively as those where there is a more balanced approach to both content and context. We need to be least kind to those students whose essays simply present prepared essays on two connected feature articles with little or no reference to the keywords and the evaluation of the assertion. Students MUST refer to TWO feature articles.

**Question 2:** “Chapters or sections of expository texts are better understood as parts of larger texts.” Discuss how your reading of a chapter or a section of a book-length **non-fiction expository text** is enhanced by your knowledge of the text as a whole.

*[Appears to have been attempted by just under 30% of candidates. This question draws closely on a comment made in the 2000 Chief Examiner’s Report: “Teachers who are using very brief extracts are punishing their students when the question demands attention to broader concerns which can only be dealt with when they are aware of the relationship between the single section or chapter to the text as a whole.”]*

The examiners intended this question to get students thinking about how texts function as a whole, something that has been requested by markers for some years. While some students might write excellent answers on one or two specific chapters of an expository text, the answers that should be rewarded here are those that attempt to synthesise how things like the structure of the text and the position of the chapters/sections within that text construct a particular reading of the larger text. We should be prepared to read “chapter” and “section” loosely when marking this question and broad overviews with attention to particular parts of a text could address the spirit of the question quite effectively. Unfortunately, some students who have attempted this question have used it as an opportunity to tell us all they know about a particular part of a text, or several parts of a text, with little or no reference to the broader context; others have simply offered their reflections on an issue without framing the discussion in terms of the question. Such essays should not be ranked as highly as those which do attempt to engage with the full demands of the question. The best essays I have seen so far have demonstrated a lively engagement with the broader concerns of a text/author and drawn on this appreciation or knowledge to inform and vividly demonstrate their understandings of sections/chapters they cite. Students MUST refer to a book-length expository text.

**Question 3:** The concept of intertextuality describes how our reading of any text is influenced by our reading of other texts. Explain how your reading of **one short story** has been influenced by your reading of other short stories.

*[Less than 5% of candidates appear to have chosen this question. Another question that responds to comments made in the 2000 Chief Examiner’s Report, along with the letter from the Chair of the English Syllabus Committee, which reminded schools of the importance of the informing principle of intertextuality]*

Students are required to respond to at least TWO short stories in this question. Other than this requirement, the question is deliberately open to interpretation and many well-supported answers may be considered as ‘good’ answers. Some of the essays in response to this question adopt the “half-and-half” approach – they discuss one text for half the essay, the other text for the next half; some of these attempt to draw the stories together in the conclusion – some do this well, others are very laboured. Others simply butt the two stories together in each paragraph without really engaging with the concept of intertextuality. Comments like “both stories use a first person narrative point of view, and so I now have a better knowledge of how that technique works” and “because these two stories are by the same author I can see his usual style” appear frequently and are often ineffective within

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

the broader discussion as the points are not sustained or developed. Better answers could use one short story as the core of the answer and then show how another short story, along with possibly other texts, inform/influence the reading of the core short story. Please, if you find such an essay, and it is more than just a few paragraphs in length, fill in a *Good Answers* slip! We should not penalise students who use a whole range of texts – some of these might be very good answers. Here we probably need to keep in mind the general 50% rule – if one short story is used for around 50% of the essay, then provided there is reference to another short story, even if brief, students have fulfilled the requirements of the question in terms of text use.

**Question 4:** “Plays are written to be performed on stage.” Discuss **one play** you have seen or read where an awareness of its performance aspects is necessary to understand how it presents themes or issues.

*[Roughly 20% of responses to this section of the paper appear to be on this question – the frequency of appearance of drama questions on TEE papers and their accessibility seems to be paying off]*

This question is designed to allow students to discuss the particular themes (syllabus: “ideas and views of human experience”) or issues which a play presents, but its emphasis is on consideration of the ways in which dialogue and non-verbal dramatic techniques are used to stage and convey these issues. Hence, candidates will need to do more than simply highlight particular themes and/or issues; to engage effectively with the question they should demonstrate with close reference to a particular play how the presentation of these themes and issues relies on the language of drama. There is certainly scope here for the question to be challenged at various levels and to varying degrees and such essays should not be penalised if they can effectively present a clear contrary argument.

“Performance aspects” has been read narrowly by some candidates as the performance of actors and these students have generally found it difficult to sustain an argument of adequate length; others have relied totally on reference to “stage directions” as the basis of discussion, with little or no reference to what those stage directions tell us about the performance of the play. The best answers I have encountered so far are those that refer closely to various aspects of the techniques and conventions of drama and how these work together to present themes or issues; some of these also make the point that it is a play after all, not a novel, so of course lighting, movement, staging, props, costume, sound effects add richness to the text.

**Question 5:** “Reading the end of a novel first ruins all the enjoyment.” To what extent does the sequence of events, as revealed to the reader, influence the meanings that may be made from a novel? Support your argument with detailed examples from at least **one novel** that you have studied.

*[The most popular question – it looks like almost 40% of candidates responded to this question, hence the dominance of these essays in the trial marking bundle]*

The emphasis in this question is to encourage thought about the deliberate plotting of a novel and the ways in which this may alter the readers’ responses. It is likely that better students may make comparisons with different generic practices such as detective novels or quest novels. However, many good answers may be found in detailed structural discussion, possibly considering characterization, settings and uses of imagery which are revealed at particular moments to readers. It is a sophisticated question that seems to call for both speculation and analysis but we need to be ready for simpler answers. “Extent” should be one of our key discriminating factors here as unfortunately there are many essays in the middle to lower range that simply summarise and give no sense of an evaluative approach to the assertion. Others have engaged in a lively manner and effectively used their text/s to demonstrate the range of possibilities allowed for by this question. “As revealed to the reader” further informs the requirement to focus attention on sequence of events and “meanings” adds another dimension as we attempt to rank the essays. “Detailed examples” should not be read as an insistence on quotation as a means of arguing the case presented, but attention to specific aspects of the novel/s discussed is another significant requirement we should use as a factor of discrimination.

### Print section penalties

- “In this section you are not permitted to write on the print version of a non-print text discussed in your answer to Section Three.” - this will be dealt with when we mark Section Three.
- “In this section you are not permitted to write on the Comprehension Passages from Section One” - deduct a percentage of marks equivalent to the percentage of the answer which relies on this.
- Incorrect text type - if the question specifies a novel, for example, and the student uses an expository text as the main reference, mark the essay on its merits out of 30, then halve the mark it and round down to a whole number where necessary. This is also the case for Question 2 - if students use one or more feature articles as the main reference, mark the essay out of 30 on its merits, then halve the mark and round down to a whole number where necessary. For question 1, if the candidate refers to only one feature article, or one short story for question 3 the same penalty is to be applied.
- If a candidate refers to a non-print text only, the response is to be given zero.

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

### Section Three: Non-Print Comment

*A sample of around 300 essays indicates that there is a good spread of responses across all five questions. Q1 – 25%, Q2 – 16%, Q3 – 20%, Q4 – 17%, Q5 – 22%.*

"In this section of the examination you are required to refer in detail to at least one NON-PRINT text. You may consider how your appreciation of a text can be strengthened when you make connections with other texts, whether of the same or a different medium" - we definitely must not penalise students who broaden the discussion by referring to other texts; frequently this will add to the quality of the response.

NOTE: Responses to all questions should be firmly grounded in the syllabus - we should not reward too highly those "walk in off the street" essays which sound great but do not display any understanding of the concepts and skills identified in the Year 12 English Syllabus.

All questions are to be marked out of 30

#### Specific Questions

**Question 1:** "Documentaries attempt to change society's values, whereas feature films tend to reflect them." To what extent is this true in your experience? Refer closely to **one documentary AND to one feature film** to support your position.

Like question 1 in the print section, this question asks students to **evaluate** their texts' capacity to either 'change society's values' or to 'reflect them'. To answer this question successfully, students should provide a detailed discussion of both a documentary and a feature film, however, there are some good answers that use a range of feature films and documentaries to support sound evaluations of the proposition and such responses should not be penalised. To a significant degree, our ranking of essays will depend on the opening thesis presented by candidates and the extent to which they can use that thesis as the basis of the discussion of values and attitudes, hopefully in terms of syllabus information linked to their own experience of film. Some candidates agree with both statements, others disagree with both, others agree with one and disagree with the other. "Attempt" and "tend" may provide extra material for the best candidates to consider. From the syllabus: *The study of non-print texts in this subject is based on the principle that these texts do more than present facts, information or stories. Students will be taught that non-print texts present attitudes and values that reflect and reinforce the attitudes and values of their target audiences. As such, they are influential in society.*

**Question 2:** "Although documentary films tend to deal with serious issues, they are also constructed to engage and entertain their audiences." Discuss how at least **one documentary film** seeks to engage and entertain its audience.

The focus here is on a detailed discussion of the film techniques which are used to construct at least one documentary in an engaging and entertaining way. The repetition of "engage" and "entertain" necessitate detailed attention to these keywords. Attention to "serious issues" should also influence our ranking of the essays in response to this question and may assist us to sort those candidates who merely rattle off a list of methods of construction from those who more fully address the various aspects of the question; "tend to deal" and "although" also add possibilities for fuller engagement and "seeks" may provide an extra angle for some of the stronger candidates. "Constructed" and "how" should encourage students to discuss the methods employed in the documentary/ies discussed. Of course, it is also possible that students may choose to agree that documentary films tend to deal with serious issues but in the case of a particular documentary the issues are not "serious".

**Question 3:** "There is nothing new in cinema any more." Construct an argument in response to this statement, making detailed reference to at least **one feature film** that you have seen.

This question was designed by the examiners to elicit a range of possible intertextual responses. Although many students will find it difficult to successfully tackle this question if only one feature film is referred to, some have managed to do so quite effectively, especially by using a particular film to reflect more widely on the film genre. Answers should be rewarded where they refer to more than one film title to support their argument but it is also possible to construct good answers which refer to only one film by title but show a sound understanding of other films by demonstrating an ability to generalise about filmic conventions and values. The question lends itself to a discussion of subject matter, technical change, narrative patterns and/or social values but need not be restricted by these parameters. It does, however, require an answer in the form of a clear **argument**. Unfortunately, some candidates have used this question as an excuse to present us with summaries on favourite films with detailed reference to techniques rather than defining and/or dealing with innovation (or its absence). In ranking essays that

## ENGLISH TEE 2001 MARKING GUIDE

respond to this question we need to look at the thesis that is established and the extent to which that thesis is clearly argued through the essay and the extent to which discussion of film/s support the viewpoint of the student. It is possible to argue with equal effect “yes, absolutely”, “no, definitely not” or “in some ways, yes, in other ways, no”.

**Question 4:** Consider how one or more documentary films you have viewed employ elements of narrative, including structure, to position the audience to accept a particular way of seeing the world.

Although the focus of this question is on ‘narrative’ elements in documentaries, answers do not necessarily have to be restricted to structure but may deal with other techniques employed in the telling of stories. A good answer might consider how the viewer is encouraged to become involved with and accept certain aspects of the ‘story’ of the documentary so that he or she is persuaded to agree with the attitudes presented in the story. “Including structure” necessitates inclusion in the essays, but expect a range of interpretations of ‘structure’, and be generous in acceptance, given the ‘elements of narrative’ phrase. Some definition about the “world” under discussion along with identification of “particular way/s” of seeing that world should also be expected. Listing of techniques/elements of narrative etc will not be an adequate response – these need to be linked to **how** they function to position the audience to **accept**. Expect “characterise” to appear frequently as the only element of narrative, both implied and stated. *Dictionary: “Consider” = contemplate, esp. in order to reach a conclusion; look attentively at; take into account.*

**Question 5:** “The most important parts of feature films are their beginnings and endings (their opening and closing scenes) and the relationships which viewers are encouraged to make between them” Respond to this claim by making close reference to at least **one feature film** that you have seen.

Although students are directed here to identify the beginning and ending of at least one feature film, the question is designed to get them to think about the ways in which these narrative frames influence certain readings of the film, both in their framing of the text and the resonances or relationships that they create with ‘the bits in the middle’. The question may also invite some candidates to consider such things as the changes in values between exposition and resolution; the problems established at the beginning that are solved or left unresolved at the end; the opening and closing “messages” of the film/s. The direction is to ‘respond’ to this claim and is therefore open to interpretation provided that ‘close reference’ is made to one or more texts. Many answers will respond with personal voice. Some will be quite engaging and effective. It is hoped that the better answers will engage in discussing the organic harmonious construction of quality film. The poorer answers will often discuss film language at either end of a chosen film and/or summarise sequence of events.

### Non-Print Penalties

- "In this section you are not permitted to write on the non-print version of a print text discussed in your answer to Section Two". After recording your mark on the marks sheet, please skim the answer to Section Two. If the candidate has used the print and non-print versions of the same text as the **main text** discussed in each section change the mark to deduct a percentage of marks equivalent to the percentage of the answer which relies on this. However, it must be noted that students MAY make reference to the same text (e.g. film or novel) in both answers. Example: Response to Section Two might discuss *Cloudstreet* as the main text, and refer to the novel or film of *Lord of the Flies* to expand the discussion, then in Section Two use *Dead Poets Society* as the main text and refer to the same version of *Lord of the Flies* again. This is acceptable. What would NOT be acceptable is to use the novel *Lord of the Flies* as the main text for Section Two and the feature film *Lord of the Flies* as the main text for Section Three.
- It IS acceptable to use the expository text *Dead Man Walking* as the main text for Section Two and the feature film *Dead Man Walking* as the main text for Section Three. The same applies to *Tell Me I'm Here* and *Spinning Out*. Other permitted combinations will be dealt with as they arise during the marking process.
- "In this section you are not permitted to write on the Comprehension Passages from Section One" again, award a mark and then deduct a percentage of marks equivalent to the percentage of the answer which relies on this.
- Incorrect text type - if the question specifies a documentary, for example, and the student does not refer at all to a documentary mark the essay on its merits out of 30, then halve the mark it and round down to a whole number where necessary. Ditto for feature film.
- If a candidate refers to a print text only, the response is to be given zero.