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**Year 10 NAEP**

|  |
| --- |
| **Student: Teacher: Date Due:** Tuesday Term 3, Week1 |
| **Assessment Type:** Reading & Viewing  Writing  **Task 14**  In 20 -30 minutes, respond to the following prompt in a short answer essay format of 250-300 words.  **Time allocation:** 20 minutes  **Conditions:** In class.  **Weighting:** Reading & Viewing 10%  Writing 10%  **Mark: / 30** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To be assessed for this task you must submit:** | **Date Due** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Short answer response Text 1 |  |  |  |

**Teacher Feedback:**

**Question 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Marks** |
| **Generic convention** |  |
| Identifies one generic convention and clearly explains how it is used to position readers | 4 |
| Identifies one generic convention and explains how these are used to position readers | 3 |
| Identifies one generic convention and attempts to explain how it is used to position readers | 2 |
| Identifies one generic convention and discusses its effect | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Interpreting - idea** |  |
| Identifies an idea developed in the text and clearly explains how one generic convention positions readers | 3 |
| Identifies an idea developed in the text and begins to explain how one generic convention positions readers | 2 |
| Identifies an idea developed in the text and attempts to explain how one generic convention positions readers | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Use of evidence** |  |
| Selects a range of evidence and explains how it is used to position readers | 3 |
| Selects an example of evidence and explains how it is used to position readers | 2 |
| Selects an example of evidence and attempts to explain how it is used to position readers | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Structure - Introduction** |  |
| Produces an introduction that begins with a well-articulated contextual sentence and thesis statement (i.e.: it identifies an idea developed in the text, names one generic convention and explains how the reader is positioned to respond to the idea) | 4 |
| Produces an introduction that attempts to create a clear thesis statement (i.e.: identifies an idea developed in the text, names one generic convention and states that the reader was positioned – but does not clearly explain how) | 3 |
| Produces an introduction using the key words from the prompt without specifically developing a clear and precise thesis statement (i.e.: it may name an idea or state a generic convention or state that readers are positioned – but not all three in any detail) | 2 |
| Produces an introduction that vaguely rewords the question without specifically developing a clear and precise thesis statement (i.e.: names an idea and/or a generic convention) | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Structure – Body Paragraph/s** |  |
| Produces a clearly structured and well-organised explanation with topic sentences and logical paragraphing related to the requirements of the question (idea and generic convention named in topic sentence; examples named, quotes integrated and explanation present, ending with final summative sentence = TREES) | 5 |
| Produces a generally well-structured and organised explanation using topic sentences and logical paragraphing (most of TREES present, as listed above) | 4 |
| Produces a mostly organised explanation with an imprecise topic sentence (vague restatement of key words from the question) and logical paragraphing (one example and one explanation offered) | 3 |
| Produces an explanation using paragraphs – no topic sentences address all of the key words from the question. | 2 |
| Attempts some ordering of the answer but the response is unclear and hard to follow – no coherent argument produced | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Spelling** |  |
| Spelling mostly correct for first draft | 4 |
| Some difficult or challenging words misspelt | 3 |
| Some common words misspelt | 2 |
| Many words misspelt | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Vocabulary** |  |
| Vocabulary is unambiguous in conveying a clear response to the task and includes some subject-specific terminology | 3 |
| Vocabulary is mostly suited to the task and includes some subject-specific terminology | 2 |
| Vocabulary used does not always suit the task | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **Sentence structure, grammar and punctuation** |  |
| Sentence structure, grammar and punctuation is mostly correct for first draft | 4 |
| Sentence structure, grammar and punctuation contains some errors, but they do not impede meaning | 3 |
| Sentence structure, grammar and punctuation contains many errors, but they do not impede meaning | 2 |
| Errors in sentence structure, grammar and punctuation impeded meaning of response | 1 |
| No evidence of this criterion | 0 |
| **TOTAL MARK** | /30 |

**Text 1: This is an excerpt from Pamela Freeman’s essay on the novel, *Strange Objects.***

**Question 1**

Identify one idea developed in Text 1 and explain how one generic convention positioned you to respond to the text.

*Strange Objects* circles around the story of Stephen Messenger, the 16-year-old who finds Loos’s journal in a small ‘cannibal pot’, along with the long-mummified hand of a white girl and a golden ring. One of the conceits of the story is that Messenger has constructed a scrapbook which contains, not only his own account of the consequences of his find, but also newspaper clippings, radio interviews, letters from a prominent archaeologist and from a schoolmate/neighbour of Messenger’s, as well as Loos’ translated journal as it appeared in an Australian newspaper.

The result of these multiple storytelling modes is that there is no one ‘truth’ represented. The lack of a single authorial voice allows doubt, and the details of both timelines are described, contradicted, reaffirmed and questioned again, leaving many possibilities for the reader to choose among.

One of these possibilities is related to the ‘magic’ effect of the ring on both Pelgrom and Messenger, the two young and probably mentally ill boys of the two timelines. In my personal correspondence with Gary Crew this year, he said, ‘… as an historian, I am not impressed by the fantastic (that’s just a red herring…), because I simply believe that all possibilities are on the table and one day we may know more’ but to my mind this balance of possibilities puts the book firmly in the tradition of the literature of the fantastic. Tzvetan Todorov, in *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre* (1975), has defined the fantastic as:

In a world which is indeed our world, the one we know…there occurs an event which cannot be explained by the laws of this same familiar world. The person who experiences the event must opt for one of two possible solutions: either he is the victim of an illusion of the senses, of a product of the imagination – and the laws of the world then remain what they are; or else the event has indeed taken place, it is an integral part of reality – but then this reality is controlled by laws unknown to us. (p. 25)

Todorov suggests that if the author chooses the first solution, the novel belongs in the category of the uncanny; if the second, then it belongs in the category of the marvellous. But if an author maintains the uncertainy; if readers are left to decide for themselves the truth of the situation, the novel belongs in the category of the fantastic. (Perhaps the best known example of this in English is Henry James’ *The Turn of the Screw*, which would be an excellent companion text for *Strange Objects,* as would Lisson’s *The Devil’s Own*.) *Strange Objects* neatly fits Todorov’s criteria. (In quantum physics’ terms, the novel remains in a superposition of states.)

The uncertainty is magnified by the fact that Messenger is an unreliable narrator. What is unclear is *how* unreliable. While his understanding of other people is obviously flawed, and his interpretation of other people’s actions towards him breathtakingly self-centred, it’s not clear whether everything he describes actually happens, or whether his problems with people are symptoms of an underlying mental illness, exacerbated by grief at the death of his father – which is only revealed at the very end of the book.

Loos, the other main narrator (through his journal) may also be unreliable – not through any mental incapacity, but through hunger, exhaustion and a profound cultural dislocation as he interacts with a group of local Aboriginal people.

Both of these narrators recount seemingly magical experiences associated with the ring, which belongs to Pelgrom in 1629 and which Messenger finds and claims for his own in 1990. But are these experiences real, imagined, or part of an untold history for which we have no current evidence?