



Trial Examination 2023

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. *Any two of:*

- natural light
- the big kitchen
- heating/air conditioning system
- modern bathroom

2 marks

1 mark for each feature identified.

b. three

1 mark

c. **Word Max uses:** tiny **OR** tight

Word Judy uses: cozy **OR** snug

2 marks

1 mark for providing a word Max uses.

1 mark for providing a word Judy uses.

d. *Any one of:*

- Max intends to live with other people. He says the property isn't right for 'all of us', which shows that more than one person would live there.
- Max intends to live with other people. He says he will let Judy know if 'we' want to view the house again, suggesting that he will be living with at least one other person.

2 marks

1 mark for identifying that Max will not live alone.

1 mark for including appropriate evidence.

e. *For example, any one of:*

- Awkward: The interaction is awkward. Max puts stress on 'if' when he says he will let Judy know if he wants to come and look at the house again.
- Uncomfortable: The speakers are uncomfortable. When Max says he is leaving, Judy replies with 'oh, okay' with falling intonation.
- Uncomfortable: The speakers are uncomfortable. When Judy asks if she can phone Max, he says 'perhaps not' with a pause between the words.

3 marks

1 mark for providing an appropriate description.

2 marks for supporting the description with quoted language and delivery.

Note: Responses must describe the end of the conversation. The delivery should support the quoted language.

Question 2 (10 marks)

a. The printers are working now but were not working earlier today. 1 mark

b. Any one of:

- Rainer means the printer problem cost their company more than \$3000, which is how much a new printer would cost.
- A new printer would cost a lot of money, but Rainer thinks the printer being broken is costing them even more money.

2 marks

1 mark for identifying that the office lost money.

1 mark for identifying that the amount of money lost is more than the cost of a printer.

c. Any one of the following items Leo and Rainer decide to buy:

Item	Reason
printer(s)	current printers are not working/working well OR to print reports
coffee machine	for the staff to use to make coffee OR to make drinks for clients
fridge	for the staff to store their lunches OR to store milk for tea and coffee OR the current fridge is too small
computer screens	for clients to see their plans OR for staff to use in the meeting room

Any one of the following items Leo and Rainer decide not to buy:

Item	Reason
computers	the office can wait to buy them later
a projector/a second projector	Leo and Rainer cannot remember where it was needed

4 marks

1 mark for each correct item identified.

1 mark for each appropriate reason given for the chosen items.

Note: Desks, bookshelves, chairs, meeting room tables and a projector are not suitable items that Leo and Rainer decide to buy as no reason is given. A bigger coffee machine is not a suitable item that Leo and Rainer decide not to buy as no reason is given.

d. buying computer screens 1 mark

e. *For example, any one of:*

- Friendly: The relationship is friendly. Rainer laughs as she tells Leo not to ‘even finish that sentence’ when Leo keeps talking about buying a coffee machine.
- Strained: The relationship is strained. When Leo lists the items they have ordered, Rainer interrupts him by saying ‘are you serious?’
- Professional: The relationship is professional. Rainer respectfully asks Leo if he has ‘a minute to chat’ about the printers.

2 marks

1 mark for providing an appropriate description.

1 mark for supporting the description with an example.

SECTION C – ARGUMENT AND PERSUASIVE LANGUAGE**Question 1** (10 marks)**a. i.** Any one of:

- Erikson claims the Council saw the Federation Elm as an obstacle.
- Erikson claims the Council saw the Federation Elm as being in the way.
- Erikson claims the Council saw the Federation Elm as something to get rid of so a housing development could be built.

1 mark

ii. Chang states the Council valued the Federation Elm.

1 mark

Note: It is not accurate to say the Council's opinion was 'visiting the tree often' as this is not a viewpoint.

b.

Group of people	Suggested action
members of GIG	attend the commemoration ceremony on Sunday
people who are not members of GIG	join GIG OR sign up to GIG OR become a GIG member

4 marks

*1 mark for each group identified.**1 mark for each suggested action identified.*

Note: Students may list the two groups in any order as long as each group is matched with the correct suggested action.

c. For example, any one of:

- Angry: Erikson's tone is angry when she calls on her readers to 'recognise this as an outrage.'
- Outraged: Erikson's tone is outraged when she says that cutting down the Federation Elm is an act of 'senseless vandalism'.
- Critical: Erikson's tone is critical when she claims the Council 'have shown no regard for the cultural, environmental or social values of Garrickville.'

2 marks

*1 mark for providing an appropriate description.**1 mark for supporting the description with an example.***d.** The Council must compromise to balance environmental needs with other needs in the local area.

1 mark

Note: A nuanced understanding of housing development and its relationship to clearing land is not required. Students do need to demonstrate an understanding that the Council needs to compromise as the competing needs of Garrickville mean there is no perfect way forward.

e. The Council will plant 300 new trees this year.

1 mark

Note: It is not correct to say that members of the council visited the Federation Elm often. This is presented as evidence that the Council valued the Federation Elm specifically, not the environment in general.

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.

In an angry post on the *Garrickville Community Action* website on 24 March 2023, Jennifer Erikson, spokesperson for Greener in Garrickville (GIG), argues that the Council was wrong to cut down the Federation Elm. In response, Councillor Paul Chang commented that the tree needed to be cut down as it was dangerous.

Erikson opens by reminding the audience of how much the local community valued the Federation Elm. She describes the tree as ‘magnificent’ and ‘beloved’ to encourage locals to feel they have lost something important. She further emphasises the loss by labelling the tree’s removal as ‘senseless vandalism’, which compares the Council to criminals. This positions local residents to feel sadness for the loss of the tree and anger towards the Council.

Erikson further attempts to discredit the Council by stating the tree’s removal was ‘profoundly shocking’ and ‘an outrage.’ She provides a quote from the Council’s website, ‘We value Garrickville’s trees because they help keep our ecosystem resilient, our city liveable and Garrickville’s unique character and heritage intact’, to contrast their words with the removal of the Federation Elm. Erikson is attempting to discourage people from trusting the Council and encourage them to feel they have been betrayed.

She includes two photographs to support the idea Garrickville has lost something very important. The photograph on the left shows the Federation Elm looking strong and healthy in 2020. The photograph on the right shows an empty patch of dirt next to a block of apartments. Since residents are likely to prefer the beautiful tree rather than the ugly, worn patch of dirt, Erikson further encourages them to feel sadness and fear for the future of their local area.

She closes her post by calling the residents to join her at a commemoration ceremony to ‘share our memories’ and ‘resolve ... to shape [Garrickville’s future]’. Erikson is attempting to show residents that they are not helpless and must take action to prevent their local area losing more beautiful trees.

Councillor Paul Chang’s comment creates the impression that the Council is not behaving unreasonably as the Federation Elm was actually dangerous. He states that ‘the tree posed considerable safety risks’ and needed to be cut down. This appeal to fear encourages local residents to see the Council as responsible and trustworthy. Chang also says the Council ‘valued [the tree] highly’ to create the impression the decision was difficult, adding to the impression the Council thinks carefully about their decisions and are not careless.

Chang also acknowledges that ‘concerns have been raised’ and states that he understands why residents are angry. He emphasises that reports about the tree are published on their website to enhance his credibility and encourage residents to see the Council is not hiding anything. He also mentions that ‘more than 300 new trees’ will be planted in 2023 to position local people to support the Council as they care about the environment.

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

In an angry post on the *Garrickville Community Action* website on 24 March 2023, Jennifer Erikson, spokesperson for Greener in Garrickville (GIG), condemns the felling of the historic Federation Elm. Erikson's post received a comment from Councillor Paul Chang, a representative of the Garrickville Council, on 27 March. In a detached tone, Councillor Chang defends the actions of the Council.

Erikson plays on her audience's sympathetic feelings towards the Federation Elm. She speaks of the tree as 'magnificent' and 'beloved' to local residents. Through these descriptions, Erikson establishes that the Federation Elm was a source of pride. Moreover, Erikson emphasises that the Federation Elm exists 'at the very heart' of the suburb's residents, linking together the elderly who 'sought its shade' and the young who 'played beneath it'. Thus, she suggests its loss will be deeply felt, especially because its sheltering presence has been lost as the result of 'senseless vandalism' – a term that connotes both pointlessness and criminality.

Relying on community support from her 'friends', Erikson seeks to discredit the Council by stating the tree's removal was 'profoundly shocking' and 'an outrage.' The Council, in Erikson's view, does not live up to the principles they profess. She notes that the Council website states they 'value Garrickville's trees' for several reasons, including keeping 'our ecosystem resilient ... and Garrickville's unique character and heritage intact'. She asserts that as the Council's actions contradict the value they say they place on trees, it follows that they should not be trusted. Erikson also argues that if 'trees in general' provide many tangible benefits, a special tree such as the Federation Elm should have been even more deserving of the Council's care. Thus, Erikson seeks to elicit feelings of disappointment regarding the Council's decision.

The photographs reinforce Erikson's line of argument. On the left is a photo of the Federation Elm appearing healthy. On the right is a rundown area adjoining a housing development. This creates a contrast between the 'beauty' of the tree and 'yet another housing development' to shock residents who value the appearance of their neighbourhood.

Erikson is realistic in saying that, regrettably, it is 'too late ... to save the Federation Elm'. She uses this unfortunate fact to motivate her fellow residents to take action. In suggesting how uncomfortable it would feel to 'be left thinking there is more you could have done', she encourages them to commit to action while there is still time. With this, Erikson's aims to recruit new supporters for GIG and elicit a more active involvement in the group from current members.

In his comment on Erikson's post, Councillor Paul Chang seeks to reassure residents that the Council has their best interests at heart. For this reason, he says that the decision to remove the Federation Elm was made because 'the tree posed considerable safety risks.' Thus, Chang aims to make the Council appear responsible.

By saying that the Council understands that 'concerns have been raised', Councillor Chang asserts he understands community views. He continuously emphasises that proper procedures were followed and that reports about the tree are published on their website to enhance his credibility and encourage residents to see the Council as professional, refuting Erikson's argument that the Council is untrustworthy.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTARY

The upper mid-range response demonstrates a solid understanding of both writers' contentions and supporting arguments. The essay includes a range of evidence, including identifying how the photographs are used to support Erikson's argument. At times, the essay describes the language rather than making connections to the authors' overall contentions. There is also a tendency to rely on overly long quotes or to use quotes to summarise instead of analysing them.

The essay attempts to explore the connotations of 'senseless vandalism', but there is not enough of this type of analysis. The essay deals well with considerations of audience but lacks the skillful use of metalanguage seen in high-range responses. 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-range response.

The high-range response also provides a close examination of both argument and language, and goes further to show clearer connections between elements of the texts and their purpose in supporting the authors' points of view. The analysis uses evidence from across the texts, which demonstrates the ability to select quotes appropriately and make connections. The points made about the photographs are concise and keep the overall purpose of Erickson's piece in mind.

The essay discusses the use of describing the readers as 'friends' but does not offer an exhaustive list of instances of inclusive language. Though the more obvious features of both articles are not overlooked, a greater proportion of time is spent in following up for subtle aspects of each text. The analysis provides astute commentary on Councillor Chang's attempt to deflect readers' attention away from Erikson's assertion that the Council is untrustworthy.

The high-range 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 does not feel forced. The high-range 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 shape language choices. The essay shows a pleasing sense of completion, and smoothly transitions between examples and authors.