

**2005 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
English Extension 2**

© 2006 Copyright Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales.

This document contains Material prepared by the Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the State of New South Wales. The Material is protected by Crown copyright.

All rights reserved. No part of the Material may be reproduced in Australia or in any other country by any process, electronic or otherwise, in any material form or transmitted to any other person or stored electronically in any form without the prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW, except as permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*. School candidates in NSW and teachers in schools in NSW may copy reasonable portions of the Material for the purposes of bona fide research or study.

When you access the Material you agree:

- to use the Material for information purposes only
- to reproduce a single copy for personal bona fide study use only and not to reproduce any major extract or the entire Material without the prior permission of the Board of Studies NSW
- to acknowledge that the Material is provided by the Board of Studies NSW
- not to make any charge for providing the Material or any part of the Material to another person or in any way make commercial use of the Material without the prior written consent of the Board of Studies NSW and payment of the appropriate copyright fee
- to include this copyright notice in any copy made
- not to modify the Material or any part of the Material without the express prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW.

The Material may contain third party copyright materials such as photos, diagrams, quotations, cartoons and artworks. These materials are protected by Australian and international copyright laws and may not be reproduced or transmitted in any format without the copyright owner's specific permission. Unauthorised reproduction, transmission or commercial use of such copyright materials may result in prosecution.

The Board of Studies has made all reasonable attempts to locate owners of third party copyright material and invites anyone from whom permission has not been sought to contact the Copyright Officer, ph (02) 9367 8289, fax (02) 9279 1482.

Published by Board of Studies NSW
GPO Box 5300
Sydney 2001
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

ISBN 1741474043

2006213

Contents

Introduction	4
Print Medium	6
Short Stories	6
Poems	9
Critical Responses	11
Scripts	15
Sound Medium	18
Speeches	18
Radio Drama	21
Performance Poetry	24
Visual Medium	26
Video	26
Films	30
Multimedia	30

2005 HSC NOTES FROM THE MARKING CENTRE ENGLISH EXTENSION 2

INTRODUCTION

These notes have been developed to provide teachers and students of the English Extension 2 course with comments regarding the Major Works for the 2005 Higher School Certificate. The comments will indicate the number of candidates and the quality of the candidates' Major Works as well as highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the candidature.

These notes should be read along with the *English Stage 6 Syllabus* and the 2005 HSC English Extension 2 marking guidelines. Reference should also be made to the 2002 English Extension 2 Standards Package and the English Extension 2 Young Writers Showcase books and CD-ROMs for the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004.

The marking guidelines follow the report from the Marking Centre.

General Comments

The total number of candidates in the English Extension 2 course for 2005 was 2,654. The following breakdown across options demonstrates candidate preference for the type of Major Work.

OPTIONS	CANDIDATE NUMBERS
Print Medium	
Short Story(ies)	1577
Poems	185
Critical Responses	349
Scripts – Radio, Film, Television and Drama	203
Sound Medium	
Speeches	66
Radio Drama	16
Performance Poetry	27
Visual Medium	
Video	171
Film	0
Multimedia	26

Markers found that the 2005 English Extension 2 Major Works were exciting, with the majority of candidates submitting Major Works that were engaging, perceptive, and sophisticated. Major Works reflected the extensive independent investigation of the form and concepts conducted by candidates.

Identification of the parts of the project

Most candidates clearly labeled the discrete parts of their Major Work: the Major Work, the Reflection Statement and the journal. Candidates are reminded to label the discrete sections of the Major Work and to ensure that all pages are printed.

The role of the Major Work journal

Candidates submit their journal with their Major Work. Journals are not marked. However, journals document the independent investigation and the composition process. Candidates who carefully recorded the development of the work, maintaining drafts of work with their reflections, were able to compose a sophisticated Reflection Statement. The journal provides candidates with documentation of their reflections across all stages of the development of the Major Work.

The role of the Reflection Statement

The Reflection Statement explains and evaluates both the process and the completed Major Work. The Stage 6 English syllabus (p 131) and the English Extension 2 marking guidelines outline the requirements for the Reflection Statement. The Reflection Statement:

- summarises the intent of the work and its relationship with the extensive investigation
- must include an outline of the intended audience for the Major Work and the purpose for which it was composed
- supports the Major Work explaining the relationships of concept, structure, technical and language features and conventions
- should explain the development of concepts during the process of composition making clear the links between independent investigation and the development of the finished product
- should indicate how the student realised the concepts in the final product.

Stronger candidates produced sophisticated Reflection Statements that explained the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work and adhered to the word limit. These Reflection Statements were thorough, logical, coherent, engaging and sustained an appropriate register. All components of the Reflection Statement were treated in a sophisticated manner.

Weaker candidates explained some aspects of the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work. The components of the Reflection Statements of these candidates were inconsistent in quality or did not reflect their Major Works.

Links with the English (Advanced) and English Extension 1 courses

Students compose a major work as an extension of the knowledge, understanding and skills developed in the English (Advanced) and English Extension 1 courses (p 92, *English Stage 6 Syllabus*). Candidates need to demonstrate that their work is an extension of their other English courses and not an imitation of the modules and electives studied.

Strengths

Markers noted the following strengths of the Major Works presented by candidates:

- The Major Work was an extension of the knowledge, understanding and skills developed in the English (Advanced) and English Extension 1 courses.
- Purpose and audience guided the development of the Major Work.
- Purpose and audience were clearly discernible in the Major Work and Reflection Statement.
- Deliberate choices about language, forms, features and structure were evident in the work and articulated in the Reflection Statement.
- Clarity was maintained across the Major Work.
- The Major Works were highly original in a range of ways.
- The Reflection Statement addressed all the requirements specified in the *English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p129.
- There was a clear relationship between the Work and the Reflection Statement.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were noted in some Major Works:

- The Major Work did not extend beyond the English Advanced and English Extension 1 course.
- Ideas and concepts were explored in a general manner.
- There was poor investigation of ideas, concepts, and form.
- There was limited understanding of the medium and its techniques.
- The Works demonstrated limited exploration of the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work.
- Lack of editing marred the Major Works.

THE MAJOR WORK – PRINT MEDIUM

Short Story(ies)

General Comments

Successful short stories explored a variety of concepts in a sophisticated and engaging manner. They experimented successfully with form, structure and stylistic features. These stories were well supported by extensive investigation into both form and concept. The results of the investigation were well integrated and resulted in strong characterisation, an authentic sense of place and a clear delineation of narrative voice/s.

The better short stories were characterised by clearly developed concepts. These stories were well edited with a strong sense of direction and purpose. There were strong links to the Advanced and Extension courses and these links were clearly articulated in the Reflection Statements.

A number of successful stories came from the exploration of a variety of contexts. Several well written stories explored issues relating to art, literature, music and speculative fiction. Students explored concepts that readily lent themselves to extensive investigation.

Some candidates presented Reflection Statements that were formulaic and often descriptive. The quality of the discussion of audience remains variable. Audience and purpose are integrally related and students must explicitly explain how they have manipulated form, feature and structure of text. It is imperative that students identify the relationship between the investigation and the Major Work. Specific texts should be cited and the direct influence on the Major Work must be highlighted.

There was an unevenness in editing evident in many Major Works. Students should allow adequate time to thoroughly proof read their work.

Students should read extensively within the short story genre in order to extend their understanding of its possibilities in shaping their own voice. This should be explicitly discussed as part of their independent investigation which many students simply take to mean research into a topic.

Some of the strengths of these Major Works were:

- Successful candidates chose a variety of textual structures.
- The concepts explored were challenging and interesting. They were developed in a thorough, personal and inventive way. They were well researched and integrated and this was evident throughout the stories.
- The stories demonstrated intellectual and emotional maturity.
- A simple story well told continues to be an engaging option.
- Many students experimented with form.
- Sense of place was convincing and sustained.
- Careful and thoughtful re-writing and editing were evident.
- Reflection Statements were logically organised with a clear explanation of intention, development and realisation of the Major Work.
- Research was extensive and students were able to show how a range of sources helped to shape their work.
- There was a highly analytical evaluation of the process of composition.

Some of the weaknesses of these Major Works were:

- The voices were often unconvincing. This was sometimes a result of the multiplicity of text types employed within the works.
- There was a broad range of influence evident in these Major Works. Some candidates relied upon inaccurate use of intertextuality and the literary canon.
- There was an overreliance on Showcase Major Works as a source of both investigation and inspiration. This resulted in works that were derivative.
- Some candidates used personal experience as background for their stories. This should not preclude the research into form, genre and concepts.
- The use of personal interview and survey were the only forms of investigation in some works. While appropriate in the formulation stage of the process, these should not be the only forms of extensive independent investigation.
- Some works explored teenage issues in a generalised manner. Candidates should show evidence of mature insight and research rather than relying upon emotive connotations to carry the story.
- Some works demonstrated inability to sustain voice. Students need to ensure they can sustain voice across the entirety of the work, regardless of whether they submit one story or a collection.
- Weaker responses showed an over reliance on qualifiers – particularly

adjectives. Less is often more in short stories.

- Spelling errors should be edited using spelling English standard rather than an American spell-check.
- Where students have attempted to offer originality, this has not always served the purpose of the work and thus has detracted from the overall effect.
- A number of students who are technically competent find it difficult to vary language according to a particular register. Over-reliance on thesauruses resulted in inappropriate vocabulary choices which were jarring for the reader.
- Reflection Statements must address investigation into the short story form as well as into the concepts.
- Language and structural choices should be validated in the Reflection Statement.

A Range

A Range short stories were clearly an extension of the knowledge, understanding and skills of the Advanced and Extension 1 courses. They were highly original, sustained and inventive in their composition and based on thorough investigation. There was a highly effective control of form, which was often experimental. The manipulation of structure and voice showed control of register, syntax and vocabulary.

A Range short stories addressed all the requirements for the Reflection Statement. (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131.) They identified the independent research undertaken, explaining in a thorough, sophisticated way how research helped shape the Major Work. They also explained the way in which intent and purpose led to important decisions regarding the process of development of the Major Work. They supported their reflection on the development of the Major Work through the articulation of clear links with their other English courses. A skilful integration of these links was an outstanding feature of *A Range* students.

B Range

B Range short stories were also clearly an extension of the knowledge, understanding and skills of the Advanced and Extension 1 courses. They were generally competent and controlled, but lacked the flair and sophistication of the *A Range* Short Stories. Investigation, although skilfully integrated, did not have the imaginative synthesis of subject matter, perspective and form of the *A Range*. Control of form was demonstrated in skilful crafting and construction of the stories. Reflection Statements did not show explicit links between the investigation and the Major Work.

C Range

C Range short stories were an extension of the knowledge, understanding and skills of the Advanced and Extension 1 courses. Claims made regarding this extension were at times tenuous and solely text-based. These Major Works were substantial and coherent but investigation was not fully integrated. In the *C Range*, stories were sometimes laboured and may have been inconsistent in their development of character and tone. Editing in *C Range* short stories was sometimes careless. The Reflection Statement tended to explain the intention and development of the Major Work rather than critically comment on the impact of investigation on these areas. This was particularly evident in relation to the investigation into form.

D Range

D Range short stories were an extension of some of the knowledge, understanding and skills of the Advanced and Extension 1 courses. They were literal and characterised by a failure to sustain integration of concept and form. These Major Works were often derivative. Poor construction, predictability and shallow treatment of their chosen topic characterised the *D Range*. Editing in the *D Range* was often careless or not evident. The Reflection Statement did not address all the requirements and explained the intention in a generalised manner.

E Range

E Range short stories attempted to compose a Major Work. They were superficial, lacking in substance or incomplete. The concepts behind the Major Work were simplistic or lacking a research base. The work therefore lacked focus and connections between aspects of the work. *E Range* responses were characterised by poor control of textual features and language. The Reflection Statement showed inconsistencies between intention and realisation of the final product.

Poems

General Comments

As in previous years, candidates explored a wide range of concepts in their work. Better works had a clear and sustained focus in the poetry as well as considerable skill in the manipulation of poetic form and language. Exploration of human experience/s was a popular choice of concept. Most candidates submitted a suite of poems that were linked by a philosophical position, theme, issue or idea. A few candidates submitted extended poems based on established forms like the epic, or in some form of extended narrative in variations of free verse.

Strengths

Some powerful inventive and thoroughly engaging works were submitted. Strengths included:

- deliberate and astute use of imagery, form and structure
- thoughtful sequencing in the collections, demonstrating not only the progression of ideas, but also the careful re-arrangement of poems in the final editing process
- evidence of structurally intelligent poetic resolution in the final poems within collections
- attention to rhythm, balance and lyricism in the collections as a whole, but equally so in the individual poems themselves
- realisation of the chosen form within the context of the work
- establishment, in the Reflection Statement, of concepts/themes/ideas as clear extensions of other English courses.

Weaknesses included:

- lack of investigation into the poetic form and an inability to reflect on the creative process revealed in the Reflection Statements
- poor investigation into free verse in many instances. Students chose this as a default position rather than as a conscious and informed decision. Students are advised to research the long and extensive body of work written using free verse. This is readily accessible
- ineffective layout
- substance failing to reflect twelve months of investigation and process
- lack of editing. Students should edit the entire collections carefully and be prepared to delete weaker poems from their suites
- poor word and imagery selection. Varying font type and size should not be substitutes for adept word choice and poignant imagery
- Reflection Statements displaying a greater sense of control and explanatory prowess than the actual Major Works.

A Range

A Range Poetry Major Works were characterised by:

- complex ideas expressed with flair
- willingness to experiment with different forms in a successful and engaging manner
- subtle, evocative, witty, poignant and dramatic language use, appropriate to the purpose
- a fresh perspective on the original where the work appropriated the idea and/or form of another. This was achieved with flair
- engagement of the responder throughout the entirety of the work
- Reflection Statements that were sophisticated in their discussion of concept and investigation. They were critical in their discussion of process and were able to show how a particular concept from the investigation was realised in the project itself
- Reflection Statements that elucidated and explicated the language and form of their Major Work.

B Range

B Range Poetry Major Works were characterised by:

- a focus on creating and maintaining a consistent conceptual foundation based on substantive investigation
- variable ability to be fluent and sophisticated throughout the collection
- skilful and conscious choice of rhythmic devices, image, motif and symbol with variable consistency, application and integration
- clarity of exploration of concept, form and language in the Reflection Statements.

C Range

C Range Poetry Major Works were characterised by:

- some attempts at originality, not sustained
- little or no risk-taking – little effective manipulation of either language or form – poems ‘talking through’ an experience or idea
- unfocused use of techniques such as enjambment. Although this was often stated as a technique employed in the work, it was merely an excuse for no punctuation rather than a technique to effectively create meaning. Too often students cited ‘free verse’ form as a liberation from restraint without exploring or showing what that liberation could achieve
- banal or forced rhyme or rhythm, undermining ideas
- descriptive rather than critical reflection statements
- lack of awareness of, and inability to discuss, the relationship between the investigation and the work
- links to only one or a small number of published poets, sometimes not extending beyond those studied in class in other English courses.

D/E Range

D/E Range Poetry Major Works were characterised by:

- limited understanding of poetic form, with inappropriate use of techniques such as rhyme and rhythm, trivialising rather than strengthening serious themes
- minor, simplistic forms such as acrostics and shape poems seen as ‘experimental’ or changing fonts seen as ‘techniques’
- limited sense of poetry as a craft where one makes deliberate choices in terms of language and structure
- ideas not explored in any real depth. Poetry often dealt with moments of angst in a pedestrian way
- Reflection Statements which revealed little or no investigation. These were mostly concerned with explaining the intention of the work or making claims about the work that could not be justified by the work itself.

Critical Responses

General Comments

Critical Responses undertaken in 2005 included:

- critical evaluation of texts drawn from a range of contexts, genres and media
- exploration of issues and paradigms through texts and their contexts
- the relationship between meaning and representation.

Not all Critical Responses satisfied the requirement that candidates ‘select an area of personal interest from their specialised study of English’ (*English Stage 6 Syllabus* p 92). This course is an *extension* of the Advanced and Extension 1 English courses. Candidates should ensure that the Critical Response does extend the knowledge, understanding and skills developed in the other English courses. This expectation includes not only the subject matter but also the scope, depth of treatment and sophistication of the

investigation. Some projects were descriptive at the expense of the analytical, some were more sociological or historical rather than supporting their claims with texts, while others were personal rather than critical.

The quality of the Reflection Statement posed a challenge to a number of candidates who did not distinguish between process and product. Sophisticated analysis of audience is important, particularly in relation to how this impacts upon the work as a whole.

Strengths

Effective Critical Responses were based on appropriate choice of subject and critical method, supported by extensive, sustained investigation. The investigation was effective in that students critically evaluated their findings, rather than taking them at face value. The investigation in these Major Works was wide ranging, particularly in relation to sources beyond the Internet. There was evidence in these projects of an ongoing process of concept development as well as experimentation and revision in the process of structuring and writing the Critical Response.

Better Critical Responses deliberately controlled form and language in recognition of the intended audience and were clearly appropriate. They were substantial in the scope and depth of investigation. Their originality was evident in the selection of texts, the critical perspective from which the texts were investigated or the unexpected but convincing links made between texts, contexts and paradigms. Primary and secondary sources were integral to the investigation and were acknowledged.

Weaknesses

Some weaker Critical Responses were not an extension of the other English courses or they were an extension in only some aspects. Some responses were ambitious in their statement of intent but simplistic or repetitive in attempting to achieve their stated objective.

Critical theory often seemed misunderstood or was applied inaccurately and inappropriately. This is particularly so in the case of feminism and postmodernism. Claims were made but not substantiated. There was sometimes a failure to make meaningful connections between texts.

Students should be mindful of the word limit when making decisions regarding the number of texts needed to explore a concept and develop an argument.

Weaker responses required more careful editing. Footnoting was sometimes superfluous or misapplied. The scope and depth of research in weaker responses was limited, inadequately supporting the thesis.

Some candidates listed sources that did not contribute meaningfully to the Critical Response. Careful attention should be given to the Major Work in its entirety, including adherence to conventions regarding bibliographies and footnoting.

Weaker Critical Responses did not observe all the requirements of the syllabus. This was particularly evident in relation to word length. An awareness of appropriate register and an appreciation of what is feasible within the form are necessary. Extensive evidence of investigation is needed, particularly in relation to those Major Works that investigate elements of popular culture.

A Range

These Critical Responses were appropriate and effective extensions of the knowledge, understanding and skills arising out of the Advanced and Extension 1 courses. *A Range* candidates were discriminating in the choice of areas for investigation. These candidates demonstrated their understanding that genuine English investigations identify, explore, analyse and evaluate one or more of the following: texts, textual features, representation, context and discourse. Their responses were highly original in the choice of topic, the selection of texts, the critical method used and the manipulation of form. They integrated content, critical theory and critical method skilfully and they observed the conventions of their chosen form of discourse. *A Range* responses were well edited.

A Range Critical Responses addressed all the requirements for the Reflection Statement (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131). They reflected on the whole process of development and realisation of the Critical Response and were able to show how the Major Work was shaped by an awareness of the syllabus requirements, including:

- selecting an appropriate investigation
- identifying and refining the concept
- deciding on the scope, methodology and depth of the investigation
- identifying the audience and its impact on the shaping of the Major Work
- investigation of content and form, detailing their impact on the Major Work
- development of the project, supported by appropriate detail
- critical reflection on source material such as critics and critical methodology
- meaningful identification and explanation of links with the Advanced and English Extension 1 courses
- realisation of the Major Work in specific terms.

The *A Range* Reflection Statements supported and enhanced the Major Work, demonstrating the substantial nature of the project and the investigative and reflective process on which it was based.

B Range

B Range Critical Responses were also an effective extension of the Advanced and other English Extension 1 courses. They were substantial, original, sustained and coherent. They were well integrated in their treatment of content, critical approach and form. These candidates demonstrated skill in the presentation of their thesis and were consistent in focus. They supported their arguments effectively. Transitions, juxtapositions and the connections between thesis and text were handled well, but without the imaginative selection of material and the flair of *A Range* responses. Where critical theory was applied it was sometimes done self-consciously, leading to minor lapses in continuity.

B Range Critical Responses addressed all the requirements for the Reflection Statement (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131). They identified the independent research and explained how it helped shape the Major Work. They covered all the points outlined for *A Range* responses (above), but they may have given more detail for some points than for others. They supported the Major Work, making clear the role of extensive investigation, planning and development.

C Range

C Range Critical Responses were an extension of the Advanced and English Extension 1 courses. They were substantial and coherent, but without the integration evident in *B Range* responses. These Major Works may have been earnest, but lacked depth and direction. The thesis of the investigation was sometimes insufficiently developed, even when the initial statement of intent seemed promising. The textual support was sometimes unsustainable or uneven. These Major Works were often more descriptive than critical. In relation to concept, students were unable to offer new insights for several reasons, including limited investigation and relatively unformed theses or concepts that did not offer sufficient depth for analysis. *C Range* responses, while demonstrating mostly effective control of expression and structure, suffered from lapses, in the use of footnotes, for example. These responses often required more effective editing.

C Range Critical Responses addressed most of the requirements of the Reflection Statement (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131). They were, however, not fully developed. While identifying independent investigation they failed to explain how this investigation had an impact on the Major Work. They sometimes cited examples from the Major Work without being able to explain meaningfully how these were shaped by the research. They often identified their audience superficially, failing to show how this audience may have led them to shape the Critical Response. Identification of links with Advanced English and English Extension 1 courses was often inadequately explained.

D Range

D Range Critical Responses were an extension of some aspects of the Advanced and other Extension courses. They were extended responses without the integration of concept, presentation of argument, and form. They lacked substance and were often predictable and unsustainable. There was a tendency to be descriptive at the expense of analysis. There was evidence of some attempt to examine the material critically, but this was not sustained. There was also evidence of some control of form. There were often problems with editing. *D Range* responses tended to lack clearly articulated theses and consequently were limited in their ability to offer a well developed line of argument. Often in-depth analysis of texts, where this was the stated aim, was compromised by superfluous and irrelevant discussion.

D Range Critical Responses addressed some of the requirements of the Reflection Statement (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131). They were uneven and under-developed, lacking examples from the Major Work to support the claimed impact of independent investigation.

E Range

E Range Critical Responses attempted a Major Work. They were superficial, descriptive, insubstantial or incomplete. There was little sense of a concept behind the Major Work. Some were not appropriate English investigations but historical, sociological, philosophical or political overviews or personal observations.

D Range Critical Responses addressed some of the requirements of the Reflection Statement (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p131). There were often inconsistencies between the Reflection Statement and the Major Work. Reflection Statements were often incomplete.

Scripts - Radio, Film, Television and Drama

General Comments

Candidates were required to develop a script of a complete work for a performance time of 20-30 minutes (*Stage 6 English Syllabus*, p 133). Students must demonstrate extensive investigation into the required conventions for their particular format, especially as more candidates are submitting scripts for film or television production. Most candidates complied with the script conventions appropriate to the particular form chosen.

Some scripts were over length or contained too many characters, or attempted to include too broad a range of ideas, thus demonstrating limited research into the 'nature' of short film (as opposed to feature film) or short plays (as opposed to full-length dramas). The stated performance time **MUST** be respected.

While extensive investigation into the longer and more readily available forms is important and useful, similar extensive research into the short forms of script is an essential part of the investigation and script development process. In particular, students should not rely solely on their experiences and investigations in the HSC Drama course. They should strengthen their independent investigation through broader and deeper reading, research and reasoning in their studies of English.

It was pleasing to see students engaging with a diverse variety of styles. While experimentation is to be encouraged, students should be aware that postmodern or absurdist scripts must be carefully constructed to ensure the intention is clear. Once again, there were many lengthy scripts (some up to twice as long as the required time). This made it difficult to perform well against the marking criteria when candidates demonstrated an inability to meet this basic course requirement. The ability to sustain the script was also often compromised through this choice. Candidates must remain well attuned to the demands of the Major Work specifications.

Dialogue, an inherently important feature of this format, must be shaped and manipulated in an effective and sophisticated manner. There is a tendency in some candidates' responses for dialogue to be too long and confused. The more engaging film and television scripts were able to integrate visual images with well-edited dialogue. Similarly, the more engaging drama scripts were able to integrate stage directions appropriately. Candidates completing radio scripts should remain well aware of the auditory cues required to engage the audience.

While many candidates wrote insightful and critical Reflection Statements which fulfilled the marking criteria, others were not specific enough in their identification of audience, or in explaining the links between independent investigation and the finished product. The intention of the work should be well justified. The Reflection Statement needs to examine the effects of research on the meaning. Specifically candidates need to identify how this research and investigation has shaped their insights and their language choices.

Some candidates provided additional material (such as audio material, bibliographies, annotated bibliographies, and extensive prefaces) as part of the script. Such material needs to be placed in the journal. Some candidates used foreign language/s without purpose, impeding the reader's engagement with the script.

Candidates should note that if they choose to utilise theorists and theories, these should be represented with clarity and insight. Some candidates attempted to represent philosophical ideas and concepts without explicitly conveying their relevance or applying this investigation to the theatrical demands of the medium.

A Range

Scripts in this range were highly original and sustained, demonstrating textual integrity. Visuals, dialogue, sound, camera angles and/or stage directions were expertly integrated throughout the script, creating highly visual and engaging Major Works. The level of technical proficiency, particularly when constructing the *mise en scène* in film scripts, was outstanding. Other sophisticated methods of manipulating techniques included being able to use the rhythms and cadences of speech effectively to create elements such as mood, tension and characterisation. These elements were thoroughly supported by the Reflection Statement. The *A Range* scripts demonstrated a superior understanding of the script form, both as it reads on the page and as it is intended to appear on stage, radio or screen.

Candidates in the *A Range* had a clear sense of the importance of extensive investigation into both the concept and particular script form. This investigation was broad and deep, and was clearly evident in the Work via authenticity of setting, voice, tone, and other contextual elements, as well as being documented and analysed in the Reflection Statement. Insights and concepts were developed in the Major Works through careful composition and fluent integration (conscious shaping) of script elements such as tension, conflict, characterisation, plot development, sound, lighting, visual design, camera angles and shot types, where appropriate. These elements were highly suited to purpose, audience and medium.

Reflection Statements presented a sophisticated, critical and analytical evaluation of the process and the Major Work. The extensive investigation of the medium and the concepts was clearly articulated as were the purpose and audience. Links between the project and the Advanced and/or Extension 1 courses were clearly discernible.

B Range

Scripts in this range were original and sustained with a clear focus and skilled integration of meaning(s), value(s) and form. The complexity and refinement of some scripts demonstrated some lapses but ideas were generally presented with clarity. *B Range* candidates were able to use their understanding of purpose, audience and medium to shape their scripts. Structure, characterisation, development of conflict, staging, setting and editing, as appropriate to form, were used effectively with some minor lapses. These minor lapses may be such things as sustaining the authenticity of the chosen idiom: for example an identifiably Australian character using ‘American TV’ dialogue or oversights in authenticity of character, place or context, or editing. Script conventions were appropriate to the style. For example, candidates who composed a Drama script demonstrated an understanding of theatrical conventions appropriate to their chosen style, such as naturalism and realism. Interesting concepts were typically supported by effective and clear vocabulary and language choices. However, language choices often lacked the refined subtlety of the *A Range* responses.

Reflection Statements showed a critical understanding of process and explained the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work. Candidates demonstrated

thorough research into the concept but often presented a weaker investigation of the medium.

C Range

Major Works in this range were substantial and coherent. There may have been lapses in the development of some characters and concepts, and ideas were not well developed. Often investigation into concepts was limited, sometimes to personal experience without broader investigation against which to compare, contrast or elaborate. For the most part, candidates demonstrated effective use of language and conventions of the form (drama, radio or film). There were lapses in some of these elements, indicating limited investigation into the particular script form. In particular, students were often unable to sustain their *mise en scène* or stage directions. Stereotyped characters and clichéd situations demonstrated organisation, but not development of insights or concepts. Audience engagement was evident in most parts of the script.

Reflection Statements in the *C Range* Major Works addressed most of the required areas but without thorough critical reflection or explanation of how aspects of investigation were realised in the script. At times, elements of these works were derivative, without appropriate acknowledgement in the Reflection Statement. Some Reflection Statements in this range contained well-written or well-intended claims that were not substantiated by the Major Work.

D Range

Scripts in this range made some connections between meaning(s), value(s) and form. Often the structure was confusing or there was a limited understanding of theatricality (in stage plays) and unclear *mise en scène* in film or television scripts. Radio scripts were often characterised by poor delineation of characters and an absence of engaging sound effects. The focus of the script was often unclear or not sustained. Insights and ideas were often predictable. Candidates demonstrated some effective control of language, skills and conventions for their medium and intended audience. However, lapses in these areas interfered with engagement.

Reflection Statements explained some aspects of the work in a limited way, lacking critical reflection. The Work was often inconsistent with the intent outlined in the Reflection Statement. Reflection Statements were often descriptive or simple recounts of the process.

E Range

Scripts in this range were superficial and/or incomplete, or if complete, fell well short of the parameters for the work (*English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p 133). The Major Works lacked focus, contained simplistic ideas that were usually undeveloped, and limited investigation. Language, technical skills, conventions and medium were often inappropriate for the purpose and intended audience. Some plotlines were confusing and contradictory.

Reflection Statements identified some aspects of the script. However, there were significant inconsistencies between the Major Work and the claims made in the Reflection Statement. Reflection Statements in this range were descriptive, often cataloguing what was included in the script rather than critically analysing the Major Work. Some candidates presented derivative scripts or mirrored familiar characters or plotlines without acknowledging their source(s) or offering an explanation for this in their Reflection Statement.

THE MAJOR WORK – SOUND MEDIUM

Speeches

General Comments

Overall, the speeches presented in 2005 demonstrated sophisticated control over medium and a clear understanding of the characteristics and conventions associated with speeches.

One of the characteristics of the more sophisticated Major Works was the candidates' ability to manipulate voice through technology, tonal variation and/or the adaptation of the persona/s. Candidates were able to create plausible, credible personas and contexts where the exploration of their concept was seamless and fluent.

More investigation is still needed into the conventions of speech writing. Students need to carefully consider how they present their speeches, paying attention to the quality of the reproduction of their Major Work and to ensure that it is audible. Few students used CD ROM format this year and some who did wasted time illustrating their speech.

Students must follow the dictates of the syllabus in relation to the student being the *principal* performer of the speech. Many speeches used another speaker for well over one third of their speech which is a most liberal interpretation of the guidelines. In addition, they should follow the instruction: 'The audience for the speech must be specified'. Students cannot assume that their audience is self-evident. The best speeches were suitably and carefully set into a clear context at the beginning of the speech so it was easily apparent who was the audience.

Students in this area presented both a single speech of up to 20 minutes in length as well as 2-4 shorter speeches that may have been related by concept or context. Variation in voice for shorter speeches was often not well done, with little or no differentiation made between voices. Appropriate decisions about gender of voices need to be made.

Better Reflection Statements placed emphasis on the investigation and manipulation of structure. Decisions regarding structure were articulated in the Reflection Statement. If there were multiple speeches the sequence of these speeches was justified, as were internal structural elements. How voices were manipulated through use of technology was explained.

Better Major Works demonstrated thorough editing of scripts and Reflection Statements.

Some of the strengths of these Major Works were:

- Candidates were able to effectively use their voices to create credible personas. They were able to convey passion and a deep understanding of their concept and of their chosen medium.
- Students were able to use a wide range of rhetorical devices in a sophisticated and inventive manner.
- There was a strong sense of context evident throughout.
- Students were able to effectively integrate music and other sound effects to complement and enhance the shaping of meaning, and to purposefully engage and manipulate audience response.

- There was clear evidence of broad and deep investigation into both form and concept and strong evaluation of this investigation. Candidates were able to articulate how this investigation shaped the work itself.
- A clear relationship was demonstrated between the student's study of Advanced and/or Extension 1 English and the development of the concept and Major Work.
- Candidates were able to control structure purposefully and effectively.

Some of the weaknesses of these Major Works were:

- Limited control over voice, pace and tone to shape meaning effectively. In several instances, this was evident through pedestrian and monotonous reading of texts.
- Overly broad interpretation as to what constitutes a speech – not all oral utterances are speeches. Debating-style speeches were often limited in their ability to engage the audience.
- Limited consideration of audience and context.
- Overuse of sound effects such as canned laughter, clapping and song. This had a negative impact on engagement and the representation of meaning, often had limited relevance and did not provide evidence of 'highly effective manipulation of language, technical skills, conventions and medium for the intended audience and purpose'.
- Limited investigation into both form and concept. Some students were only able to cite one or two speeches by one speaker as the extent of their investigation into form.
- Choice of form without due consideration of the development of concept. On occasion, these Major Works would have been more suited to other mediums such as Critical Response and Short Story.
- Didacticism, resulting in a failure to sound authentic.
- Tendency to repeat ideas and themes as opposed to developing and exploring a concept. There seemed to be a misunderstanding of how a hook or unifying metaphor can be used in a speech to sustain meaning and ensure audience engagement.

A Range

Speeches in this range were both sustained and highly original. Students were able to demonstrate effective manipulation of form to achieve the communication of their concept and to artfully evoke audience response. Speeches in this range were driven purposefully and deliberately by exploration of concept. Extensive independent investigation into both form and concept was clearly evident where new insights were gained through the informed synthesis and evaluation of this investigation.

Deliveries of speeches in this range were enthusiastic and passionate. Candidates manipulated voice and sound effects successfully to subtly enhance and shape meaning. These speeches avoided being overly didactic in tone and nature. The focus of the Major Works was clearly sustained throughout, irrespective of whether the student chose to present a single speech or a collection of speeches. Candidates were able to create a clear, plausible and sustained persona together with a credible context and audience. Major Works in this range demonstrated the student's acute awareness of and control over the nuances of language.

Candidates clearly articulated the relationship between their concept and their study of Advanced and/or Extension 1 English in their Reflection Statements. In addition, they were able to demonstrate the impact of their investigation on the development of their Major Work.

Reflection Statements in this range were highly self-referential and evaluative in nature. They clearly addressed all the required elements of the Reflection Statement in a critical and intellectual manner.

B Range

Speeches in this range were original and sustained. However, there were some issues in relation to the fluent integration of form, values and meaning. This resulted in speeches that demonstrated skill rather than sophisticated execution and expertise.

Major Works in this range were well investigated; however, this investigation tended to be analysed rather than evaluated and synthesised. As a consequence, students had difficulty offering new insights.

Students were able to effectively manipulate the various elements of speech to shape meaning and engage audiences, but there was a more limited range of rhetorical devices successfully and purposefully employed. In addition, the relative success of various structural devices tended to be 'generally evident throughout the work'.

Speeches in this range showed evidence of conscious shaping of meaning; however, there was a less consistent focus on audience and/ or context.

The candidates' Reflection Statements clearly represented the scope of the independent investigation and the relationship the work had to the students' study of English Advanced and / or Extension 1 English. However, there was less evidence of evaluation and conscious shaping of meaning to communicate developed ideas.

C Range

Speeches in this range were substantial but at times problematic in relation to form. As a result, there were lapses in tone, voice, register and pace, adversely affecting the integration of meaning, value and form. In this range candidates tended to be less aware of how values are explored in texts, and the manipulation of techniques to achieve this representation was uneven.

Speeches in this range showed uneven control over rhetorical devices, structural elements and voice. At times, the development of the concept and/or thesis was unclear. Speeches often became too didactic without demonstrating a clear purpose for being so. These speeches were, in effect, 'essays on tape'.

Candidates employed simple repetition instead of an extended metaphor or other device to make simple connections between sections of the Major Work. This affected audience engagement and tended to limit the effectiveness of the phrase or image.

Reflection Statements in this range covered most of the elements of development, realisation and intention of the Major Work. These Reflection Statements articulated, to some extent, the relationship between the student's study of Advanced and/or English Extension 1 and the Major Work.

D Range

Speeches in this range were not substantial and made only some connections between meaning, value and form. These speeches demonstrated limited investigation into form, resulting in works that indicated students had misunderstood the limitations, characteristics and conventions of speech.

Candidates' speeches tended to be predictable in nature and failed to offer any new insights or any genuine or coherent development of ideas. The exploration of the concept tended to be subverted into an exposition on an idea or topic. There was inappropriate use of long quotations from poetry or other texts. There was limited deliberate engagement of audience through the manipulation of structural elements or other techniques such as variation of voice, use of motif and sound effects. Major Works in this range at times did not recognise and purposefully engage the audience in order to realise their purpose and manipulate response.

Speeches in this range were at times problematic in relation to length. Reflection Statements were descriptive and at times superficial. There was limited evidence of extensive independent investigation in both the Major Work itself and the Reflection Statement. Investigation into both the form and concept and consideration of how this shaped the Major Work as a whole was lacking.

E Range

Speeches in this range were superficial and/or incomplete. They presented disjointed arguments that were not consistently focused on the concept explored through the investigation. Control over language, technical skills and conventions was limited. Speeches in this range were often inadequately rehearsed and demonstrated poor editing and clumsy expression. These speeches tended to be short and it appeared that the candidate had chosen an inappropriate form for their Major Work.

Reflection Statements in this range were inadequate in terms of articulating the scope of the independent investigation and how this shaped the Major Work itself. In addition, the relationship between the Major Work and the candidate's study of Advanced and/or Extension 1 English were unconvincing or omitted entirely. There were few speeches in this range.

Radio Drama

General Comments

Students compose a 10–15 minute complete radio drama presented on tape or CD-ROM. In 2005, candidates presented works in a variety of ways and most of the works were completed competently. Some students completed their work on CD-ROM and many included a taped and CD ROM version. Quality of production has improved and most projects were crisp and easy to listen to. The integration of music and sound effects was often seamless. Layering of sound and music was well done. Stronger Major Works validated their choices of FX and/or music in their Reflection Statements.

Concepts explored included satire, fantasy genre, ways of reading texts, crime fiction, social and political commentary, and journey. Forms appropriated included narratives, allegory, film noir and traditional dialogue-based radio drama.

Some of the strengths of these Major Works were:

- effective use of humour to engage the listener
- intellectually stimulating and thoughtfully developed concepts
- broad based and wide ranging research across media, including research into radio drama
- a variety of forms, structures or concepts used within a piece
- effective and stimulating use of parody, satire and allegory.

Some of the weaknesses of these Major Works were:

- poor recording quality
- flat dialogue, demonstrating little differentiation between voices
- discrepancies between the print and aural versions of the text
- no evidence of depth of research into the concept
- disorganised and confusing sound effects.

A Range

A Range Major Works demonstrated:

- artistically integrated and suitable sound, music and voice/s
- inventive use of the form, incorporating factual, poetic, literary and other styles
- seamless integration of FX and music, with these elements often overlaying each other
- justification for choices made, validated and extrapolated upon in the Reflection Statement
- well sustained development of the piece
- well sustained and witty satire
- smooth transitions between scenes
- thoughtful underpinning of conceptual material with extensive and rigorous independent investigation
- clear relationship between the Major Work and the Advanced and/or Extension 1 courses
- expert differentiation of voices in dialogue
- consciously structured work which was explained in the Reflection Statement.
- intellectual engagement and emotional evocation.

B Range

B Range Major Works demonstrated:

- strong development with a sincere and explicit research base
- effective use of humour, especially slapstick
- focused and sustained point of view
- use of puns and some use of metaphor, satire and allegory to promote point of view
- somewhat politically astute understanding and social commentary on contemporary issues
- use of absurdist techniques to carry action
- less subtlety than *A Range* Major Works but an evident sense of refinement

- interesting concepts or structures, always explored in depth
- well-depicted characterisation, although less sophisticated than *A range*.

C Range

C Range Major Works demonstrated:

- derivative faults. These Major Works were nonetheless sustained, well-structured and for the most part coherent. Most Radio Drama Major Works were in the C Range
- a rather narrow, close focus which limited the development of the concept
- satisfactory investigation into form with less investigation into the concept. This limited students' understanding of the concept
- defined characters whose voices at times were not well differentiated
- use of stereotypes and clichés.
- inauthentic contexts of radio dramas
- propensity to 'tell the listener' rather than reveal the themes through the dialogue
- often clumsy transition between scenes
- lack of indication in the Reflection Statement of how the Major Work was an extension of Advanced English or English Extension 1
- less definition of audience
- clear explanation of the influence of human resources
- conscious shaping of meaning, satisfactory use of conventions and an attempt to use emotion, dialogue, music in an engaging manner.

D Range

There were few *D Range* Major Works.

D Range Major Works demonstrated:

- very limited use of music. Major Works were often repetitive and/or not well integrated
- choices of stylistic devices, music and form which were not justified in the Reflection Statements
- a lack of originality. Major Works were literal in matter, form and concept
- a tendency to be very didactic and therefore less engaging
- ineffective attempts at humour
- use of stereotypical voice(s) and overuse of American accents
- poor transition between scenes
- inappropriate and confusing sound effects
- description as the dominant characteristic of the Reflection Statement. In these cases, candidates struggled to establish the relationship between the investigation and the process of composition
- poor recording and editing of work
- limited mention of research into the medium in the Reflection Statements or evident in the Major Work itself
- discrepancy between the ideas expressed in the Reflection Statement and the Major Work itself

- little thought given to structure of the Major Work
- lack of character lists and instructions to actors in the print scripts. Sometimes the scripts were discrepant with the aural text
- poor adherence to time limit.

E range scripts

There were no scripts in this range in 2005.

Performance Poetry

General Comments

The number of students submitting performance poetry Major Works has increased again this year as more students appreciate the possibilities offered by this interesting and creative medium. Overall the standard has improved as students become more aware of the significance of the relationship between the written and the spoken word. What reads well on the page does not always translate effectively to performance.

Strengths

Stronger Major Works used voice (pitch, cadence, diction, rhythm, balance) effectively to control and manipulate meaning. The influence of cultural trends such as 'free-style' and 'slamming', not to mention hip hop, was evident in many Major Works and was generally effective. The benefit of models is not to be underestimated. The production quality of most was excellent, students having used sound accompaniment with discernment to enhance performance rather than to compensate for it.

Weaknesses

Most works were concept-driven and these tended to work well except when ideas were not developed and the student relied on repetition or strident delivery to make a point. While most students have grasped the importance of voice manipulation in performing poetry, weaker projects presented poetry which did not allow for a range of expressive techniques. This often resulted in a lacklustre performance, even if the poetry itself had merit. Generally there was a correlation between poor poetry and poor performance.

A Range

A Range Major Works were:

- original and sustained, often engaging in a complex and sophisticated creation of meaning. They were coherent and intelligent
- dealing with a range of concepts and insights, including the nature of schooling, feminism, body image and disempowerment. There was evidence of a great deal of research which underpinned the intelligent and perceptive interpretation of the concepts

- using voice effectively. The ability of the student to utilise and manipulate their voice is a key discriminating factor in this range. Students who incorporated external elements such as music, sound effects (eg. reverb and echo) did so with balance, fluency and skilled integration. The poetry itself was of a high standard, demonstrating skill, insight and control over the material as performance
- exhibiting and explicating a deep and substantive understanding of the forms and features of performance and poetry, as well as an integrated and extensive research base.

B Range

B Range Major Works were:

- original and sustained, exhibiting a structural coherence in their overall production of meaning and values
- demonstrating insights and concepts which were often worthy but lacking in flair. The communication of these concepts showed some complexity, subtlety and refinement through a sound engagement with the extensive research
- having strong performance aspects, while the poetry itself was weaker. There was a strong engagement in the medium of production, demonstrating technical proficiency and a clear sense of audience and purpose. Often Major Works in this category were experimental in their use of voice, pace, rhythm and poetry
- accompanied by Reflection Statements demonstrating intelligent and extensive research. The Statements tended to be more explanatory in their approach, looking towards justifying the work on a conceptual basis and not clearly delineating the performative aspects of the work. This was often evident in a lack of self-referentiality.

C Range

C Range Major Works were:

- demonstrating lapses in tone, register and voice
- dealing with concepts such as teen angst and world peace. While not inherently poor choices, these were not clearly and extensively developed through substantial research and a fresh engaging interpretation. Major Works in this range were well-organised but had not developed the idea/concept
- demonstrated some ability to control the form. However, candidates used technical aspects to improve their work, often with clumsy results. They relied upon only one or two effects over the duration of the work, and as a result the work became repetitive and lacked consistent audience engagement. There was a lack of variety in the use of voice
- relying upon Reflection Statements to explain the conceptual and philosophical underpinnings of the work, rather than seeking to critically examine the performance of their poetry. There was often reliance upon listing and/or explaining the issues surrounding choice of hardware and software.

D Range

D Range Major Works were:

- making some connections between meaning, value and form
- communicating predictable ideas which relied upon clichéd and unoriginal insights. There was an evident lack of research into the form and the focus thus became unclear. A prevalence of personal insights, without extending these through research, was detrimental to the overall communication of ideas
- demonstrating some effective use of language, both in terms of the poetry and the performance. However, there was lack of engagement with the overtly performance-based nature of this form. Candidates may write poetry in different forms or styles, but it should be delivered with a sense of the medium and use of a variety of appropriate performance techniques
- accompanied by Reflection Statements which were explanatory at best, not completely elucidating or examining the main elements of the Major Work. Often there was inconsistency between the Major Work and the Reflection Statement.

E Range

There were no Major Works in this range.

THE MAJOR WORK – VISUAL MEDIUM

Video

General Comments

There was an increase in the number of video Major Works submitted for marking in 2005, continuing a trend in the last three years. Increased production values were evident in a significant number of these Major Works, particularly in the areas of editing and the visual composition of shots. This may have been a result of students' increased confidence with and competency over the medium, as well as technological advances that make it easier for candidates to work competently in the post-production stage.

Overall the composition, editing and post-production skills were impressive. However, in some cases it was evident in the Reflection Statements that there had been a reluctance to explore the values in the Major Work and how these have been the result of a conscious and extensive investigation process.

Highly sustained Major Works deliberately and purposefully shaped values, recognised how film operates as a medium and how a film-maker can manipulate the expectations and/or reactions of the audience by the use of cinematic devices/techniques/conventions.

Some Major Works emphasised technical manipulation at the expense of the concept. Better Major Works provided clear evidence, in the video itself and in the Reflection Statement, of how the independent investigation shaped the development of the Video Major Work, and how a student's own evaluative skills shaped the material.

Some Reflection Statements focused too much on the virtues of particular software or on describing the difficulties encountered in the execution of the Major Work. Better Reflection Statements provided self-reflection and self-evaluation regarding the realisation of the concept and purpose and about the candidate's deliberate shaping of the representation of values and meaning.

Whilst many candidates said they decided to work with the video medium because they liked and enjoyed it, they did not always investigate the form adequately or consider its suitability for the development of their concept.

In some cases Major Works were effectively influenced by philosophy and literary theory, but candidates did not treat with the specificity of film theory, showing poor investigation into the form they chose to work in. Story-boarding provides clear guidance for the production team, and highlights problem areas in the overall 'look' of the work.

Where students worked in a particular genre, there was sometimes insufficient evidence that they had adequately investigated the characteristics, conventions and elements of the genre.

A range of concepts and styles were explored in 2005 videos. A number of videos/DVDs were subversive, idiosyncratic and highly entertaining. A small number of videos dealt with the 'new war on terror', but in most cases the focus of these Major Works was not sustained or it was too cumbersome to easily be accommodated within the time limit of the short film.

One important aspect of Videos is the identification of a relevant audience and of how the project was developed to appeal to this targeted audience. This is especially crucial as this medium is routinely classified into suitable audience brackets: G, PG, M, MA, R. Candidates should consider this when trying to identify the targeted audience for their Major Work.

Some of the strengths of the 2005 Major Works were:

- technical proficiency/competency with both the camera and editing software that gave the Major Works a professional look
- demonstrated and insightful appreciation and understanding of the elements of a short film feature, such as the focus on one single character, or idea, or event
- outstanding control over technical video elements, and a fluent integration of the three processes of production – pre, shooting and post. This tended to result in a consciously developed structure and careful manipulation of pace and tone
- short videos that concentrated on situations where the character undertook only one conscious new experience. This demonstrated a sophisticated knowledge of the scope and conventions of the short feature
- willingness to experiment purposefully with concepts and technology, resulting in highly organised work
- exploration of the development of concept and the impact that investigation into form had on shaping meaning and fulfilling purpose, as evident in the Reflection Statements
- articulation of a clear relationship between the Advanced and Extension 1 courses, and the Extension 2 Major Work that demonstrated the scope and breadth of the planning and investigative process.

Some of the weaknesses of the 2005 video Major Works included:

- non-adherence to the BOS memorandum to reference all non-original images and sound (including music)
- non-adherence to guidelines such as the provision of scripts
- non-adherence to time limits

- literal visual representations of what is being told through dialogue and/or Voice Over, adding little to the engagement and success of videos
- lack of investigation into the form of the short video as distinguished from the feature film
- highly developed technical skills, editing skills and camera work not always used purposefully or deliberately to shape meaning, and in some cases used gratuitously
- unsuccessful integration of the elements of video/film, sound, image and shots to effectively shape meaning and pursue the development of the student's concept
- repetition of images and segments of the video without purpose, tending to lessen the original impact
- Reflection Statements making claims that were not realised in the work itself.

A Range

Videos in this range were highly original and sustained. They purposefully achieved a fluent integration of meaning, values and form. The majority of these were narrative-driven. There was a deliberate focus on and awareness of how values are represented in video through the successful integration of all elements: sound (diegetic and non-diegetic), *mise en scène*, motif, metaphor, lighting, colour, camera shots and editing techniques.

These candidates demonstrated clear control and expertise over the medium. The employment of the medium was conscious in terms of the realisation of the candidate's concept and purpose; and there was a sophisticated understanding of the audience and of how to manipulate their expectations.

Videos in the *A Range* pursued concepts that were appropriate to the form. These could be investigated, developed and presented within the confines of the short Video/DVD.

Candidates in this range were able to clearly articulate the relationship between their independent investigation into both form and concept and the realisation of their Major Work. These candidates were able to demonstrate, in a precise and sophisticated manner, the relationship between their study of Advanced and Extension 1 English and their Major Work.

While concepts were not always complex, the techniques used to develop them were original, inventive, clever, refined and engaging. There was a highly conscious consideration of audience and how to manipulate the chosen audience.

Candidates in this range were able to articulate the connection between their investigation and the Major Work in their Reflection Statements, often demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of film theory. These students were more likely to take risks, not only with video and editing techniques, but also with sound and lighting.

B Range

Video Major Works in this range were on the whole sustained, demonstrating coherence and a skilled integration of meanings and form. The importance of values was often ignored or simply not consciously explored within the Major Work. Films within this range did not manage to maintain their focus, either through structure or through a problem with one element of video making. In most of these cases the spoken word dominated the film

to the detriment of the Major Work: for example, long chunks of dialogue between two actors necessitated a number of close-ups and did not allow for any other inventive shots.

Major Works within this range were ambitious and impressive, dealing with a variety of concepts and/or issues. One predominant area of concern was the sometimes inappropriate nature of the concepts given the confines of the medium. Candidates needed to narrow the focus to an aspect of the concept to make the project more manageable as a six to eight minute video.

Videos in this range demonstrated control over the medium and offered interesting ideas. Although the communication of the students' ideas was sound, there were some lapses in refinement and/or complexity. A number of students worked within specific genres and explored these successfully.

Where the acting performances of the cast were not complementary to the intent of the film, this was largely ignored in the Reflection Statement. Some lapses in elements of textual integrity may have affected fluency and/or weakened the development of the concept; this was particularly so when dialogue was not used sparingly.

Reflection Statements reflected on the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work. Links to the English Advanced and or Extension 1 courses and the audience needed to be more clearly defined.

C Range

Videos in this range demonstrated control in the integration of meaning and form and were generally substantial. Most works experienced problems in either the integration of the investigation into the form or some element of textual integrity.

Some areas of weaknesses in these Major Works included:

- poor editing
- listing links to other Stage 6 English courses instead of showing a clear extension of Advanced and English Extension 1
- heavy reliance on content originated by others and not acknowledged
- the over use of voice-over, telling the responder what to think and feel rather than revealing meaning through other, more subtle or refined cinematic techniques
- uneven or inappropriate use of sound, both diegetic and non-diegetic
- use of non-diegetic music inadequately addressed or evaluated in the Reflection Statement
- lack of planning in the pre-production stage, notably in some of the more ambitious projects in this range.

D Range

Video Major Works in this range were insubstantial, demonstrating significant technical difficulties impeding the process of making meaning. These Major Works did display some connection between meaning, values and form; however, at least one of these elements was extremely problematic. The Major Work itself then suffered a major lapse in fluency.

The critical role of the director was inadequately fulfilled in this range.

There was little evidence of investigation into either concept or medium and the discussion

of process was descriptive rather than analytical. The Reflection Statement explained some aspects of the intention, development and realisation of the Major Work. One area of concern in this area was the use of family histories as a vehicle to say something about contemporary living and contemporary values. These Major Works tended to over rely on still photography, and the closeness of the composer to the material did not allow for a critical appraisal of the content.

E Range

Video Major Works did not show an integration of form, value and meaning. They were, on the whole incomplete, not developed coherently, or demonstrated an ability to carry out only one aspect of video-making, in most cases editing, or assembling a series of thematically connected images which, in some cases, were generated by other people without acknowledgment. The basic premise of the videos in this range was often simplistic, lacked subtlety and showed little attempt to use the medium dynamically and purposefully.

The Reflection Statement of *E Range* videos were on the whole explanatory or simple in nature, dealing with some of the obstacles faced by the composers, summarising the intention, or in most cases, the subject matter, of the video but not articulating the intention, the development or the realisation of the Major Work.

Films

No candidates presented a film as their Major Work in the 2005 English Extension 2 Higher School Certificate.

Multimedia

General Comments

The types of multimedia presented by candidates were internet sites (on CD-ROMs), narratives and PowerPoint presentations. The concepts explored by students were varied; however, candidates generally neglected investigation into form (website, PowerPoint presentation etc). Some candidates did not present their logic/site map in hard copy form as required.

Some of the strengths in the multimedia Major Works were:

- the medium was controlled in a skilful way that was appropriate to purpose. Image, sound, movement and written text were carefully woven together in an effective manner
- candidates were experimental with their use of the technologies available to them
- a sophisticated sense and manipulation of design elements
- clear demonstration of the extension of the English Advanced and English Extension 1 courses.

Some of the weaknesses in the multimedia Major Works were:

- some candidates experiencing difficulties linking their concept and approach to the skills, knowledge and understanding of the Advanced and/or English Extension 1 courses

- some candidates confusing their English Extension 2 Major Work with the approaches to subject matter of other courses, eg Studies of Religion, or Society and Culture. The approaches to concepts selected should be relevant to candidates' English studies
- limited investigation of the multimedia form leading to poor decisions about the composition of the website
- limited understanding of multimedia design (layout, colour, movement, sound)
- technical difficulties which made engagement problematic. Students need to ensure that their disk is fully operational
- the appropriateness of the multimedia form to their purpose. Some Major Works explored content at the expense of exploration of the possibilities the medium offered
- not observing the parameters of this medium. Disks submitted must allow markers to view the entire work without having to go on-line to the internet. The multimedia composition must be able to function directly from the submitted disk or CD ROM
- a lack of consistent evidence of the appropriate use of the features of the medium for the content
- weaker Reflection Statements demonstrating that students had done little investigation into form. This was clearly evident in the Major Works themselves.

A Range

Multimedia Major Works in this range were highly original and sophisticated. They developed their concept/s in an engaging manner. These works were focused and creative and used multimedia techniques in a purposeful manner. There was extensive evidence of investigation of the concept and the multimedia form. Candidates in this range had clearly experimented with the form as part of their investigation. These Major Works provided multiple reading paths and demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of the role of the audience in responding to this form.

The control of the multimedia features demonstrated a deliberate approach to creative decisions that were appropriate to the audience. The Reflection Statements articulated a critical evaluation of the exploration of form, audience, concepts, intention, development and realisation of the Major Work.

B Range

Major Works in this range were substantial and focused. The medium was skilfully controlled. There was a deliberate and conscious shaping of the features of the multimedia medium. However, these Major Works did not use the full range of the attributes of the form, which at times resulted in works that were relatively static. In some cases, there were been some technical flaws in the presentation of the medium.

The Reflection Statements treated the form, intention, and development of the work but, as in previous years, they tended to lack critical self-reflection.

C Range

Major Works in this range were substantial and generally coherent. Typically, the independent investigation did not adequately consider the multimedia form selected. Candidates were able to explore their ideas through the medium. The exploration, however, did not use the features of the medium to full advantage. Features were used without a clear sense of purpose. Material presented was often descriptive rather than analytical or creative. Reflection Statements in this range explained the intent, development and realisation of the Major Work, but lacked critical reflection.

D Range

Major Works in this range demonstrated limited investigation of both the form and the concept. Candidates experienced difficulties manipulating the multimedia composition and their selected concepts. The Reflection Statements explained some aspects of the Major Work.

E Range

E range Major Works were typically incomplete or superficial. They provided limited exploration of concepts and form. Reflection Statements explained some aspects of the Major Work but were inconsistent with the multimedia composition.