



Trial Examination 2021

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. Yes, he does. He says it is available everywhere in China. 1 mark

b. Yes, he does.

Any one of:

- He says they are ‘pleasantly sour’.
- He says ‘sadly’ he cannot buy them in Australia.

1 mark

c.

Fruit	Change to the recipe
strawberries	adds honey
oranges	adds more water

2 marks

1 mark for identifying the correct fruits.

1 mark for identifying the appropriate changes to the recipe for the given fruits.

d. Waiting for the sugar to cool takes longer. He says cooking the sugar takes 8 to 10 minutes, but cooling down takes at least 10 minutes. 1 mark

e. *Any one of:*

Example of language use	Example of delivery
Take the pan off ‘as soon as it changes colour’	Stress on ‘as soon’ for emphasis
‘Immediately’ take the pan off the heat	Stress on ‘immediately’ to show it is important
‘Otherwise’ it could become bitter	Falling intonation to show it would be disappointing

2 marks

1 mark for a correct example of language use.

1 mark for an appropriate example of delivery for the given example of language use.

f. a thermometer 1 mark

g. *Any one of:*

- He wants to win the digital camera.
- He thinks it might give him a chance to be a filmmaker in the future.

1 mark

Question 2 (10 marks)

a. She is annoyed when meetings interrupt her work. 1 mark

b. *Any two of:*

- Who is that?
- Why am I here?
- What is this meeting about?

2 marks

- c. Don reminds Sarah about the topic they were discussing. 1 mark
Any one of:

- He does this because she got distracted.
- He does this so they can continue their conversation about meetings.

1 mark

- d. No, she does not. 1 mark
For example, any one of:

- She asks how she can ‘make’ people turn up on time, placing stress on ‘make’.
- She says she finds it ‘incredibly difficult’, placing stress on ‘incredibly’ for emphasis.
- She says it is ‘incredibly difficult’ in a frustrated tone.

2 marks

*1 mark for identifying the example.**1 mark for identifying the technique.*

Note: A range of responses are acceptable. Examples of Sarah’s language and delivery must be taken from the text and clearly support the response in relation to the question.

- e. *Any one of:*

- He respects the manager who uses the sign. When Sarah asks him if he thinks it is delightful, he says ‘it is.’
- He thinks this style worked for her, but wouldn’t work for him. He says it ‘wouldn’t suit’ his management style.
- He respects the manager who uses the sign, but would not use this style himself. He says it is ‘extreme’.

2 marks

*1 mark for identifying how Don feels.**1 mark for providing appropriate evidence.*

SECTION C – ARGUMENT AND PERSUASIVE LANGUAGE

Question 1 (10 marks)

a. Mrs Winterson believes Mr Maiocchi's property is unsightly. 1 mark

Any one of (example):

- the stack of cars
- the sculpture garden

1 mark

b. *Any two of:*

- reduced property prices
- looks unappealing
- does not fit with the local area
- prevents locals from enjoying the surroundings

2 marks

c. Mrs Winterson wants the DRC to demand that Mr Maiocchi removes his sculpture garden. 1 mark

d. Mr Maiocchi implies that Mrs Winterson is interfering. 1 mark

e. Mr Maiocchi uses his sculptures to make money. 1 mark

Mr Maiocchi uses his sculptures to express himself creatively. 1 mark

f. *For example:*

- Mr Maiocchi's tone is formal. Supporting quotes include 'I would like to thank the Archerwood DRC [...]' or 'I dispute Mrs Winterson's representation of my property'.
- Mr Maiocchi's tone is frustrated. A supporting quote is 'Whatever Mrs Winterson may prefer to think'.
- Mr Maiocchi's tone is critical. A supporting quote is 'Where is your imagination, Mrs Winterson?'

2 marks

1 mark for appropriately describing Mr Maiocchi's tone.

1 mark for providing a supporting quote.

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 7 February 2021, the Archerwood Dispute Resolution Centre received a formal complaint from Mrs Patricia Winterson, spokesperson of Archerwood Residents for Enterprise and Action (AREA). In her letter, Winterson contends in an irritated tone that a neighbour, Mr Frank Maiocchi, has outraged locals with his unsightly sculpture garden. Writing in reply, Maiocchi defensively asserts that his sculpture garden has artistic value and that he is free to do as he wishes with his own property.

From the outset, Winterson establishes that she acts with the full support of AREA. In speaking of a situation that has become ‘increasingly frustrating’ and has proved ‘exhausting’ for herself and others, she makes a plea for sympathy and support. Since the dispute is a matter of ‘the gravest concern’, she implies that it is very serious and merits the immediate attention of the DRC. Winterson also aims to appeal to local knowledge and civic pride. She draws on real-estate jargon when she writes of the sculpture garden detracting from the charm of ‘a very desirable residence’ and ‘bringing down property values’. By referring to ‘the enjoyment that other residents expect to have in their local surroundings’, Winterson implicitly depicts Maiocchi as existing outside the neighbourhood consensus and the expectations of any ‘reasonable person’. She is keen not to be seen as a nosy or unsatisfactory neighbour. Where Winterson wants to be seen to have been appropriately neighbourly (mentioning, for instance, that Maiocchi was ‘warmly welcomed [...] to the neighbourhood’), she represents Maiocchi himself as stubborn, or, as she puts it, downright ‘uncooperative’. She would like the DRC to regard him as acting unreasonably and refusing friendly overtures. Her use of scare quotations around the words ‘innovative sculpture garden’ and ‘junk artist’ is designed to belittle the claims of artistic merit that Maiocchi makes and question his status as an artist.

Having done everything she can to brand Maiocchi’s redevelopment of 17 Viewcrest Road and its sculptures as ‘monstrosities’, Winterson goes on to claim that it is a ‘public nuisance’ and could be a cause of legal action. Using inclusive language, she reiterates that ‘ours is a heritage area’ and lets it be understood that it is to no-one’s advantage to see its local character diminished in any way. At this point, Winterson adds weight to her claims by invoking her role as spokesperson (‘AREA is of the view’). She makes a conventional expression of regret, noting that AREA ‘will be obliged to proceed with legal action’ as if this is a regrettable necessity and not a choice. In addition to this, she incorporates a threat aimed, not at the DRC, but at Maiocchi. Legal proceedings, she suggests, may be ‘long and potentially costly’. Implicit in this assertion is the message that Maiocchi would be well-advised to fall into line to avoid trouble and expense. The visual accompanying Winterson’s letter is intended to provide evidence that the ‘so-called “innovative sculptures”’ are ‘monstrosities’. The stack of cars dominates the image and appears run-down and unsightly. It is not difficult to grasp that there could be objections to such a site in a suburban setting, but, on the other hand, it is not out of the question that the sculpture garden could be of artistic interest.

This idea of subjective art appreciation is the basis of Maiocchi’s argument. He firmly states that he is at odds with Winterson and resents the claim that he has been ‘uncooperative’. If anything, he maintains, he has listened to Winterson ‘patiently’. Maiocchi wants to sound like a reasonable man who has given Winterson every chance to have her say. He wants to establish that he and Winterson are on equal footing and that he is entitled to exercise his rights ‘just as Mrs Winterson uses hers’. He relies on his superior knowledge of art to inform his argument, providing an overview of the junk art movement and its spreading acceptance in the wider world to enhance the credibility of his sculpture garden and make those who would disparage it seem out-of-touch. Maiocchi also affiliates himself with a ‘growing movement’, which appears to be at the cutting edge of artistic practice. He therefore presents himself as forward-looking by speaking of the ‘ever-evolving project’ to which he has committed himself. Conversely, in Maiocchi’s account of her, Winterson emerges as a person of limited vision (‘Perhaps Mrs Winterson cannot see it, but junk can be a beautiful thing’). As one who has ‘worked hard to acquire [...] skills’, he is understandably piqued by Winterson’s dismissive and scoffing reference to him as one ‘who calls himself a “junk artist”’. In an act of verbal retaliation, he rhetorically asks ‘Where is your imagination, Mrs Winterson?’

As he reaches the end of his letter, Maiocchi is determined to demonstrate that legal threats do not faze him. He adopts legal language to assert that he has not ‘broken any local laws’ and expresses his self-assuredness

that, in any ‘purely aesthetic dispute’, his expertise will prevail. He declares, unsurprisingly, that he is ‘happy to engage in discussions about art with Mrs Winterson and AREA whenever they choose’, further reinforcing he is confident of his authority in this field. He closes by suggesting that ‘we should resolve to let everyone make their own [...] choices’, to reinforce that Winterson and AREA have no right to impose their standards on him and are, perhaps, proving themselves rather naïve in making the attempt. In a final flourish, he signs off as ‘Mr Frank Maiocchi, junk artist and home-owner’ affirming both the title that Winterson has questioned and his rights in relation to his own property. His response indicates that there will be no easy path to mediation between the parties to this dispute.

ASSESSOR’S COMMENTARY

This essay 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 some missed opportunities to connect these to the broader contention (such as the mention of ‘property values’ or the rhetorical question ‘Where is your imagination, Mrs Winterson?’) that prevent this essay from being a high-scoring response. The thorough understanding of the two points of view and the precise selection of quotes and examples are typical of an upper mid-range response, but a greater emphasis on *how* and *why* this language aids in the authors’ persuasion would elevate this to a high-scoring response.

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

In her letter to the Archerwood Dispute Resolution Centre, AREA spokesperson Mrs Patricia Winterson contends, in a tone of barely-concealed irritation, that a neighbour, Mr Frank Maiocchi, has outraged local sentiment by creating an unsightly sculpture garden that is an incongruous addition to the neighbourhood. Writing in reply, Mr Maiocchi asserts with a mix of defensiveness and pride that his sculpture garden has artistic value and that he is free to do as he wishes with his own property.

From the outset, Winterson establishes her voice as having the weight of the collective neighbourhood's discontent, actively declaring her position as 'spokesperson'. In speaking of a situation that has become 'increasingly frustrating', she draws attention to a problem that is of some duration, as the adverb 'increasingly' underscores that matters are only escalating. The personal impact felt by Winterson is highlighted by a somewhat confidential tone marked by the expression 'quite frankly', and a confession that it has all become 'exhausting' for herself and others. Employing a superlative, she characterises the existing discord as a matter of 'the gravest concern', implying that it merits the immediate attention of the DRC. However, not wanting to lecture them, she asserts that she 'need hardly tell [them]' of the 'natural and historical attractions' of the area, insinuating that those who share this knowledge should also share the view that nothing should be done to disrupt the neighbourhood's character and appeal. Thus, Winterson casts herself as the reasonable party in the dispute who is prioritising the interests of the community and its residents, thereby endeavouring to align herself with the DRC in seeking an outcome in favour of the majority.

Winterson also seeks to call into question Maiocchi's artistic merits and credibility. To some extent, she pre-empts live-and-let-live arguments by stating that Mr Maiocchi has engaged in a form of development that is so conspicuous as to be 'impossible to ignore'. By their very nature, the 'eyesore[s]' obtrude themselves on anyone's attention, evoking discomfort and annoyance. Hence, her use of such pejoratives imply that Maiocchi is at fault for inflicting such misery upon his own neighbourhood. By contrast, she portrays herself as diligently neighbourly in 'welcom[ing]' him to Archerwood and reveals this to be in vain given Maiocchi's 'uncooperative' attitude, connoting stubbornness and recalcitrant behaviour. Moreover, Winterson's use of scare quotations around the words 'innovative sculptures' is designed to belittle the claims of artistic merit that Maiocchi makes. She launches an ad hominem attack against Maiocchi styling himself as a 'junk artist'. Through her dismissive tone, readers can infer that it is unlikely Winterson would think highly of any 'junk artist', but a person who merely 'calls himself' this does not even rise to the credibility of deserving the title in her estimation. Collectively, this language disparages Maiocchi, framing him as disrespectful and antagonistic and forms part of Winterson's efforts to elicit sympathy for her plight.

Furthermore, Winterson suggests that AREA 'will be obliged to proceed with legal action', as if this is a regrettable necessity and a matter of obligation rather than choice. Her use of the plural to incorporate the concerned residents of AREA and the members of the DRC in 'ours is a heritage area' insinuates that their interests are aligned and it is to no-one's advantage to see Archerwood's local character diminished. In addition, she extends her target audience to include Maiocchi in her subtle threat that legal proceedings may be 'long and potentially costly'. Implicit in this assertion is the message that Maiocchi would be well-advised to accede to AREA's demands to avoid trouble and expense. Meanwhile, the foundation of Maiocchi's argument is not cohesive neighbourhood aesthetics, but rather the merits of artistic expression. After some polite preliminaries, he states unequivocally that he is at odds with Winterson and resents the claim that he has been 'uncooperative'. If anything, he maintains, he has listened to the representations of Mrs Winterson with patience. Equity and fair play lie at the heart of the claim that he should be able to use his rights 'just as Mrs Winterson uses hers'.

Maiocchi proceeds to adopt the posture of one who has superior knowledge of the art world and expresses a desire to instruct his less well-informed peers. He provides an overview of the junk art movement's burgeoning popularity and acceptance to enhance the credibility of his own project and make those who would disparage it seem parochial and out-of-touch. Maiocchi affiliates himself with the 'growing movement' of junk art and positions himself as an avant garde figure working on an 'ever-evolving project', employing words that connote positive advancement. By implication, he therefore paints

Winterson as a person of limited vision who ‘perhaps [...] cannot see’ the beauty of his craft. Thus, Maiocchi claims that it is he (and not the supporters of AREA who supposedly enshrine the qualities given by their acronym) who is showing the values of a ‘modern society’ and hence deserves the DRC’s support. In stark contrast to Maiocchi’s elevation of his art form, Winterson seeks to persuade her audience that the ‘so-called “innovative sculptures”’ are ‘monstrosities’ by appending a photograph. This visual depicts a stack of dilapidated old cars that dominate the visual field, almost towering over the viewer in a precarious if not outright menacing way. This supports Winterson’s attempt to undermine Maiocchi’s art as ‘nothing more than a public nuisance’, which she intimates is compromising the reputation and happiness of Archerwood.

In an act of retaliation, Maiocchi rhetorically and somewhat witheringly asks ‘Where is your imagination, Mrs Winterson?’ Here, the fact that he ceases to address the DRC and instead directly confronts Winterson suggests a degree of personal antagonism that he previously worked to conceal. He positions Winterson’s lack of imagination as antithetical to his art, proudly stating that he ‘celebrate[s] what she condemns’. Moreover, it is his view that it is he, rather than the long-established residents of Archerwood, who is progressive and ‘in tune’ with the contemporary world of enterprise. His insistence that he can ‘make beauty out of what others throw away’ may well be an implicit critique of his neighbours. He also levels further criticism against the ‘lawns and flowers’ of his neighbours by suggesting that these are ‘boringly predictable’, thereby recontextualising Winterson’s talk of assimilation and integration as something mediocre and vapid. He closes by suggesting that ‘we should resolve to let everyone make their own [...] choices’ to reinforce that Winterson and AREA have no right to impose their standards on him and are, perhaps, proving themselves rather naïve in making the attempt. In a final flourish, he signs off as ‘Mr Frank Maiocchi, junk artist and home-owner’, affirming both the title that Winterson has questioned and his rights in relation to his own property. His response indicates that there will be no easy path to mediation between the parties to this dispute.

ASSESSOR’S COMMENTARY

This high-scoring essay closely examines both argument and language, skilfully explaining how points of view are constructed, using written and visual evidence. The analysis draws from the scope of material presented whilst also pausing for more detailed dissection of connotations and word choice at opportune moments. Most importantly, the analysis frequently revisits the authors’ contentions and explicitly links what these authors do with how they persuade their target audience. The essay smoothly transitions between examples and authors without needless comparison, maintaining a focus on why certain language supports a persuasive intent, and its consistent use of metalanguage amplifies the efficient and effective analysis.