



BOARD OF STUDIES
NEW SOUTH WALES

1997 HSC

**EXAMINATION
REPORT**

**Contemporary
English**

© Board of Studies 1998

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

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce
this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study
purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 1455 7

**1997 HIGHER SCHOOL CERTIFICATE
EXAMINATION REPORT
CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH**

In 1997 18 303 candidates presented for the examination in 2 Unit Contemporary English.

2 UNIT

The paper was well presented, included high quality photographs and, on the whole, the layout of stimulus material was good.

PAPER 1 Reading and Writing

All three questions here proved to be well within the compass of most candidates, who obviously felt confident about the reading material. As a result, they had no difficulty in finding evidence to back up their statements in responding to most parts of each question. There were few non-attempts.

Question 1

Students are reminded to read carefully all questions, including instructions.

- (d) In Question 1(d) there seemed to be some confusion over what *language features* meant. Most students focused on visual aspects, which would indicate that the teaching of visual literacy over the years has been successful. As *language features* poorer students reworded, quoted or summarised what was said in the brochure and were generally vague in their responses. The better candidates, however, were able to specify an aspect of language such as tone, sentence structure or vocabulary.
- (e) Some confusion was evident between the terms *describe* and *explain* in this question. The better students clearly distinguished between the two, but poorer students tended to repeat their answers in each part or to run the two parts together. In this question, some students misinterpreted *could be used* as being synonymous with *are used* and penalised themselves unnecessarily.

Question 2

This question produced a range of answers in which most students felt confident about using the diary form. Use of the first person and a personal voice were handled well. Most of the answers followed the stimulus of the cartoon from *Calvin's Diary* very closely but, nevertheless, tended to be very ordinary. Consequently, those who showed an individual approach to a day on which nothing seemed to go right, that is, those who made the story their own, scored well in this section. Poorer students tended to list events, used timetables or, in the worst cases, described the cartoon. In general, literacy levels were reassuring, although the use of paragraphs caused some concern.

Because the diary form was required and the stimulus material provided a structure, most students felt confident about expressing themselves. In below average answers spelling, vocabulary, syntax and structural errors affected meaning and marks reflected this.

Question 3

This question proved to be a good discriminator. The majority of students grasped the general idea of how violence is promoted in the media.

- (a) Part (a) made students feel confident, but Part (b) developed the difference between those who *and* could express their opinions about the support or promotion of violence and those who vaguely (b) skirted around the idea and summarised the material.

As with Question 1 (e), the link between parts (i) and (ii) and Part (b) proved very difficult for a number of students. Most could isolate features, but had difficulty in explaining why they worked.

- (c) In Part (c), expressing specifically what *dual classification* meant proved to be a problem. The majority of candidates seemed to know that it meant two classifications, but did not relate this back to the distinction between a film viewed at the cinema and a film viewed at home as a video.
- (d) This also proved to be an effective discriminator. Most students appeared to feel comfortable in expressing an opinion about violence in the media and, because they had read the stimulus material, had something to say. The best students were able to incorporate aspects in support of their opinion and chose supporting material in addition to the stimulus material. This gave them a strong focus and an assertive tone that was appropriate to the task. The majority, however, used the ideas from the stimulus material with varying degrees of success. The word *aspects* seemed to confuse many who felt obliged to summarise everything in the reading material and then express ideas of their own. Poorer students plagiarised heavily from the stimulus material, restating ideas and details from this. As in Question 2, the use of paragraphs in structuring ideas was very poor.

Question 4

The stimulus material here appeared to be quite appropriate, being clear, well reproduced, Australian and contemporary. This made it quite accessible to most candidates.

- (a) The question was straightforward and required a clear understanding of what was being advertised. The marks allocated were appropriate.
- (b) In this question, which proved to be an effective discriminator, candidates were required to analyse the elements of an effective advertisement.

Question 5

- (a) (i) Heiss's article was long, but, since it was the stimulus material for the whole of Question 5, its length was easily justified. It was contemporary and Australian and dealt with issues relevant to the candidature in a manner that most found entertaining.

The space provided for answers in Question 5(a) (i) and (ii) seemed to be inadequate and the better candidates required more space to give a more sophisticated response.

- (ii) The word *identify* presented some interpretational problems, causing some candidates to answer inappropriately.

- (b) Instructions for these questions were very clear and most candidates were able to score good marks, since they successfully presented arguments both for or against. Those who scored well had a good grasp of the art of speech-writing. They were able to manipulate the stimulus material, using the information presented in the article as a basis for their own arguments for or against one of the holidays mentioned. They also showed good control of language and wrote with both confidence and flair. Poorer candidates who had only limited understanding of the article's tone and intent often responded in a personal and emotional way to some of the points raised by the writer. It is important for students to realise that the Reading and Writing Paper frequently requires them to select and combine ideas from the stimulus material and present them in another form, for a different audience and a different purpose.

Weaker candidates were unable to develop an argument for or against a specific holiday and simply wrote about public holidays in general, or about more than one holiday. Some simply responded to Anita Heiss's article.

- (c) The majority of candidates were able to write a personal letter, showing understanding of the relationship between register, audience and purpose. While the use of informal register was certainly appropriate for this task, the gratuitous use of vulgarities and offensive language sometimes marred otherwise competent scripts.

The best candidates had good control of language and dealt with the terms of the question explicitly, responding well to both parts.

Some of the weaker candidates wrote similar responses for both Parts (b) and (c). Using the same celebration in both pieces of writing sometimes caused them to fail to distinguish clearly between a speech and a letter. The better candidates discriminated well in terms of what the question required and described different celebrations.

PAPER 2 Contemporary Issues

Section I

Question 1

One of the main aims of Contemporary English is to increase your understanding of human behaviour.

Choose ONE of the Contemporary Issues you have studied. Write an essay outlining what you have learnt about human behaviour from your study of this issue. Refer to at least ONE of the set texts and related materials.

A The strengths and weaknesses noted in the general performance of the candidates as reflected in the scripts marked.

Most candidates seemed to have a good knowledge of texts studied and showed an ability to structure an essay and present a point of view. An improved standard of literacy was evident in the scripts which tended to be sustained and relevant rather than brief and superficial. Candidates across all levels of ability showed a strong sense of personal voice and had a sound understanding of the Issues studies. It was pleasing to note that students had learnt some valuable lessons from their studies of the Issues.

The answers of the better students were fluent and coherent, dealt with the question directly and showed ability not only to progress from the specific to the general, but also to draw out aspects of the issue rather than simply recounting the material's content. Such candidates also showed ability to discuss the aspects of the issue perceptively and to integrate and link this discussion with the text and related material. These students came to terms with the abstract concept of human behaviour presented in the question.

The average students were able to discuss aspects of the Issue and link them to text and related material but often did so without insight. These students tended to fulfil the requirements of the question in that they dealt with the Issue and its aspects and were able to relate this discussion to text and related material, but often neglected the specifics of the question or dealt with it in a broad but superficial manner.

Students of lesser ability still attempted a discussion of the Issue but frequently had difficulty in understanding the requirements of the question. Nevertheless these students showed a knowledge of essay structure and of the requirements of the course but frequently failed to present their case logically or fluently and often relied on anecdote or either a poor selection of, or no related material. These students often relied on film versions of texts and frequently made basic errors of plot and characters' names.

Matters of concern which were identified across all ranges included:

- a) The use of a narrow range, little variety and an inadequate number of related materials which were also frequently generated by the teacher to the exclusion of the students' personal research and understanding of the Issue. This tended to produce predictable and unoriginal responses and prevented some students from expressing a personal judgement.
- b) Problems with sourcing of related material. It is recommended that students should practise clearly sourcing their material and avoiding generalised comments on topical news items.
- c) Problems with very slight or forced linking between related material, text and aspects of the Issue.
- d) Evidence of prepared answers presented irrespective of the question.
- e) The use of the question by some candidates as a springboard to present generalised commentary with little relevance to the question or which had little relevance to the Issue.

Individual research and selection of related material which will allow the students to develop more personal responses and a broader understanding of the Issues studied should be encouraged.

The more popular Issues were *Growing Up* and *Sport* (although responses on *Sport* tended to be less successful in that they were very general and tended to lose sight of the question's focus). Both aspects of the Issue *Peace and War* should be considered. The Issue *Cultural Identity* was not a popular choice for this Section.

B The quality of the examination question, its relevance to the course and its capacity to discriminate between candidates.

The examination question presented a number of difficulties for many students. The term *human behaviour* was too abstract for many students and they often confused it with human nature. Few were able to define the concept and simply repeated it throughout the body of the essay.

The question did not appear to allow students to extend themselves into the excellent range; they might have been intimidated by the wording of the question. The statement referring to the aims of the Contemporary English course appeared to have caused some confusion and seemed superfluous.

Whilst the question might have discriminated between students, it tended to favour or advantage those who addressed it in a pedestrian manner to the exclusion of original and creative responses.

Questions need to be structured in such a way as to discourage students from presenting a prepared or predetermined answer and so that they can show their individual understanding of the Issue.

Section II

Question 2

Choose ONE Contemporary Issue.

Through your study of set texts and related material you have come to ‘know’ many interesting people. These may include imagined characters or writers and other real people.

Select TWO of these people you have come to ‘know’ and write what you have learnt about them, focusing on their experience of the Contemporary Issue.

Write in ONE of the following ways:

EITHER

(a) a feature article for a popular magazine;

OR

(b) a news article for a local newspaper;

OR

(c) a script for a TV documentary .

Strengths

- Literacy and level of expression were very good and there were very few illiterate scripts.
- A very good knowledge of texts was apparent so that most students were able to write very well about characters.
- Responses showed this to be a very worthwhile learning experience, since they dealt well with the issues as they discussed the chosen text and related material.

- Students' ability to interpret and respond to the question indicated the value of a skills-based course.
- The quality of the scripts generally showed a very high level of written communication skills.
- Although the Issues most commonly chosen were *Sport* and *Growing Up*, the responses to the *Peace and War* Issue were generally better balanced.

Weaknesses

- In these responses the ability to use genres well was limited. Parts (a) and (b) allowed some students to write without showing any strong sense of genre. Few could handle well the documentary format required by (c), and resorted to the interview approach which many also used in (a) and (b).
- Compared with past years there was a lack of related material. This was due to the nature of the question and to the fact that many students studied two texts, so that they tended to be over-reliant on text rather than emphasising and using a range of related material.
- There was little variety of types of related material and lack of sourcing of material.
- Many answers in this section were very short.
- In the Issue *Peace and War*, the majority of candidates concentrated on the *War* aspect and neglected aspects relating to *Peace*.
- Many students should an inability to integrate related material and, in many cases, each source was discussed separately.
- The *character driven* question hindered students' discussion of, and focus on, issues.
- The greatest hindrance to writing in the required genre in Section II appeared to be the question, which asked for:
 - two characters and what they had learned
 - a complete understanding of the Issue
 - a wide variety of related material
 - knowledge of genre and text type.

This appeared to confuse many candidates who focused on the genre rather than using related material.

- Too many good scripts could not get into the Excellent range because they did not satisfy all parts of the question.
- The fact that candidates could create an *imaginary character* led many into story-telling, nevertheless a number managed to deal with the question directly.
- Those who managed to show understanding of the Issue, as well as of two characters' experiences, the text and at least of some related material, scored well.

- The first two parts of the question related to the print media so there was little variety.
- The distinction between a local newspaper and feature article question was *hazy* especially in the minds of the candidates. The majority saw little difference between local newspaper layout and feature article layout.
- Most candidates interpreted the term *documentary script* as meaning an interview.
- Section I tests essay writing and knowledge of Issues. Section II is focused on issue-driven questions.

Criteria for Judging Categories A – E

A Allocated Mark 19 – 20

- Highly successful at using a sustained, well-structured discussion to deal with the terms of the question.
- Answers questions fluently and communicates ideas clearly.
- Clear response to what has been learnt about human behaviour.
- Detailed and perceptive discussion of the specific issue.
- Effectively links material to question and issue.
- Able to integrate detailed and in-depth discussion of text-related material and personal ideas about the specific Issue.
- Range of material including text.

B Allocated Mark 16 – 18

- Very successful at using a sustained, structured discussion to address the terms of the question.
- Competent communication of ideas based on what has been learnt about human behaviour.
- Usually fluent.
- Links material to question and specific Issue.
- Able to integrate text, Issue and range of materials in some detail and in depth.
- Reasonable understanding of the complexities of the Issue.

C Allocated Mark 10 – 15

Most answers will fall into the C range, which, therefore, will have the most variation.

- May include some retelling of text and material.
- Attempts to show understanding of the question.
- Displays some attempt at presenting and/or expressing personal response to what has been learnt about human behaviour.

- May attempt a sustained argument: answer may be disjointed, superficial.
- Range of material may be limited, but a text must be included in the discussion.
- Related material may lack meaningful link to Issue, may be anecdotal or unsourced.

D Allocated Mark 6 – 9

- Inability to deal adequately with question.
- Poor discussion, little fluent expression.
- Very little sense of Issue.
- Limited use of materials (no text and/or related material).
- Re-telling of text or discussion incorporating text only.

E Allocated Mark 0 – 5

- Usually short.
- Little or no sense of the specific Issue apparent.
- Little or no understanding of question.
- May have no reference to text or related materials, or little understanding of them.
- May be incoherent or irrelevant.

Mark of 0 is given for a minimal attempt to answer the question. Response may consist of only a few words or any amount of totally irrelevant writing.

N/A is given when no mark is made on the paper.

Contemporary English – 1997 Issues Marking Guidelines: Section I					
	A 20–19	B 18–17–16	C 15–14–13–12–11–10	D 9–8–7–6	E 5–4–3–2–1–0
Text Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good and sustained effort at text type • Clear and thorough organisation, coherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good effort at text type but may not be fully sustained • Clear organisation, coherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable attempt at form and register will be evident • Some attempt at organisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usually attempts text type but may be weak • Poorly organised • May lack coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak or no attempt at text type • No organisation
Strong text type with weak content OR weak text type with strong content unlikely to get above C. Ought to be strong text type and content for A and B					
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays strong understanding of the material • Shows a very clear understanding of the question and of the complexity of the Issue • Uses a range and variety of appropriate source material • Has unity and develops ideas • Usually emphasises link between text and material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays good understanding of the material • Shows a competent understanding of the complexity of the Issue and the question • Uses a range and variety of appropriate source material • Has sense of unity and development of ideas • May indicate link between text and material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows awareness of the requirements of the question • May use only a narrow range of material or have a narrow focus on the Issue • Generally gives an adequate treatment of the material and Issue • Reasonably coherent development of ideas • May lack meaningful link between material and Issue • Answers which largely or only rely on inference of human behaviour, cannot move above C range 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May misinterpret the question • Hardly touches the question or very soon moves off it • Retells the story • May be weak, short, superficial response • Weak development of ideas • May deal with text but have no related material • Fails to deal adequately with Issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no understanding of the question • Little or no comprehension of text or material • Poor attempt to retell text • May be brief • May not mention/deal with text/other material • Little or no sense of the Issue
Answers which do not discuss text at all cannot get higher than D Responses which fail to address the terms of the question explicitly cannot get above the C range					
Expression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluent and articulate • May demonstrate flair, originality, sophistication of style <p style="text-align: center;">THESE MAY BE SUPERSCRIPTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression generally competent and correct • Communicates well • Weaknesses in expression are not a barrier if text type and content are strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional problems in expression • Reasonably fluent • A reasonable attempt to communicate ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems in expression may interfere with communication • Often vague, repetitive and <i>waffly</i> • May be incomprehensible or convoluted in parts • Poor communication of ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious problems in expression • Incoherent • Fails to communicate ideas

Contemporary English – 1997 Issues Marking Guidelines: Section II					
	A 20–19	B 18–17–16	C 15–14–13–12–11–10	D 9–8–7–6	E 5–4–3–2–1–0
Text Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good and sustained effort at text type • Clear and thorough organisation, coherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good effort at text type but may not be fully sustained • Clear organisation, coherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable attempt at form and register will be evident • Some attempt at organisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usually attempts text type but may be weak • Poorly organised • May lack coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak or no attempt at text type • No organisation
<p>Strong text type with weak content OR weak text type with strong content unlikely to get above C. Ought to be strong text type and content for A and B</p>					
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays strong understanding of the material • Chooses and develops two characters to display good understanding of the Issue • Uses a range and variety of appropriate source material • Has unity and develops ideas • Usually emphasises link between text and material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays good understanding of the material • Chooses and develops two characters to display a sound understanding of the Issue • Uses a range and variety of appropriate source material • Has sense of unity and development of ideas • May indicate link between text and material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows awareness of the requirements of the question • May use only a narrow range of material or have a narrow focus on the Issue • Chooses two characters with some development • Reasonably coherent development of ideas • May lack meaningful link between material and Issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May misunderstand the question • Chooses one or two characters with weak development and understanding • Retells the story • Response may be weak, short, superficial • Often deals only with text or related material • Fails to deal adequately with Issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no understanding of the question • Little or no comprehension of text or material • Poor attempt to retell text • May be brief • May not mention/deal with text/other material • Little or no sense of the issue
	<p>Responses failing to refer to a text are limited to D or below</p> <p>Responses which fail to address the terms of the question are unlikely to get above the D range</p> <p>Responses strong in text–type and character discussion but which contain no related materials score no higher than mid–C</p>				
Expression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluent and articulate • May demonstrate flair, originality, sophistication of style • May have minor errors of expression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression generally competent and correct • Communicates well • Weaknesses in expression are not a barrier if text type and content are strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably fluent • A reasonable attempt to communicate ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems in expression may interfere with communication • Often vague, repetitive and <i>waffly</i> • May be incomprehensible in parts • Poor communication of ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious problems in expression • Incoherent • Fails to communicate ideas

Pilot Marking Observations		
Feature Article	News Article	Script for TV Documentary
Content	Content	Content
Each question requires reference to a range of material including a text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses with only one reference (text or material) are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • Responses which fail to address the terms of the question are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • May include partial interview format • Better responses integrate related material well • Better responses focus on characters' specific experience in the Issue • Some characters are totally <i>imagined</i> (not from text or related material) • Focus on Issue may tend to be narrow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses with only one reference (text or material) are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • Responses which fail to address the terms of the question are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • May include partial interview format • Better responses integrate related material well • Better responses focus on characters' specific experience in the Issue • Some characters are totally <i>imagined</i> (not from text or related material) • Focus on Issue may tend to be narrow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses with only one reference (text or material) are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • Responses which fail to address the terms of the question are unlikely to get above the <i>D</i> range • Better responses integrate related material well • Better responses focus on characters' specific experience in the Issue • Focus on Issue may tend to be narrow • Often easier to present related materials with this text type • Seems least popular option
The ability to use related material effectively beyond the choice of one character is an important discriminator Using a second text for an Issue is considered related material		
Text Type	Text Type	Text Type
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable introduction and effective conclusion • Should not be in essay form • Common text features observed: headlines, columns, photos, captions, subheadings, enlarged bold quotations, etc • May address specific audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable introduction and effective conclusion • Should not be in essay form • Better responses convey specific text type through language, tone, layout etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview format is common with some more sophisticated attempts • Little attempt at the concept of scripting

LISTENING CRITERIA

Question 1 To earn 1 mark, candidate should write:

- (a) Elders of NSW for keeping on preserving the stories **or** passed down stories.
- (b) Mrs Kelly gave permission to retell stories **not just** Mrs Kelly/has to mention **permission** to get one mark/ also **telling, allowing**.

Question 2 To earn 3 marks candidate needs to include the following:

Spirit teaching birds to be birds
Flying Fox wants to be a bird **NOT one mark per point**
Cheeky/annoying/rude
Spirit teaches lesson — *that is not the way to behave*/Hung upside down

To earn 4 marks, candidate needs to include not only the above points, but also:

Still did not learn lesson
Spirit made him stay upside down **forever**

- 1 mark** Mentions only the desire to be a bird/mentions only the Dreamtime **not** why Flying Fox is upside down.
- 2 marks** Summary — not detailed
Dreamtime story about *Why the Flying Fox hangs upside down*.
- 3 marks** A good summary but fails to go one step further and talk about learning a lesson.
- 4 marks** **Must** explain that Fox did not learn lesson first time and was hung upside down forever.

Question 3 To earn 1 mark candidate writes any one of:

- (a) **1 example = 1 mark**
'Teach me', 'teach me how to be a bird', 'teach me how to be a bird right now', 'Great Spirit', 'Flying Fox'
'I wanna be a bird', 'upside down'
'You're not a bird, you're a bat'
'Getting underfoot', 'kept on'
'Teach me right now', 'how to'
'Cheeky', 'little flying fox'
'I can hang upside down like this all the time if I want to'
'I don't care', 'that's the way you're gonna be'.

Not only quotations — referring to quotations — can say in own words, eg:

Flying Fox keeps pestering the Great Spirit to teach him how to fly.
Kept asking the Great Spirit to teach him how to fly.
Flying Fox kept getting underfoot.

NOT music — the response has to be element of the *story* **not** performance.
NOT Fox repeated himself etc.

Question 3 To earn 2 marks candidate writes any two of:

(b) **2 points = 2 marks**

Unifies story
Easy to remember — sticks in mind for oral retelling
Shows how annoying Flying Fox is/creates character
Emphasises differences between characters
Emphasises conflict/disagreement/argument
Conveys message clearly — makes it clear/understandable
Stubborn
Entertaining/humorous/comical
Dramatic, captures audience attention
Emphasises character of Flying Fox/Great Spirit
Emphasises moral to story
Emphasises Flying Fox's enthusiasm to be a bird/he is anxious and excitable

DON'T have to explain the effect of their example given in 3(a).

Can generally repeat information.

NOT interesting.

Question 4 To earn 2 marks candidate writes any two of:

2 points = 2 marks

Shows continuity
Introduces story and marks ending
Setting Dreamtime mood/hypnotic
True/authentic
Imitates highlights of story
Slows down and deepens at end to match seriousness
Matches characters/actions
Change of pitch — Flying Fox — low and serious for Great Spirit
Accompanying dancer on stage
Creates traditional/Aboriginal atmosphere
Like an Aboriginal campfire
Helps make image in mind/emotions
NOT exciting or interesting.

Question 5 To earn 3 marks candidate writes any three of:

3 points = 3 marks

2 points = 2 marks

1 point = 1 marks

Reprimanded by the Great Spirit
Demanding
Trying to get attention/annoying
Picture imagery of embarrassed bat, getting underfoot etc
Volume
Tone — sound of voice/screeching/way they say it
Does not give up/persistent
Refuses to take *no* for an answer
Rudeness — disrespect — speed of speech
Repetition
Didgeridoo/music changes
Irreverence to Great Spirit
Mimicking of voice/bat/sounds/gasps

NOT: *interrupts*

NB: *If list tone, pace, volume etc — worth only 1 mark*

If a comment for each = 1 mark each

NB: *Not just literary techniques, answer can include what the bat does or says that makes him seem cheeky*

Question 6 To earn 1 mark candidate writes:

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

(Inform)

(introduce) *Kooris in Theatre* performers' performance **or** introduces storyteller

(explain)

or introduces Pauline McLeod

NOT just: *inform*

NOT just: *introduce*

NOT What the story is about

NOT Initial voice reading requirements of examination

NOT *persuade*

NOT *inform* what is going to happen next

NOT *male voice*

To earn 2 marks candidate writes any two of:

(ii) **2 points = 2 marks**

Calm voice

Simple language

Semi-formal/formal tone/presentation

Friendly tone

Clear

Speaks quickly/with enthusiasm

Not much variation in voice/monotone

Undramatic

Logical/planned

Normal everyday voice

Australian sounding

Informative tone

Speaking in bursts — pauses

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF SPEAKER BUT NOT NECESSARILY VOICE

(b) **To earn 1 mark candidate writes:**

(i) Tell a story **or** explain so that the listener becomes involved **or** entertain/storyteller **or** educate **or** teach a lesson **or** share Aboriginal culture with the audience.

To earn 2 marks candidate writes any two of:

- (ii) Appeals to different age groups
- Excited voice/lively
- Adapts voices for different characters
- Dramatises
- Dialect — Aboriginal
- Simple vocabulary
- Informal and slang
- Colloquial
- Variation in tone/pitch/speed/colourful
- Slow and fast
- Dramatic performance
- Emphasises
- Humour
- Repetition

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF *SPEAKER* NOT ONLY *VOICE*;

NOT female voice

NOT free and easy

NB: *Be careful!* — *Flying Fox* — *high pitch*. *Great Spirit* — *low voice*.

Is worth only 1 mark because it states only **ONE** feature.

NB: No marks given if speakers are confused, eg:
Speaker 1 Flying Fox/Speaker 2 Great Spirit.