



This report is addressed to experienced teachers, new teachers and candidates of the subject. It is recommended that the whole report is read, rather than specific module reports, as different constructive criticisms are made across the modules, rather than repeat similar points.

Markers considered the 2007 paper, overall, to be a fair and mostly accessible assessment tool for the majority of candidates. In particular, the structural change in Section B to a single focus question has resulted in improvements to responses, allowing candidates to develop an integrated discussion, with no repetition.

Whilst examiners are aware that Criterion 10 is not being specifically rated, we found candidates' language skills disturbingly poor. The use of the personal pronoun 'I' may tend to encourage the use of overtly simplistic and colloquial expression, such as 'the reader was sucked in' as well as 'as long as documentaries are being made, I'm happy.' Refer further to Significant Problems (P5).

There were also an increasing number of scripts in which handwriting was almost illegible and therefore ratings were put at risk.

Another issue appears to be time management, with many candidates beginning very good responses which they were not able to complete.

The examination experience also poses the question of whether the Information Sheet does in fact help or hinder the candidates. It would appear that it leads them into using prepared answers rather than responding to the set questions; plagiarism and poorly structured citation amongst other weaknesses in style. A strong voice of opinion continues to suggest that the Information Sheet be completely removed.

In Section B the use of the word 'you' in the question may be problematic, encouraging many candidates to write in first person in a Criterion 9 -type reflective style. It is recommended that the setting examiner avoid the second person in *Text and Contexts* questions.

Again this year markers are concerned that this syllabus continues to attract a significant number of candidates who do not have the skills expected at this level. Our conviction is that there needs to be firm discrimination in the marking: it is for this reason that we have adhered to the standards set down and failed where appropriate.

This year there was an increasing cohort of candidates approaching the questions in a selective way; and in not following the established procedures, limit rating success.

A significant number of candidates seemed to have been either unclear as to the choices appropriate for them, or inadvisably chose to ignore the directions of their teachers. Permutations in addressing the examination involved:

-
- Retelling/paraphrasing stimulus and both set texts
 - Discussion of stimulus only
 - No reference to stimulus as a springboard when discussing two set texts
 - Discussion of stimulus but reference to only one set text
 - Response which did not address the question and read as ‘pre-prepared’
 - Using ‘satellite’ texts only - (texts that teachers may choose to use in class)
 - Using only Section B texts to respond to Section A Ideas and Issues
 - Using a stimulus from another module to respond to another module’s question
 - Using two pieces from one prescribed anthology (e.g. two short stories) as two separate texts
 - Discussing two DVD covers in lieu of two documentaries
 - Combining two questions e.g. using the focus of the ‘ethnicity’ question when discussing ‘Belonging’ texts
 - Using documentaries (*I Know I’m Not Alone, Cunnamulla*) and feature film (*The Castle*) to respond to Crime Fiction
 - Answering all 3 questions in Section A using the same texts

This significantly highlights the need for all candidates to have experienced and familiarized themselves with a model of the written paper in its entirety in the mid year practice, in order to understand the methodology of responding appropriately in the final examination.

Some markers suggest that the lists of core texts from the supplement be listed in Candidate instructions.

Markers suggest Criterion 9 be the focus of 2008 moderation; or at the very least, exemplars be circulated from responses which have been given ‘A’ for Criterion 9.

Information Sheets

If these are to remain as a tool for candidates, they need to learn how to layout points and use them *appropriately*. They are not meant to be used to copy notes into an exam response which may have the consequence of limiting rating success. Their purpose is mainly to assist memory under pressure.

Candidates are misusing them by inappropriately:

- Copying full sentences and paragraphs of notes and regurgitating them, mostly in a way which is irrelevant to the question
- Such copying also leads to the same set of sentences being reiterated and similarity between scripts which may be perceived as prepared, rather than a fresh application of knowledge
- Copying introductions and conclusions from previous class responses that they reuse, regardless of whether they address the specific key words of the question

- Notes plagiarized from websites that are presented as original work
- Not checking for accuracy when citation is used

N.B Candidates are instructed not to write in pencil. If they believe their handwriting may become difficult to read, consider writing on every second line.

Suggested Cues that may be of use for candidates to include on Information Sheet as memory cues only:

- Accuracy/Spelling
 - key words such as authors, character names and text forms
 - production details e.g. Al Gore as the director of *An Inconvenient Truth*
 - words commonly misspelt by the candidate e.g. Arthur Conan Doyle (not 'Arthur Lonan', 'Arther Conan Doil' or 'Arther Lonigan' or 'Matt Spurlock')
 - Transition Vocabulary to remind them of paragraph fluency e.g. 'However' 'accordingly' 'on the other hand' 'nevertheless'
 - Reference Lists of Texts to use for specific Section modules
 - Section A categories of ideas and issues that may be relevant
 - Citation- short quotations that may illustrate an issue/idea
- N.B. Referencing in the examination is not required
- Critical Terminology which may be troublesome
- N.B. Defining terms in responses is not required.
- Section B: Positioning and Contexts
 - reminder of various contexts that may influence the reception of a text: of production, construction, historic, political etc
 - brief summaries of dominant readings in texts and socio cultural values that may have been privileged in it

Significant Literacy problems still reoccurring:

- Although spelling, grammar and expression are not directly assessed, it cannot be expressed how important attention to these aspects are in an exam response, in order to convey and communicate your thoughts, responses and views clearly. If these are not done well, your ideas are not being communicated clearly.
- Formatting and other problems continue and while we are not assessing this, it is a worrying sign that pre-tertiary candidates cannot:

- use apostrophes for contraction and possession
- use homophones e.g. their/there
- acknowledge text titles
- structure clear introductions and conclusions that are relevant to the question;
- Use internal or transition links to aid fluency of paragraphing; lack of paragraphing
- Use conventions of embedding short quotation
- Use complete and varied sentence structures
- Use the language of critical literacy e.g. 'The linguistic features of crime fiction genre responders are distinctively positioned.'
- Maintain formal register
- Use sophistication in vocabulary

Question 1

The ability of most candidates to engage with the stimulus was evident this year. However, many of the candidates in Tasmania would not have experienced living in a truly multicultural society and may not have genuinely connected with the piece. Many candidates, especially candidates of different ethnic origins commented on the fact that the experiences of the author were not theirs. Clearly ESL candidates really connected with the piece.

The question clearly requires 3 elements in response:

1. discussion of ideas and issues extrapolated from the stimulus
2. connections with the candidate's own personal context
3. connections (and comparisons between) with two prescribed texts.

Whilst the wording of the question for *Imagining Australia* was a departure from previous years, it proved to be an excellent tool. It suggested a personal discursive response by expressing a personal opinion first, and in doing so 'take the lead' in the discussion which either confirmed or contested the view presented in the stimulus, followed by support or opposition from two texts

However, the Setting Examiners and Critics need to be mindful that the question can be applied through all the prescribed texts on the list. It was felt that the question narrowed the range of some candidates' choices of texts to apply to 'ethnicity' as an issue within *Imagining Australia*. While it is important to challenge candidates with an unpredictable question each year, this question did not enable some candidates to incorporate their prescribed texts to full advantage, particularly those who had studied *In Sunshine or in Shadow*, *Dream Stuff*, *Radiance* and *The Shark Net*).

It was also felt that the *Belonging* question and *Telling Truths* question had not been narrowed to the same extent and this was unfair to those candidates who answered the question on *Imagining Australia*.

The definition of the term '*ethnicity- background, allegiance, or association*' as supplied is not what the term means in general usage and many candidates did not demonstrate a good understanding of it, particularly the weaker responses.

Had terminology such as 'diverse cultural identities' been used in the question instead of *ethnicity*, many more candidates could have made more connections.

However this narrowing of the question enabled a clear distinction between very capable candidates who could apply the idea from the stimulus to their own study and those who were not capable of completing a pre-tertiary English Course.

Using abbreviations for titles can cause confusion. One examiner read a response which only referred to the Sydney Olympic Opening Ceremony as The O.C. It did seem unusual that a candidate referred to an American teen drama when discussing ethnicity in Australia! The use of abbreviations must be signaled: e.g. The Sydney Olympic Opening Ceremony, hereafter referred to as The O.C

Criterion 2: Demonstrate understanding of ideas and issues

In general, best responses had to take risks and make fresh connections and not rely on any prepared comments. Strong candidates demonstrated an ease with which they discussed and analyzed stimulus material, much more so than has been the case in the past, addressing issues of:

- multiculturalism,
- socio-economic class
- indigenous Australians
- the historical contexts influencing Australian society
- Sub cultural groups and Australian identity.

Good responses showcased their knowledge and understanding of core texts and their relevance to today's society. The best pieces had original, relevant introductions. These candidates made their personal context/stance clear. They attacked the question, making sophisticated connections with the stimulus and the core texts they had studied. Their evaluations of the texts and the way in which they employed critical literacy terminology were impressive. Whilst these lucid pieces showed a high level of fluency and accuracy, citing appropriate quotations, embedding them within their writing is still not well done.

Strong responses needed to examine both the question and the stimulus to structure their piece. Many did so to broaden the nature of their response. The best responses clearly were not reliant on the Information Sheet.

Best responses also managed balance: with detailed reference to both the stimulus and the two texts studied. Weaker responses either spent considerable time on the stimulus to the detriment of their discussion of their studied texts or mostly ignored the stimulus.

Excellent responses compared the ideas and values in the stimulus to their texts and further made comparisons between the texts which informed their discussions. Candidates should make this a fundamental element of their responses. There can be little movement from the C ratings if this is not done.

The ability to evaluate the representations provided in the stimulus and to challenge and question, where relevant, is highly regarded. There were some notably strong responses from candidates who were able to consider the various ‘readings’ of a text and to offer a critical view.

However, understanding of ‘*ethnicity*’ was a considerable issue for many candidates who merely substituted racism for ethnicity – implying that ‘*ethnicity*’ was a major problem for Australians and it needed to be eradicated.

Many interchanged ‘*ethnicity*’ and multiculturalism with no real understanding of these terms. A few candidates seemed hesitant to include texts relating to indigenous Australians, thinking they were required to discuss ‘ethnics’ in a narrow sense as used in the text (*ethnics, skips, nerds*). This provided severe constraints on their choice of text and was unfortunate.

However, impressive answers connected a discussion of Aboriginal identities through statements about ‘real Aussies’ or through a connection between the marginalising of ethnic groups, (represented in the stimulus piece) comparing this to the treatment of indigenous Australians. Weaker responses moved directly to a discussion of Aboriginality and to texts such as Malouf’s short stories or Nowra’s play without connecting this to a discussion of ethnicity. These generalised responses did not demonstrate an understanding of ethnicity.

Further, there appears to be emerging trend to deal with set texts first and then the stimulus material. The best responses integrated a discussion of the stimulus and set texts, while addressing an understanding of ethnicity. A number of responses avoided addressing the stimulus in any detail. These responses were penalised as analysing the stimulus is an important component of the exam question.

Criterion 9: clarify and articulate own ideas attitudes and values

Discussion of context, particularly personal context, means candidates must be able to discuss how the text has shaped or influenced their thinking. The best responses clearly foreground how their own attitudes had been ‘shaped’ by their texts’ explorations of the issue and emphasized what they now valued regarding the issue. Candidates who use the first person: e.g. ‘My response to the text has been shaped by my ...’ are clearly addressing criterion 9 and are being rewarded for it.

Many candidates provided a very clear insight into their thoughts but they failed to connect this to the stimulus and/or texts and did not demonstrate any progression or development in their thoughts from their study. In weak responses autobiographical and irrelevant responses dominated. Examiners are not interested that you are sixteen and have always lived in Tasmania nor are they interested in broad philosophical statements. Comments tended to be isolated and not interwoven within discussion.

Particularly with this question, some candidates provided some extreme and worrying statements. As a marker, the importance of withholding judgment is paramount, yet candidates should be careful of making statements that they would not make in public or that may offend most people.

What is of interest is how this shapes your responses to the ideas and issues presented in the texts. Do the texts challenge or support the values that you hold? Which characters or scenes do you identify with and why?

Structurally, many were able to weave their personal responses throughout the essay, as opposed to a one to two line response at the end of the paragraph or a separate section at the end of their essay.

Few candidates elected to respond to the creative option in the question. For those who did the quality was strong in terms of the way they adapted the content, tone and style to engage their peer audience.

Similarly many responses took ethnicity to mean 'multiculturalism', which didn't consider the underlying components of attitudes/values (of societal groups or of individuals.) It is understood why candidates would have made these generalisations, as multiculturalism and/or Aboriginality may have been focal ideas in their study of the module.

Question 2

The intention of the Communications Course in the Telling Truths module is for candidates to be able to identify and analyse the complexities and subtleties of the concept of truth, the guiding question for the module is, 'whose reality prevails?'

The stimulus, *White Liars*, provided some excellent opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their understandings of the ways in which language or discourse is used to ensure that a particular social reality prevails.

Overall, teachers have done a great job to prepare their candidates with a solid understanding of the ideas and issues related to truth telling in individual texts under study in the module. Candidates had a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved and were able to support these with examples from the texts. There was also evidence of their understanding of key terms and concepts in respect to critical literacy.

The stimulus was also very interesting and generated some great discussion. The *Telling Truths* question focused on motivations for concealing truths and was extremely useful in terms of separating candidates who over relied on Information Sheets or had prepared answers that allowed for no flexibility and those who were able to apply their knowledge from the year.

Where some candidates require guidance, is how to pick out **key words** in a question and then use them in **topic sentences** so that the information they provide directly addresses the question being asked. They also require additional guidance as to how to **adapt and apply** their knowledge to the actual question being asked, and therefore provide a relevant response. The majority of candidates explained reasons why people lie but did not necessarily address why people might ‘hide the truth’. Although very similar, lying is only one way of hiding the truth.

Many candidates limited their discussions when they presented an irrelevant introduction and/or conclusion that supported the binary opposition of truth and lies.

It may well be useful for teachers to be aware of and make curriculum adjustments that recognize that candidates must adapt knowledge to a permutation of ‘truth telling’ and must avoid reiterative generic discussion on truth V lies.

General Comments for Candidates:

Read the question carefully and identify the key words. The question clearly asked you to discuss and analyse ‘why people may wish to hide the truth’.

Use the key words in the question to keep your answer relevant. Don’t waste time defining truth; how the issue of truth telling is very complex; ‘how’ people hid the lies they told, how we know when we’re told the truth or when particular characters told lies or what different types of truths there are. You were asked to analyze and reason ‘why’ people may hide the truth.

The biggest mistakes made were with candidates going into the exam with often very generalized prepared answers noted on their Information Sheet and showed their inability to adapt their knowledge (which was quite expansive) to the actual question being asked. This then made their personal responses and reflections irrelevant, as they did not provide the reasons why people may ‘hide the truth about themselves and/or about their world’.

Criterion 2: Demonstrate understanding of ideas and issues

Hiding truths was a complex issue, and is determined by a person’s/character’s perspective and contextual position.

Shaffer's use of the fortuneteller plays on the idea of the existence of absolute truth. She represents herself as someone who can distinguish absolute truth, ‘truth does not have to be

told. It is evident', ironically she is, of course, totally dependent on someone else's perception or fabrication of 'a truth'.

The Machiavellian Tom represents the idea of relative truth: 'How real am I to them?' The text reveals the pitfalls of both positions on truth: the post modern - that truth regarding social reality is relative - and the objective - that there is an absolute truth.

Candidates who could discuss dominant and resistant readings produced more sophisticated and relevant answers. The weakest answers showed no understanding of the underpinnings of the Communications Course: they assumed the existence of an absolute truth and basically reduced the debate to a simplistic adage, 'The truth will always come out'.

The core of the stimulus text and the springboard for the best discussions of the complexities of 'truth' is in the lines,

'...And your parents, do they know that you have abolished them completely - like they never existed?'

'No, but it doesn't matter...Both of them are talking about themselves, not me. And that's fine, because that's what everyone is doing all the time, everywhere. Do you dig?'

For Tom the ends justify the means, he invents a persona, or a reality, to achieve his goals. The most sophisticated answers could expand upon this individual interaction to discuss more widely '...why people may wish to hide the truth about themselves and/or about **their world**.

Strong responses demonstrated an understanding of the way manipulation of truth operates to achieve not just individual ends but the realization of the goals of the powerful groups in society, the consequences of which determine the distribution of power in society.

Whether it be the politics of gender, (Tom's manipulation of Sue's sympathies), the politics of class, (assuming a working class role to avoid socio/cultural prejudice, his parents' construction of a 'truth' to protect their position), the politics of economic rationalism, (Tom assumes an identity, hides the truth and constructs a social reality to fulfil a professional agenda - an economic imperative - sustains it to maintain his power). All of these imperatives to maintain power linked to the prescribed texts very successfully in the best answers.

However many candidates failed to recognize the subtle **difference** between telling lies and withholding information; that they are not the same thing.

Some candidates' ideas relating to set texts:

For a professional agenda/to maximize business opportunity/economic imperative/power/to achieve success

- Tom in the stimulus 'hides some part of the truth' to undermine arrogance: 'to a professional eye like mine, truth [a part of] does not have to be told.'

- Tom is ambitious so hides his background in order to be successful
- Linked to Mike Moore's editing/omission of some aspects in his film BFC to maximize success as a documentary maker
- Christof hides the fake scenario to increase ratings
- Suzy hides some truths due to greed for compensation in *Brilliant Lies*
- Gilead leaders and 'aunts' at Red Centre hide truth to manufacture fear and maintain power over new handmaids
- People lie/hide truth to serve a political agenda. (The Stolen Children, BFC)

For ethical imperative/compensation for perceived unfairness or lack of justice/assert moral authority/

- Tom is judged not to sing with an 'authentic voice of the people' if he was 'the son of an accountant so creates a persona to achieve social justice
- Tom's revenge on parents
- Brilliant Lies' truth in harassment in workplace
- Linked to Mike Moore's editing/omission of some aspects in *BFC* due to his view that the resistance to unethical practice by authorities manufacturing fear was more important
- Self protection- Jane hides her depression in *Lantana*
- VFV pursuit of justice and hiding personal identity
- People lie/hide truth to achieve a greater good. (The Truman Show, BFC, Lantana)

For social agenda: image or social status; to avoid socio cultural prejudice/judgment/to avoid disadvantage or disapproval

- Tom is judged not to sing with an 'authentic voice of the people' if he was 'the son of an accountant
- Katy and Brian hides truth of abuse in *BL*
- Moore hides truth of his NRA membership in *BFC*
- Katy hides truth of her lesbianism, taxi driving in *BL*
- People lie/hide truth to get a serious message across (*Bowling for Columbine, The Stolen Children*)
- Personal control/power - Tom constructs own identity to hide his middle class background

Conversely to reinforce class based respectability

- Tom's parents hide the truth that Tom is 'a singer' in order to create respectability
- People lie/hide truth because they are ashamed. (Wolf Lullaby)
- People lie/hide truth because society rewards liars. (Brilliant Lies)

For emotional imperative/to create empathy and enhance a personal relationship/situation/gain acceptance from others/protect self, others/to gain personal

advantage and gain something, for self preservation, to promote a personal agenda, to avoid embarrassment, or because of a lack of trust.

- Personal gratification- to provoke reaction; Tom's effort to gain sympathy from his girlfriend; 'borrows suffering'
- Sophie asks Tom, 'Do you think you can borrow suffering just to make yourself attractive?' This shows that people have no problem with using other people's disadvantages to their own advantage.
- Tom- personal vanity- reality can be banal or not match expectation
- Tom lacks self esteem, easier than facing truth
- Tom's patriarchal attitude- that he can, because he is male (to girlfriend); what she does not know won't hurt her
- Susy hides truth in her blending Gary+ father's experiences; Susy hides her own 'personal truth' because she can and enjoys the game in *BL*
- Dylan hides truth from mother to protect father in *L*
- Christof, as father figure, hides truth to protect Truman in a safe world/altruism
- Negus hides names- fear of repercussion in *NFP*
- Tom undermining Sophie
- Tom hides truth because he is a compulsive liar :Tom's attitude is truth is not important
- People lie/hide truth to escape the past. (V for Vendetta)
- that a 'white lie' can often be delivered to protect another or for good purposes ie. Sonja and Leon's son in *Lantana*
- we hide the truth to improve our own lives and the lives of those around us (*Brilliant Lies, White Liars, Bowling for Columbine*)
- that we can also hide the truth by omission, the revealing of half truths (*Brilliant Lies, Bowling for Columbine*)
- that society places pressure on individuals to succeed and fulfil certain stereotypes and this leads to lies and false personas (*White Liars, The Handmaid's Tale, Brilliant Lies*)
- that we have a duty of care to other human beings to accept them at face value/accept their truth and protect them (*Joe Cinque's Consolation*)

Often, better answers use effective textual references, like these examples from the same essay:

'Sophie asks Tom, 'Do you think you can borrow suffering just to make yourself attractive?' This shows that people have no problem with using other people's disadvantages to their own advantage.

Masters also gives the impression that even he does not know the absolute truth sometimes, stating in his book,' so blurred are perceptions you start to worry after a while that, when facts are presented, they won't be recognised.'

Weaker ones show little attempt to provide relevant references. One wonders what some candidates have written on the exam sheets because there is little evidence of using them in their essays.

Criterion 9: clarify and articulate own ideas attitudes and values

Discussion of context, particularly personal context, means candidates must be able to discuss how the text has shaped or influenced their thinking. The best responses clearly foregrounded how their own attitudes had been ‘shaped’ by texts’ explorations of the issue and emphasized what they now valued regarding the issue. Candidates who use the first person e.g. ‘My response to the text has been shaped by my ...’ are clearly addressing criterion 9 and are being rewarded for it. The capacity to provide the personal voice of original reasoned opinion/reflection throughout the written response was the hall mark of an A rating on criterion 9.

Candidates continue to forget the importance of providing their own explicit reflections/ideas about the complex and multifaceted nature of truth and lies within the body of their work and not merely as a ‘tack on/concluding paragraph’ at the end of a written response. This last minute approach to providing their own personal opinion/reflection resulted in a C rating on criterion 9.

Many candidates provided a very clear insight into their thoughts but they failed to connect to the stimulus and/or texts and did not demonstrate any progression or development in their thoughts from their study. Criterion 9 continues to be largely ignored by some candidates. Last minute comments and superficial or perfunctory comments seem to be commonplace within the less convincing responses.

Weak responses autobiographical irrelevant responses dominated. Unfortunately, if the initial focus in response to the question/Criterion 2 was irrelevant, then it followed that their personal position/criterion 9 was also irrelevant and did not clarify or articulate their personal views as to as to how the texts shaped their understanding as to why people may feel compelled to ‘hide the truth’.

Some candidates reacted to the prescribed texts negatively, in that they failed to foreground ‘truth’, rather than developing a personal response in view of the question.

This was indeed a complex topic and markers became thoughtful of the ways teachers can encourage candidates to take on a more expansive view of *Telling Truths* in texts, indeed how to develop and widen the impact of candidate responses in relation to criterion 9.

Few candidates elected to respond to the creative option in the question. For those who did the quality was strong in terms of the way they adapted the content, tone and style to engage their peer audience.

Question 3

The stimulus was very accessible and provided plenty of ideas for candidates to connect to their texts and to their own understanding.

Candidates wrote at length with very few scripts less than two pages, showing an ability to sustain their discussions. Many candidates used the discursive essay as invited by the question, with most launching straight into a discussion of the stimulus and texts without unduly lengthy definitions of ‘belonging’ at the start.

The question gave candidates a good opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of their prescribed texts, but that information needed to relate to the idea of ‘how people’s sense of belonging can change’.

Candidates who were able to do this managed to write detailed and relevant answers. However, some candidates seem to have prepared for a different answer and wrote an ‘all I know about belonging’ response, completely ignoring the question and providing information which was not relevant to the idea of how the ‘sense of belonging can change’.

Weak responses struggled to link texts to the question, providing only a single sentence to ‘connect’ the text to ‘change’

Criterion 2: Demonstrate understanding of ideas and issues

The best answers managed to ‘interweave’ the three parts of the question, demonstrating a close and detailed understanding of the stimulus, their personal context and two texts.

Some candidates answered Criterion 2 very well but performed poorly on Criterion 9. The best answers integrated both criteria in their discussion on how people’s sense of belonging can change.

Good answers focused on aspects such as Johnno’s attitudes and feelings to his new house, his old house and to his parents. Better candidates explored these feelings and their significance while others resorted more to restating the passage, and simply adding a comment.

Criterion 9: clarify and articulate own ideas attitudes and values

Discussion of context, particularly personal context, means candidates must be able to discuss how the text has shaped or influenced their thinking. The best responses clearly foregrounded how their own attitudes had been ‘shaped’ by texts’ explorations of the issue and emphasized what they now valued regarding the issue. Candidates who use the first person e.g. ‘My response to the text has been shaped by my ...’ are clearly addressing criterion 9 and are being rewarded for it.

Many candidates still struggle to provide more than a simplistic personal reaction to an idea in the stimulus and/or the texts e.g. ‘I also had to move house’. There were some unusual comments which had very little to do with the idea of ‘sense of belonging can change’. There

were comments on racism and suicide - candidates had obviously thought about these ideas and wanted to include them, whether relevant or not.

As many candidates dealt with the stimulus and texts in a brief fashion this prevented them from demonstrating their own understanding and personal attitudes towards change and belonging. Weak responses prefacing sentences about the text with 'I believe' can expect little movement from C ratings if this is done.

Many candidates chose to 'tack on' a personal statement at the end of their discussion of texts and stimulus – often, these responses had very little to do with any of the material discussed.

Question 4

The article selected as the stimulus material was typical of its genre and enabled candidates, generally, to easily identify the specific language features used by the writer to position readers about the world of sport.

The question referred to 'Sports Journalism' rather than the module title of Sports Reporting but otherwise offered a straightforward direction for the candidate's response.

Criterion 3: Demonstrate understanding of the ways language is used to position audiences

Responses assessed in the A range explored the representation of Meares in the written body text and in the accompanying photograph, discussing the techniques used to portray her in a positive, successful manner, including : the headline (its link to the visual image), diction and word choice, sporting terminology and idiom, direct quotations, dates and statistics.

Several responses further discussed the notion of the 'hero' overcoming adversity and obstacles and the ways in which the stimulus and other sports reporting texts use this metaphor to represent sports persons. A- range candidates were able to clearly articulate the ways in which other texts studied in the module had positioned a response to the sports people involved.

In order to gain a C rating, candidates needed to show some understanding of sports reporting and to refer to the stimulus and two other texts in the genre. Candidates were penalized if they referred to only the stimulus, did not address the stimulus at all in their response, or if they referred to inappropriate texts (texts that were not sports reporting texts in some form).

Many candidates failed to complete adequate length responses: a significant number of responses were 1 page or less. Some showed signs of promise and deep understanding but did not complete the task, seeming to indicate a failure (by otherwise able candidates) to manage the time allowed for the exam.

Candidates commonly spent almost a page listing the generic features of sports reporting without referring specifically to the stimulus or to any texts. Such comments were too general to benefit the candidate's overall assessment. Several candidates wrote long definitions of terms such as 'metanarrative' and 'metonym'. Unfortunately and frustratingly, many of these candidates were not able to adequately link these terms to the texts with understanding.

The rich language and skill with writing techniques used in exemplary sports journalism, especially in portraying action, was too infrequently discussed; as were the range of themes related to nationalism.

Question 5

This module provided an excellent tool to differentiate between capable candidates and those who should not be attempting a pre-tertiary English Course.

The DVD cover of *The Fog of War* as a stimulus provided plenty of good material on which to springboard and share knowledge and understanding of context. The choice of this DVD Cover meant that very few candidates had viewed the film – based on their responses.

A concern generated by the use of a DVD cover was that some candidates incorrectly assumed that they had to only analyze the covers of the documentaries they had studied, thus severely restricting their ratings.

The question, a sophisticated one, was appropriate but only accessible to some candidates. Its specific direction: to comment on '*social and/or cultural issues*' was effective in trying to foreground the invited reading of the documentary and therefore values embedded which viewers were being positioned to accept.

However, the specific wording, of this question was problematic because it narrowed the focus by asking the candidates to 'demonstrate how the creators have used written and visual language to position audiences towards the '*social and/or cultural issues they present*'. The word '*issues*' is not used in the marking standards, but rather 'values/ideas'.

The other questions in Section B would have been stronger if the phrase '*socio cultural and political [values]*' had been consistently inserted.

Another background sentence explaining some basic elements about the historical context of the documentary and the dominant reading of the documentary in the stimulus could have helped candidates. Candidates need to be encouraged to identify a likely dominant/invited reading of a text so that they have something to link their comments to in relation to the techniques they see at work in the text and in relation to the specific requirements of the question. Only the very good responses explored resistant reading practices.

N.B Those candidates who had studied *March of the Penguins* did not address the question as well as those who studied documentaries that more specifically emphasized social and cultural values.

Candidates do not need to provide a definition of ‘documentary’ or other definitions such as ‘cinema verite’.

Many, many candidates failed to indicate the titles of the documentaries to which they referred which made their responses very difficult to assess.

Some candidates discussed *The Castle* or horror films which do not fit into the genre of documentary.

Criterion 3

There appeared to be a limited understanding of ‘positioning’: as a process which engages audiences in films, or attracts an audience to respond to a text; rather than to the ideological process of accepting an invited reading.

Strong responses were able to identify that the written and visual language (in the stimulus) position the viewer towards the general cultural acceptance of white, Anglo, male dominance in political affairs. The men highlighted on the cover are what western society accepts as worthy participants on the debate on war.

The invited reading of McNamara was (through techniques) as a man who holds power but the effects of his leadership/power in society and the way in which he has dispersed this power, both in the US and abroad, is framed around him - a coffin, dead bodies etc positioning viewers to believe that there are negative effects his power has had on other cultures, political systems, societies etc. There were alternative readings of McNamara. Some ‘read’ the cover as an endorsement of him; while others more accurately concluded that there was a powerful person who must take responsibility for the negative consequences/effects of war.

Highly regarded responses often incorporated more than two documentary films in discussion. (Some candidates, however, need to keep in mind the time available to this question and in trying to include an analysis of 3-4 studied documentaries plus the stimulus, resulted in responses lacking depth due to time restrictions).

In general, candidates needed to address the question more specifically and develop a better understanding of contexts of production and construction with emphasis on the social and cultural values being espoused within the documentary studied.

Candidates need to be specific about the nature of the positioning. It’s not enough to say that a technique ‘positions the audience’, or ‘attracts the audience’ or to simply list generic features and rely on repeated phrases such as ‘The use of this technique positions the

audience.’ These responses missed the opportunity to analyze and to comment on the social and cultural values embedded in the dominant or invited reading.

Alarmingly, the overall standard of responses was low, with many candidates failing to understand ‘positioning’. There was little evidence of candidates’ ability to analyze text, understand sub-text, or recognize how they were being positioned.

There were some obviously pre-prepared introductions which showed no connection to the question and candidates who could only list the generic features of a documentary. An overwhelming number of these candidates failed to connect in a meaningful manner with the stimulus piece and resorted to listing irrelevant details such as its Academy Award standing and that ‘the colour red was used’.

The best responses came from candidates who had a sound general knowledge of world affairs and ability to link and connect their study texts to the stimulus. The single focus question was a structural advantage to them and the cohesiveness of their essays stood out. The key to success was using the stimulus as their starting point and to organize their responses around it.

Very strong responses used a discussion about documentary genre as a springboard to discussing socio-cultural values and showed a sound understanding of the dominant readings, the techniques employed and hidden agendas.

Candidates who were able to elaborate on how the context of construction influenced viewers’ thinking and values developed some excellent responses and there is no doubt that this module really engaged candidates, and that they felt that had broadened their knowledge of the genre and of the world in which they live.

Some candidates wrote introductions and conclusions which were much too general and they did not present a firm stance drawing on the question components as an organizer. More sophisticated responses linked back to and interwove elements from the stimulus. Quotations were used effectively to support arguments, but as with other modules there is a general concern about the conventions of embedding quotations. NB ‘quote’ is colloquial and does not replace ‘says’.

There also appears to be the use of terminology that candidates have not mastered. For example, many discussions identified ‘gaps and silences’ as a positioning technique rather than as a result of a number of generic conventions (for example the specific selection of interview material or the editing of the film). Candidates did not always use terms such as ‘discourse’ or ‘intertextuality’ accurately.

As teachers we need to focus more strongly on what terms such as ‘positioning’ on social and cultural values/ideas mean and draw out examples. It is clear that we need to define for and lead our candidates to a stronger understanding of ideological positioning and what creates this influence on our way of thinking about and behaving in our world. We also need to encourage them to read and view and think more widely.

Question 6

The stimulus was considered by markers to be a difficult. Although as experienced readers of historic context, we were able to identify points that could have been used to answer the question; the links to these that were provided in the stimulus were obscure and difficult for candidates to access in forty-five minutes. The stimulus was further complicated by mixing the genres of novel and newspaper which clearly confused a number of candidates who referred to the stimulus constantly as a ‘newspaper article’.

Considering that there is a *Telling Truths* module that many *Crime Fiction* candidates may have answered, the first sentence of the Crime Fiction stimulus, ‘*Truth is said to be stranger than fiction...*’ also had the potential to confuse. This type of ‘cross over’ should be avoided.

Candidates clearly found the stimulus difficult to work with. Candidates were clearly disadvantaged by the choice of stimulus and one candidate expressed her disappointment:

‘ It evades me as to why a newspaper article from the events of the novel was selected rather than a scene featuring actual characters and dialogue to help reflect the language of the story rather than that used in this isolated extract.’

Such candidates found little in the language of the stimulus to engage in any clear discussion of audience positioning on values in the invited reading. Rather they were left to generic features, such as the element of mystery and the setting, as vehicles for the examination of language in their studied texts. Candidates sensed that social and cultural values were not clearly evident through this stimulus. Later on the candidate above wrote that s/he could have made further points: ‘*if only further details of the novel’s language were supplied*’.

This was borne out by some capable candidates who actually felt the need to state that many of the identifiers of the world of crime were not present in this stimulus and went on to show how they were in set texts! This is a confident approach that worked for them, but it is unfair to expect that weaker candidates would have the confidence to take such a risky approach and nor should they have to under examination conditions.

The overall result was that candidates tended to ignore the stimulus completely or discuss only set texts, or make slight reference to it but were not able to use it as a spring board to set texts.

Candidates clearly struggled with the stimulus and teachers agreed at the markers’ meeting that it was significantly more difficult than the stimulus for the other *Texts and Contexts* modules.

Clearly the majority of the candidates knew a great deal about the construction context of crime fiction but this stimulus did not allow them to answer the question in any depth, with a balance of material from stimulus and set texts.

Examiners strongly suggest that future questions ask candidates to discuss the world of crime in terms of the historic, social and cultural contexts in texts. Unlike the Documentary question, this question did not direct candidates to specifically address ‘social and/or cultural issues’ (insert ‘values’) on which audiences are positioned by the genre of crime fiction.

Criterion 3

The few highly rated responses demonstrated an outstanding understanding of the question. These candidates were capable of drawing conclusions from the stimulus and clearly linking their discussion of the question, the stimulus material and their prescribed texts.

Most candidates were disadvantaged by their lack of knowledge about the historic context of the novel. It would have been better for many if they had been informed that the stimulus extract was from the novel published in 1886. The words ‘hansom cab’ simply signified a taxi cab to many, so placed the action in the 20th century. The more able candidates were able to identify the 19th century context and setting which greatly enriched their discussion of the socio-cultural values from this period of time.

Stronger responses did address the socio-cultural values raised in the stimulus and their study texts. For example the stimulus text positioned its readers on class and justice and gender. There is no doubt that many responses generally conveyed in their responses human beings’ desire for things to be set right, for things to be solved, for resolutions to be found, for justice to be delivered.

The extract describes the events as occurring at night – darkness is a common technique for building suspense and a sense of mystery. The setting is urban and the crime took place ‘within a short distance of the principal streets of [the] great city’. Readers of the time were being positioned to feel unsafe – dangerous crime can occur ‘*within a short distance of the principal streets...*’ and that threatens those who have social and economic power in a city which may appear civilized.

In an historic context, readers are being positioned on the values of class- the sophisticated element of society is represented positively in the extract: a ‘*gentleman*’ standing near a church wearing ‘*evening dress*’.

There is further spoken language in the stimulus that reinforces readers of the time to accept that a sense of a class superiority over others is proper and natural: as the gentleman says: ‘*look here cabby, ...*’ positioning readers to accept the inferiority of the working class hansom cab driver and: ‘*Being taken into the presence of the inspector, the cabman...*’ further reinforces that there are those in society (at this time) who are seen to be socially superior to others.

There is also mention of the French detective, Lecoq and the suggestion that only the deductive mind of a (male, non Australian) hero/‘super sleuth’ investigator will be able to solve the case. The criminal is referred to as an ‘assassin’ which heightens the sense of

mystery , positions us to accept that money can buy social power and revenge; and increases the readers sense of indignation that the crime is against social ‘betters’ , and that ‘he’ must be brought to justice by the end of the novel. Social power seems only in the hands of some.

Candidates clearly enjoyed and engaged with this module overall. The various texts chosen as illustration of understanding of context seemed to make it easy for candidates to develop a critical and analytical response, so that the overall discussion of two texts was encouraging. The responses showed evidence that candidates had enjoyed responding to these texts.

However candidates must be further encouraged to read more closely and develop their analyses of the genre of crime fiction in order to discuss the techniques employed to position audiences and support the dominant readings of texts and the hidden agendas of socio cultural values.

Question 7

The question directed candidates to demonstrate how creators position their audience to feel sympathy for people being represented in their texts. So responses needed to centre on discussion of positioning to create sympathy. The reader is positioned to feel sympathy for the writer, the text creator, but also for the focus of the piece, her son. As both are represented in the text both must be considered. Several responses spent too long introducing the generic features of positioning without specific reference to the stimulus or any text.

Texts that may be referred to in the generic question, include those from the Applications and the Communications Project as well as texts studied in sports journalism, documentaries and crime fiction.

The best answers interwove their discussion of positioning in the stimulus material with the texts they had studied. For example, Doreen Wendt-Weir immediately drew sympathy from her readers by admitting that she had ‘not been a marvelous mother. No, I have not.’ Answers then considered other text creator’s ability to elicit sympathy for main characters, in relation to ‘This Marvellous Life.’ The responder needs to consider the son’s representation by his mother as well as the image she presents of herself.

Wendt-Weir draws us into her narrative, into her own understanding of her journey as a mother. Strong answers considered how narrative voices are used in texts studied as well as the stimulus material. In the stimulus piece, because the narrator blames herself, we accept her point of view as being truthful. Her narrative voice is strong and positive. In the stimulus material only the narrator’s voice is privileged.

Techniques used in texts to position audiences needed to be explored in some detail. Strong answers considered a variety. Using the stimulus text, the responder might explore linguistic features such word choice, especially the use of strong emotive verbs, hyperbole and emotive imagery. Other texts might have inter-textual references.

Careful selection of detail should also be discussed. In the stimulus material we are shown the history of their relationship. Other texts may be discussed by explaining the camera angles used, the omission of detail, the use of colour or black and white film, visual metaphors, repeated scenes.

Strong answers used examples and quotations within the text, a richness of language that reflected the texts selected for discussion and a deep understanding of those texts.

Unfortunately few answers were lengthy enough to explain most of these textual features. Several candidates were victims of time constraints and many of the candidates in the lower C range had unfinished answers. A planned answer shows. If a candidate is concerned about time, a plan will allow the examiner to see where their thinking and understanding of positioning was going.

A structured response that analysed the stimulus and related the studied texts immediately was more effective in demonstrating an understanding of positioning than a generic introduction.

Folio

Folios provide a cross-section of the teaching and learning of Communications across Tasmania. The three pieces are chosen from work completed during the course in at least two of the following modules:

- Ideas and Issues
- Texts and Contexts
- Applications
- Communications Project into the power of language within texts

Marking them gives valuable insights into modules, texts and teaching.

In 2007 there were new modules in Strand 2 *Texts and Contexts*:

- Crime Fiction
- Documentary Film
- Sports Reporting

The folios contain plenty of new texts and teaching ideas for markers.

Most folios included pieces across a range of units. This has improved from previous years, and reflects the revised Folio Guidelines which state:

The three pieces must be selected from at least TWO modules. A text can only be used once as a basis for response. Each text must be identified in the Context Statement.

Predictably, there is a wide range of standards in the folios. On the one hand, this is inevitable in a large subject with over 2000 candidates, many of whom are not specializing in English/Humanities. On the other hand, it is a continual concern that many candidates, including good ones, do not follow the Guidelines in their selection of pieces. However, the standard of the folios has improved on last year.

There are still too many folios with the following errors:

- Unsuitable pieces for the chosen form(s)
- Three pieces from the same module
- Two pieces based on the same text.
- Inappropriate Communication Study focus

Folios with these errors were penalized. Teachers must note the penalties applied in 2007:

- One or more inappropriate pieces or 2 pieces from same text: C- D- for C7
- 3 pieces from same module: 'D' for C7 and 10.

Markers often comment on potentially strong folios which get a 'C' or 'D' rating for one criterion, usually C7. Such folios tended to reflect poor choices in collation rather than be extremely weak responses.

Teachers who need guidance in selecting suitable pieces should note the comments of individual markers in this report.

Those candidates who had read the folio guidelines and had selected pieces appropriately, tended to achieve higher ratings. The higher ratings tended to balance content of folios well. The higher ratings were awarded for a wide range of genres, styles and in particular, reflective pieces which were distinctively personal. The three pieces included were of an equal length and equal quality. There were few errors of collation and the context statements tended to be clear concise and simple.

Whilst there were lesser Folios that showed the sophisticated analysis, reflection and creativity that is expected of an A rating candidate, there was some solid B rating work in relation to this criterion. There was a wide variety of texts used for springboards into different forms of writing and the quality and accuracy of presentation was also better than previous years. In responding to texts, many candidates showed a deep level of critical, creative and reflective thinking about many current discourses in society. The fact that these are publication pieces makes them a pleasure to read. As a team we double marking a significant number.

However, clearly there are still too many candidates presenting for external assessment who are not pre-tertiary English candidates in terms of either their language skills or their conceptual understanding.

Context Statements

Context statements were not always handled well this year. Many candidates did not stick to the agreed pro forma or address each of the mandatory fields.

For candidates who used the pro forma supplied by TQA, it made the task of marking so much easier.

Most candidates generally identified the *Module/Text* connections and adequately explained their intentions for each piece. Some candidates did not know what *Module/Text* meant and simply called this 'Texts and Contexts'

However, many candidates did not provide details of the text composers and too many simply put the title of their Applications or Communications Study without stating what the actual source was. Most complied with the requirement of 3 different writing styles for their folio; a couple of folios doubled up with their genres.

Candidates need to consider carefully how they are going to label their pieces. Still, in some cases, a piece was clearly analytical and yet it was labeled reflective. Many candidates did not seem to know which module their piece came from. Some candidates seemed to want to fool the marker by excluding the name of the module from their context statement in order to try to submit a third piece from the same module.

The main problem came with the *Selection of Form* heading. Many candidates wrote about the form of the text connection and did not indicate what form they had chosen for their own piece. Candidates need to state this in terms of whether their piece is an essay, a short story, a reflective journal entry, a newspaper article, report, monologue etc. Many candidates summarized the text which formed the basis of the piece. It is not necessary to paraphrase plot e.g. '*Stolen* is a play about the stolen generation. There are five diverse characters.' etc

While the Context Statements are not marked, candidates should be aware that they provide a first impression. If the expression is clear and logical, the punctuation is accurate and the content is clear, concise and relevant, the marker is gaining a positive impression before they read the actual text. In most cases, the Context Statement was invaluable in informing about the chosen form, purpose and audience of the piece. It is important to realize that the marker may not have read/seen the text being discussed so the Context Statement provides a very important introduction.

Context statements should be kept to one page in length. Some candidates took the opportunity to add more reflective writing in their Context Statement, to paraphrase the written piece or to continue their argument; all of which are unnecessary and unproductive.

Criterion 7

Creative responses

The creative response gives the candidate the opportunity to address and expand Criterion 7 well by using a different voice from their own.

- This year, there was a wider variety of creative texts, for example: short story, interview with composers, photographic jigsaw puzzle, power point presentation, a mini documentary, an impact statement, an extract from a biography of a grandparent, an alternative ending to a crime fiction novel, fairy tales, DVDs, feature articles, drama scripts, monologues, interviews with characters.

While there are many forms and styles that come under the creative banner, pieces that either built on from a text or were crafted from completely original ideas but in connection to a module, allowed candidates to develop a much stronger range. Many of these responses were successful in creating different voices while at the same time highlighting the attitudes and values privileged in the texts that the candidates have been inspired by.

A definition of ‘creativity’ is always difficult. A simple project type presentation, with pictures and some information, is not really suitable at this level. A CD cover which has an inside fold containing some blurb analyzing the content of the songs is not an adequate creative piece.

The creative pieces which were not strong seemed to mitigate against the best demonstration of ‘creativity’. Creating a product is not necessarily creative in the genuine sense if all that has been done is to synthesize information (most often downloaded from the internet) rather than offer any imaginative extension to the task. There were not as many multimedia texts submitted this year. Candidates who did submit them, however, still fell into the trap of thinking that making a PowerPoint presentation which analyzed a band’s music was a good example of a creative piece.

The choice of form in the creative sometimes limited the scope and flare of language e.g. interviews, news articles and PowerPoint presentation, enabled a retelling of the story, an analysis of particular criterion or an analysis of the text rather than a creative response to a text. Having said this, there were some outstanding pieces that used the interview and news article forms extremely well. Obvious consideration had been given to development a persona whose opinion or ideas were not analytical or retelling the story.

In a few cases photographs were taken straight from websites and collated with very little creative writing of any sort. Some folios included information such as a DVD in one case which was not the candidate’s work: it was simply included as a means to explain a personal position. E.g.’ This comment has been included for your information rather than publishing. In one case in particular a power point presentation about abortion was included which was not the candidates work. It contained material that was confronting and distressing and should not have been included.

Long stories, mainly ‘retelling’ of a personal incident, were also less successful. A number of these were merely retelling or remodeling plots and used no techniques to engage the responder. A book review, which is a combination of analysis and reflection, does not qualify as a creative piece.

Some of the best creative responses, ironically, were those that were more traditional in approach simply because they had an imaginative/original dimension to them. Other creative pieces used images and written text very successfully, to present a more sophisticated creative component.

Analytical/Interpretative/Investigative Responses

Analytical essays are by far the most sophisticated and demanding choice. This piece was often the strongest in the folio and most folios included analytical essays. They mostly came from the *Texts and Contexts* module, in particular, Crime Fiction and Documentary or the Communications Study

Analytical/interpretative/investigative pieces really varied in standard but generally used relevant quotations as support evidence. Often, analytical pieces in the form of essays failed to answer the question specified in the Context Statement. Weaker analytical pieces failed to include evidence or quotations. Most failed to include in-text referencing and were not scholarly at all.

The Investigative and Interpretative pieces were in most cases very basic and lacking in evidence. Often they were observations rather than showing a candidate’s deeper thinking.

Communication Study

Many Communication Studies do not allow the candidate to address the focus of demonstrating an understanding of the power of language in contemporary texts in Australian society. There were a number of projects that did not address the focus stipulated in the syllabus e.g. the history of computer technology. Many projects that had been included were almost Sociology and Psychology based rather than English analysis. This seems very much to be down to the teacher approving inappropriate topics. It is critical that these answer an inquiry question based on the power of language (in texts) in a contemporary Australian Context.

A number of candidates included their Communications Study as an ‘investigative’ piece but most of these were not investigative at all. Many were just ‘projects’ that were informative rather than investigative and were over-reliant on synthesizing downloadable information or summarizing events.

Although the focus of the Communications Project is to demonstrate an understanding of the power of language (of texts) in contemporary society, this was rarely evident.

The better responses focused on the representations in specific texts such as picture books, film, written and electronic media where visual and written techniques were analyzed and linked to how audiences were positioned. Where a candidate had analyzed the texts themselves rather than included other people's ideas and research on a social issue the ratings were higher.

Candidates generally were able to analyze the construction of texts to show how the audience is being positioned. The best ones referred closely to the structures and features of the genre and examined the linguistic features: visual, spoken and written. Analytical pieces of a high standard drew on detailed examples to support insights.

Strong analytical pieces avoid re-telling. When candidates had a limited understanding of the purpose of creating the analytical piece, the piece retold the plot of texts. Pieces of a lower standard were written in informal register and casual language.

Research Referencing

Material from the Communications Study appeared as popular choices, particularly as analytical pieces. It is very important that these pieces contain detailed references, as outlined in the folio guidelines. Often generalized comments were made, without support ('Research has shown...' etc). Quotations also need to be footnoted and correctly referenced.

The guidelines for folios clearly state that a list of websites is not a bibliography however these lists continue to appear. A better range of research material might include at least 3 sources: one electronic, one written and one other. Candidates must also be discouraged from using a URL as a footnote. Images also need to be referenced. A number of photographic essays contained predominantly plagiarized material that had been downloaded and not correctly referenced.

Personal Reflection Responses

Whilst there was considerable improvement in the reflective writing style this year, there appears to still be confusion on what constitutes a reflective piece.

This was disappointing as reflective writing guidelines were distributed to teachers this year to improve understanding about what constitutes a reflective piece in this course and it is quite different to analysis. The poorest reflective pieces were often the ones not linked to a text.

Reflective writing charts how the candidate's personal context and values have led them to react to the texts they have met in the course, and whether their ideas and values have been challenged and/or confirmed.

Those reflective pieces that focused on a text rather than a general discussion of an idea such as Australian values were far stronger, allowing a deeper analysis of the candidate's personal context. The difficulty occurred when, focused on a text, they tended to become more analytical; the personal reflective remains a real challenge for many candidates. In some otherwise excellent Folios, the style of the candidate's reflective piece didn't differ much from that of their analytical piece. Only the best candidates were able to discuss how their attitudes and values had been affected by the intention of a composer as represented through their texts.

While there was a variety of forms e.g. journal, diary entries, editorials etc. it is not considered that autobiographical writing, or a letter from the candidate introducing themselves to the teacher is an appropriate example of reflective writing at pre tertiary level. A newspaper article is similarly not a good choice of form for a reflective piece.

- Journal entries and work diaries describing the process of creating a piece of class work were interesting to read but too often were logs of time spent or summaries rather than personal responses to ideas and issues in texts.
- There were a number of power point presentations, which contained no reflective statements
- There were a number of written pieces which re-told personal experiences without reflective comments. Simply giving an opinion is not enough to make a piece strongly reflective. Prefacing a statement with 'I think' or 'I believe' does not automatically make it reflective. Many candidates begin this way but then go on to make statements that are simply a factual retelling of an element of a text.
- A number of candidates continue to include autobiographical writing (maybe from set Applications) as reflective pieces when these were usually simple retelling of experiences. For such a piece to be genuinely reflective, the candidate needs to develop it and go on to reflect on how this experience has impacted on his or her growth as an individual in relation to ideas, attitudes and socio cultural values
- There was a problematic overlap when candidates submitted pieces assessed internally on Criteria 2 and 9 (exam responses e.g.) This resulted in reflective pieces that contained a great number of analytical points; as well as analytical pieces in which the opinions of the creator were clearly articulated, rather than the responder's. It is important that candidates select pieces which do not overlap in criteria or form. This is as important as not overlapping in content.
- Most candidates can articulate the personal context of influence of family and friends on their ideas, attitudes and values but few attempt to make the next step into the higher

level elements of reflection in terms of demonstrating some understanding of themselves in relation to their socio-cultural; political contexts

- A number of tasks set for the purposes of ‘reflection’ do not appear to be conducive to that process, in terms of the candidate’s reflecting in relation to his/her own ideas, attitudes and values

Strong reflective pieces clearly reflect on and precisely articulate the composer’s (candidates) connection to and engagement with the texts that had influenced their ideas and values:

- What the candidate believed the invited/dominant reading is
- How their response may have/supported or contested the dominant reading
- How the text connected with their personal attitudes and their values
- To what extent they believed their own beliefs, values and attitudes affected their ‘reading’ or response to the text
- How it has impacted on or developed or changed their personal understandings of ideas, issues or socio cultural attitudes or values
- What they believed was influential or effective in the text that positioned them positively or negatively;
- What was difficult or challenging and why
- How they knew about the contexts that influenced the creation of the text: what kind of person, from what background, with what values and how they knew this

Perhaps there could be some productive sharing of tasks or activities that have lent themselves to strong reflective responses as part of the Moderation process

Criterion 10

The writer with flair is rare!

Many pieces were pedestrian, utilizing clumsy expression and limited syntactical variation. Given that candidates had been permitted to rework their pieces, there were some folios with a disturbing number of typographical errors.

The usual problems were evident:

- over-reliance on unchanging and simplistic sentence structures
- misused apostrophes
- comma splice errors
- By and large the editing left much to be desired, even though candidates are expected to have polished these pieces to publication standard.
- Some folios were very under length – one by 1000 words. Some folios were also substantially over length. Candidates are reminded that part of the discipline of Criterion 10 is adhering to a word limit.

- Proof reading was very poor. There were many spelling mistakes, ‘typos’, repetitious words and phrases as well as words being omitted altogether.
- Many candidates failed to indicate text titles correctly. Whole text titles need to be shown in italic font and parts of whole texts, such as chapter titles or newspaper or magazine article headings, should be shown in inverted commas. The same applies to poem and song titles.
- There were also folios that never, in a whole piece, indicated the name of a text, either with italics, or any other device.
- Many candidates did not know how to punctuate direct speech correctly.
- Tenses were often mixed - as an example: ‘It was half time. The Kangaroos are winning by two points.’
- Limited informal register and vocabulary. The register adopted by the candidates was often too casual and informal. Candidates need to differentiate between situations that call for formal expression and diction and those which require informal/colloquial expression/diction. A small amount of SMS jargon is creeping in e.g. ‘U’
- Confusion of – lose/loose, affect/effect, practice/practise
- Use of second persona e.g. ‘you’ in formal essays
- Long quotes incorrectly cited (should be indented both sides of the page and a space above and below them in the candidate’s prose)
- Single sentences becoming one single paragraph
- Introductions using ‘In this essay, my personal response...’
- Addressing a quote (‘In this quote, you can see...’)
- Apostrophes for plurals
- Citation of page numbers - p 18, pg 18

This is a concern in pre-tertiary English. This year, generally, the overall standard of written expression made the candidates’ responses easy to follow in relation to the meaning being made. The main issues with general expression and accuracy seemed to be a result of poor proof-reading by the candidates. It is obvious that many candidates who are not capable of a pre-tertiary English course have chosen to do this course.

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Tasmanian Qualifications Authority
PO Box 147, Sandy Bay 7006
Ph: (03) 6233 6364 Fax: (03) 6224 0175
Email: reception@tqa.tas.gov.au
Internet: <http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au>