

2001 HSC Notes from  
the Examination Centre  
English (Standard) and English (Advanced)

© 2002 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 1 74099 113 3

2002147

## Contents

English (Standard) and (Advanced) Paper 1 – Area of Study.....	5
Section I.....	5
Section II.....	6
Section III .....	7
English (Standard) Paper 2 – Modules.....	9
Section I – Module A: Experience Through Language.....	9
Section II – Module B: Close Study of Text .....	12
Section III – Module C: Texts and Society .....	17
English (Advanced) Paper 2 – Modules.....	18
Section I – Module A: Comparative Study of Texts and Context .....	18
Section II – Module B: Critical Study of Texts .....	19
Section III – Module C: Representation and Text .....	23



# 2001 HSC NOTES FROM THE EXAMINATION CENTRE ENGLISH (STANDARD) AND ENGLISH (ADVANCED)

## Introduction

This document has been produced for the teachers and candidates of the Stage 6 courses in English (Standard) and English (Advanced). It provides comments with regard to responses to the 2001 Higher School Certificate Examination, indicating the quality of candidate responses, and highlighting the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidature in each section and each question.

It is essential for this document to be read in conjunction with the relevant syllabus, the 2001 Higher School Certificate Examination, the Marking Guidelines and other support documents which have been developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of English (Standard/Advanced).

## English (Standard) and English (Advanced) Paper 1 – Area of Study

Markers felt candidates made a good effort with the questions but many candidates seemed to hit a barrier in moving beyond reasonable comprehension into the type of analysis envisioned in the syllabus.

## Section I

### Question 1

#### General Comments

- There were a number of excellent responses achieving more than was required.
- There was a solid minority of strong responses and a number of weak responses. The middle ground was a bit thin.
- Candidates need to be competent with and aware of language techniques.
- Many candidates needed to develop their answers beyond the explanatory and descriptive.
- Quoted references were often too long.
- Quotations needed to be used and not merely quoted.
- There was a lack of exam technique displayed with candidates failing to take note of the number of marks.
- Candidates need much more preparation on the ‘how’.
- Candidates overall were quite fluent in expression, made a sincere effort and were well aware of the need to address the question.
- The majority of candidates could demonstrate their understanding of the three texts and make some pertinent links about change and youth.
- Language aspects of parts (b) and (c) texts were difficult for some candidates. The figurative aspects of part (c) would be one example.
- Even the best responses were often repetitive.

- Candidates need to be explicit in their comments and not assume marker knowledge.
- There was some evidence that candidates are starting to use the terms of the new syllabus in their answers.
- There is a need to better address visual literacy.
- Discussion of change was often superficial.
- Part (b) was generally done poorly.
- Too much summary and quotation were done for parts (b) and (c).
- There was evidence of candidates running out of time. For example too little time for part (d).

## Section II

### Question 2

Candidates were asked to write a story about the concept of a change in relation to one of three topics:

- (a) Dancing to a different beat.
- (b) Now it's their turn to choose.
- (c) An image of a person leaving a chair/situation.

The writing task clearly allowed all candidates the opportunity to express their understanding of change within the context of their study. Candidates either drew on their study of change or took their inspiration from the content and/or types of texts used in Question 1. The question allowed candidates the scope to determine the type of story they would write and the type of school magazine and audience for whom they were writing.

The question was a good discriminator that provided for a variety of approaches, types of stories, persons and voices. This flexibility in the question allowed all candidates the opportunity to respond in ways that best demonstrated their concept of change and their skill in writing for a specific audience and purpose. Stories generally took the form of a narrative, media article or speech. The specified audience, the 'school magazine committee', was representative of a wider intended audience which may have been for candidates only or it may have had a readership which incorporated candidates, parents and teachers.

The topics provided scope for both literal and metaphorical levels of interpretation. This provided a range of ways of responding. The context for writing allowed candidates the choice to compose an imaginative story that presented a real or imagined experience of, insight into, or reflection upon change. Such stories may have been appropriate to the literary section of a school magazine. Others chose to present a story in the form of a speech and were able to construct a persona and communicate directly with the perceived audience through the use of the first person. Many of these responses indicated that the audience for whom they were writing were mainly fellow Year 12 candidates.

Candidates, in responding to the choices the question made available, need to develop the confidence to go with the options that will best allow them show the full range of their ability to write. The need to show, rather than tell, is a goal to pursue.

Strengths and weaknesses of candidates' responses in regard to the marking are as follow:

Stronger responses successfully developed or displayed a complex understanding of change in relation to the chosen topic. The ability to effectively use the topic to explore or develop notions of change was a key discriminator. These responses were likely to use the topic metaphorically to express a sophisticated understanding of change, though not all above-average responses did so. They interpreted and responded to the question in ways that allowed them to demonstrate effective control of language. Their controlled use of a strong, sustained and distinctive voice or persona showed ability to successfully manipulate features of language to reach and influence an audience. The effective control of a range of language features was also a significant discriminator within this question.

Many mid-range responses showed a more simplistic understanding of change, which attempted to develop appropriate links to the chosen topic. Responses were written with an awareness of audience and purpose. There was a tendency in this range to make statements about change. These statements required more development or elaboration if they were to convey a greater depth of understanding of change. Some of the conventions appropriate to the form of writing were successfully used to engage the audience, but without the essential control of the range of features of language necessary to always sustain audience interest.

Weaker responses were inclined to depend substantially upon the ideas contained within texts relating to Question 1 or to their study of prescribed texts and to classroom experience. They demonstrated a more general and at times undeveloped understanding of change which had slight connections with the chosen topic or which responded to the concept in very literal and limited ways. Responses were either unclear in indicating a possible audience or ineffective in attempting to hold audience interest. These responses were usually let down either by the quality of the ideas or by the variable control of language.

Overall, in any writing task, candidates need to give consideration to the ways in which they can best demonstrate to the examiners their ability to write. They need to demonstrate a control of written language and be able to adopt a voice which brings conviction to their writing. Candidates should be reminded that this question is worth the same number of marks as the other two questions on Paper 1. As such, it deserves the same careful attention and an allocation of time that does not limit a candidate's ability to showcase their writing talents.

### **Section III**

#### **Question 3**

Candidates responded to the inclusion of a visual stimulus in the question variously. Some ignored it and some used it as an organising motif or as a related text. Candidates often quoted the written script in their introduction or conclusion.

The question reflected the intent of the Stage 6 syllabus well. The description of the Area of Study in the syllabus explicitly directs teachers and candidates to consider how texts make meaning. Candidates have to understand and articulate style and technique, and sound knowledge of the content and purpose of texts.

## The Responses

Stronger responses were impressive. These candidates understood that change is a process that naturally has consequences or effects and that different texts convey ideas about change in a variety of ways. Moreover they were able to discuss the differences in technique and style between different types of texts. They also referred to their prescribed text, one text from the stimulus booklet, *Changing*, and at least two other pieces of related material. The phrase ‘other related texts of your own choosing’ in the question should have alerted candidates to the need to refer to texts other than those prescribed and studied in class for the Area of Study, and the plural ‘texts’ indicates the need for more than one.

Stronger responses referred to a range of different types of texts. That is, if candidates had studied prose fiction as a prescribed text, they went on to discuss visual texts, poetry, drama etc. These responses also demonstrated a firm understanding of what constitutes an ‘appropriate’ text. That is, texts that relate to change and offer the candidate scope for discussion of the effects/results of change. Candidates should be aware that a novel such as *Great Expectations* is not necessarily more appropriate than a cartoon; it depends on what a candidate wishes to say about change. Discerning candidates chose texts that were useful for a synthesised response.

Stronger candidates were also able to write a ‘synthesised and effective critical personal response’. That is, they were able to develop a strong line of argument about change and its consequences and sustain this thesis throughout their answer, with judicious reference to various texts. Some candidates integrated their material on various texts and some wrote confidently on each text in turn. These candidates also demonstrated a strong empathy with their material. They had thought about it and had developed a firm understanding of how and why the composer used a particular medium to convey ideas.

Better responses also tended to include discussion of the philosophical aspects of change rather than confining themselves to the physical or more apparent features of change.

Some responses were not appropriately balanced between prescribed texts and ‘other related texts of your own choosing’. The main problem in these cases was that too much time was spent on the prescribed texts. For example, a few candidates attempted to discuss all the poems set for study rather than just two or three and ran out of time for a thorough discussion of other texts, or they discussed more than one text from the stimulus booklet with a similar result.

Many candidates found it difficult to incorporate a discussion of at least four texts. This could have been because of poor time management or because they misread the question.

Some candidates were able to deal with ‘techniques’ in prescribed texts effectively but not so well or not at all, in related texts. Candidates should be prepared to discuss how a composer shapes meaning in all of the texts they choose to write about. Teachers and candidates should address literary, dramatic and film techniques and the language of visual, written and spoken texts in their preparation.



Weaker candidates struggled with the techniques used by various composers. Particularly when discussing prose fiction or non-fiction, they tended to story-tell rather than focus on how the story is told. For example, when discussing the novel *Looking for Alibrandi*, candidates need to be able to explain the journal-like qualities of the text, the strong personal voice, the juxtaposition of present time and reflection on past events and so on, rather than merely write about the events of the novel. Candidates also often chose to discuss substantial related texts such as films and television programs or other books eg novels and autobiography, but discussed them in a superficial way. Candidates should be aware that if they wish to use such texts, they should confine their discussion to a relevant segment so that they have time to discuss it in some detail.

The level of literacy of the responses was satisfactory. It was also evident that candidates had absorbed some of the ‘new’ language of the syllabus and wrote quite confidently about composers, responders, shaping meaning and so on. However, teachers could be advised that while the terms composer and responder are useful when referring to writers, poets, directors, cartoonist etc in a generic way, there is no need to use them all the time. For example, when discussing a novelist’s work, it is appropriate to talk about a writer, or a director of a film and so on.

## Summary

On the whole, the question was challenging and discriminated between candidates effectively. Weaker candidates tended to struggle with discussion of the consequences of change. Ability to do this became a discriminator in the lower grades, while the discussion of techniques discriminated in the higher grades, as did the ability to draw several texts together and discuss them in terms of how composers made meaning of change and its consequences.

It was also evident that:

- some candidates did not understand that ‘other related texts of your own choosing’ means more than one
- some candidates did not discuss the ‘consequences of change’. These students appeared to have studied ‘change’ thematically rather than as a process
- some candidates did not demonstrate ‘variety’ in the text choices as required by the rubric and/or they appeared not to understand that they needed to ‘analyse, explain and assess the ways change is represented’. Once again perhaps their preparation for this question has been thematic rather than based on how composers shape meaning in texts
- some candidates did not use a variety of different types of text. For example, several candidates used all poetry texts.

## English (Standard) Paper 2 – Modules

### Section I – Module A: Experience Through Language

#### General Comments

In this Module candidates had to attempt one question based on their study of an elective. ‘Image’ was the most popular elective with 42% of the Standard candidature with ‘Dialogue’ a close second on 40%. ‘Telling Stories’ was studied by 18% of Standard candidates.

## Specific Comments

### Question 1 – Telling Stories

The majority of candidates chose Henry Lawson and many demonstrated a good understanding of his use of narrative techniques. Of the less frequently chosen texts, *Through Australian Eyes* was generally handled well, often by superior candidates who then balanced discussion with reference to complex related material. Candidates who answered on *Maybe Tomorrow* sometimes fell into the trap of discussing Boori Pryor's techniques as an oral storyteller rather than the narrative techniques of the text itself. *Tales from the Blackboard* was the least well-handled text.

Better candidates effectively demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of narrative techniques, and could apply that equally to their set text and to a piece of related material, with examples and concise explanations of their effectiveness. Such candidates did not simply retell the story.

Many candidates were clearly challenged by the necessity to treat one piece of related material to a similar depth as their set text. Some appeared to be unaware of the necessity of responding using related material.

Other candidates found the concept of writing a radio conversation equally challenging. A significant number of candidates spent too much time 'setting up' the radio interview concept, taking a page or two before the concept of narrative techniques was addressed. Candidates who did not write a conversation but wrote an essay instead, were unable to demonstrate the full range of their ability to write for a specific audience, purpose and context.

Candidates who chose a composer and text they had studied in another section of the course as related material often had enormous difficulty discussing this text's narrative techniques — especially if the chosen text was not particularly narrative.

A significant number of candidates wrote about story structure ie Orientation, Complication, Sequence/Series of Events, and Resolution as their only understanding of narrative technique. This severely limited some otherwise able candidates.

Candidates need to be aware that preparation of related text is essential for this question, and that thorough knowledge of the set text and related material, including identifying the composer, will be required. Candidates also need to be adept at writing in different text-forms. Better candidates avoided related material such as songs, cartoons, paintings and newspaper articles, which offered little opportunity to discuss narrative technique.

In general, better candidates wrote a well-integrated conversation between two composers, whereas weaker candidates tended to construct an interview with a radio presenter, or an exposition punctuated by the odd comment. Again, the skill of writing in different text-forms is important. It is noteworthy that the overall literacy level of candidates was sound.

## Question 2 – Dialogue

*The Club* was the dominant text in this elective and proved the most accessible to this candidature. *Stolen* and *Komninos by the Kupful* presented difficulties for weaker candidates. When dealing with *Stolen* candidates relied on recount of events rather than an analysis of dialogue while candidates who had studied *Komninos* seemed to have little understanding of dialogue. Weaker candidates who selected poetry frequently tried to discuss all five poems but focused on content rather than dialogue.

The better candidates successfully engaged with the concept of the relationship between voices but weaker candidates had difficulty understanding the term ‘voices’ and resorted to analysis of characters. The best responses provided a clear understanding of voices, dialogue and relationships. Many candidates gave a traditional close study of text response which hampered their ability to demonstrate an understanding of the concept of dialogue. Candidates need to ensure that their focus in this elective is the concept, not only the text.

There were candidates who were literate, fluent and knowledgeable but who did not engage with the question and focused instead on the more traditional areas of character analysis, themes and content. Weaker candidates often did not understand the concept of ‘voice’ and took a literal interpretation eg a loud or soft voice.

Knowledge of the prescribed text was generally detailed. Better responses included relevant and appropriate scenes or characters which best demonstrated the question. The listing of various features of dialogue eg tone, pitch, volume was not successful unless it was clearly linked to the question. Many candidates were able to discuss the techniques of dialogue but were unable to make the connection to relationships.

Related texts must be used in this elective. Better responses discussed at least two related texts and were able to successfully incorporate their related texts into their response. Weaker candidates had difficulty in selecting appropriate related texts and appropriate examples within those texts to demonstrate how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue. It was evident that a number of candidates had been exposed to a range of film and television texts in this elective but had not been guided to specifically focus on dialogue and what the dialogue did. It is important to expose candidates to related texts that clearly and successfully demonstrate features of dialogue and its effect. Candidates need to be given guidance in their choice and use of related texts.

## Question 3 – Image

In ‘Image’, the majority of candidates chose the *Truman Show*, the second most popular text was *Strictly Ballroom*, while *When the Wind Blows* was marginally more popular than *Inside Black Australia*. Of all the texts, *Inside Black Australia* was the least well handled.

Candidates with the best responses were extremely proficient in language and used two or more pieces of related material. The best candidates emphasised ‘how’ images shape the responder’s perceptions and established clear, strong connections between technique, image, world and responder. The better responses were more sophisticated with a broad concept of understanding of image across all texts. Better candidates addressed the ‘how’ in the question and were conversant with a variety of techniques appropriate to the medium of the text. Their responses were both informed and analytical and the better candidates were able to integrate and synthesise their responses in a sustained and well-structured manner. Better candidates not only demonstrated a

highly developed understanding of how composers use image but were able to incorporate their personal responses to the worlds created.

In better responses, the more able candidates, who used film as related text, analysed two or three scenes in detail rather than the film as a whole. Better poetry candidates concentrated in depth on two or three poems.

Thorough knowledge of both the set text and related material is a requirement of this module. Better candidates not only had a better choice of related material but were also able to demonstrate a more convincing personal response. These candidates did not confine themselves to related texts, which had obviously been taught as class texts. Less able candidates referred to related materials in a very shallow and superficial way, generally describing or listing images in the text without analysing the images. Some candidates were limited to referring to the Stimulus Booklet and or other prescribed HSC texts.

Weaker candidates had a very narrow or limited understanding of the concept of image. Some focused on describing character as image and frequently linked materials by theme rather than image. Some candidates treated their text in a more traditional manner concentrating on textual analysis rather than focusing on the concept of image. Weaker candidates often were unable to use the language of film necessary for analysis of technique used to create image in the films studied.

Weaker candidates often used one or no related texts or used related texts poorly. Where related material was referred to, it was often too brief and tacked on as an afterthought at the end of an often lengthy narrative recount of the prescribed text. Choice of related text was frequently inappropriate.

Weaker candidates who selected the poetry text frequently tried to discuss all six poems but focused on content rather than how image/world was constructed and shaped.

There was a general concern that some candidates may have disadvantaged themselves in the other modules by writing excessively long responses in this first question. The literacy level of the candidature in general was very pleasing.

## **Section II – Module B: Close Study of Text**

### **General Comments**

Overall, candidates were familiar with their texts.

In the Standard Course knowledge of the ideas only, is insufficient. All candidates preparing for a close study of literature need to be aware of the techniques used by the composer and how those techniques shape meaning.

Candidates must be prepared to write in a variety of forms in an examination of this type.

## **Question 4 – Drama**

### **Specific Comments**

#### **Strengths**

Candidates with the best responses appeared to be familiar with their chosen text. They had personally engaged with the text, even if they had difficulty responding to aspects of the question.

The small number of candidates who responded to the *Navigating* text generally handled the question well. The responses were well expressed and well structured.

#### **Weaknesses**

Weaker candidates had difficulty engaging with the question and confused the term ‘dramatic techniques’ with ‘language techniques’, ‘film techniques’ or ‘theatrical techniques’.

They often had difficulty structuring their personal letter or essay response appropriately and often chose an inappropriate register in which to write.

#### **(a) Katherine Thomson, *Navigating***

The cost of whistleblowing was a central issue in the play and was easily accessible to candidates.

The text itself has a large number of dramatic techniques eg soundscape, stage directions, that candidates were able to use well.

The challenge for candidates was in linking dramatic techniques to the cost of whistleblowing to the individual.

#### **(b) John Misto, *The Shoe-Horn Sonata***

Better responses were able to sustain the personal tone of a letter to a friend and through the letter form convey an analysis of the challenges of performing a role.

Many candidates wrote chatty letters or creative pieces that did not sufficiently demonstrate close study of the text eg ‘I was nervous before the show’; ‘It was hard to learn my lines’.

Weaker responses showed ability to recount the plot of the play to their friend.

**(c) William Shakespeare, *Macbeth***

*Macbeth* was the most popular text in this section. Many of the candidates responding to this question struggled with the complexity of a Shakespearian play.

A number of candidates confused their viewing of film versions of *Macbeth* with the actual text. These candidates gave in to the temptation of discussing film techniques rather than dramatic techniques in conjunction with a discussion of the relationship between Macbeth and the women of the play.

Weaker responses simply retold the story or presented prepared responses on the themes of the play.

**Question 5 – Prose Fiction**

**General Comments**

Sound knowledge of both texts and of narrative techniques was clearly evident and generally candidate responses were of good length and depth.

**Specific Comments**

**(a) Robert Cormier, *We All Fall Down***

Better responses were able to sustain the use of the speech form and they showed understanding of a range of narrative devices.

Many candidates concentrated on incident and character ignoring other relevant narrative techniques. A number of these responses either struggled with the requirements of a speech or presented essay style responses.

The speech form of Question 5(a) allowed many candidates to convey a really strong and enthusiastic enjoyment of the Cormier novel.

**(b) James Yolán, *Briar Rose***

Better responses focused on discussing different types of journeys, including the journey of the responder. These responses sustained a focus on the question and sustained their use of the speech form.

A number of responses did not address all the requirements of the question, choosing to present an exploration of use of the fairytale rather than the idea of journey.

Weaker responses presented a loose collection of ideas without due consideration to structure and the importance of including relevant supporting evidence in relation to the set question.

Candidates need to avoid the temptation to simply present a list of literary terms. To do so shows little understanding of their effect.

## Question 6 – Nonfiction, Film, Media or Multimedia

### General Comments

#### Strengths

- Most responses were sound and showed familiarity with their chosen text.
- *Witness* question was accessible to most candidates who attempted it.

#### Weaknesses

- Some candidates presented poorly adapted prepared responses to ‘clash of cultures’ in *Witness*.
- Candidates need to be taught techniques and how they are used.
- Tendency to recount.
- Poor use of the required form eg ‘review’.
- Many candidates knew techniques but could not link to the question asked eg response to character, interactivity or engagement.
- Many candidates listed details in their introduction, taking too long to unpack the question and respond to it.

#### (a) Film – Peter Weir, *Witness*

*Witness* was the most popular text answered in this question.

Better responses had a sound grasp of filmic techniques and their impact in influencing a personal response to character.

Weaker responses did not address all aspects of the question and overlooked the importance of a personal response. A number of these candidates showed limited knowledge of the text as they referred to the first few scenes only.

#### (b) Nonfiction – Gordon Matthews, *An Australian Son*

Very few candidates attempted the question *An Australian Son*. Those who did not demonstrate their engagement with the text had problems responding to the question.

There was little understanding of the construction of the text, with only elementary knowledge of nonfiction techniques.

#### (c) Multimedia – *Australian War Memorial Website*

Many candidates could list features of a website but many of these features were generic and not specific to the website selected for study.

Better responses referred to specific examples from website and the best responses could link them to the example of war.

Candidates needed to include in their response reference to the ‘feedback’ section as an example of interactivity.

## Question 7 – Poetry

### General Comments

This question allowed candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the poetry they had studied. Better responses were rewarded for their ability to demonstrate particular insight into the distinctive qualities of the texts. Better candidates were also able to explore ideas and poetic techniques perceptively and skilfully.

Weaker responses did not demonstrate a sound understanding of the techniques and ideas in the poetry. They had problems in organising and developing their responses and exhibited weaknesses in expression.

### Composing a Critical Response for Poetry

It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates used quotations. However, only a few integrated these effectively into their responses.

Most candidates focused on the first element of the rubric, ie distinctive qualities of text, at the expense of the second element eg language appropriate to audience, purpose and form.

Candidates' responses were generally in essay form. The introductions and conclusions to the essays were too often dull and predictable. Only some candidates were able to structure an effective critical response. Others relied on story-telling of the content and on simple explanation rather than critical analysis.

### Specific Comments

#### (a) Debbie Westbury

Whilst the Debbie Westbury question appeared relatively straightforward, candidates could not analyse the poetry very well and their responses were often simplistic and descriptive. Most candidates neglected to deal adequately with all aspects of the question – ideas, techniques; the 'what' and the 'how'. On too many occasions, candidates misread and/or misinterpreted *the prince* and *The Scribe's Daughter*.

#### (b) Wilfred Owen

For this question many candidates used pre-prepared material that did not address the question on the 'horror' of war. Their focus was the 'pity' of war. Many of the poorer candidates found the subject of war accessible and were able to attempt a discussion of Wilfred Owen's poetic techniques and ideas about war. A large number of candidates did not make any attempt to address the idea of 'the power of poetry' beyond mentioning the word 'power'. The better Wilfred Owen responses showed depth of analysis and personal engagement with the poetry.



## **Section III – Module C: Texts and Society**

### **Introduction**

The demands of the questions in Module C presented a considerable challenge for the English (Standard) candidature. The complex layers within the questions required candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a particular elective through synthesis of a range of texts for an imagined audience in a specific context. As in previous years, the marking guidelines accommodated a range of ways for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding of their chosen elective.

### **Candidates' Responses**

The majority of candidates responded to Question 10: Consumerism. There was limited evidence of uptake of the newly prescribed texts set for study.

The better candidates displayed a thorough knowledge of the set texts and were able to integrate original and appropriate related material in a report. They demonstrated a strong understanding of the relationship between audience, purpose and situation. Effective synthesis of ideas and evidence were key discriminators in the A and B ranges. Most candidates made a genuine effort to respond to what they believed the question asked.

Candidates were required to shape their response in the context of a workplace report. A large number of candidates found it difficult to sustain a report form throughout their response, lapsing at times into an analysis of the prescribed text. Weaker candidates had difficulty in understanding what the question was asking them to do and commonly struggled with addressing the 'how' element, particularly in Elective C 'Consumerism'.

Many displayed little understanding of a workplace document and/or a report format. A significant weakness was the inability of many candidates to synthesise their ideas and evidence within the parameters of the question. This was related in part to the use of inappropriate related material that was clearly not a text of a candidate's own choosing. For many candidates there was an over-reliance on recount of content rather than addressing the central requirements of the question.

### **Texts of Candidates' Own Choosing**

Better candidates presented a well-chosen range of types of texts that elaborated the view adopted in the report. These candidates had prepared individually chosen texts that linked appropriately and effectively to the elective. Poorer responses tended to sequentially recount the content of each text rather than provide a synthesis of their texts.

## English (Advanced) Paper 2 – Modules

### Section I – Module A: Comparative Study of Texts and Context

#### General Comments

##### Strengths

Candidates showed genuine engagement with the requirements of the module demonstrated by their ability to interpret the demands of the question. This involved a complex balance of rubric, module, text, context and question. Most responses were lengthy and detailed in their knowledge of texts. Better responses showed a sophisticated and insightful understanding of concepts, ideas and values. The better responses were able to develop and sustain a strong, clear thesis supported by relevant textual evidence. A distinguishing characteristic of these responses was the skilful evaluation of language forms, features and structures of texts. Those candidates who responded to film texts showed a knowledgeable grasp of the language of film. Good responses displayed substantial discussion of both texts, despite the question foregrounding one text eg Question 1. Many responses were fluent and articulate, drawing on an extensive vocabulary and reflecting the terminology of the new syllabus.

##### Weaknesses

Some candidates wrote prepared responses ignoring the demands of the question in the examination. Weaker responses neglected the requirements of the rubric. They also demonstrated a superficial understanding of the concepts of the module. Linking between the texts was also simplistic. These responses frequently listed parallels between texts without elaboration. The weakest responses offered fragmented and disjointed arguments, which often lapsed into recount. The lower range neglected to identify and discuss language forms and features. A weakness was a lack of balance in the response, eg a discussion of *Clueless* with little understanding of *Emma* or focusing on context at the expense of textual discussion.

#### Specific Comments

##### Question 1 – Elective 1: Transformations

The question allowed the candidates to establish the relationship between the two texts, their contexts and the concept of transformation. Better responses were able to clearly articulate the way that language forms, features and structures shape and influence meaning. They were characterised by a balanced approach to texts and an integrated discussion of text and context.

In the upper range, responses dealt with the concept of transformation as part of their thesis. They were fluent and original in their approach, and included sophisticated and sustained arguments with detailed textual reference. They demonstrated an ability to focus on the question, and to skilfully select appropriate material to support their argument. Better responses clearly addressed the demands of the rubric.

Weaker responses presented the texts as ‘adaptations’ or ‘modern versions’ reflecting a superficial understanding of the nature of transformation. Weaker responses often dealt with each text separately, drawing limited parallels in the opening and closing paragraphs. They often explored the earlier text in insufficient detail and generally selected the more obvious examples from the contemporary text. Weaker answers often tended to ignore language forms and features. They also

relied on sweeping generalisations about text, rubric, context and elective, presenting limited and inaccurate ideas.

Overall the candidates demonstrated sound literacy skills which allowed them to attempt to come to terms with the demands of the elective and write an appropriate interpretive response.

### **Question 2 – Elective 2: In the Wild**

The question allowed the candidates to effectively demonstrate what they learned in this module, particularly with regard to the rubric for ‘In the Wild’. Better responses explored this open question developing their own definitions of the key terms, ie ‘humanity’, ‘natural world’ and ‘tension’.

In the top range of answers candidates saw that humans had ‘natural’ and ‘artificial’ aspects and that within ‘humanity’ there were degrees of tension between humans and the natural world. In the weaker responses the lack of definition manifested itself in simplistic divisions between eg natives and Europeans, eg *The Explorers* and *The Tempest* or simplistic views of John the Savage as a representative of all that is good in nature, *Brave New World* and *Bladerunner*.

This question did not direct candidates to an explicit discussion of context. However, candidates should be aware that context is a focus of Module A ‘Comparative Study of Texts and Context’ and the rubric on the examination paper. Better responses treated context explicitly while others merely discussed context through attitudes and values. Top-range responses integrated their knowledge of context with discussion of the relationships between texts as well as discussion of language forms and features. The word ‘how’ in the question clearly required a discussion of technique.

A few candidates chose to write in an inappropriate type of text such as narrative, feature article, which did not allow them to address the evaluative and analytical requirements of the question adequately. Overall, candidate responses indicated an engagement with the spirit of the module.

## **Section II – Module B: Critical Study of Texts**

### **General Comments**

The majority of candidates answered Questions 4 and 5 *King Lear*, *Donne* and *Plath*. Smaller proportions answered Question 5 on *Sylvia Plath*, Question 3 on *In the Skin of a Lion*, *Jane Eyre* and *Cloudstreet*, and Question 7 – Speeches. A very small percentage answered Question 10, *Wild Swans* and only a handful answered Question 6 on *Dr Faustus* or *Citizen Kane* and Questions 8 and 9.

Markers were impressed by the high literacy level of candidates undertaking Advanced English, and the comprehensive nature of the candidates’ responses both in terms of length and detail. Considering the larger candidature in the Advanced Course, markers found little evidence of candidates struggling with the demands of the texts and the questions.

Candidates were most successful in their responses when they showed a sound understanding of the requirements of the question, and specifically addressed the rubric assessment criteria. The questions did not limit the capacity of candidates to write about their chosen text. Some candidates allowed a narrow focus on the critical readings of others to prevent them from engaging with the literature themselves. The importance of evaluating critical readings in a discerning manner, and responding to the literature and these readings from a personal perspective, was evident in the

higher achievement levels. The syllabus statements for Critical Study of Texts indicate clearly the scope and balance required in the study of this module. The highest quality responses demonstrated a confident capacity to engage with the demands of the question and the requirements of the rubric assessment criteria in an integrated way, while also communicating in a fluent and sophisticated style. Less capable responses either leant towards a presentation of other critical viewpoints with variable links to the demands of the question, or presented a more prepared type of response with little attention to the rubric requirements or the specifics of the question.

## Specific Comments

### Question 3 – Prose Fiction

In this question there was evidence of some very sophisticated responses by candidates who studied *In the Skin of a Lion*, although some candidates did not focus sufficiently on the ending of the novel as required. The use of a discussion-style response brought an enthusiastic engagement with the question from a significant number of candidates. While there were some competent responses to *Cloudstreet*, many candidates did not engage with the breadth and depth of the novel's issues and ideas, or merely selected a few religious or overtly symbolic aspects to explore. Candidates who answered using the text *Jane Eyre* showed variable control of the novel's ideas and issues, as well as critical responses to the text.

### Question 4 – William Shakespeare

The *King Lear* question was extremely complex and challenging with three distinct elements to synthesise. Some candidates confused 'readings' with 'productions' and found 'chaos and order' a very specific and difficult element to deal with in relation to the concepts of 'dramatisation' and 'productions'. The best answers skilfully integrated the elements of the question in their responses.

Stronger candidates had a clear understanding of 'productions' and were able to discuss either productions they had seen as film/video experiences or theatre productions. These candidates linked their knowledge of the productions specifically to the idea of chaos and order, usually giving an overview of that concern followed by a detailed discussion of key scenes which exemplified specifically the nature of the struggle between chaos and order. Many candidates discussed notional productions, focusing on the term 'might' in the question, and discussed how an imagined production could present the struggle between chaos and order. Candidates who examined the underlying concern with chaos and order throughout the play rather than focus on details of props, costume etc were able to demonstrate a wider vision and develop a more cohesive thesis for their response.

Better responses were able to demonstrate how a particular reading could manifest itself in a production of the play. Weaker responses substituted 'reading' for 'production' and this limited their essays considerably. The majority of responses were literate with a very good knowledge of the play and a strong understanding of the nature of critical study of text. They demonstrated a good understanding of the text being open to a variety of interpretations and these interpretations manifesting themselves in different productions over the past 400 years.

### **Question 5 – Poetry**

In the *Donne* and *Plath* question, many candidates were inclined to simplistic portrayals of ‘feminist’ or ‘Marxist’ readings of the texts, and this led to some difficulties in fully exploring the requirements of the question. Many candidates had not personally engaged with the literature, and so showed a limited appreciation of, or insight into, other critical responses to the literature over time. Some candidates found difficulty in unpacking the question’s specific elements, sometimes avoiding the issue of ‘personal voice’, or the aspects of ‘emotional and intellectual responses’. The ‘how’ element of the question eluded many candidates, who concentrated on other readings they had encountered during their studies.

### **Question 6 – Drama or Film**

The Drama or Film question brought few responses, and a significant number of candidates had difficulty in relating the requirements of the question to the assessment criteria within the rubric. This question did not explicitly invite engagement with the rubric, and a substantial number of candidates did not address the second rubric point. There was generally a sound knowledge of the film’s contents and issues among those more able candidates who focused on *Citizen Kane*.

### **Question 7 – Nonfiction – Speeches**

Most candidates understood what was being asked of them and tended to discuss the original context of the speech and the enduring qualities of both the content and the rhetoric of the speeches. There was some tendency to discuss content and context at the expense of the ‘how’ part of the question which suggested a focus on ‘rhetorical technique’. There was a strong correlation between facility with expression, understanding of the texts and focus on the question.

Better responses examined the original contexts of the selected speeches, placing them within a sociopolitical frame and commented on how the subject matter was still relevant, but usually placed a great deal of emphasis on the ‘how’ of the question. These responses examined rhetorical technique in detail, examining the construction of argument and the use of language. Candidates chose a wide variety of speeches, usually limiting themselves to a discussion of two, or occasionally three. Most argued that the speeches were ‘great’ though some argued that one of their examples was a great speech contrasting it to another speech which they did not feel belonged to the category of ‘great’ and arguing their case.

Weaker responses tended to paraphrase the content of the speech with little examination of rhetorical technique or spent too much time on the original context of the speeches without developing their argument into a consideration of contemporary or other contexts. The weaker responses also tended to be rather mechanistic in their analysis of rhetoric, offering a list of techniques in their attempt to discuss the ‘how’ of the question.

Most responses tended to divide their argument into a ‘then’ and ‘now’ dichotomy. Each of two speeches was discussed in its original context then discussed as having continued relevance to modern times. Some better responses tended to look in more generalised terms at the enduring, transcendent qualities of the speeches indicating that they would continue to endure and to speak to future generations.

### **Question 8 – Multimedia – *ATSIC Website***

*ATSIC Website* responses were very few in number but candidates were able to evaluate the texts, melding content and form in their discussions. Some candidates perhaps dwelt too long on generalisations about websites and hypertexts at the expense of specific discussion of the prescribed texts.

The *ATSIC Website* responses demonstrated a good understanding of the various forms a review could take. Candidates adopted a range of ‘voices’ from the youthful and technologically ‘hip’ to the more academic and staid. The strongest responses were focused consistently on the evaluative function of the review, examining the website’s content and form in considerable detail. When these responses discussed websites generally they related such a discussion specifically to the *ATSIC website*’s strengths or shortcomings. There was a sophisticated understanding of how the technology, design and functioning of a website could impact on the user and how these elements were integral to the presentation of content. Stronger responses also analysed content of the site and examined perceived strengths, weaknesses and biases in the material.

Weaker responses, whilst adhering to the review format, were far more descriptive, giving details of content or functioning with little or no evaluation of effectiveness. The weakest responses discussed the five listed sections of the site giving an overview of their content with little analysis or evaluation of form or content.

### **Question 9 – Multimedia – Deena Larsen, *Samplers: Nine Vicious Little Hypertexts***

*Samplers* responses were very few in number but the strongest presented a clear and sophisticated evaluation of the co-creation of meaning. They synthesised discussion of content and form and demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of the nature of hypertext. There was a good deal of evaluation of the effectiveness of this ‘sealed’ or close-ended hypertext with a finite number of productive paths to travel.

Weaker responses spent a good deal of time on generalisations about hypertext which did not lead specifically back to a close analysis of *Samplers*. The weakest responses merely recounted how a particular ‘story’ or ‘stories’ could be formulated and reformulated, without any evaluation of how effectively responders could participate in the creation of meaning.

### **Question 10 – Nonfiction – Jung Chang, *Wild Swans***

Able candidates included a discussion on the reception of *Wild Swans* in different contexts in their answer. Some candidates indicated an imperfect understanding of the concept of ‘personal voice’ which limited their response.

Stronger responses clearly understood the concept of personal voice and examined how the writer’s construction of the text shaped the reader’s response. They were aware of the difficulties in categorising the text as a historical/biographical/autobiographical/fictional piece and the complexities produced by the interplay of these elements. They usually indicated an awareness of the author’s biases in the selection and relation of material. Some commented on the text’s presentation ie graphics, maps, cover, blurb etc and the way that played a role in shaping reader response.

Most responses used a chronological structure, discussing each generation of the family as a different historical and/or social context. Weaker responses relied on recount giving factual detail of

each generation with little or no analysis of the historical and social context and no discussion of how the reader's response is being shaped by the personal voice. The weakest responses showed little understanding of the term 'personal voice' and little awareness of issues of genre.

### **Section III – Module C: Representation and Text**

#### **General Comments on the Question**

The speech format for the three questions allowed for a consistency of approach and allowed the candidates to explore a different, non-essay response. This did allow for greater creativity. The 'you' aspect of the questions meant that candidates had to adopt a persona to introduce their exhibition and most candidates were able to do this.

Generally, candidates were able to compose a speech with an awareness of the conventions of speech making. A greeting or opening address and an effective closing to the speech were evident. The better responses also attempted to engage the audience throughout with questioning techniques or conversational asides. There was less differentiation in the speech aspect of the question than in the other two criteria.

Most candidates produced a literate response, revealing an understanding of the fundamentals of writing ie paragraphing and sentence construction; the use of inverted commas for quotations. The better responses showed sophistication in language and an ability to discuss the question with an abstract understanding.

'Explain how the exhibition reflects' was a clear instruction and was dealt with effectively by most candidates.

Responses generally dealt with the concept 'Representation and Text' quite well. The majority of candidates revealed an understanding of their set text. It was evident that many candidates' strength was in a thematic understanding of the text. However, this was often not balanced by a deep understanding of the techniques used to represent meaning in the set text.

Candidates needed to show clearer links between the set text and related texts in their analysis. Many discussions were superficial in terms of revealing the 'relationships' between texts. The syllabus states: 'Each elective in this module requires the study of one prescribed text offering a representation of an event, personality or situation'. Candidates are also required to supplement this study with texts of their own choosing which provide a variety of representations of that event, personality or situation. Candidates need to be made aware that responding to related texts to some depth is important if they are to be able to show how representation through texts shapes the meaning.

## General Comments on the Responses

The better candidates had obviously closely looked at the rubric for the question and had read the question carefully, noting the keyword ‘how’. They were then able to construct a sophisticated response that acknowledged the key elements of how texts use representation to express meaning and show the composer’s point of view. These responses were able to integrate the discussion of the techniques the composers use to represent a point of view.

Weaker responses relied on the essay format, tacking on a ‘Welcome, Ladies and Gentlemen’ and then writing a traditional essay. Some gave the impression that they were prepared responses, thus they did not address the requirements of the actual question.

A significant weakness was in the analysis of techniques. Many candidates could offer an overview or list of techniques but these were not effectively analysed in terms of the texts. It was essential that candidates then developed this understanding through direct reference to the texts. A number of candidates did not acknowledge the actual composer but saw the characters in the texts as the composers. For example, it was stated that ‘Antony was an excellent orator and persuasive speaker’ rather than ‘Shakespeare employs the technique of persuasive language in order to heighten the powerplay between his characters’.

Candidates who demonstrated clear understanding of the module were often those who understood the need for a clear balance between the set text and the related texts. They did not try to cover too many episodes in *Frontline* or too many of Ted Hughes’ poems. They concentrated on two or three examples from the set text and did so in a very thorough way. This allowed them to integrate their related texts more effectively and in the depth that was required to show a full understanding of the nature of this module.

Timing may have been an issue for many candidates. As this was the last question in the second paper, there were signs that candidates had not allowed sufficient time for a complete response. This was especially evident when candidates treated only one related text when the question clearly stated ‘related texts’ and did so in a very superficial way.



# English (Standard) and (Advanced) Paper 1

## 2001 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
1 (a) (i)	1	Area of Study	H4, H5, H6
1 (a) (ii)	2	Area of Study	H4, H5, H6
1 (b)	3	Area of Study	H4, H5
1 (c)	3	Area of Study	H4, H5, H6
1 (d)	6	Area of Study	H2, H4, H5, H6, H10
2	15	Area of Study	H8, H10, H11
3	15	Area of Study	H1, H2, H3, H4, H8, H10, H13

**2001 HSC**  
**English (Standard) and English (Advanced)**  
**Paper 1 — Area of Study**  
**Marking Guidelines**

**Section I**

**Question 1 (a) (i) (1 mark)**

*Outcomes assessed: H4, H5, H6*

**MARKING GUIDELINES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
• Identification of ONE way the father changes in the visual text	1

**Question 1 (a) (ii) (2 marks)**

*Outcomes assessed: H4, H5, H6*

**MARKING GUIDELINES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
• Explanation of how TWO visual features are used to represent the change in the father	2
• Explains how ONE visual feature is used to represent change in the father OR • Describes or identifies TWO visual features representing change in the father	1

**Section I (continued)****Question 1 (b) (3 marks)***Outcomes assessed: H4, H5***MARKING GUIDELINES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Explains how TWO or more techniques are used by the speaker to represent her vision of change</li></ul>	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identifies and describes TWO techniques used by the speaker to represent her vision of change</li></ul>	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identifies and describes ONE or more techniques with no explanation of how the techniques are used by the speaker to represent her vision of change OR</li><li>Identifies and discusses ONE technique showing understanding of how the technique is used OR</li><li>Describes the speaker's vision of change without identifying techniques</li></ul>	1

**Question 1 (c) (3 marks)***Outcomes assessed: H4, H5, H6***MARKING GUIDELINES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Explains how changes in the children are represented through appropriate reference(s) to the text</li></ul>	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Explains in a limited way how changes in the children are represented using some appropriate reference to the text</li></ul>	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Describes/outlines changes in the children</li></ul>	1

**Section I (continued)****Question 1 (d) (6 marks)***Outcomes assessed: H2, H4, H5, H6, H10***MARKING GUIDELINES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of how the connections between youth and change are made in each text</li><li>• Writes a critical, personal response supported by appropriate references and aspects of all three texts</li></ul>	5 – 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of how the connections between youth and change are made in each text</li><li>• Writes a critical, personal response supported by references to aspects of the texts</li></ul>	3 – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of how the connections between youth and change are made in each text</li><li>• Writes a response which communicates simple ideas and information about the texts</li></ul>	1 – 2

## Section II

### Question 2 (15 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Composes skilfully a story on the concept of change</li><li>Demonstrates sophisticated control of language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	13 – 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Composes competently a story on the concept of change</li><li>Demonstrates well developed control of language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	10 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Composes a story on the concept of change</li><li>Demonstrates control of language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	7 – 9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Composes a limited story on the concept of change</li><li>Demonstrates variable control of language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	4 – 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Attempts to compose a story with limited control of language</li></ul>	1 – 3

## Section III

### Question 3 (15 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H2, H3, H4, H8, H10, H13*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a highly developed understanding of the consequences of change using a variety of appropriate texts in a discerning way</li><li>• Explains skilfully how various composers use techniques to shape responders' understanding of the consequences of change</li><li>• Composes a synthesised and effective critical personal response using language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	13 – 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a developed understanding of the consequences of change through the use of a variety of appropriate texts</li><li>• Explains effectively how various composers use techniques to shape responders' understanding of the consequences of change</li><li>• Composes an effective critical personal response with some synthesis using language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	10 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a sound understanding of the consequences of change through the use of a variety of texts</li><li>• Explains competently how various composers use some techniques to shape the consequences of change</li><li>• Composes a sound critical and/or personal response attempting to use some language appropriate to audience, purpose and context</li></ul>	7 – 9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a limited understanding of the consequences of change</li><li>• Understanding of change with limited reference to consequences of change.</li><li>• Uses a narrow range of texts to demonstrate a limited understanding of the consequences of change</li></ul>	4 – 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrate an elementary understanding of the concept of change</li><li>• Composes a limited personal response</li></ul>	1 – 3

# English (Standard)

## Paper 2

### 2001 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
1	20	Experience Through Language – Telling Stories	H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11
2	20	Experience Through Language – Dialogue	H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11
3	20	Experience Through Language – Image	H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11
4	20	Close Study of Text – Drama	H1, H4, H6, H8
5 (a)	20	Close Study of Text – Prose Fiction	H1, H4, H6, H8
5 (b)	20	Close Study of Text – Prose Fiction	H1, H4, H6, H8
6 (a)	20	Close Study of Text – Film	H1, H4, H6, H8
6 (b)	20	Close Study of Text – Nonfiction	H1, H4, H6, H8
6 (c)	20	Close Study of Text – Multimedia	H1, H4, H6, H8
7 (a)	20	Close Study of Text – Poetry	H1, H4, H6, H8
7 (b)	20	Close Study of Text – Poetry	H1, H4, H6, H8
8	20	Texts and Society – The Institution and Personal Experience	H1, H2, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11
9	20	Texts and Society – Exploration and Travel	H1, H2, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11
10	20	Texts and Society – Consumerism	H1, H2, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11



**2001 HSC  
English (Standard)  
Paper 2 — Modules  
Marking Guidelines**



## Section I — Module A: Experience Through Language

### Question 1 — Elective 1: Telling Stories (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows highly developed understanding of how relationships between composers, responders, texts and context shape perceptions of others and the world</li> <li>Demonstrates an insightful understanding of the use of narrative techniques and their effects</li> <li>Uses language and form skilfully to establish context, purpose and engage audience</li> <li>Composes an imaginative conversation to skilfully present both composers' use of narrative techniques to shape meaning</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a developed understanding of how relationships between composers, responders, texts and context shape perceptions of others and the world</li> <li>Demonstrates an informed understanding of the use of narrative techniques and their effects</li> <li>Uses language and form effectively to establish context, purpose and engage audience</li> <li>Composes an imaginative conversation to effectively present both composers' use of narrative techniques to shape meaning</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a sound understanding of how relationships between composers, responders, texts and context shape perceptions of others and the world</li> <li>Demonstrates a sound understanding of the use of narrative techniques</li> <li>Uses language and form adequately to establish context, purpose and engage audience</li> <li>Composes a conversation to competently present both composers' use of narrative techniques</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a limited understanding of how relationships between composers, responders, texts and context shape perceptions of others and the world</li> <li>Demonstrates a limited understanding of narrative techniques</li> <li>Uses language and form inconsistently in relation to context, purpose and audience</li> <li>Composes a limited conversation to present both composers' use of narrative techniques</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows an elementary understanding of how relationships between composers, responders, texts and context shape perceptions of others and the world</li> <li>Makes limited reference to narrative techniques</li> <li>Attempts to use language and form in relation to context, purpose and audience</li> <li>Composes an elementary conversation</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section I (continued)

### Question 2 — Elective 2: Dialogue (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows highly developed understanding of how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue</li> <li>Demonstrates insightful understanding of the composers' use of dialogue</li> <li>Uses language and form skilfully to construct an informed and interpretive response</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows developed understanding of how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue</li> <li>Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the composers' use of dialogue</li> <li>Uses language and form effectively to construct an informed and interpretive response</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a sound understanding of how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue</li> <li>Demonstrates sound understanding of the composers' use of dialogue</li> <li>Uses language and form competently to construct an interpretive response</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a limited understanding of how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue</li> <li>Demonstrates limited understanding of the composers' use of dialogue</li> <li>Uses simple language and inconsistent form to construct an interpretive response</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows an elementary understanding of how relationships between different voices are shaped through dialogue</li> <li>Demonstrates elementary understanding of the composers' use of dialogue</li> <li>Attempts to construct response with some relevance</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section I (continued)

### Question 3 — Elective 3: Image (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates highly developed understanding of how composers use images to shape responses to the worlds presented in texts</li> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of the composers' use of images</li> <li>• Uses language and form skilfully to compose an informed and analytical response</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a developed understanding of how composers use images to shape responses to the worlds presented in texts</li> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the composers' use of images</li> <li>• Uses language and form effectively to compose an informed and analytical response</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a sound understanding of how composers use images to shape responses to the worlds presented in texts</li> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the composers' use of images</li> <li>• Uses language and form competently to compose an analytical response</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a limited understanding of how composers use images to shape responses to the worlds presented in texts</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of the composers' use of images</li> <li>• Uses simple language and inconsistent form to compose an analytical response</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates an elementary understanding of how composers use images to shape responses to the worlds presented in texts</li> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of the composers' use of images</li> <li>• Attempts to compose a response with some relevance</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section II — Module B: Close Study of Text

### Question 4 — Drama (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H6, H8*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of how ideas in the play are developed through dramatic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas skilfully using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with sustained skill and flair</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of how ideas in the play are developed through dramatic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas effectively using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with competence and some flair</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of how ideas in the play are developed through dramatic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas competently with some sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with variable control</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of some of the qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of ideas in the play which may have some reference to dramatic techniques</li> <li>• Attempts to organise, develop and express ideas with limited sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with limited control</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of some of the ideas in the play</li> <li>• Refers to some aspects of the text</li> <li>• Expresses ideas with little sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with elementary control</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section II (continued)

### Question 5 — Prose Fiction (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H6, H8*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of how ideas in the novel are developed through narrative techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas skilfully using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with sustained skill and flair</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of how ideas in the novel are developed through narrative techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas effectively using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with competence and some flair</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of how ideas in the novel are developed through narrative techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas competently with some sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with variable control</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of some of the qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of ideas in the novel which may have some reference to narrative techniques</li> <li>• Attempts to organise, develop and express ideas with limited sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with limited control</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of some of the ideas in the novel</li> <li>• Refers to some aspects of the text</li> <li>• Expresses ideas with little sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with elementary control</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section II (continued)

### Question 6 — Nonfiction, Film, Media or Multimedia (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H6, H8*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of how the composer uses the medium of production to shape responses to the text</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas skilfully using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with sustained skill and flair</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of how the composer uses the medium of production to shape responses the text</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas effectively using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with competence and some flair</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of how the composer uses the medium of production to shape responses to the text</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas competently with some sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with variable control</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of some of the qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of the composer's use of the medium of production to shape responses to the text</li> <li>• Attempts to organise, develop and express ideas with limited sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with limited control</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of some of aspects of the medium of production</li> <li>• Refers to some aspects of the text</li> <li>• Expresses ideas with little sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical, interpretive or imaginative response with elementary control</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section II (continued)

### Question 7 — Poetry (20 marks)

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H4, H6, H8*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates insightful understanding of how ideas are explored through the use of poetic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas skilfully using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical response with sustained skill and flair</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of how ideas are explored through the use of poetic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas effectively using language appropriate to audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical response with competence and some flair</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the distinctive qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of how ideas are explored through the use of poetic techniques</li> <li>• Organises, develops and expresses ideas competently with some sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical response with variable control</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of some of the qualities of the text</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of ideas explored through the use of poetic techniques</li> <li>• Attempts to organise, develop and express ideas with limited sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical response with limited control</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of some of the ideas in the poetry</li> <li>• Refers to some aspects of the text</li> <li>• Expresses ideas with little sense of audience, purpose and form</li> <li>• Composes a critical response with elementary control</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section III — Module C: Texts and Society (20 marks)

### Questions 8, 9 and 10

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H2, H4, H7, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows insightful understanding of how text and context shape meaning</li> <li>Demonstrates skilful use of the forms, structure and features of language appropriate to a workplace report</li> <li>Adapts and skilfully synthesises a variety of appropriate texts to compose an imaginative and interpretive response</li> <li>Demonstrates skilful use of the report form to communicate ideas</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows perceptive understanding of how text and context shape meaning</li> <li>Demonstrates effective use of the forms, structure and features of language appropriate to a workplace report</li> <li>Adapts and effectively synthesises a range of appropriate texts to compose an imaginative and interpretive response</li> <li>Demonstrates effective use of the report form to communicate ideas</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows sound understanding of how text and context shape meaning</li> <li>Uses language forms, features and structure of a workplace report</li> <li>Adapts and attempts to synthesise a range of texts to compose an imaginative and interpretive response</li> <li>Demonstrates competent use of the report form to communicate ideas</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows limited understanding of how text and context shape meaning</li> <li>Uses the form, structure and features of language inconsistently in a workplace report</li> <li>Attempts to adapt some texts to compose an imaginative and interpretive response</li> <li>Demonstrates inconsistent use of the report form to communicate ideas</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows elementary understanding of how text and context shape meaning</li> <li>Attempts to compose an imaginative and interpretive response with limited reference to texts</li> <li>Attempts to use the report form to communicate ideas</li> </ul>	1 – 4



# English (Advanced)

## Paper 2

### 2001 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
1	20	Comparative Study of Texts and Context – Transformations	H1, H2, H2A, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11
2	20	Comparative Study of Texts and Context – In the Wild	H1, H2, H2A, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11
3	20	Critical Study of Texts – Prose Fiction	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
4	20	Critical Study of Texts – Shakespeare	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
5	20	Critical Study of Texts – Poetry	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
6	20	Critical Study of Texts – Drama or Film	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
7	20	Critical Study of Texts – Nonfiction – Speeches	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
8	20	Critical Study of Texts – Multimedia	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
9	20	Critical Study of Texts – Multimedia	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
10	20	Critical Study of Texts – Nonfiction	H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A
11	20	Representation and Text – Telling the Truth	H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11
12	20	Representation and Text – Powerplay	H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11
13	20	Representation and Text – History and Memory	H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11



**2001 HSC  
English (Advanced)  
Paper 2 — Modules  
Marking Guidelines**

## Section I — Module A: Comparative Study of Texts and Context (20 marks)

### Questions 1 and 2

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H2, H2A, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluates with insightful understanding the relationship between the two texts and their contexts</li> <li>Demonstrates insightful understanding of the ideas and values of both texts</li> <li>Evaluates skilfully how language forms and features, and structures of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes a skilful interpretive response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluates with perceptive understanding, the relationship between the two texts and their contexts</li> <li>Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the ideas and values of both texts</li> <li>Evaluates effectively how language forms and features, and structures of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes an effective interpretive response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains the key aspects of the relationship between the two texts and their contexts</li> <li>Demonstrates sound understanding of the ideas and some awareness of the values of both texts</li> <li>Explains competently how language forms, features, and structures of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes a sound interpretive response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains some aspects of the relationship between the two texts and their contexts</li> <li>Demonstrates limited understanding of the ideas of both texts</li> <li>Explains language forms and features, and structures of texts with some sense of how meaning is shaped and responses are influenced</li> <li>Composes a limited interpretive response</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains with limited understanding the two texts and their contexts</li> <li>Demonstrates elementary understanding of the ideas of both texts</li> <li>Attempts to explain language forms and features, and structures of texts</li> <li>Attempts to compose an interpretive response</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section II — Module B: Critical Study of Texts (20 marks)

### Questions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10

*Outcomes assessed: H1, H2A, H3, H4, H6, H8, H10, H11, H12A*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates insightful and critical understanding of the ideas/issues expressed in the text</li> <li>• Evaluates skilfully the text's reception in different contexts</li> <li>• Evaluates skilfully how language forms and features, and structure of the text, shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>• Composes a sophisticated interpretive/imaginative/critical response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates perceptive and critical understanding of the ideas expressed in the text</li> <li>• Evaluates effectively the text's reception in different contexts</li> <li>• Evaluates effectively how language forms and features, and structure of the text, shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>• Composes an effective interpretive/imaginative/critical response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates sound understanding of the ideas expressed in the text</li> <li>• Explains the text's reception in different contexts</li> <li>• Evaluates competently how language forms and features, and structure of the text, shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>• Composes a sound interpretive/imaginative/critical response using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of the ideas expressed in the text</li> <li>• Examines some elements of the text's reception in different contexts</li> <li>• Describes language forms and features, and structure of the text, with some sense of how meaning is shaped and responses are influenced</li> <li>• Composes a limited interpretive/imaginative/critical response</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates elementary understanding of the ideas expressed in the text</li> <li>• Attempts to describe some language forms and features, and structure of the text, with limited sense of how meaning is shaped and responses are influenced</li> <li>• Attempts to compose an interpretive/imaginative/critical response</li> </ul>	1 – 4

## Section III — Module C: Representation and Text (20 marks)

### Questions 11, 12 and 13

*Outcomes assessed: H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H8, H10, H11*

#### MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluates and shows insightful understanding of the relationship between representation and meaning in a variety of appropriate texts</li> <li>Explains and evaluates skilfully how media of production and other aspects of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes skilfully a speech using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	17 – 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluates and shows a developed understanding of the relationship between representation and meaning in a variety of appropriate texts</li> <li>Explains and evaluates effectively how media of production and other aspects of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes effectively a speech using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	13 – 16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a sound understanding of the relationship between representation and meaning in a variety of texts</li> <li>Explains competently how media of production and other aspects of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes competently a speech using language appropriate to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	9 – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a limited understanding of the relationship between representation and meaning in some texts</li> <li>Describes how media of production and other aspects of texts shape meaning and influence responses</li> <li>Composes a speech with some appropriateness to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	5 – 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows an elementary understanding of the relationship between representation and meaning with limited reference to texts</li> <li>Attempts to describe how media of production and other aspects of texts shape meaning</li> <li>Attempts to compose a speech which has limited appropriateness to audience and purpose</li> </ul>	1 – 4