It is recommended that this report for external assessment is read in conjunction with previous reports of 2004–2011, available on the TQA website at http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/1071. Candidates are advised to read all reports carefully, and employ the advice and direction given therein.

WRITTEN EXAMINATION PAPER

The following remarks necessitate some repetition of report comments from previous years. Once again examiners are concerned at the extent to which problems and errors recur from year to year, especially given the extent of report advice available to candidates and teachers at http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/1071.

An example of past advice that is equally applicable in 2012 is the following comment from the 2011 report: ‘Too many candidates demonstrated that they had limited or no understanding that texts are fictional constructs which severely restricted their ability to write analytically in Section A and in a sophisticated manner in Section B. Candidates repeatedly made statements such as: If ‘x’ had or had not done ‘y’ then s/he would still be alive and the whole story would have been different etc. Typically such responses used the past tense and discussed the characters as if they were ‘real’ people with ‘real’ alternatives. Use of the present tense tends to encourage candidates to focus on characters as fictional constructs as distinct from historical factual information in the past tense to show they understand the distinction between the two’.

Better scripts were fluent, coherent and formally expressed. Stronger answers were longer, demonstrated careful preparation and attention to detail, made effective use of quotations, answered the question, and gave balanced attention to each criterion. The best answers were really very impressive with their articulate, original, complex and polished discussions.

Weaker scripts tended to be shorter in length, therefore compromising balanced or adequate attention to the two criteria being addressed. Often the question was not answered. Some weaker candidates demonstrated weak written expression that was below pre-tertiary standard. Weaker responses often were rambling general discussion, commentary or plot summary, with few or no quotations nor detailed reference to texts. Weaker personal responses were often simply reactive comments rather than deeper reflections or explorations of issues and values.

Some responses in Part B included reference to historical context of the text. This detracted the focus from the requirements of the question. Time was spent on the historical context, at times not connecting the information to the question, consequently weakening the response, and limiting attention to criterion 9.

Candidates are advised against using personal anecdotes as they address criterion 9 in Part B answers.

Even though candidates can introduce non-list texts in Part B answers, it was sometimes difficult to assess Part B scripts that focused on texts not on the lists at http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/4DCGI/_WWW_doc/066760/RND01/FINAL__TextList_2012ENS.pdf, especially in the cases of candidates prioritising attention to such texts. In can only be assumed that such texts featured in the Application studied by those candidates and/or featured as the potentially non-list second text for the paired text study, (and in which case the candidate would not have written on the paired-text question in part A).

Most scripts were legible; however those that were illegible made it difficult for markers to assess the script.

The extent of spelling errors is concerning. There is no excuse for misspelling titles, nor composers’, characters’ and place names.

Writing conventions were often ignored, including paragraph indentation and correct use of punctuation, especially inverted commas.
Candidates are again reminded to use *quotation marks only* for poem and short story titles, and to *underline only* the titles of novels, plays and films.

Quotation procedure continues to be poorly observed. Quotations must be used to support points and be presented accurately. Short quotations should be in single inverted commas within the line. Longer quotations must be blocked and do not need inverted commas. Poetry quotations must observe the line breaks in the poem, either by placing them on separate lines, as per the poem, or using/to show line delineation. This protocol in particular was very poorly observed.

Candidates need to pay more attention to details on the front of their exam booklets. If they write the incorrect question number on the front, marking examiners are obliged to mark the paper accordingly, even if it seems that the script is perhaps an answer to another question.

Furthermore, it is imperative that candidates are absolutely clear about which texts can be admitted to section A and to each of questions 1, 2 and 3, and equally absolutely clear about how to apply a text to a Section B question.

The written examination guidelines provide relevant advice to assist candidates prepare for the exam.

**Section A**

**Question 1**

(a) **Love**

Many candidates seemed to struggle with this question, particularly with its use of the term ‘restricted’. Their instinct is to agree with whatever statement is made; in this instance, however, candidates may well have disagreed with it. Evidence of revision to one answer suggested that one strong candidate began by challenging the statement but went back and changed the argument to be in keeping with the line taken by the quotation; this candidate really seemed to wrestle with the question. Unfortunately, many candidates did not seem to have the confidence to reject the statement or partially agree with it. Some candidates became confused and ended up contradicting themselves - they began by agreeing with the statement but obviously really meant to disagree with it.

The best answers directly addressed the question and maintained a close focus on it throughout the discussion, while demonstrating an excellent understanding and knowledge of the poems and the poets. Strong answers also seamlessly integrated the discussion of the poets’ historical and cultural context and their view of love as developed in the respective poems.

Weaker answers showed some confusion over which historical and cultural context was being referred to. A clear understanding of the poems’ contexts is essential for this section of the exam.

Weaker candidates also showed some confusion about the nature of ‘context’. When they did mention historical points, weaker candidates remained general, saying that this ‘shows the attitudes of people at that point in time’ rather than spelling out exactly where and when.

Some answers began with a lengthy, seemingly prepared, introduction that mused on the nature of love and took away valuable time from addressing the question itself.

In some scripts there was some confusion between the date of publication and the assumed date of composition. Some candidates included inaccurate dates.
There were some excellent introductions that were developed around the question and included considerable background detail. The weaker introductions were very brief and made a one line reference to the question, or no reference.

The term ‘restricted’ was interpreted in various ways. The question was asking about the poets’ views of love, but candidates seemed to focus on the word ‘restricted’ and apply it to other things. Candidates interpreted ‘more restricted view’ as ‘narrow understanding’, a ‘lack of experience, or restricted by ‘circumstances’. Other interpretations included the following:

- Restricted by a complex form (i.e., Marvell)
- Restrictions on marriage and whom one could love in earlier eras (societal constraints).
- Views of love and sex unrestricted by convention
- Feminism has restricted love in that women are free to choose and to criticise (Scott)
- Scott’s view of love is more restricted because she is ‘picky’ and can choose, whereas Donne ‘lost himself in love’
- In Harwood and Scott’s poems, love is restricted because both women hold something back through fear of being hurt
- Gender roles equated with restriction or lack of it

One candidate distinguished between a lack of restrictions (Scott) and a lack of care for the restrictions of society (Marvell).

In Donne’s time people were questioning concepts of religion, heliocentrism, courtly love – and therefore, love is unrestricted because its true experience had not been settled yet.

One candidate explained that Donne and Marvell write of a cosmic, idealised and therefore unrestricted view of love; whereas more modern poets had a more realistic and therefore restricted view.

Most candidates used two poems upon which to base their argument. Weaker candidates made a poor choice of poems to compare, perhaps based on a lack of preparation. For example, choosing Scott and Harwood or Scott and Cummings did not allow the same breadth of contextual comparison as some other potential pairings. The most popular pairings were Donne and Cummings and Marvell, or Donne and Harwood. Other answers contrasted Barrett-Browning with Scott. Poems discussed less often were ‘La Belle Dame sans Merci’, ‘Sonnets from the Portuguese: XIII’ and ‘Your Paris’.

Adequate (and appropriately chosen) quotations and textual references are essential to support the discussion and provide evidence of knowledge and understanding. Inaccurate spelling of unusual words from the poems detracts from the effect of an otherwise appropriate reference – ‘saucy pentamic wrench’ being an example.

Some candidates did not use many quotations. Accurate quotations must be used. No referencing is needed.

Candidates should refer to the poet by surname only. Referring to the poet by his or her first name, i.e., Margaret, is inappropriate protocol, and implies an intimacy that doesn’t exist.

Weaker candidates writing on Harwood failed to distinguish between the poet and the persona she created.

Knowledge of poetic terms and how they are used in the poems to develop meaning is essential. Many candidates wrote about the poems as if they were narrative, referring to the poet or persona as ‘characters’. There was much inaccuracy around the speakers of the poems. Candidates must practise writing analytically, using quotations to support a point they are making. This is not the same thing as paraphrasing the content of the poem and attaching quotations to it.
(b) Loss

There were a very small number of scripts for this question. The answers were varied in terms of how effectively the candidates discussed the 'negative view' of loss. Candidates generally agreed with the stimulus quotation.

(c) Journey

There were a very small number of scripts for this question. Candidates generally struggled with the stimulus quotation in terms of comparing the nature of the journey in the nominated poems.

(d) Fulfilment

The poems in this group elicited quite strong responses from candidates. Their understanding of the nature of fulfilment appeared quite well developed, and the nominated poems generally inspired insightful answers. The exceptions to this were ‘Frost at Midnight’ and ‘North Light’.

Question 2

This question was more straightforward for texts that were set in the time of their composition. However, the majority of candidates who studied texts that were set in a different context from that of composition demonstrated skill in addressing the question and discussing both contexts. In some cases, this more complex aspect of the question allowed candidates to show depth of understanding of historical and cultural contexts. Conversely, some candidates writing on texts which had the same context for both setting and composition relied on formulaic, prepared essays which meant they were able to include much textual detail but not directly address the question.

This question seemed to pose a problem for some candidates through the perceived ambiguity of the word ‘their’. The majority of candidates interpreted this as belonging to the works themselves and discussed the contexts of setting, rather than the contexts of composition implied by the question.

There were two main approaches to the question: ignore the context of composition completely and discuss context of setting; or discuss the complexity of the question in explaining how the writers’ views are influenced by their historical cultural context. This approach was rewarded on Criterion 3. One candidate disagreed with the statement, arguing that contemporary views are challenged by the themes of the text – ‘a cart-before-the-horse’ way of saying that composers’ values ie freedom of speech are shown in an historical context where they are absent. Another candidate took the question ‘to mean that writers’ works and the historical cultural contexts of those works are determined by the writers’ views and due to these, the contexts can differ. The candidate wrote this interpretation in a stand-alone paragraph at the start of the answer.

In addition to looking for contextual understanding, markers were looking for a comparison of two texts. Textual understanding was looked for in links between the text and its contexts.

The best answers managed to address the question and evenly balance the discussion between the two texts and their contexts; unfortunately a few answers were very uneven with one text being the predominant focus.

Hamlet was a very popular text, being paired with such diverse texts as Sophie Scholl, The Lion King and Animal Kingdom. Although there were many answers comparing The Book Thief to Sophie Scholl, only two candidates understood the idea that what was occurring in the US and Australia in 2005 provided inspiration for the concerns explored and expressed in the texts, both set in Nazi Germany. There were some strong answers exploring the contexts of Clinton’s America, and its interest in the human genome, and Huxley’s context.

In Section A, especially with a focus on criterion 3, it is expected that the names of the composers, as well as the dates of production/publication will be included. A number of answers omitted these details.
In general, the introductions were not very well developed. These are the chance to introduce the texts and their composers, as well as the characters and the contexts, while also directly addressing the question.

Candidates need to remember to give equal weight to each text and to address both criteria. This is very demanding in an hour and should only be attempted by confident and capable candidates.

As the question focuses on the creators’ views, candidates needed to be careful to balance this with also fully addressing criteria 1 and 3.

There were many impressive answers that analysed and compared the texts’ key ideas with insight, originality and an excellent use of textual references. The weakest answers resorted to simple retelling of the plots and/or very few textual references.

The criterion focus of this question meant that the majority of answers did address it. The better answers addressed this criterion throughout their answer in an integrated manner, while the weaker answers tended to address it by ‘dropping’ information about the context into the discussion.

The best answers were able to grapple with the creators’ views, contexts and the contexts they used for their texts and write a sophisticated and very engaging discussion. The very best answers were also able to include discussion of the context of responding to the texts.

The weak answers usually dealt with the essential link, or the context, or the issue, or the history, but usually only one of these elements.

Often contextual statements were made with no reference to textual examples so limiting achievement on criterion 3.

A recurring problem was lack of understanding of the historical context, or claims were made which were historically inaccurate. One example was that ‘Gatsby held lavish parties to celebrate the end of the Great Depression’.

Spelling, punctuation and the basic conventions of written language were quite poor in many scripts.

**Question 3**


Stronger candidates addressed implications of the phrase ‘privilege a particular historical or cultural view’ in their answers by examining the writing context of their chosen texts and revealing how the composers either challenged or reaffirmed their historical and cultural contexts. Those writing on *The Book Thief* examined how Zusak extends the Holocaust discourse, focusing on the plight of the German civilians, using Death as the omniscient narrator to implicate the readers. Stronger answers on *Sophie Scholl* examined the significance of the release of the film in 2005, over sixty years after World War Two. A very insightful candidate wrote:

‘By 2005 almost two generations had passed, all growing up with the scar of Germany’s past etched within them. What the film does by highlighting Sophie’s resistance is provide the people of Germany with solace. It shows that even in a time of great evil there were still...those with humanity who fought the Nazis. By revealing this spark of human decency in an otherwise still hearth, it shows the people of Germany and the world some hope. It is this hope that stems from Sophie’s privileged role within the text that is exactly why the creators emphasised it.’

Better answers were able to identify how authors, or composers of texts, had manipulated their material to present a particular cultural view and realised that characters are constructed so that the author’s particular view
of the world would be obvious. For example, F. Scott Fitzgerald saw the decadence of the Jazz Age in America and the immorality of those who partied without regard for propriety, and who were slaves to money and outward appearances, as being immoral and indicative of the corruption of The American Dream. Fitzgerald was commenting on his own era and what he perceived had gone wrong after the war in the land of opportunity. Nick Carraway is his observer and narrator.

The stronger answers on *Tess* emphasised how Hardy uses Tess to criticise the morality of his own Victorian society and the changes he saw happening around him. Similarly the stronger answers on *The Great Gatsby* showed how Fitzgerald manipulates his characters and setting to reveal the faults of his own 1920s American society. These candidates were a minority. Rather, many candidates appeared confused by the question and lapsed into plot retelling. This was particularly evident with candidates who wrote on *The Kite Runner* and *Brave New World*. There were also many candidates who wrote prepared answers to an issues based question without referring to this year’s question.

Candidates mostly understood the verb ‘privilege’ to mean ‘give prominence to’, and were able to identify what the author was trying to convey about the setting of their text. However, deep and detailed exploration of a particular historical context did not always follow.

Some candidates wrote about authors being ‘privileged’ because they had certain ideas. This was not a correct interpretation.

Length of answer was often directly related to quality of answer.

Some candidates incorporated footnotes into their answers, citing spark notes, e-notes etc. This is not necessary for exam purposes and in many cases confusing for the marker to read.

Although sentence construction, poor spelling and handwriting are not assessed specifically by any criterion, it is fair to say that, if these components cloud the meaning, candidates are certainly not helping themselves as their good ideas may not become apparent to the marker. There is no excuse for misspelling characters’ names.

In the stronger answers it was pleasing to see evidence of detailed insightful knowledge of texts using plot as a scaffold for deeper meanings. These answers were the minority though and far too many scripts showed little detail, no use of textual references and no awareness of layers of meaning.

Many candidates had difficulty sustaining the discussion of ideas relevant to the question.

The stronger candidates were able to seamlessly integrate their knowledge of relevant contextual information with the discussion of ideas and issues. The word ‘privilege’ was misunderstood by many and in some cases completely ignored, resulting in irrelevant answers.

Most candidates showed awareness that texts are a product of their time but did not provide enough detailed evidence to support their statements.

There is no excuse for incorrect dates, monarchs and eras. A common mistake was that *Antigone* was written in the fifth century.

The use of first person is not appropriate in Section A.

**Section B**

**Question 4**

There were a very small number of scripts for this question. The question appears to have been challenging for candidates. Some misunderstood the question, or simply could not find the ‘contemporary transformations’.
Question 5

A full report for question 5 is not available.

A number of candidates discussed only one text – for example Bombshells, in which case it seemed to be assumed that multiple voices equally a range of works. This was not what the question meant.

Question 6

Candidates needed to think carefully about the central idea in the question before applying it to a text. Some candidates appeared not to have done so, resulting in less focused answers.

Writing on more than ‘at least two works’ seems to have compromised richness and depth of discussion in such scripts.

Several candidates submitted a strong discussion of the role of struggle in people’s lives, compelling them to clarify their own ideas and attitudes and values. Interpretation of the question focus was handled well by stronger candidates.

The keyword in the question was ‘struggle’ and many essays engaged with the plight of the underdog. An assortment of responses focussed on an array of characters confronting interior and exterior conflict: better quality answers explained how these conflicts were associated. Most responses explored the basic idea of how the protagonists battle injustice, and then how the characters represent hope in their flawed society. Some responses chose to focus on the antagonist with different levels of success. Some of the interesting ideas and themes explored the following:

The Book Thief / Sophie Scholl – oppression, freedom of speech; self-belief.
Antigone / Sophie – as a feminist struggle.
Gattaca / Bladerunner – individualism, genoism, racial and social equality
Hamlet / The Great Gatsby – dreams, desire, class struggle, destiny, divination and doom
Kite Runner / Atonement – guilt and penance; class and race; cultural divides

It was good to see how candidates explored the various ‘struggles’ of Amir, Sophie, Liesel, Hamlet, Nick Caraway, Antigone et al. who each express different levels of self-awareness in their struggle for status, acceptance, profit, honour, … Good responses explored the who/what/why of struggle, extending into evaluating who is more in need of self-correction – the individual or society? The best answers explored layers of meaning and supported their response with the appropriate evidence. Besides characterisation, the best responses also integrated knowledge of literary devices e.g. style and technique, settings, structures, symbolism to reinforce a point, address the question and illuminate the text as a construction. However, candidates are cautioned against over-discussing techniques to avoid a lapse into addressing criterion 5.

Many answers structured their response as a ‘what would I have done in their situation’ to engage with criterion 9 which worked - some of the time. Often this type of response would identify and reflect on a range of values inside the text such as freedom, hope, choice, and individualism and how they are played out within the narrative. Generally, the better answers went on to analyse and evaluate similar values but also explored how personal values are influenced by a good knowledge of political, social and cultural forces outside of the text that shape interpretation. This usually makes the response more relevant to writer and reader, and therefore more engaging.

The majority of responses explored a rudimentary personal position but better answers revealed a developing personal position represented by a strong, genuine voice. Such responses clearly articulated how the text stimulated the adoption of a new attitude, or an open mind, or may have renewed and strengthened a previous belief. Many candidates wrote of how ‘struggle’ mirrors the growth of the hero - that is, character building is a necessity in life. It is an idea fundamental to the bildungsroman. Candidates may have identified with one
character more than another by the essay’s conclusion and explained why. Some of the more original and better responses questioned the worth of the struggle, or other existential questions such as the nature of destiny and ambition. One excellent essay considered how hypocrisy and prejudice function in the text but also in their judgement and interpretation.

Question 7

Candidates needed to think carefully about the central idea in the question before applying it to a text. Some candidates appeared not to have done so, resulting in less focused answers.

The question called for discussion of one (‘a’) character. A number of candidates used character contrasts and parallels to build the discussion of their focus character and the realisations about themselves that they were invited to examine. This lessened attention to the character in some cases.

The statement and question was very accessible and very popular. Many responses identified how the protagonist, and their narrative, exists as either a moral guide or a source of inspiration. Many good responses employed this empathetic angle – the better essays examined ideas and attitudes the characters represented in more detail and with pertinent text evidence. Many essays focussed on the primary character (but sometimes a secondary) such as Tess, Vincent, Amir, Sophie, Liesel, Hamlet (Claudius), Lester Burnham (Carolyn / Col. Fitts), John Savage, Deckard, Gatsby (Nick / Daisy) – their words, actions and narratives subject to different levels of scrutiny and analysis.

To make their responses stand out, candidates really needed to use prudent text examples to prove their knowledge of the text, to enforce a point, and to answer the question. Different themes and ideas surfaced with regard to society and its faults, or to the individual and their faults. There were examinations of characters who search for freedom and truth while trying to retain their moral integrity. There were one or two responses that explored the enduring difficulties of remaining human within strange dystopian worlds. One response put it well: ‘Roy (in Bladerunner) is not just a character, he is an idea.’ They went on to analyse and evaluate this idea with precise quotations and appropriate text evidence. The same response analysed the filmic qualities and the construction of the idea. There were also some very good deliberations on Hamlet, Sophie and Amir and their levels of heroism or cowardice. Other subjects included the notions of loyalty, duty and responsibility, justice and revenge, martyrdom and madness.

Arguably, the word ‘ourselves’ may refer to the individual reader/viewer and their interpretation but also acts as an intensive pronoun representing broader historical, political and societal attitudes and values regarding race, gender or class; in other words what the text says about the human condition. For example, there were quite a few responses that explored how Tess was a victim of her society – prey to the pious, double standards. Then they explored double standards in contemporary society – attitudes to young pregnant mothers for example. Many advocated on behalf of Sophie and her cause for freedom and bravery suggesting the modern individual would not exhibit the same determination. There were good responses unveiling respect for Elizabeth I as a role model. The format of the questions was successful in extracting interesting personal opinions and to a lesser extent the critical engagement – how the text positions the reader to accept values and attitudes.

Candidates needed to select their focus character carefully to achieve a comprehensive discussion of meaning and invite personal reflection.

The main problem with this excellent question was that many candidates neglected the second part of the question, ie ‘prompts us to examine ourselves’, and thereby wrote about a character in detail with only a perfunctory reference to their own engagement with the text. Criterion 9 was compromised in such cases.

Stronger essays were by candidates who had reflected deeply about the influence of a text upon their own positions. These scripts evidenced a strong personal voice that conveyed how the text had challenged or endorsed their own attitudes and values.
A number of stronger candidates demonstrated deep reflection on the issues in the text and the impact on their personal position. However, personal realisations and evaluations should arise from examining the meaning of the question. Reference to text/s and use of evidence is necessary to justify arguments made and to make links with other situations.

Repetition of the phrase ‘this caused me to examine myself’ was evident in weaker answers. In such cases the comment rarely went further in terms of what deeper reflection had occurred. Furthermore, weaker answers tend to be reactive in that there was regular, and un-developed, comment such as ‘this made me feel’, and ‘this irritated me’, rather than ‘I was prompted to reflect on …’

Failure to draw on supporting evidence lead to generalised discussion.

Question 8

This was not a popular question.

Some candidates mentioned ‘doubt’ in the introduction and then continued writing what appeared to be prepared essays.

The notion of ‘understanding’ was mostly not understood or ignored.

The instruction to discuss ‘two characters’ meant that no credit could be given for discussion of additional characters.

As in previous years, many candidates simply reacted to characters and events, expressing their feelings, and not progressing the analysis to an exploration of their ideas, attitudes and values. Candidates must avoid moving into personal anecdotes.

Imperatives (recurring) and Recommendations

Candidates are strongly advised to read the reports for 2004 – 2011, in which imperatives and on-going concerns are detailed, especially about candidates’ use of language. These concerns remain relevant for the 2012 report. Markers continue to be concerned that the same problems recur annually, especially in regard to expression, and writing conventions.

Learn and practise formal essay structure.

Spend time deconstructing previous exam questions, understanding the need to produce relevant answers addressing the demands of specific questions.

For Part A answers, do not merely ‘dump’ learned ‘chunks’ of data about historical / cultural context. Practise how to integrate such data into discussion of the question.

For Part B answers, it is recommended that candidates select texts that feature on the prescribed list. Examiners cannot be expected to know the range of non-prescribed texts used, and selection of these for exam purposes can be problematic for the marking process.

Practise time management. Do ‘practice exams’ at home against the clock. Acquire self-knowledge about capabilities for managing the exam time frame.

Avoid using prepared answers.

Practise and develop personal response that go beyond merely articulating that ‘I believe’, ‘I feel’, etc.
Provide textual evidence for each point discussed.

Learn and use correct spelling of key terms including names of composers, titles, characters, places, events …..

Write in black or blue pen; do not use pencil.

**EXTERNALLY ASSESSED FOLIO**

The following remarks should be read in conjunction with the general remarks of previous reports. It is imperative that candidates note the recurring problems and take measures to avoid those same problems in the future.

There were many thought provoking and unique approaches to the texts. It is inspiring to read insightful, inquiring and engaging folios which demonstrate a real development of candidates’ ideas and engagement with their chosen texts. Some of the strongest studies evidenced a unique and insightful approach to the chosen text. Strong studies also evidenced the candidates’ deep intellectual and/or emotional connection to the text.

Better studies showed varying degrees of sophistication, but weaker candidates struggled to find a focus. Such studies were often poorly conceived and evidenced a lack of proficiency in language use and discussion capability.

There is a high correlation between the quality of the focus question/statement and the overall quality of the folio. ‘Fuzzy’ or unfocused questions mostly result in poorly structured discussions. A carefully articulated question usually acted as a ‘lens’ for candidates, enabling them to write effectively and with relevance.

Many cover pages did not have the question/topic on them and thus the marker had to search for the focus of the study. The study question and the word count (for each component) also need to appear on the front page. Candidates need to reach the 3000 word limit specified in the guidelines at [http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/4DCGI/_WWW_doc/118455/RND01/ENS315109--Folio_Guidelines_2012.pdf](http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/4DCGI/_WWW_doc/118455/RND01/ENS315109--Folio_Guidelines_2012.pdf)

Overall there was a balanced allocation of word limit between the major pieces. Studies that evidenced an imbalance tended to compromise attention to criterion 7.

Film text was less well written about than print text; film text studies tend to be weaker overall.

Candidates writing on poetry need to include copies of the poems in appendix.

The focus question ought be designed to focus the candidate’s response. Many candidates did not answer/address the question set for themselves.

Some questions were multi-faceted, resulting in a difficult challenge for the writer in regard to addressing all components of a complex question.

The focus question must be written on the cover page.

There is an emerging pattern of some candidates sourcing text quotations from on-line sources eg from notablequotes.com and gradesaver.com etc. This is not appropriate. Quotations sourced directly from the text ought be part of the candidate’s close engagement with the text.

Quotations should NOT be italicised.

Candidates are advised against using texts that have been / are studied in other English courses wherein different foci have been/are required.
Use of small font is problematic. Size 12 Times is an example of a suitable font. Do not use ‘fancy’ fonts.

Borders, decoration and ‘project’ style covers and presentation do not add to the worth of the folio. Markers are assessing what candidates have written.

Do not staple the Study itself to the TQA folder; just insert within the folder.

**Context Statement**

Stronger folios evidenced candidates’ very good use of the context statement. Therein candidates had clearly articulated the approach they had taken and the link between the two components of the study. The context statement forms part of the folio and its value ought not be underestimated. The purpose of the context statement is to explain significant aspects of both the analytical and imaginative components of the study, and to outline the connection between the two components.

Better context statements were evaluative and highly self-referential, boasting a strong and authentic voice that was an accretion of the entire independent study process. Such context statement possessed a lucid thesis.

Less successful context statements tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative, sometimes including a litany of texts that were discarded from the developmental process, and the reasons therefore. This is not an appropriate use of the context statement. Furthermore, it is not necessary to proffer a lengthy rationale for the selection of the text that became the focus of the study.

Candidates who appeared to have spent little time on the Context Statement did themselves a disservice because their aims and approach were mostly not clear to the marker. It is difficult to appreciate fully the goals of, and endeavour applied to, the study if the explanation is not adequate.

In many cases there was a discrepancy between the written expression and formatting of the context statement, and that of the remainder of the folio.

Candidates must remember that this is the first component the marker reads. A number of candidates appeared to have rushed the Context Statement, perhaps at the ‘eleventh hour’, with the result of a carelessly composed statement and inadequate attention to the specific nature of the study in question.

The study is too often referred to as the IP; this term does not apply to ENS315109 and the use of the term IP indicates a lack of rigour and attention to the terms of the Guidelines.

**Analytical Component**

The analytical responses in most folios were the strongest element and clearly most candidates spent most time on this, often to the detriment of the imaginative component, and of the context statement.

Analytical responses varied greatly in terms of quality and breadth of analysis. The most meritorious ones contained a clear, often original, thesis that was analysed in the main body of the essay using well-crafted, rigorous and structured discussion. Better responses offered a strong interrogation of the thesis, supported by a rich research base. The ability to formulate a nuanced and relevant question was also a characteristic of better responses. The following features typical of the ‘A’ range of folios:

- discerning choice of text that was used in an original and insightful manner
- real engagement with the text/s and a willingness to explore confronting ideas and issues
- genuinely wide research was undertaken and was evident in the major work with a clear understanding of conceptual issues.
- a strong sense of voice enhanced the argument
- highly original choice of a question that incorporated a personal response in an integrated manner
- creative and controlled use of the essay form
- referencing was used correctly and effectively

Candidates need to put time, care and effort into the wording of their focus question; it is strongly recommended that candidates write themselves into this question.

Candidates are reminded to write in the present tense when discussing fictional constructs.

Persistent use of emotive vocabulary is ineffective. Examples of over-used verbs include ‘challenged’, ‘appalled’, ‘confronted’, ‘disturbed’, ‘shocked’ …

Statements such as ‘I cannot even begin to imagine …’ imply that there has been no impact of the text upon the candidate’s own ideas, attitudes and values.

Brief reference to other texts within the analysis of the main text is impressive; however such references should be incidental and occasional, and should not intrude on the main discussion.

Remarks about characters and setting need to be accurate. An example of a comment that was inaccurate and also reflected lack of understanding of the text was: ‘Elizabeth Bennet was of low social class and embattling impoverished circumstances’.

Accurate spelling of proper nouns is an imperative.

Most candidates were able to write at length in this component. However, responses over 2000 words were often at the expense of a well-developed imaginative piece.

Weaker responses retold plot rather than critically engaging with their text through responding to the focus question.

Imaginative Component

Imaginative pieces, in a variety of forms, were sustained, original, coherent and explored a clearly discernible central idea, or ideas, with insight and with a direct connection to the analytical work

The most successful ones were consistently engaging and connected with the analytical response in an effective, but subtle manner. These often exhibited a knowing appreciation of the chosen form and utilised considered narrative choices. Strong characterisation and the use of a real authentic voice was another impressive aspect of successful imaginative pieces. Other such characteristics were:

- evidence of rigorous and pertinent independent investigation in the major work as well as in the reflection statement
- strong, distinctive characters
- plausible plots that were, more often than not, within the ‘zone’ of the chosen texts (for example a commendable imaginative piece on *Atonement*, written in the voice of Robbie, attempted to approximate the style and voice of McEwan)
- believable and engaging voice/s
- dialogue that was unique and authentic to specific characters and enabled readers to distinguish characters
- engaging and developed concepts
- fresh and plausible perspectives emanating from the chosen text
- insight into character motivations that, again, were believable in reference to the chosen text
- sophisticated language and syntactical accuracy
- original plot lines or original uses of established conventions
skilful use of imagery, development of motifs that developed meaning and enhanced the integrity of the text
powerful evocation of time and place
conscious engagement of the reader through controlled communication of emotion, not just through situation
evidence of careful drafting and thorough editing
well-researched engaging narratives with a strong sense of personal involvement and authenticity

Weak studies showed:
lack of originality or engagement with idea
overuse of dialogue that was banal and ineffective
over-use of the journal entry form
overuse of the rhetorical question
counter-productive repetitive explanations of quotations
little meaningful connection with the chosen text
re-telling of plot
literalness, cliché, lack of subtlety
simplistic investigation into countries / cultures / historical periods
unnecessarily graphic depictions of violence
prosaic style, overuse of predictable adjectives and similes
different text types employed without a significant reason
lack of evidence of research into form
use of non-linear time sequences or stream-of-consciousness
little evidence of drafting or close editing of work

Some imaginative components were perfunctory with little understanding of the historical or social scenarios of the text. One example was a response to *Slumdog Millionaire* in which the candidate created a scene wherein a poor mother in the slums of India could feed her children only ‘fruit and biscuits’. Another such example was derived from *The Road* in the case of which the candidate created a romantic and traditional wedding of the boy in the narrative, with all the associated wedding formalities. This seemed quite out of keeping with a post-apocalyptic world scene.

The style conventions for different forms used for the imaginative ought be researched and adhered to. For example, dialogue and script ought be correctly set out and structured.

**Additional remarks including specific references to criteria**

**Candidates must read the following additional remarks alongside those at the end of the 2011 report**

The more successful candidates were able to present a skilful and sophisticated Independent Study that explored and developed complex ideas about a chosen text and answered the focus of the devised question/task. The phrasing of such tasks (including the analytical and the imaginative responses) was sufficiently complex and demanding to allow the candidates the opportunity to show what they were capable of producing.

The more able analytical/critical responses contained evidence of deep personal and critical engagement with texts and higher order thinking skills. More often than not, such superior responses showed evidence of independent research that was used judiciously to contrast with own position/understanding.

More successful candidates created an engaging, skilful and, at times original, piece of imaginative writing that worked within the generic parameters of the chosen form and sometimes even challenged such conventions.

More successful candidates chose an ‘appropriate’ form in which to write their imaginative response with due respect to the text’s context. For example, diary entries from different characters in a speculative fiction text is perhaps not the best ‘form’ for the imaginative response.
More able candidates could evaluate the influence of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes, values in a cohesive, sustained and skilful manner. They expressed this explicitly in their context statement but this was also integrated into the main body of the work in a nuanced manner.

Some exceptional candidates were able to demonstrate this criterion by their choice of the two pieces; that is the formulation of the critical/analytical and the imaginative response, which showed a sophisticated personal engagement.

Most candidates did include aspects of contextual features in shaping personal responses and current understandings but these were, more often than not, presented as a given (for example ‘I believe in feminism… equality etc’) without an evaluative aspect that considers the impact of the chosen text on their values, attitude and ideas.

More able candidates were able to demonstrate skilful control of language and structure appropriate in all their three pieces and in doing so created authentic texts that were cohesive, engaging and a pleasure to read.

There were many examples of superior engagement with the world of ideas and some superb examples of refined writing that was clearly edited and drafted numerous times.

Some outstanding Independent Studies were able to demonstrate that the text they were using as their focus is a construct and were able to scrutinise the nature of such a construct as a cultural artefact that emanates its own ideological agenda.

Candidates were aware of the Folio guidelines and most stated some impressive connection between the Analytical and the Imaginative pieces; however the more able candidates were able to effortlessly demonstrate this by their carefully phrasing of the question.

Consistent referencing is essential and most candidates tried to show this in their work.

Candidates choosing poetry for the basis of their folio should be analysing more than three poems in the analytical response – three poems by any of the poets does not allow any candidate to demonstrate the complexity and breadth of any poet’s work.

The very weakest candidates were limited by inaccurate punctuation, faulty sentence structure and inadequate paragraphing.

Sometimes there was a discrepancy between the language skills demonstrated in each of the three components.

Poor proof reading remains the biggest limitation for criterion ten. For example, glaring errors occurred when text titles were misspelt. Some candidates, in an effort to sound eloquent, are not using words appropriately. Some candidates are writing long contorted sentences. Others are not planning their analytical response in a logical way, which weakens their discussion.
When studying complex texts from a wide range of different types of texts, the student can:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1 — demonstrate skill in interpretation of texts</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clearly and competently demonstrate an understanding of the plot and its progression</td>
<td>clearly demonstrate an understanding of the plot and its progression</td>
<td>demonstrate an understanding of the plot and its progression</td>
<td>struggles to demonstrate an understanding of the plot and its progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accurate, relevant and insightful knowledge of character, character relationships, narrative events, setting, context</td>
<td>• accurate and relevant knowledge of character, character relationships, narrative events, setting, context</td>
<td>• relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• little knowledge of character, character relationships, narrative events, setting, context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excellent, integrated and relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• some use of textual references</td>
<td>• no use of textual references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly understand, explain and analyse how the plots acts as a scaffold for deeper meanings</td>
<td>demonstrate an understanding of how the plot acts as a scaffold for deeper meanings</td>
<td>identify how the plot acts as a scaffold for deeper meanings</td>
<td>struggles to demonstrate how the plot acts as a scaffold for deeper meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• insightful understanding and analysis of layers of meaning</td>
<td>• understanding and analysis of layers of meaning</td>
<td>• appreciation of layers of meaning</td>
<td>• little or no awareness of layers of meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows how narrative features such as structure, plot, character, setting etc are used to develop deeper meanings</td>
<td>• shows how narrative features such as structure, plot, character, setting etc are used to develop deeper meanings</td>
<td>• shows how narrative features such as structure, plot, character, setting etc are used to develop meanings</td>
<td>• is unable to show how narrative features such as structure, plot, character, setting etc are used to develop meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows how literary devices such as symbolism are used to develop deeper meanings</td>
<td>• shows how literary devices such as symbolism are used to develop meanings</td>
<td>• may show how literary devices such as symbolism are used to develop meanings</td>
<td>• is unable to show how literary devices such as symbolism are used to develop meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excellent, integrated and relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• some use of textual references</td>
<td>• no use of textual references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically evaluate and interpret the main ideas and issues in the text</td>
<td>demonstrate an understanding of the main ideas and issues in the text</td>
<td>identify the main ideas and issues of the text</td>
<td>struggles to demonstrate how the plot acts as a scaffold for deeper meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identify the key ideas and issues of the text/s</td>
<td>• identify ideas and issues of the text/s</td>
<td>• identify some ideas and issues of the text/s</td>
<td>• identify few or no ideas and issues of the text/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sustain insightful discussion of the question</td>
<td>• sustain discussion of the question</td>
<td>• basic discussion of the question</td>
<td>• attempted discussion of the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• address the complexity and sublety of the ideas and issues</td>
<td>• may address the complexity and subtlety of the ideas and issues</td>
<td>• elements of re-retelling story</td>
<td>• reliance on re-telling story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excellent, integrated and relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>• does not address the complexity and subtlety of the ideas and issues</td>
<td>• does not address the complexity and subtlety of the ideas and issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• some use of textual references</td>
<td>• no use of textual references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>use critical thinking to examine and explain clearly the connections between the ideas and issues of the text</strong></td>
<td><strong>think critically about the connections between the ideas and issues of the text</strong></td>
<td><strong>use thinking skills to examine the connections between the ideas and issues of the text</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • compose a reasoned argument  
• make reasoned judgements  
• evaluate information and ideas  
• make plausible inferences or deductions about ideas and issues in the text/s  
• imagine alternative/innovative outcomes  
• develop hypotheses | • compose a reasoned argument  
• make reasoned judgements  
• may make plausible inferences or deductions about ideas and issues in the text/s  
• may imagine alternative/innovative outcomes | • compose a reasoned argument  
• make reasoned judgements | |
| **clearly display intricate knowledge of the complexities of meaning in the text.**  
• sustained discussion that addresses the complexity and subtlety of the ideas and issues  
• excellent, integrated and relevant use of textual references | **clearly display knowledge of the complexities of meaning in the text.**  
• sustained discussion that addresses some aspects of the complexity and subtlety of the ideas and issues  
• relevant use of textual references | **display knowledge of the complexities of meaning in the text.**  
• discussion may attempt to address some of the complexity of the ideas and issues  
• some use of textual references | |
| **does not understand the complexity of the ideas and issues**  
• no use of textual references |  |  |  |
When studying complex texts from a wide range of different types of texts, a student can:

| A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- |
|-----|----|----|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|
| demonstrate clear understanding of how a text may have been influenced by the prevailing ideas of the time  
- the text itself is understood to generate questions about its ideological context  
- effective use of surmise and conjecture in regard to the influence of prevailing ideas  
- seamless integration of context information with discussion of ideas and issues  
- context information is relevant to the ideas and issues discussed  
- accurate reference is made to sources of contextual information  
- extensive, integrated and relevant use of textual references | show understanding of how a text may have been influenced by the prevailing ideas of the time  
- the text itself is sometimes understood to generate questions about its ideological context  
- use of surmise and conjecture in regard to the influence of prevailing ideas  
- attempted integration of context information with discussion of ideas and issues  
- context information is relevant to the ideas and issues discussed  
- accurate reference is made to sources of contextual information  
- relevant use of textual references | show awareness of how a text may have been influenced by the prevailing ideas of the time  
- ideological context may be imposed upon the text  
- little to no use of surmise and conjecture in regard to the influence of prevailing ideas  
- little to no integration of context information with discussion of ideas and issues  
- evidence of the ‘Cr 3 dump’ within or at the end of the discussion  
- context information is mostly relevant to the ideas and issues discussed  
- little or no reference is made to sources of contextual information  
- some use of textual references | Any or all of the following:  
- no understanding of ideological context  
- no use of surmise and conjecture in regard to the influence of prevailing ideas  
- no integration of context information with discussion of ideas and issues  
- context information has limited or no relevance to the ideas and issues discussed  
- no context information is given  
- no reference is made to sources of contextual information  
- no use of textual references |

Criterion 3: Demonstrate understanding of how historical and cultural contexts influence, and are influenced by, texts

- demonstrate awareness of how historical events may have impacted on the text  
- the text itself is understood to generate questions about its historical context  
- effective use of surmise and conjecture in regard to the influence of historical events  
- seamless integration of context information with discussion of ideas and issues  
- context information is relevant to the ideas and issues discussed  
- accurate reference is made to sources of contextual information  
- extensive, integrated and relevant use of textual references
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain clearly ways in which the text under consideration influenced or was influenced by other writings</th>
<th>Show connections between the text under consideration and other writings</th>
<th>Show awareness of other writings at the time of a text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• there may be clear evidence of this, depending on the text/s under discussion, eg the CHC module, the Paired Text Study, the Application</td>
<td>• there may be some evidence of this, depending on the text/s under discussion, eg the CHC module, the Paired Text Study, the Application</td>
<td>• there may be limited evidence of this, depending on the text/s under discussion, eg the CHC module, the Paired Text Study, the Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive, integrated and relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>relevant use of textual references</td>
<td>some use of textual references</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give evidence of how a text influenced thinking in its own or subsequent times</th>
<th>Explain how a text influenced thinking in its own and subsequent times.</th>
<th>Show understanding of the impact a text had in its time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• there may be some evidence of this, depending on the text/s under discussion</td>
<td>• Probably not addressed</td>
<td>• Probably not addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain how a text has contributed to the philosophical or aesthetic discourse over a period of time.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• there may be some evidence of this, depending on the text/s under discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive, integrated and relevant use of textual references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- The basic premise of this criterion is that texts do not exist in a vacuum. Texts are understood to be a product of their time in regard to the ideological, cultural, and historical context of the composer, of the narrative setting and of the narrative’s characters. Often it will be the case that ideas and issues that a composer is addressing in the text/s derive their significance within the ideological, cultural and/or historical context of the text’s composition and/or its setting.

- Students are encouraged to allow the text/s to invite and/or generate questions about context, rather than impose or overlay contextual information upon the text/s.

- Students should integrate discussion addressing criterion 3 with that for criterion 1. Students should avoid the criterion 3 ‘dump’ or ‘add-on’. By this is meant the insertion of ‘chunks’ of contextual data that has limited or no apparent connection with or relevance to the discussion of the ideas and issues of the text/s.

- Historical context includes time and place as well as events.

- Cultural context includes ideology, philosophy, beliefs, traditions, values, cultural mores, cultural practices and rituals.
When studying complex texts from a range of texts types, and in the creation of their own texts, the student can:

| A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- |
|-----|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|
| reflect on, articulate and critically evaluate personal position and current understandings | reflect on, articulate and justify personal position and current understandings | reflect on and articulate personal position and current understandings | • identifies previous, emerging, and perhaps a developing personal position | • identifies a personal position | • no evidence of personal position |
| • identifies previous, emerging and developing personal position | • reflective voice | • poor reflective voice | | • thoughtful voice | |
| • strong reflective voice | • genuine/authentic thoughtful voice | • limited reflection about how own position has been challenged, consolidated, strengthened etc | | • reflection about how own position has been challenged, consolidated, strengthened etc |
| • genuine/authentic thoughtful voice | | | | | |
| • reflection about how own position has been challenged, consolidated, strengthened etc | | | | | |
| • breadth of response | | | | | |
| • unique approach | | | | | |

- **Criteria 9** - clarify and articulate their own ideas, attitudes and values through reflection and critical engagement with texts

- **Evaluate the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values**
  - even balance between critical engagement and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - strong connection between the ideas of the text/s and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - extends out of the moment into the wider context
  - own position is integrated throughout the discussion
  - extensive, integrated and relevant use of textual references

- **Articulate the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values**
  - balance between critical engagement and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - clear connection between the ideas of the text/s and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - may extend out of the moment into the wider context
  - own position is integrated throughout the discussion
  - integrated and relevant use of textual references

- **Monitor the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values**
  - attention (not necessarily even) to critical engagement and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - identifies some connection between the ideas of the text/s and own ideas, attitudes and values
  - may emphasise plot recount
  - own position may be integrated throughout the discussion
  - own position may be in the form of a concluding paragraph
  - relevant use of textual references

- **Little to no understanding of the influence of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values**
  - ignores either the text/s or self or both
  - superficial attention to ideas and issues
  - plot recount
  - little or no use of evidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display skilful language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>• distinguishes appropriately between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• understands the difference between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• identifies the difference between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• does not identify own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appreciates the link between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• makes the link between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• may identify the link between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td>• does not understand the link between ideas and attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• logical and substantiated discussion/argument</td>
<td>• logical and substantiated discussion/argument</td>
<td>• discussion/argument may not be clearly defined/outlined</td>
<td>• no logical development of discussion/argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong command of written expression</td>
<td>• sound command of written expression</td>
<td>• appropriate command of written expression</td>
<td>• weak/inappropriate written expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sophisticated vocabulary</td>
<td>• sound vocabulary</td>
<td>• appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>• limited/inappropriate vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the influence of contextual features in shaping personal responses</td>
<td>• weak/inappropriate written expression</td>
<td>• strong command of written expression</td>
<td>• limited/inappropriate vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• influences upon thinking are identified, considered and evaluated</td>
<td>• sound command of written expression</td>
<td>• appropriate command of written expression</td>
<td>• sound/vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consideration given to personal, local, societal, national and global contexts</td>
<td>• sound/vocabulary</td>
<td>• appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>• limited/inappropriate vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Criterion 9 is a challenge for students. It demands a balanced (ie about 50:50) response from the student in regard to the two components of the criterion, ie own ideas, attitudes and values; and critical engagement with text/s. This criterion evaluates students’
• understanding of ideas and issues in the text/s
• engagement with their own ideas, attitudes and values as these were before engaging, as engaging and following engagement with the text/s
• expression of their understanding, and competent language use
• evaluation of influences that inform their own thinking
### Appendix – ENS315109 Folio Marking Tool (subject to refinement in 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Compose and craft a range of texts for different purposes and audiences.</strong></td>
<td>Composes and crafts a range of sustained spoken, written and visual texts which explore and develop key ideas. Meets the expectations of a range of audiences and selects a variety of forms for a range of purposes. Critically evaluates the effectiveness of texts and creates texts that are original and authentic.</td>
<td>Composes and crafts a range of sustained spoken, written and visual texts which explore and develop key ideas. Meets the expectations of a range of audiences and selects a variety of forms for a range of purposes. Evaluates the effectiveness of texts and creates texts that are original and authentic.</td>
<td>Composes and crafts spoken, written and visual texts which explore and develop relevant ideas. Meets the expectations of an audience and selects an appropriate form for a purpose. With assistance, evaluates the effectiveness of texts and creates texts that are original and authentic.</td>
<td>Has difficulty crafting texts and understanding the connection between purpose and audience. Is unable to evaluate the effectiveness of texts. Struggles to create texts that are original and authentic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

It is the expectation of markers that ‘a range’ means the three pieces required for the study: the context statement, the analytical component, the imaginative component.

This criterion evaluates students’

- knowledge of form, genre, style etc
- attention to expressed purpose
- appreciation of intended audience
- ability to explore ideas

The range from A to D/t can be described as

(A) sophisticated > (B) well-developed > (C) basic > (D/t) inadequate

**Criterion 7 rating indicators (Draft)**

- Argument/discussion is convincing/persuasive/engaging/sustained; Clear focus Authentic voice. Inspired imaginative response Strong evidence of analytical skills; creative skills Creative has strong connection with the focus; takes the
- Argument/discussion is clear/sustained Good analysis; fresh approach in the creative Clear link between analytical and creative Textual evidence is relevant Thinking skills are developing
- Often inappropriate register Minimal links with text Plot recount Lack of meaningful application; imaginative aligned with rather than growing out of the analytical Poor quotation skills Few to no references
- Selected forms are inappropriate and/or lacking in key features of the form Poor word processing skills Lacks clear or any structure Word count not adhered to
9. Clarify and articulate own ideas, attitudes and values through reflection and critical engagement with texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on, articulate and critically evaluate personal position and current understandings</td>
<td>Reflect on, articulate and justify personal position and current understandings</td>
<td>Reflect on and articulate personal position and current understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Articulate the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Monitor the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express clearly their own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Express clearly their own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Express clearly their own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display skilful language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Display competent language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Display competent language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the influence of contextual features in shaping personal responses.</td>
<td>Analyse the influence of contextual features in shaping personal responses.</td>
<td>Identify the influence of contextual features in shaping personal responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate word processing skills</td>
<td>Lacks formal genre</td>
<td>Too much similarity across pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count adhered to</td>
<td>No new perspective</td>
<td>Ideas identified but not explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong command of word processing skills</td>
<td>Basic word processing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count not adhered to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central ideas further</td>
<td>Rigorous and insightful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual evidence that is succinct and relevant</td>
<td>High order thinking skills are evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong command of English expression including sentencing and paragraphing</td>
<td>Strong command of word processing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count adhered to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Struggles to reflect on and articulate personal position and current understandings</td>
<td>Struggles to monitor the influences of texts and language on own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Struggles to identify the influence of contextual features in shaping personal responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggles to express clearly their own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td>Struggles to display competent language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggles to display competent language use to express ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tasmanian Qualifications Authority
This criterion evaluates students’

- understanding of ideas and issues in the text/s
- engagement with their own ideas, attitudes and values as these were before engaging, as engaging and following engagement with the text/s
- expression of their understandings, and language use
- evaluation of influences that inform their own thinking

The range from A to D/t could be described as

(A) sophisticated  > (B) well-developed > (C) basic > (D/t) inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticon 9 rating indicator s (Draft)</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies previous, emerging and developing personal position. Strong reflective voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences upon thinking are identified/considered/evaluated. Genuine/authentic thoughtful voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even balance between critical engagement and own ideas, attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection about how own position has been challenged, consolidated, strengthened etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of response. Unique approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extends out of the moment into the broader context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own position is integrated throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive and relevant use of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the connection between the text and themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argues/discusses in steps/logical progression of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages consistently but lacks high-order thinking and originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to extend out of the moment into the broader context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted consistent integration of own position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant use of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and reactive - I think, I feel, I value etc; undeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often an emphasis on plot recount. Not good grasp of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice not developed. Focus question not clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not balance the argument between text and self; ‘tacked on’ personal views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenuous link between analytical and imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor use of the context statement; waffle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores either the text or self or both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No logical development of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot recount. Superficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor to no link between analytical and imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor use of the context statement; waffle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to no use of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communicate ideas and information</td>
<td>Considers, selects and competently uses methods and styles to communicate information clearly, accurately, precisely and comprehensively.</td>
<td>Considers, selects and appropriately uses methods and styles to communicate information clearly, accurately and precisely.</td>
<td>Considers, selects and uses methods and styles to communicate information clearly.</td>
<td>Struggles to use methods to communicate clearly and accurately. Very little evidence of editing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion evaluates students’
- command of language skills
- range of vocabulary
- English expression
- punctuation
- referencing skills

The range from A to D/t could be described as

(A) sophisticated > (B) well-developed > (C) basic > (D/t) inadequate

### Award Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>8% (50)</td>
<td>18% (120)</td>
<td>45% (291)</td>
<td>29% (192)</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>14% (98)</td>
<td>18% (128)</td>
<td>43% (300)</td>
<td>24% (170)</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Distribution (SA or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>29% (188)</td>
<td>71% (465)</td>
<td>68% (441)</td>
<td>32% (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>35% (246)</td>
<td>65% (450)</td>
<td>70% (490)</td>
<td>30% (206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>