

Student Name: _____

ENGLISH (1)

2021 Written Trial Examination

Reading Time: 15 minutes

Writing Time: 3 hours

TASK BOOK

<i>Section</i>	<i>Number of questions</i>	<i>Number of questions to be answered</i>	<i>Marks</i>
A – Analytical interpretation of a text	20	1	20
B – Comparative analysis of texts	8	1	20
C – Argument and persuasive language	1	1	20
			Total 60

- Students are to write in blue or black pen.
- Students are permitted to bring into the examination room: pens, pencils, highlighters, erasers, sharpeners, rulers and an English and/or bilingual printed dictionary.
- Students are NOT permitted to bring into the examination room: blank sheets of paper and/or correction fluid/tape.
- No calculator is allowed in this examination.

Materials supplied:

- Task book of 16 pages

Instructions

- Complete each section of the Task book in an external answer book/ space.
- If you choose to write on a multimodal text in Section A, you must not write on a text pair that includes a multimodal text in Section B.
- All written responses must be in English.

At the end of the examination

- You may keep this task book.

Students are NOT permitted to bring mobile phones and/or any other unauthorised electronic devices into the examination room.

SECTION A – Analytical interpretation of a text**Instructions for Section A**

Section A requires students to write an analytical interpretation of a selected text in response to one topic (either 1. or 2.) on one text.

Your response should be supported by close reference to the selected text.

If your selected text is a collection of poetry or short stories, you may write on several poems or stories, or on at least two in close detail.

If you choose to write on a multimodal text in Section A, you must not write on a text pair that includes a multimodal text in section B.

In the answer book, indicate which text you have chosen to write on and whether you have chosen to answer i. or ii.

Section A is worth one-third of the total marks for the examination.

Text List

1. *After Darkness*.....Christine Piper
2. *All the Light We Cannot See*.....Anthony Doerr
3. *Behind the Beautiful Forevers: Life, Death, and Hope in a Mumbai Undercity*.....Katherine Boo
4. *Extinction*.....Hannie Rayson
5. *In Cold Blood*.....Truman Capote
6. *Like a House on Fire*.....Cate Kennedy
7. *Much Ado About Nothing*.....William Shakespeare
8. *Nine Days*.....Toni Jordan
9. *Old/New World: New & Selected Poems*.....Peter Skrzynecki
10. *Persepolis: The Story of a Childhood*.....Marjane Satrapi
11. *Pride and Prejudice*.....Jane Austen
12. *Rear Window*.....directed by Alfred Hitchcock
13. *Runaway*.....Alice Munro
14. *Station Eleven*.....Emily St John Mandel
15. *Stories We Tell*.....directed by Sarah Polley
16. *The Golden Age*.....Joan London
17. *The Lieutenant*.....Kate Grenville
18. *The Women of Troy*.....Euripides
19. *Things Fall Apart*.....Chinua Achebe
20. *William Wordsworth: Poems Selected by Seamus Heaney*.....William Wordsworth

***After Darkness* by Christine Piper**

- i. “My silence had been weak.”

After Darkness explores the debilitating power of silence. Discuss.

OR

- ii. Piper explores how choices are ultimately motivated by obedience and fear.

To what extent do you agree?

***All the Light We Cannot See* by Anthony Doerr**

- i. “But we are the good guys. Aren’t we, Uncle?”

Doerr reveals that in times of conflict, moral choices do not matter. Discuss.

OR

- ii. “Open your eyes, concludes the man, and see what you can with them before the close forever.”

How does Doerr explore the painful struggle for self-awareness?

***Behind the Beautiful Forevers: Life, Death and Hope in a Mumbai Undercity* by Katherine Boo**

- i. “For every two people in Annawadi inching up, there was one in a catastrophic plunge.”

How does Boo empower her readers to experience and understand the harsh realities of slum life?

OR

- ii. “...it is blisteringly hard to be good. The astonishment is that some people are good.”

Boo suggests that when confronted by formidable obstacles, it is impossible for people to be good.

To what extent do you agree?

***Extinction* by Hannie Rayson**

- i. ‘If you want to make a difference to the environment, you have to be rich.’

Rayson’s play suggests that economic interests will always be prioritised. Discuss.

OR

- ii. ‘Who’s this ‘we’? You don’t serve your cause by being indifferent to the interests of the working people.’

Rayson’s play suggests that indifference and compromise are dangerous. To what extent do you agree?

***In Cold Blood* by Truman Capote**

- i. “Four shotgun blasts that, all told, ended six human lives.”

Capote is ambivalent about whether his readers should focus on the killers’ brutality or their humanity.

To what extent do you agree?

OR

- ii. ‘Always certain of what he wanted from the world, Mr. Clutter had in large measure obtained it.’

Capote’s investigative journalism exposes resentment of the American Dream. Discuss.

SECTION B – Comparative analysis of texts**Instructions for Section B**

Section B requires students to write a comparative analysis of a selected pair of texts in response to one topic (either i. or ii.) on one pair of texts.

Your response should analyse how the two texts present ideas and/or issues, and should be supported by close reference to both texts in the pair.

If you choose to write on a multimodal text in Section A, you must not write on a text pair that includes a multimodal text in Section B.

In the answer book, indicate which text pair you have chosen to write on and whether you have chosen to answer i. or ii.

Your response will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out of page 14 of this book.

Section B is worth one-third of the total marks for the examination.

Pair 5 *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller and *The Dressmaker* by Rosalie Ham

- i. “Tragedy includes everyone ... wasn’t everyone else in the town different, yet included?” (*The Dressmaker*)
 “But you must understand, sir, that a person is either with this court or he must be counted against it, there be no road between.” (*The Crucible*)
 Compare what the texts reveal about the judgement and treatment of those who are different.

OR

- ii. Compare what the texts suggest about protecting reputations at all cost.

Pair 6 *Photograph 51* by Anna Ziegler and *The Penelopiad: The Myth of Penelope and Odysseus* by Margaret Atwood

- i. The texts suggest that patriarchal expectations and behaviours equally diminish men and women. Discuss.

OR

- ii. “I kept my mouth shut.” (*The Penelopiad*)
 “We made the invisible visible.” (*Photograph 51*)
 Both texts demonstrate the importance of storytelling from those previously silenced. To what extent do you agree?

Pair 7 *The 7 Stages of Grieving* by Wesley Enoch and *Deborah Mailman* and *The Longest Memory* by Fred D’Aguiar

- i. “Reconciliation: what does it really mean?” (*The 7 Stages of Grieving*)
 “We must not allow this trade to turn us into savages. We are Christians.” (*The Longest Memory*)
 Compare what the texts have to say about the struggle and necessity for a social change.

OR

- ii. Compare what the texts suggest about the value of memories and grief.

Pair 8 *I Am Malala: The Girl Who Stood Up for Education and Was Shot by the Taliban* by Malala Yousafzai with Christina Lamb, and *Pride* directed by Matthew Warchus

- i. “I was the only girl with my face not covered.” (*I Am Malala*)
 “It’s just I don’t really want to be too visible.” (*Pride*)
 Compare what the text suggest about the courage required to resist oppression.

OR

- ii. Compare what the text suggest about the importance of valuing the well-being of others.

**END OF SECTION B
 TURN OVER**

SECTION C – Argument and persuasive language**Information for Section C****Instructions for Section C**

Section C requires students to write an analysis of the ways in which argument and language are used to persuade others to share a point(s) of view.

Read the background information on this page and the material on pages 12 and 13, and write an analytical response to the task below.

For the purposes of this task, the term ‘language’ refers to written, spoken and visual language.

Your response will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on page 14 of this book.

Section C is worth one-third of the total marks for the examination.

Task

Write an analysis of the ways in which argument and written and visual language are used in the material to try to persuade others to share the points of view presented.

Background Material

According to the latest National Drug Survey, 2/3 of current smokers and 1/5 of non-smokers in the 18-to-24-year age group had used battery operated E-cigarettes to simulate the smoking of cigarettes.

E-cigarettes and their potential health effects have been hotly contested, and the ongoing Parliamentary Inquiry on Tobacco Harm Reduction in 2020, focused on whether products associated with E-cigarettes, should be banned or should be available on a “prescription-only model.”

The TGA (Therapeutic Goods Administration) has created policy regulations to be introduced in October 2021, where imported liquid nicotine can only be prescribed by a medical doctor. Several organisations have published press releases in response.



Fears about adolescent vaping overstated

Pro-Vape Australia was formed in 2020. As an activist organisation, we're dedicated to campaigning for fair regulation of vaping and e-cigarettes. We aim to improve

- ✓ the quality of life and better health of all Australian smokers
- ✓ by ensuring they have access to effective and safe products.

Our mission statement strongly opposes the TGA's overzealous regulations for a 'prescription only model.' This is a slap in the face to 500,000 Australians who use e-cigarettes to try and quit tobacco.

We are calling on all pro-vaping voters and MPs to fight against this ridiculous decision.

We will mobilise 500,000 vapers against anti-vaping MPs, not fulfilling their responsibility to those in need.

All fair-minded Australians, whether they are vapers or not, strongly believe public policy should be based on the best available evidence. Public health experts, tobacco specialists, vapers and frontline health workers want to reduce harm. We should support a *consumer product model of regulation*, treating e-cigarettes like other quit aids, including nicotine patches, that are sold without prescription.

Reject the lies.

How common is regular vaping by teenagers? Contrary to the lies, regular vaping by young people is rare and almost exclusively confined to current or past smokers.

Is vaping a "gateway" to smoking? Scientific evidence does NOT support the '[gateway theory](#)' that young people who would never have smoked cigarettes:

- a) try vaping
- b) become addicted and
- c) then go on to regular smoking.

Is Vaping an effective means to harm reduction?

If vaping was attracting young people to smoke, wouldn't an increase in youth smoking rates be expected?

The reputable Australian Institute of Health review recently concluded, "it is likely that vaping is replacing — rather than encouraging — the smoking of tobacco cigarettes". Our research reveals vaping may be a "reverse gateway" used by some teens to [quit smoking](#). In America allowing the sale of e-cigarettes, has coincided with significant falls in youth smoking rates. In contrast, Australia's smoking rates have remained largely unchanged.



EXTRA

EXPERIENCED TEACHER RESOURCES & ASSESSMENTS

Student Name: _____

ENGLISH (1)

2021 Written Trial Examination

Reading Time: 15 minutes

Writing Time: 3 hours

SECTION C SOLUTIONS

SAMPLE

EXTRA 2021 English Units 3&4 Trial Exam (1)

Solutions for Section C

Sample Response

The sudden popularity of e-cigarettes has led to a storm of controversy over whether they are a healthier way to quit smoking or an insidious ploy by tobacco companies to maintain profitability. In an earnest and insistent press release for Pro Vape Australia titled, “Fears about adolescent vaping overstated” John Sutherland contends that the Therapeutic Goods Administration’s (TGA) proposed restrictions on liquid nicotine products are excessive and unjust. He explicitly targets vapers, those trying to quit smoking and policy makers who are in a position to repeal this decision. A media release by Professor Justin Morris paints a very different picture; with him arguing vehemently that all tobacco products are “deadly” and arguing that claims that e-cigarettes assist smoking reduction are spurious.

Sutherland opens with a sternly political argument that any MPs who support the TGA policy are potentially creating a backlash against themselves in the future. Initially he sets out the mission statement and values of Pro-Vape Australia presenting their apparently noble core aims in two bullet ticks. The emphasis on “better health of all Australian smokers” and “safe products” suggests an organisation that is primarily altruistic and socially responsible. Smokers and those related to smokers may feel that at least there is someone who is not simply engaged in criticising smokers and instead working to improve health outcomes for those who are addicted. The ticks subtly convey a sense that these goals are both irrefutable and represent an agreed consensus, thereby priming readers to feel that these goals are worthwhile and sensible. In a sharp tonal shift, the writer turns his attention to the “slap in the face” the proposed regulations represent to “500,000 Australians who... try and quit tobacco.” The sense of violence inherent in the word slap and the number of people involved encourages readers to appreciate the scale and intensity of the issue. But the sudden direct address to “all anti-vaping MPs” who he claims are “not fulfilling their responsibility to those in need” may send a shiver of apprehension through politicians who are sensitive to shifts in public sentiment that may affect their re-election prospects. In a starkly conflicting tone Professor Morris exploits his academic credentials to bluntly claim that there is “no scientific merit in their claims.” Readers who are looking for authoritative guidance on this complex issue may appreciate his focus on research and hard evidence as a basis for making an informed decision.

Morris initially mounts a stridently moral argument against tobacco companies and their “deadly” product. By characterising tobacco companies as mounting an “immoral push to addict our kids” the writer calls into question their integrity and trustworthiness. The word “addict” carries powerful connotations of illicit street drugs and criminal activity. As such, a feeling of repulsion and disgust may be evoked from parents of vulnerable teenagers who are often easily influenced by advertising and cultural fads. Building on his accusation of immorality Morris definitively claims there is “NO scientific merit in their claims.” The use of capitalisation emphasises his degree of certainty in saying this and the fact that as an academic he is well placed to make an assessment in this regard. Critical thinkers might feel inclined to look back at the claims made by Sutherland and check to see if he does indeed marshal any scientific support for his arguments. This attack on the integrity of the tobacco industry is echoed and enlarged upon in the sinister graphic that accompanies the piece. The central focus of the image is a silhouetted figure of a man in a suit, shrouded in smoke, implying that he is a tobacco executive. There is a satanic connotation to the image, clearly designed to evoke feelings of revulsion and threat with regard to the motivations and character of the people who run tobacco companies. Flanking the figure on either side is an enlarged cigarette and a vape device which are clearly the source of the dark smoke. The equal size of both and the mirroring of their angle conveys the sense that they are of equal significance and serve a similar purpose. Readers are guided to the conclusion that, rather than benign products to help smokers to quit, they are a significant part of the new business model of these companies. The red hundred-dollar bills from which they spring symbolise the idea that the profits accumulated via e-cigarettes are also little more than blood money. Thus, readers are left with the subliminal idea that e-cigarettes are as dangerous and toxic as any other form of smoking. Quite the reverse is seen in Sutherland’s piece as he claims that vaping actually represents a form of “harm reduction.” This phrase has strong pragmatic and rational connotations. In this way, practical readers may feel that any measure that reduces harm is, in a utilitarian sense, the rational choice that should be supported.

(This sample is an extract of the full solution)