



Trial Examination 2022

VCE English as an Additional Language (EAL) Units 3&4

Aural and Written Examination

Suggested Solutions

SECTION A – LISTENING TO TEXTS**Question 1** (10 marks)**a.** the lounge room

1 mark

b.

Kate	Olivia
heard about it at school	saw it on the news on TV

2 marks

*Note: Award 1 mark for each correct cell of the table.***c.** *For example, any one of (Kate):*

- confused
- puzzled

For example, any one of (Olivia):

- relaxed
- calm

1 mark

*Note: Descriptions should not refer to the tone of the speakers when they are discussing Kate not attending the light show.***d.** Kate means that Olivia was asking for something reasonable.

1 mark

Asking for a million dollars would be unreasonable.

1 mark

e. Yes, they have.

1 mark

Kate asks why Olivia is ‘always like this’ to show it has happened before.

1 mark

f. Kate is older. She mentions that she had a similar experience when she was Olivia’s age.

1 mark

g. No, they do not.

1 mark

Question 2 (10 marks)**a.** Sam believes people should not swim alone.

1 mark

For example, any one of:

- Sam says it is ‘not the best idea’ after pausing for emphasis.
- Sam says that there is nobody to help if swimmers get in trouble, placing stress on ‘nobody’.

1 mark

*Note: The quote ‘dangerous’ is not appropriate evidence as it refers to the attitude of teenagers feeling like nothing can hurt them.***b.** **1:** They could get themselves in trouble as well.

1 mark

2: More people will be needed to come and help.

1 mark

Note: Accept responses that present the reasons in any order.

c. *For example:*

	Ocean	Swimming pools
Attitude	prefers swimming in the ocean	thinks pools are acceptable, adequate, okay, etc.
Evidence	'hard to resist'	'fine'

2 marks

Note: Award 1 mark for each correct row of the table.

d. *For example, any one of:*

- Swimming lessons can help them improve their swimming.
- Swimming lessons can help them be more efficient.
- Swimming lessons can help them swim without getting as tired.

1 mark

e. Yes, she did.

1 mark

f. No, there is not.

1 mark

Sam says her café is 'the' café at South Side Beach, suggesting there is only one.

1 mark

SECTION C – ARGUMENT AND PERSUASIVE LANGUAGE

Question 1 (10 marks)

a. For example, any one of:

- **Reason:** Gated communities exclude people/are only for wealthy people.
Example: Houses are very expensive OR residents must pay annual fees.
- **Reason:** Gated communities can cause residents to feel more fear OR may increase violence.
Example: reference to psychology professor Ben Wong's expert evidence

2 marks

1 mark for giving an appropriate reason.

1 mark for providing a supporting example for the given reason.

b. For example, any two of:

- Carringtonvale is known as an inclusive place, but gated communities are not inclusive.
- The Carringtonvale community may be weakened by having a gated community.
- Zenith Estate may encourage arrogance/snobbery.

2 marks

1 mark for each appropriate reason.

Note: Do not accept 'Zenith Estate may cause fear/violence'. The question asks about Carringtonvale in general; Lett's article links fear/violence specifically to the residents of gated communities.

c. For example, any one of:

- dismissive
- judgmental
- critical

1 mark

d. She means that gated communities are not a solution for people who want a better life.

1 mark

Note: Do not accept responses that state only that gated communities do not provide a good life. This does not show sufficient understanding of the text. Responses should show an understanding of how the word 'gateway' suggests leading to something (in this case, life being 'better' rather than simply 'good').

e. For example, any two of:

- Chambers supports Zenith Estate, but is not disconnected from his community.
- Lett's article could cause divisions between people, even though she says that she opposes division.
- People can live in a gated community with increased safety.

2 marks

1 mark for each appropriate argument.

Note: Responses must use the arguments in Chambers's letter that directly refute the points made in Lett's article. Do not accept arguments such as 'Zenith Estate will provide economic benefits' or 'Lett is just envious'.

f. Chambers suggests that Lett's true motivation for writing the article is envy.

1 mark

Question 2 (10 marks)

The following is an example of an upper mid-range response to Section C Question 2 that appropriately responds to all the assessment criteria.

On 2 February, the *Carringvale Gazette* published the article ‘Gateway to the Good Life or Trajectory to Trouble?’ by columnist Maria Lett. Adopting a scornful tone, Lett argues that Zenith Estate, a gated community still in the planning stages, will only cater to snobbery and introduce social division to her local area. Lett’s article prompted an irate reply from the former deputy Mayor of Carringvale, Winston Chambers. In his letter to the editor of the *Carringvale Gazette*, Chambers indignantly defends the merits of Zenith Estate and questions Lett’s motives in discrediting it.

Lett opens her article with the statement ‘So, it’s come to this’. The note of exasperation implies the culmination of a long and unproductive process. She proceeds to identify the source of her discontent as Zenith Estate. Lett goes on to disparage the supposedly ‘prestigious Zenith Estate’. She dismantles the flattering notion that it will attract ‘select residents’ by noting that ‘only the cashed-up need apply’. Zenith Estate, she maintains, ‘exists solely to shut other people out’. Hence, its exclusivity can only buy a ‘cocooned life’, which will encourage residents to look down on non-residents. By insinuating this is ‘elitist’ behaviour, Lett calls on locals to see Zenith Estate as a detriment to their community spirit.

The visual accompanying Lett’s piece depicts a well-tended and peaceful, but lifeless, enclave. No people are visible and, despite the air of general prosperity, the presence of security cameras, warning notices and discreet but functional fences remind the reader of prevailing security concerns. As this visual is included in the advertisement for Zenith Estate, Lett encourages Carringvale residents to see the development as unsettling.

To provide balance to her article, Lett offers an overview of the reputed benefits of gated communities while also questioning just how tangible those benefits actually are, since Carringvale is a ‘relatively quiet suburb’ and people living there are at little risk of ‘exterior violence’. Speaking as a local and appealing to shared community sentiment, Lett asserts that ‘we all know’ there is no need for ‘private fortresses in our midst’. Lett also calls in the expert opinion of psychology professor Ben Wong to add weight to the idea Zenith Estate will not prevent violence.

Recognising that safety is socially desirable, Lett does not attempt to dissuade her readers from seeing value in it. Instead, she argues that gated communities will obstruct the pursuit of safety by breeding ‘social resentment’. It cannot be in the interests of the residents of Carringvale to see their community ‘become weaker’. A gated community that polarises people based on their wealth will, in Lett’s view, be a greater evil than any imaginary threat that it may exist to combat. She contends that there is nothing new or glamorous about Zenith Estate.

Lett’s analysis of the local situation is controversial enough to invite debate. The former deputy Mayor, Winston Chambers, is likely to be familiar with neighbourhood disputes and interested in promoting the economic good of the area. He is quick to dismiss Lett’s views and question her motives. He represents her as ‘obviously’ disgruntled and plainly resentful of those who are ‘better off’.

Chambers both affirms his enthusiasm for the proposed development and fends off some of Lett’s blunter accusations. ‘I, for one, find the lifestyle offered by Zenith Estate highly attractive’, he remarks, finding it necessary to add ‘I am neither elitist nor paranoid’.

As former deputy Mayor, he is a citizen of some note and ‘resent[s] the insinuation’ that he would not have the best interests of the community at heart. Revealing that Lett has got under his skin, he resorts to a personal attack. He reduces her arguments to an ‘if I can’t have it, nobody can’ attitude, suggesting she is simply envious of the opportunities available to others.

The exchange between Lett and Chambers suggests that social resentment already exists in Carringvale and Zenith Estate may inflame it further.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response to Section C Question 2 that appropriately responds to all the assessment criteria.

Resistance to change is a phenomenon frequently seen in neighbourhood disputes. On 2 February, the *Carringvale Gazette* published the article ‘Gateway to the Good Life or Trajectory to Trouble?’ by columnist Maria Lett. Taking the high moral ground, Lett argues that Zenith Estate, a gated community still in the planning stages, will only cater to snobbery and introduce social division to the area. Lett’s article prompted an angry riposte from the former deputy Mayor of Carringvale, Winston Chambers. Chambers indignantly defends the merits of Zenith Estate and questions the motives of Lett in discrediting it. Although they speak from seemingly irreconcilable positions, it is evident that both Lett and Chambers believe they have special insight into the needs and nature of Carringvale.

Lett opens her article with the statement ‘So, it’s come to this’. The note of exasperation implies the culmination of a long and unproductive process. She sets before her fellow residents a vision of a truly radical new departure from their shared community values: Zenith Estate. By enclosing terms such as ‘select residents’ and ‘premium gated community’ in scare quotations, Lett casts an ironic light on the claims made by the developers in an attempt to discredit them. Readers who have been rendered wary of the inflated language of advertising may thus be primed to approach Zenith Estate with caution.

Having set the scene, Lett proceeds to disparage the supposedly ‘prestigious Zenith Estate’. She dismantles the flattering notion that it will attract ‘select residents’ by noting that Zenith Estate ‘exists solely to shut other people out’. Lett appears to be confident of the support of the bulk of her readers when she poses the rhetorical question ‘Does anyone else find this just a bit elitist?’

Lett acknowledges that Zenith Estate does not lack superficial appeal when she states it is ‘not a bad life, perhaps’. However, Lett is careful to balance such a concession with the weightier claims that gated communities promote snobbery and paranoia. The visual accompanying her piece depicts a well-tended and peaceful, but remarkably lifeless, enclave. No people are visible and, despite the air of general prosperity, the presence of security cameras, warning notices and discreet but functional fences remind the reader of prevailing security concerns. As this visual is included in the advertisement for Zenith Estate, Lett encourages Carringvale residents to see the development as unsettling.

To demonstrate that hers is a well-informed critique, Lett offers an overview of the reputed benefits of gated communities whilst simultaneously questioning their actual benefits. As for the risk of ‘exterior violence’, it may be a disproportionate response to build an entire lifestyle around it in a ‘relatively quiet suburb’ like Carringvale. Appealing to shared community sentiment, Lett asserts that ‘we all know’ there is no need for ‘private fortresses in our midst’. Once again, she links Zenith Estate to a bunker mentality that is unnecessarily distrustful of the decent people of Carringvale. She supports this sentiment with a quote from psychology professor Ben Wong, who notes that it may ‘simply create a vicious cycle fuelled by fear’.

Nearing the conclusion of her argument, Lett dispenses with any concessions to opposing views and invokes phrases such as ‘Paranoia and incitement to violence’. Her words have alarming connotations of disturbances of the peace. By stating ‘We have always been known as an inclusive suburb’, Lett reminds her readers of their honourable traditions of acceptance – traditions in which she shares.

Recognising that safety is socially desirable, Lett does not attempt to dissuade her readers from seeing value in it. Instead, she argues that gated communities will obstruct the pursuit of safety by breeding ‘social resentment’. It cannot be in the interests of the residents of Carringvale to see their community ‘become weaker’. If there is any paranoia in their thinking, Lett addresses it by painting a picture of a hostile community ‘divided by wealth’, which would be a greater evil than any imaginary threat that it may exist to combat.

Lett's analysis invites debate. Former deputy Mayor, Winston Chambers, presumably writes from a rich knowledge of neighbourhood disputes. He is quick to question Lett's motives and to launch an *ad hominem* attack. He categorises Lett as 'obviously' malcontent and plainly resentful of those who are 'better off'. This is intended to undermine her professed interest in larger social concerns such as the survival of a 'diverse, multi-faceted community' and reduce it to something altogether more petty. Whilst seeking to diminish the standing of Lett, Chambers simultaneously aims to cast himself as a man whose capacity to buy into Zenith Estate reflects not unearned privilege but 'hard work and good money management'.

Chambers introduces a decidedly more personal note into his letter by using the first-person singular pronoun 'I' five times in short succession. 'I, for one, find the lifestyle offered by Zenith Estate highly attractive', he remarks, adding 'I am neither elitist nor paranoid'. Downplaying any imputation of privilege, he asserts his right to 'live comfortably' without attracting judgment.

In contrast to Lett, Chambers sees the question of Zenith Estate as a highly personal matter with direct application to himself. While both parties declare a commitment to Carringtonvale and its future, in all other respects they are as thoroughly divided as if the walls of Zenith Estate already stood between them.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTARY

The upper mid-range response reflects a strong grasp of each author's arguments and fluently integrates evidence to support this. Although some examples are analysed using metalanguage, there are also missed opportunities to connect these to the authors' broader contentions. These omissions prevent the essay from becoming a high-scoring response. The essay displays a tendency to concentrate on relatively obvious persuasive techniques, such as reference to expert opinion and inclusive language, rather than more subtle questions, such as the connotations of 'private fortresses' or the jargon used in the advertising material for Zenith Estate. The thorough understanding of points of view and the precise selection of quotes and examples are typical of an upper mid-range response. A greater emphasis on how and why this language aids in the authors' attempted persuasion of the target audience would elevate this to a high-scoring response.

The high-scoring response also provides a close examination of both argument and language, but shows greater facility in explaining how the points of view are constructed. The analysis draws from the scope of material presented, but is appropriately selective and does not labour examples. Although the more obvious features of both articles are not overlooked, a greater proportion of time is spent in following up matters requiring some subtlety of analysis. Considerable attention is devoted to the social attitudes that inform the stance taken by Lett and Chambers and how this is reflected in key words such as 'elitist' and 'social resentment'.

The high-scoring response displays a greater awareness of tonal shifts than the upper mid-range response and employs accurate metalanguage in discussing them. For example, the high-scoring response notes the change in direction in Chambers' argument from the altruistic to the personal and links this to a more frequent use of the first-person singular pronoun. The high-scoring response also features a greater control of the material and a deeper exploration of implication. This is made possible by a wide-ranging command of vocabulary, which is suited to the task but is not intrusively conspicuous. The high-scoring response often stands back from the stimulus material and presents it in perspective. Most importantly, the analysis frequently revisits both authors' contentions and considers how these continually shape the authors' language choices. The essay shows a pleasing sense of completion and smoothly transitions between examples and authors. It maintains a steady focus on why certain language supports a persuasive intent and its consistent use of metalanguage frames the discussion, which effectively enables efficient, insightful analysis.