

Summary of Viewing Commentary

Script	Teachers' comments
1 Range 16-18	Discussion of the topic is superficial and lacks depth and sophistication, particularly in relation to the still images. While there is some understanding of "values", there is too much discussion of plot rather than viewing conventions. There is insufficient textual analysis, not enough references to codes and conventions and no meaningful connections between texts are made.
2 Range 22-24	A strong, sophisticated response which fully addresses and engages with the question. Comparisons between texts are made, as well as relevant links to ideas about audience context and the social and political functions of texts. The writer has made good use of subject specific vocabulary ("dominant representation", "symbolic elements", "marginalised") and has demonstrated an excellent understanding of the codes and conventions. Both the still images and film are discussed in detail.
3 Range 20-21	A sound understanding of the construction of still images is demonstrated and some links are made to the values promoted by these texts. A good range of texts was used to support the argument but references to viewing codes are superficial and indicate an incomplete understanding of how techniques can be manipulated to position viewers.
4 Range 15-16	The question is not fully addressed as the script deals only with the visual images supplied and does not refer to course viewing; consequently, there are no comparisons or links made to other texts. The response is simplistic with too much emphasis on descriptive elements ("We can see that there isn't really any ice for it to stand on") rather than a detailed analysis of the texts. There is some discussion of techniques but not enough use of specific terminology.
5 Range 19-20	This response tries to engage with the question, although it does not address the whole question as it deals only superficially with film. There are too many general statements ("These purposes are conveyed to the reader through particular themes and ideas"), with a consequent lack of specific examples to support the argument. More references to the codes and conventions of viewing needed.
6 Range 14-16	The writer struggles to identify codes and is unable to make meaningful connections between texts. The discussion of still images relies on description ("Both the characters are looking off at something in the distance") rather than on a detailed analysis of the text. There is a lack of detail although there is an attempt to make the connection between visual texts and own context.
7 26-28	This perceptive ("Often we are oblivious to the way in which we are purposefully manipulated") response demonstrates a strong, confident engagement with the question. There is a clear thesis statement which is developed into a well-structured argument with a sustained focus on the conventions of each of the texts discussed. There is familiarity with conventions and a focussed discussion of gender representation in visual texts.
8 Range 24-26	Develops a sound argument based on the images and film. There is strong engagement with the question and clear, specific examples are used as supporting detail ("By placing the male in a suit and the fact that he is holding a gun further defines his masculinity and powerful position"). The analysis of visual texts maintains a clear focus on the conventions ("The low camera angle creates a dominating, empowered persona") and purposeful links are made between texts.

Summary of Writing Commentary

Script	Teachers' comments
1 Range 20-22	This response works well as a speech for a specified audience. It is fluent, accurately written and indicates a good sense of context, purpose and audience. It makes use of persuasive techniques such as rhetorical questions effectively and tries to use inclusive language to gain and maintain audience interest. There are references to a wide range of texts and quotes are used to convince and engage the audience.
2 Range 17-20	Some markers identified this response as more of a list rather than an engagement with the question. The insights are general and there is too much focus on retelling the plot features. The language tends to be simplistic and the necessary depth of analysis is lacking. Other markers saw this as well-structured, accurate and focussed, with sound written expression and a comprehensive and well-developed argument.
3 Range 18-20	While this response demonstrates a good sense of personal voice and structures a competent argument, it uses a limited vocabulary and does not maintain the conventions of the chosen form. Each text is dealt with quite briefly and there are insufficient examples to support the argument fully. The rather informal tone, together with the low-level vocabulary, result in problems with expression and too many syntactical errors.
4 Range 9-12	This simplistic response is a superficial treatment of the issues and ideas in texts. Simple sentence structure, poor syntax, informal tone, limited references to texts and lack of detail have resulted in an essay which seems unfinished and disjointed. A basic and under-developed response which does not address the question.
5 Range 18-22	While this response does not fully demonstrate the conventions of feature articles, it puts forward some thought-provoking and valid points in constructing a sustained argument. It uses a range of references/examples and a wide vocabulary to write persuasively and to achieve a good sense of audience.
6 Range 12-16	There was general consensus that this response would have benefited from a brief explanation of purpose and form. It fails to successfully demonstrate writing skill: it is poorly organised; there is some awkwardness with language; imagery is not consistent; it is not sufficiently developed; the ideas are disjointed. On the other hand, it can be seen as a "brave" choice, creative and highly imaginative.
7 Range 19-22	Although this imaginative attempt at a suspenseful narrative is somewhat clichéd, it succeeds in creating conflict and atmosphere with some effective descriptions and good use of imagery. The strong use of 1 st person narrative helps to create suspense and to engage the reader. Paragraphing errors, problems with spelling and syntax and some flaws in expression detract from the flow of the story.
8 Range 25-28	This highly readable and engaging response demonstrates thoughtful engagement with the stimulus. Language conventions are effectively controlled and a good sense of the character's voice is created. There is evidence of wide reading and the intertextual references add to meaning, while the vivid vocabulary used helps to position the reader.
9 Range 14-18	Badly-structured, with repetitive starts to over-long paragraphs and no conclusion, this response lacks depth, flair and sophistication; however, some ideas are clearly expressed and there appears to be some understanding of context. Consideration of audience and form is needed.
10 Range 24-27	This response makes a clear statement of purpose and presents a well-structured argument, making use of quotes and a range of texts for persuasive effect. The speech begins strongly with a number of rhetorical questions and continues with an interesting exploration of the topic, using relevant examples to support validity of argument.