



1999 HSC

2 Unit

Contemporary English

Notes from the Examination Centre

© Board of Studies 2000

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

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9262 6270

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

March 2000

Schools may reproduce all or part of this document for classroom use only. Anyone wishing to reproduce elements of this document for any other purpose must contact the Copyright Officer, Board of Studies NSW. Ph: (02) 9367 8111; fax: (02) 9279 1482.

ISBN 0 7313 4521 5

200023

Contents

Paper 1 – Reading and Writing	4
Paper 2 – Listening Paper.....	16
Paper 2 – Contemporary Issues.....	24
Section I (20 marks).....	24
Section II (20 marks)	25

1999 Higher School Certificate 2 Unit Contemporary English Notes from the Examination Centre

PAPER 1 – Reading and Writing

General Comments

The 1999 paper contained three pieces of stimulus material relating to questions 1, 2 and 3. The three pieces – ‘A Guide to Bicycle Friendly Motoring’, ‘The Great Fashion Rip-OFF’ and ‘Summer Work in the U.S.A.’ were relevant, appropriate, contemporary and accessible. Responses to ‘Summer Work in the U.S.A.’ suggested that many candidates were genuinely interested in the stimulus material and we would not be surprised if Camp Counsellors (sic) USA received a flood of genuine applications as a result of this paper.

The candidature’s responses were in line with expectations. Most candidates performed in the Average to Above Average range. It was hard for outstanding candidates to demonstrate their flair on questions of this nature, as high level thinking and creativity were not called for. Literacy problems were very evident in the bottom third of responses.

In short answer questions that were predominantly of a reading comprehension nature, literacy was of a lesser concern, but in the more sustained responses literacy problems detracted significantly from the quality of the responses and hence the marks awarded.

Most of the questions asked were clearly worded and designed to test a range of skills.

Specific Comments

Question 1 (8 marks)

Turn to page 3 of the Stimulus Booklet and read Item 1, ‘A Guide to Bicycle Friendly Motoring’.

- (a) What is the purpose of this pamphlet?*
- (b) Who is the target audience?*
- (c) In your own words, explain the meaning of, ‘Giving Cyclists a Fair Go’.*
- (d) Why are blindspots dangerous?*
- (e) The writer of the pamphlet uses simple and direct language. Why is this appropriate?*
- (f) Why are cartoons used in a pamphlet that has a serious message?*

Questions 1(a), (b) and (c) were quite straightforward and handled well by the vast majority of candidates.

- (d) This was really an inferential question.
- (e) This question was straightforward.
- (f) This called for a more sophisticated response, and it proved to be difficult for many candidates who found themselves unable to explain the apparent contradiction of including some humour in a serious pamphlet.

Question 2 (9 marks)

Turn to pages 4 and 5 of the Stimulus Booklet and read Item 2, 'The Great Fashion Rip-OFF'.

The following people have been invited to appear on a television current affairs program to discuss issues raised in the newspaper article, 'The Great Fashion Rip-OFF':

- *A registered clothing manufacturer*
- *A market stallholder*
- *A customer.*

The interviewer begins the program by saying:

'This is your chance to tell our viewers what you think about the article. They're waiting to hear your point of view.'

Write each person's response in the spaces below:

- (a) *Registered clothing manufacturer*
- (b) *Market stallholder*
- (c) *Customer*

More able candidates adopted a very clear persona and strong voice, and addressed the issues well. Weaker candidates tended to rely on direct copying, failed to address the content clearly, lacked a convincing voice, and/or had literacy problems.

Question 3 (15 marks)

Turn to pages 6 and 7 of the Stimulus Booklet and read Item 3, an American advertisement, 'Summer Work in the USA'.

(a) Identify THREE different features of the advertisement that made it effective in presenting information to its target audience.

(i) Feature

Effectiveness

(ii) Feature

Effectiveness

(iii) Feature

Effectiveness

(b) Chris Smith, a Year 12 student, has just completed the HSC. Chris wants to go on a working holiday overseas.

Chris sees the advertisement (pages 6 and 7 of the Stimulus Booklet) at the local travel agency. Chris decides that he/she is a suitable candidate for the position of camp counsellor.

Write Chris Smith's letter of application for the position. The application should include Chris's reasons for applying, and the experience and qualities that make Chris the right person for the job.

(c) Chris has got the job. After a month at camp Chris sends a postcard home to a friend.

Write Chris's postcard describing camp life.

(a) This question called for candidates to identify a feature of the advertisement and then comment on its effectiveness.

In general, the question was not handled well. Comparatively few candidates actually named the feature. Many simply copied out a heading. Weaker candidates concentrated on content, rather than explaining the effect. The most successfully identified feature was 'photos' and many candidates were able to explain the appeal of the happy smiling faces. Few came to terms with language or were able to link the notion of 'effectiveness' with the target audience.

(b) This part was successfully attempted by most candidates. The stronger candidates combined a level of formality with relevant content, and they managed to produce a convincing application.

Comparatively few candidates failed to respond adequately in terms of content. Poor literacy levels relegated scripts to the lower ranges.

(c) The postcard question was generally handled quite well but some candidates spent too long on this 3 mark question. Markers felt that the nature of the task – writing in an informal style – was well chosen.

Question 4 (13 marks)

Turn to page 8 of the Stimulus Booklet and read Item 4, 'This Dreadful Time'.

(a) In this speech, Earl Spencer expresses a range of feelings, including:

- *sadness*
- *gratitude*
- *anger*
- *admiration*
- *pride*
- *protectiveness.*

Choose any **THREE** of these feelings. In the spaces provided:

- (i) write your choice of feelings
 - (ii) find an example of language used to express **EACH** feeling
 - (iii) explain why **EACH** example of language is effective.
- (b) In the third paragraph, Earl Spencer addresses Diana directly. Why is he doing this?
- (c) In the six paragraph, Earl Spencer says:

'It is a point to remember that of all the ironies about Diana, perhaps the greatest was this: a girl given the name of the ancient goddess of hunting was, in the end, the most hunted person of the modern age.'

What point is Earl Spencer making by comparing Diana to the goddess of hunting?

- (d) What are **THREE** important messages Earl Spencer delivers to the audience in the last three paragraphs of his speech?

The stimulus material was appropriate, accessible and of good length. It reflects the contemporary nature of the course and it is as free from cultural bias as can be reasonably expected. The kind of questions asked emphasise that it is a language based syllabus, requiring both reading and writing. The layout of the paper effectively guided candidates in the length of their responses. The overwhelming majority of candidates completed the paper and appeared to have managed their time well.

- (a) The question refers to the feelings expressed by Earl Spencer in the stimulus material and gives six examples. Candidates were asked to select three feelings. Most selected three from the list, but a few identified other feelings from the passage.

Most candidates were able to find an example of language which expressed each feeling. The majority quoted directly from the passage.

The more demanding part of the task was to say why this example of language is effective. Many candidates did not grasp that the response required here should be language-based rather than content-based. This was a clear discriminator between the better candidates and the average candidates.

Candidates need to be familiar with a range of basic language devices and be able to name them and locate and identify examples, eg word choice, tone, repetition, sentence structure, metaphor, etc.

- (b) This question was a very effective discriminator. Most candidates were able to understand the question and provide some sort of response, although the level of sophistication of these responses varied. The more able candidates moved beyond the content of the paragraph in question and addressed the purpose of Earl Spencer in using the second person, ie they have a language-based response.
- (c) This question was an effective discriminator requiring a high order language-understanding as well as the ability to communicate ideas effectively. The majority of candidates were able to suggest how Diana may be likened to a goddess, or to infer the link with the paparazzi, while the more perceptive answers could also succinctly explain the irony Spencer saw in Diana's name.
- (d) This involved a simple order task which was performed well by most candidates. It required candidates to process information given at length and to extract three definite and separate messages from it, commonly in the form of three quotes. Some candidates had difficulty identifying the messages in the text or in expressing their response as a message. The majority of candidates, however, were able to succinctly present the information from the last three paragraphs, whether in paraphrase or in quote form.

The word 'important' in the instructions became less significant because of the subjectivity involved in making such a judgement. Consequently there were a large number of messages for candidates to choose from.

Question 5 (5 marks)

You have been asked to write an article for a student magazine on the topic, 'A Person I Admire'. Write this article in a personal and interesting way.

This question provided candidates with ample opportunity to demonstrate their writing skills. The topic allowed for greater candidate choice which led to a variety of responses. An insignificant number of candidates were off-task. Because the question required a personal response, candidates were able to write with conviction and sincerity, while many incorporated humour into their response. The markers felt that there was a significant improvement in literacy over previous years, with fewer candidates exhibiting extremely poor control of language.

The fact that this was an article for a student magazine allowed candidates to showcase their writing skills. It is emphatically a writing task where the candidates can show their command of language and their control of the writing conventions. The marking criteria affirm this. Candidates understood the nature of the task. This was one of the strengths of the question. It was a fair question which all candidates could attempt, while giving scope for the best writers to demonstrate their flair and technical competence. Some candidates used the stimulus material as a springboard for a piece of personal writing. Poorer candidates who simply paraphrased the stimulus material were unlikely to demonstrate their own writing skills.

Most candidates had a good sense of the importance of closure and were able to conclude the piece of writing with a sense of finality. The best candidates clearly had an understanding of the importance of structure.

Marking Guidelines – Reading and Writing

The different ranges may be characterised by some of the following.

Question 1. This is a reading question.	
Question 1(a)	
1 Mark	Possible answers include: To inform people about bike riders' rights on the road To raise motorists' awareness of bicycles on the roads To alert motorists to the dangers facing cyclists To persuade car drivers of the importance of safe and friendly motoring for cyclists To save cyclists from getting hurt by car drivers To tell drivers that bicycles have a right to use the road as they do. May simply be a label, such as: To guide drivers To inform To educate.
Question 1(b)	
1 Mark	Possible answers include: Motorists Drivers of cars (and motorbikes, trucks, etc) People who ride bikes or drive cars on the roads Road users (drivers, motorbike riders, etc) People with a licence People with a car. Candidates must mention drivers or motorists in some form If cyclist is mentioned, it must be in conjunction with drivers and motorbike riders etc.

Question 1(c)	
1 Mark	<p>Emphasis on EXPLAIN</p> <p>Cyclists are legal road users and deserve the same rights, space and courteous treatment as other road users.</p> <p>Cyclists need to be given enough room on the roads so that they can ride safely.</p> <p>Cyclists are generally smaller and slower and it is important that other road users go out of their way to respect their rights.</p> <p>The concept of equality should be addressed.</p>
Question 1(d)	
1 Mark	<p>Blindspots are dangerous because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the driver can't see some areas around the back and sides and this could injure cyclists - blindspots can be overlooked and cyclists not spotted. One of the dangers might be hitting a cyclist when opening a car door - cyclists cannot be seen without special effort, and you may swerve into another lane and crash into an unseen cyclist, etc. <p>NB Some explanation, elaboration or clear implication of what the danger is is required, not just 'because you can't see', or explanation of what a blindspot is.</p>
Question 1(e)	For full marks either two reasons need to be given, or one well developed point.
1 Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it means that everybody should be able to understand information that is being put to them - it's simple and easy to understand - it's readily understandable by people of all ages
2 Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is clear and precise, and would reach a wide audience, some of whom may not be very literate in English - to get the message across clearly. It is easy to understand. So people don't get frustrated reading it or trying to understand. So it sinks in and/or is easily remembered.
Question 1(f)	Needs to address the impact of these cartoons to get two marks. May make two distinct points, or one point well. Good answers may address the paradox of humorous cartoons in a serious pamphlet.
1 Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cartoons are used to emphasise everything that has been written in the pamphlet - because people notice cartoons and seem to be able to pick up on their messages.

2 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - because it is easier to show what they are talking about. Cartoons overdramatise it to make it seem almost humorous - cartoons are used to show the reader that it may look funny but has a serious side to it. It also catches the reader's attention and makes them want to read the pamphlet.
0 Marks	Misses the point completely, muddled and confused, poor expression affects meaning.
Question 2 This is a reading and writing question.	
2 - 3 Marks	<p>Candidates have been asked to respond to the issues raised in the article, or the article itself.</p> <p>The better answers will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use an appropriate voice and register for each person - express a clear point of view - not simply 'retell' or construct a character and narrative with scarce reference to the article - show good control of language.
0 - 1 Mark	<p>Weaker answers may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - show a misunderstanding of the articles or issues - use an inappropriate voice or register - lack technical proficiency and control of language - be repetitive - rely heavily on simply rewriting the text, or constructing a narrative - not express a clear point of view - tell us about the issues rather than express a point of view

Question 3	
Question 3(a)	<p>Although this question has 3 parts, there is one whole mark and this needs to be kept in mind when deciding on the total.</p> <p>It is best to look at features and effectiveness together as a rough mark out of 2 for each example.</p> <p>‘Features’ should not be weighted equally with ‘effectiveness’.</p>
5 - 6 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clearly addresses the question - links features and effectiveness clearly - tends to use the correct terminology - Understands who the target audience is in at least one part (no need to repeat it 3 times) - identifies features and effects and provides example/s from the advertisement - must explain WHY and HOW
3 - 4 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may generalise - may repeat the same example of effectiveness - doesn't specify examples - may not use correct terminology, but shows understanding of features and effectiveness - tends to focus on content - may have two quite strong points and one weaker one, or one good answer and two weaker ones.
0 - 1 - 2 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tells about content rather than explaining about features and effectiveness - focusses on WHAT, rather than HOW or WHY - discusses features of the camp instead of the advertisement - may list features only - labels generic features of the ads - little reference to camp.

Question 3(b)	
5 - 6 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - formal tone - some flair - good control of language, literate - attempts/should address three criteria: reasons, experience, personal qualities - well structured, with a sense of closure - convincing, confident application.
3 - 4 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may rely too heavily on article – may be derivative - less fluent - less persuasive - lists qualifications - lacks a sense of confidence - inconsistent control of language and structure
0 – 1 – 2 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unrealistic - wrong tone - misunderstands - not persuasive - partial response - unconvincing application.
Question 3(c)	
3 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strong sense of voice-appropriate register - describes camp life - personal involvement is clear
2 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may be some listing - some sense of voice
1 Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lists, retells the day - little sense of personal/voice - a tangential response to camp life - poor literacy - short.

Question 4(a)	
1 Mark	For correctly identifying a quote or paraphrase appropriate to the feeling. This could be a list of appropriate words.
1 Mark	For the effectiveness of the language eg word choice, repetition, metaphor, tone, audience response (eg empathy), listing, visualisation, placement in the speech, etc. NOT content.
Question 4(b)	
2 Marks	For addressing why the passage is in the second person, eg that she is present in their minds, present in the church, present in spirit, present in a spiritual sense, watching them, that he is speaking to her personally (either as a brother or as a representative of the collective consciousness), as a dramatic technique to heighten the emotional impact, etc.
1 Mark	For addressing why he is saying it, eg mentions last respects, to thank her for all she has done, to say goodbye, to convey his feelings, so that everyone can feel something, etc.
Question 4(c)	
2 Marks	For identifying the irony or recognising the reversal of Diana becoming the hunted rather than the hunter.
1 Mark	For talking about the goddess or the immortal aspect of Diana, or mentioning that she is hunted by the paparazzi, but not grasping the irony or reversal.
Question 4(d)	One mark for each of the three different messages taken from the last three paragraphs. These may be generalisations, or quotations or paraphrases etc.
1 Mark	That the Spencer family is fully supportive of the way Diana tried to bring up her children.
1 Mark	‘We give thanks for the life of a woman I am so proud to be able to call my sister.’
1 Mark	That Earl Spencer felt privileged in having Diana for a sister and thanked God for that.

Question 5	The following criteria are to be used as guidelines/points, not a checklist. There may be scripts which do not fall exactly within these categories.
5 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focuses clearly on the topic - appropriate register and tone for the target audience - very good control of language (largely free from surface errors) - well structured including appropriate paragraphing - shows flair / maintains interest - ideas flow smoothly
4 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - still a clear sense of structure - still maintains interest - good control of language - may be less well organised - occasional surface errors - less successful in terms of flair
3 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may be an uneven response - obvious surface errors - pedestrian / often predictable or stilted - adequate control of language - may have some interesting features - may have structural flaws
2 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor control of language (lots of surface errors) - badly organised/disjointed - inappropriate register - may be too brief - lacks interest - over reliance on/paraphrasing of stimulus material
1 Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - too short - very poor control of language (excessive surface errors) - overuse/indiscriminate copying of stimulus material
0 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - just a few words - completely off task – total misunderstanding of the purpose/question

PAPER 2 – Listening Paper

General Comments

The paper appears to be a success and has provided a chance to discriminate well between candidates. Allocation of marks per question proved easier than last year, with one mark being allocated for each line/space of answer.

Tape: Well produced, good clarity, pace and intonation, enabled candidates to clearly identify the main ideas in the tape. There were few factual inaccuracies in the responses.

Questions: Appropriately developed from the tape with a good mix of literal and interpretative. Sufficient scope for candidates to demonstrate skills in language analysis covered by the course. Questions appropriately reflected the emphasis of the Contemporary Syllabus. Scope for higher order thinking skills was catered for in questions.

Layout: Instructions at top of script were clear and easy to understand. Introduction to tape supported/corresponded to paper. Line spaces were appropriate to the nature and emphasis of the question. Most candidates were able to adequately respond to the questions in the space provided. There was sufficient note-making space provided.

Student Performance: Overall candidates responded to all questions. Candidates produced a range of responses for each question and as such the full mark range was utilised. This paper had a better layout than the 1998 script. In particular Question 6, being divided into three parts, made the marking of this section more accurate.

The provision of 20 lines (arbitrary as it may seem) enabled an easier mark allocation as well.

The number of questions set was appropriate to the time allocation. The majority of candidates were able to address each question within the time provided.

Specific Comments

Question 1 (2 marks)

Why is Dr Christopher Green introduced as an expert on child behaviour?

Many candidates were unable to reflect higher-order/interpretative response required by the 'why' question which was asked.

- (a) Weaker candidates simply listed credentials, eg 'paediatrician, head of child development unit, leading child care expert'. Some candidates gave factually inaccurate responses, eg 'psychologist', 'head of child care centre' and 'nutritionist'.
- (b) Good candidates identified credentials and offered explanation, eg 'he's a paediatrician who has a great deal of experience in child development and parenting'.
- (c) Better candidates offered interpretative responses demonstrating higher order thinking, eg 'Because his credibility needs to be established so people will listen to and believe him'.

Question 2 (2 marks)

The presenter lists several ways the tape will help parents of toddlers.

List TWO of the ways the tape will help these parents.

This question was generally answered well by the majority of candidates. It was a literal question requiring candidates to identify two facts which were clearly stated on the tape. There were some interpretative responses. Very few candidates were unable to score 2 marks.

- (a) Weaker candidates gave factually inaccurate responses, eg ‘because Dr Green is a paediatrician’. They also mis-cued on the information or went off on a tangent describing their own views and experiences. Some candidates misread the question by recognising ‘presenter’ and gave incorrect answers based on other speakers’ ideas.
- (b) Better candidates clearly listed the points made by the presenter, eg ‘put the fun back into parenting’, ‘boost your confidence’. Most quoted directly from the tape.

Question 3 (2 marks)

According to Dr Green, there are certain dangers that parents of toddlers must be aware of.

Name TWO of these dangers.

This question proved more challenging than first thought. The term ‘dangers’ necessitated a very broad range of criteria. ‘Dangers’ was identified very literally, eg ‘roads, poison, fires’ as well as highly interpretative responses such as, ‘no respect for the concept of ownership’. Due to editing, this question required candidates to base their responses on a substantial section of the tape. This accounts for the broad range of answers.

- (a) Weaker candidates did not base their answers on what Dr. Green said and hence did not specify the dangers.
- (b) Better candidates quoted directly from the tape or paraphrased responses very similar to the tape, eg ‘toddlers have zero sense’.

Answers to this question in general ranged from adequate to very good. Because the question necessitated broad criteria, candidates often scored full marks, hence it was difficult to utilise the full range of marks.

Question 4 (2 marks)

Why does Dr Green compare Sylvester Stallone and other action superheroes to a toddler?

The question asked candidates to identify the point of comparison between toddlers and Sylvester Stallone. Most candidates had little difficulty in identifying the point of comparison as ‘mess, destruction, demolition’ or some synonym for which they received one mark.

- (a) The weakest candidates were unable to identify the point of comparison eg ‘they copy action heroes’.

- (b) Superior answers were able to draw out the detail of the comparison and make it quite explicit for the award of 2 marks, eg ‘Both action heroes and toddlers create a large mess’. Some candidates went beyond explaining the simile and addressed the question as to why Dr. Green used it as an illustration to his point, eg ‘Dr Green compares action heroes to toddlers in order to create a dramatic and humorous association for the parents’.

Question 5 (3 marks)

In his conclusion, what does Dr Green suggest is the big mistake that parents make? Why is it such a big mistake?

Question 5 attracted 3 marks. The first mark was awarded for the identification of ‘the mistake’ which was quite clearly stated by Dr Green as ‘trying to make toddlers behave like adults’.

For the second of the 3 marks, candidates had to see that this mistake was ‘pointless’ or ‘just didn’t work’. An elaboration of the idea, ie ‘that children are not developed well enough mentally to be able to behave in an adult fashion’ was also accepted for the second mark.

For the third mark, candidates had to identify that ‘trying to make toddlers behave like adults only led to worry and frustration for the parents’. Dr Green stated quite clearly that this was the case and the point became an important discriminating factor between the award of 2 and 3 marks. It was felt that the Centre had to discriminate using the phrase ‘for the parents’ in order to get an appropriate spread of marks. Had the phrase not been used as a discriminator the marks for Question 5 would have been skewed to either 1 or 3.

Question 6 (9 marks)

The tape is designed for parents of toddlers. Name any THREE techniques that have been used to appeal to this audience. Comment on the effectiveness of each technique that you have chosen.

Although the question was allocated 9 marks, it was quite clearly divided into three sections of equal value, ie 3 marks. The question asked specifically for three techniques.

This question discriminated well because the ‘what’ and ‘why’ elements gave scope for a range of answers.

- (a) Weaker candidates in the bottom of the range could not name any identifiable techniques. More able, but still poor responses, could name techniques (some relevant to the tape, some irrelevant) but demonstrated no understanding of what the techniques really were. Attempts at describing effectiveness were either nonexistent or generalised and clichéd, eg ‘the music set the mood’ without any qualification of type of music or type of mood.

There was some evidence of prepared stock answers to this question.

- (b) Better candidates were able to accurately identify techniques, describe them in the context of the passage and show some understanding of how they were effective, eg ‘Music – cartoon; animated style of music is used to introduce the topic which is both appropriate to the topic (toddlers) and easily and effectively gains the parents’ interest through familiarity’.

Some candidates confused ‘parenting’ techniques and techniques used by the presenter/producer of the tape. In discussing techniques of any text, candidates need to be aware that this question attempts to measure their understanding of how language is used to achieve a purpose.

The division of the question into (a), (b) and (c) enabled the candidates to organise their responses far more effectively than if 9 lines of undifferentiated space had been provided for the answer. The 3x3 line responses made it less intimidating for weaker candidates and minimised the number of non-attempts.

Hearing-Impaired Papers

Videos: On all videos the signing, facial expression, enunciation and diction were all clear. Backgrounds, clothing, colour and lighting all assisted with the clarity of presentation.

Marking Guidelines – Listening

The different ranges may be characterised by some of the following:

Question 1	
0 Mark	(a) Factually inaccurate eg ‘child psychologist’, ‘Head of Children’s hospital’ (b) Restating the question – ‘Because he is an expert’ (c) Misinterpretation of question.
1 Mark	Any of the three facts/qualifications directly stated or implied.
1 Mark	Factually inaccurate statement and a reason WHY, eg ‘Because he’s head of a children’s ward and people will listen to him.’
1 Mark	A reason only, eg ‘This can be used to attract listeners.’
2 Marks	Any of these three facts/qualifications directly stated or implied: (a) leading child care expert/child care expert (b) consultant paediatrician/paediatrician (c) head of Child Development Unit at Sydney Children’s Hospital PLUS why this makes him an expert.
2 Marks	Competent, interpretative answer: allusion to credibility, trust, confidence.

Question 2 (Maximum 1 mark for (a), 1 mark for (b))	
0 Mark	(a) Too far from the original eg 'it will explore the mix' (b) Inaccurate.
1 Mark Each For:	Any two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explodes the myths - Explains the mysteries of parenthood - Boosts confidence levels - Puts the fun back into parenting - Interpretative answer, eg 'It will help parents understand their toddlers'.
1 Mark	Two interpretative answers.
1 Mark	If the interpretative answer is simply elaborating on or paraphrasing what has been said (a) 'put the fun back into parenting' (b) 'so they can enjoy their children better'.

Question 3 (Maximum 1 mark for (a), 1 mark for (b))	
0 Mark	Anything NOT specifically mentioned by Green: 'playing'.
1 Mark Each For:	Any dangers given by Dr Green. Only what Green actually says, or a paraphrase. Straight quotes accepted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - roads - poisons - fires - demolition experts - no sense - no sense of danger - climbing - vulnerable - hurting themselves - awesome power to stir - zero sense - don't think of the stop at the end of the drop - no respect for the concept of ownership - no idea of social interaction – if they want something they'll grab it - do not share.

Question 4	
0 Marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no comparison or trigger word - inaccuracy, eg ‘they think they have power like action heroes’ - assumption, eg ‘toddlers see the heroes leave their mess around’ - factually inaccurate.
1 Mark	Use a trigger word but no comparison made, eg ‘Toddlers make mess’
2 Marks	Interpretative answer, eg ‘Dr Green uses the comparison to involve parents in something familiar’ or ‘make parents feel more comfortable with mess’.

Question 5	
1 Mark	Must name the mistake: ‘Trying to make toddlers behave like adults’. Must be correctie the notion of ‘trying to make’ and ‘adults’ must be there, but does not have to be word for word.
2 Marks	<p>A further 2 marks for mentioning 2 from this list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pointless, just won’t work - causes worry and frustration for the parents - at that age toddlers just can’t do it: toddlers don’t have the capacity to behave like adults.

Question 6	
1 Mark	Technique named.
1 Further Mark	Technique qualified or example given.
1 Further Mark	<p>How the technique connects with the audience, ie explanation of its effectiveness.</p> <p>Simple explanations of effectiveness such as ‘can relate to’, ‘attracts attention’, ‘gets our interest’, ‘easy to understand’, ‘interesting’, ‘creates an atmosphere’ – can only be used once, overall, to get 3 out of 3 marks.</p> <p>To get 9 marks for this question, a script must have a more sophisticated answer, eg:</p> <p>Technique: ‘tone’ – 1 mark</p> <p>Qualification: ‘conversational’ – a further mark</p> <p>Explanation of effectiveness: ‘it is relaxing, the audience can relate to it’ – a further mark</p>

Acceptable Techniques:

- humour/comedy
- structure
- music – in qualification/effectiveness – must show that they realise it's selected for a purpose
- sound effects
- question/interview style
- style of language
- tone
- use of voice
- pause, nonverbal, eg 'drawing breath'
- use of expert, expertise
- introduction, with some discussion or aspect of it
- rhetorical questions
- direct speech/ 'talks to' /dialogue
- anecdotes
- comparisons
- first person
- exaggeration/hyperbole
- figures of speech/imagery
- variety of speakers
- persuasion
- narrator
- level of language usage
- pace

Not Acceptable (as names of techniques):	
0 Marks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- language – without qualification- knowledge- restatement of content- introduction – without qualification- examples – without qualification- can only name a specific technique once- repetition of why a technique is effective (in (a) and/or (b) and/or (c)) – only count the point once- re-telling the content

PAPER 2 – Contemporary Issues

Section I (20 marks)

Question 1

You overhear the following conversation:

ADULT How did you go in your Issues test?

STUDENT It was okay. Better than I expected.

ADULT That's great! So, you did get something out of all that reading, after all.

What did you get out of your study of ONE of the Contemporary Issues this year?

In your ESSAY, refer to a range of material that includes at least ONE of the tests listed on page 2 of this paper.

DO NOT WRITE A DIALOGUE.

General Comments

Overall this year there was a greater success in candidates fulfilling the expectations of the issues essay question. The scripts provided numerous examples of good teaching and learning practices that were heartening to see.

Appropriate use of genre was shown by many candidates. Better candidates used paragraphing effectively to organise ideas. Most candidates also made an effort to write in the correct register. Lack of essay skills affected some results markedly, including some candidates who displayed quite good knowledge.

The use of text was quite reasonable by most candidates. Better scripts supported each sub-issue with textual reference and discussion. Some scripts treated text lightly and were unbalanced in favour of sources. There was a general lack of variety in text choice with a few easier texts dominating.

In the strongest scripts, the sources were plentiful, original and fresh. Problems with sources included insufficient number, lack of variety, lack of specific sourcing and fabrication of sources.

Better scripts also integrated source and textual material.

The broadness of the question caused some problems – it failed to discriminate, to allow the better candidates to shine, and it played into the hands of the generalised prepared answer.

Some candidates clearly did not understand the word 'dialogue'. Quite a few less able candidates wrote a dialogue.

The wording of the question was far too colloquial for a formal essay. Some candidates did not understand 'got out of.'

The Peace and War issue remained a concern. Peace is being handled better but is rarely balanced. Better balance might be achieved by having candidates write about peace first.

While genre and content are showing improvement, general usage was weak. Areas which need improvement are grammar, punctuation, paragraphing and spelling.

The originality and personal responses of many candidates were encouraging but the trend towards prepared answers and class conformity was discouraging. Markers vastly prefer the former and it is easy to distinguish between the two.

Section II (20 marks)

Question 2

As part of an English oral assessment task, you have been asked to present your views to your class on ONE of the following topics:

Cultural Identity – Fitting in is hard to do.

Sport – Sport is a serious business.

Growing up – Growing up today is harder than it used to be.

Peace and War – Understanding what war is really like leads us to value peace.

Write a SPEECH in which you state your views on your chosen topic.

In your SPEECH, refer to a range of materials that includes at least ONE of the texts listed.

General Comments

In general candidates appear to have written longer responses than in previous years, and the overall standard was good.

Most candidates were comfortable with the speech register. The majority of scripts began with some kind of salutation, although many were unable to sustain the register. Poorer responses began with 'Good morning', ended with lines such as 'Thanks for listening', but reverted to their prepared essays in the middle.

Overall, candidates were well prepared and knowledgeable about the issue. Even the poorer candidates were able to write something on the topic, and there appeared to be fewer 'E' range scripts and non-attempts than last year.

Many candidates, however, failed to address the question and gave a 'shopping list' of everything they knew, rigidly adhering to learned sub-headings, irrespective of their suitability or relevance to the question. The better scripts referred to a wide range of appropriate related material, integrating this in a sophisticated manner with the set text and relating it well to the question. Poorer responses relied mainly on movies as related material, or on newspaper articles alone.

A common weakness was the number of passing references to current affairs (eg events in East Timor or Kosovo, merging of football clubs) or to related material without giving any sources. Otherwise good scripts were weakened by:

- references to personal experience or anecdotes only
- no documented related material
- misquoted text or materials.

In general, candidates need to refer in greater depth to their set texts, although more candidates did this than in previous years. Most candidates sourced their set text well, giving correct title and author.

Candidates from some centres all used the same 'prepared' answers and related material without adapting it to the question. Some wrote more than one response on different issues in the one section.

More candidates seemed to be able to use apt quotes from set texts and related materials meaningfully this year.

Responses were generally more literate but the following weaknesses were of concern:

- illegible handwriting
- lack of grammatical sentence structure
- use of pencil or very pale ink to write answers.

Stronger responses used a range of devices to establish and sustain speech register and a sense of the peer group audience.

Lower range responses used a limited range of devices, and/or did not consistently sustain the register/sense of audience.

Devices may include:

- Opening and closing statements
- Inclusive personal pronouns: 'I', 'we', 'us', 'you'
- Question tags: eg 'Don't we all?'
- Directly addressing audience
- Rhetorical questions
- References to shared experiences, inclusive generalisations
- Repetition/reiteration of key ideas/images/rhetorical structures for effect
- Jargon/slang/tone appropriate to peer group audience – may be formal or informal
- In a formal speech, many aspects of an essay structure may be apparent
- Previews/outline of main points; signposting of main points

A strong response did not necessarily use the most obvious speech devices.

Specific Comments

The questions allowed candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and skills, and gave scope for superior candidates to achieve more. Many markers favoured the specific focus provided for each issue, for (a) and (b) and felt that having the same text-type for all responses was excellent.

A standardised reference point was available which made briefing and marking easier.

Sport: The wording of the question resulted in a number of different interpretations. 'Sport is a serious business' often became 'Sport is a business'. Candidates sometimes had problems interpreting this: 'business' equated with money and 'serious' equated with 'not fun'. Many candidates wrote about aspects of sport without using them to show why or how 'sport is a serious business'.

Growing Up: With this question candidates found the comparison difficult. Candidates were not sure what to compare 'harder' with – for whom? and when? Most did not have the experience or maturity to come to terms with the question and were unable to draw any real comparisons with the past except hypothetically (eg 'it would have been easier for our parents'). This was the most difficult question and the majority of candidates wrote superficially about drugs, suicide, etc but failed to come to grips with the sub-issues of their text and related materials. Better candidates challenged the focus and pointed out the positives and negatives of growing up in any era. The question also invited personal anecdotes instead of recognised sources.

Peace and War: This question was seen as demanding for candidates but it elicited a good range of responses. Some candidates re-interpreted the question as 'you can't have peace without war.' The question required a focus on peace as well as war.

Cultural Identity: This question was seen as the most straightforward and accessible to the full range of candidates. It proved to be a good discriminator and lent itself to a broad range of texts and related material.

Marking Guidelines – Contemporary Issues (Section I)

	A 20, 19	B 18, 17, 16	C 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10	D 9, 8, 7, 6	E 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0
TEXT TYPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Very good and sustained effort at text type. – Clear and thorough organisation, coherent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Good effort at text type but may not be fully sustained. – Clear organisation, coherent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reasonable attempt at form and register will be evident. – Some attempt at organisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Usually attempt text type but may be weak. – May be poorly organised. – May lack coherence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Weak attempt at text type. – No organisation.
CONTENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Displays strong understanding of the material. – Shows a clear understanding of the question and of the complexity of the Issue. – Uses a range of appropriate related material. – Has unity and develops ideas. – Usually emphasises link between text and related material. – May use personal voice well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Displays good understanding of the material. – Shows a competent understanding of the question and of the Issue. – Uses a range of appropriate related material. – Has sense of unity and development of ideas. – May indicate link between text and related material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Will probably make reference to the question. – May use only a narrow range of related material or have a narrow focus on the Issue. – Generally gives an adequate treatment of the material and Issue. – Reasonably coherent development of ideas. – May lack meaningful link between material and Issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Will probably make reference to the question. – Elements of story-telling supported by weak comment. – May be weak, short, superficial response. – Weak development of ideas. – May deal with text only, or related material only. – Fails to deal adequately with Issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Little or no comprehension of text or related material. – Only retells story. – May be brief. – May deal with text only, or related material only. – Little or no sense of the Issue text or related material.
<p>Answers which do not discuss text, cannot get high than a ‘D’</p> <p>Answers which do not discuss related material, cannot get higher than a ‘D’.</p>					
EXPRESSION (May have the following elements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fluent, articulate shows flair – originality, good style sophistication – sustained argument. – Minor weaknesses in expression are not a barrier if text type and content are strong. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Expression generally competent and correct. – Communicates well. – Minor weaknesses in expression are not a barrier if text type and content are strong. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Occasional problems in expression. – Reasonably fluent. – A reasonable attempt to communicate ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Problems in expression may interfere with communication. – Vague, rambling and ‘waffly’. – Poor communication of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Serious problems in expression. – Incoherent. – Fails to communicate ideas effectively.

Marking Guidelines – Contemporary Issues (Section II)

	A 20, 19	B 18, 17, 16	C 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10	D 9, 8, 7, 6	E 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0
SPEECH REGISTER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Uses a range of devices to establish and sustain the speech register. – Uses appropriate language to engage the peer group audience. – Clear and thorough organisation, coherent. – Often a strong personal voice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clearly establishes speech register; may not be fully sustained. – Demonstrates clear sense of audience. – Clear organisation, coherent. – Personal voice may be evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reasonable attempt at speech register will be evident. – Some attempt at organisation, reasonably coherent. – Some sense of audience and personal voice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May make weak attempt at speech register. – Poorly organised. – May lack coherence, sense of audience and personal voice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Weak or no attempt at speech register. – No organisation, usually lacking coherence. – Weak personal voice, little or no sense of audience.
Out to be a strong Speech Register, Content and Expression for A and B.					
CONTENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong response to the question / set topic. – Presents and develops insightful view(s) on the Issue and set topic, supported by a range of appropriate material, including text. – Has unity and develops ideas. – Establishes close link between text, related material and set topic / Issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sound response to the question / set topic. – Presents and develops clear view(s) on the Issue and set topic supported by a range of appropriate material, including text. – Has sense of unity and development of ideas. – Should indicate link between text, related material and set topic / Issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Shows awareness of the requirements of the question and set topic. – Reasonable understanding of Issue. – Presents view(s) but may lack clarity or consistent argument. – Reasonable attempt to support view(s) with reference to text and related material. – May lack meaningful link between text, related material and set topic / Issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May misunderstand the question. – Limited understanding of set topic / Issue. – Weakly presented view(s); inadequately supported. – Re-telling of text and related material may occur. – Could be weak, short, superficial response. – Often deals with only text or only related material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Little or no understanding of the question. – Little or no comprehension of set topic / Issue. – Poor attempt to retell text / related material. – May be brief. – May not mention / deal with text / related material.
Responses with only one reference (text or material) are unlikely to get above the 'D' range. Responses which fail to address the set topic are unlikely to get above low 'C'.					
EXPRESSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fluent and articulate. – May demonstrate flair, originality, sophistication of style. – May have minor errors of expression. – Does not have to be a 'superscript' to get 'A'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Expression generally competent and correct. – Communicates well. – Weaknesses in expression are not a barrier if speech register and content are strong. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reasonably fluent. – A reasonable attempt to communicate ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Problems in expression may interfere with communication. – Often vague, rambling and 'waffly'. – May be incomprehensible in parts. – Poor communication of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Serious problems in expression likely to be evident. – Incoherent. – Fails to communicate ideas effectively.