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| --- |
| **Student: Date Due:** Thursday April 1st 2021 |
| **Assessment Type:** Responding: Short answer  **Task 4**  Answer the following questions in short answer responses of 250-300 words per response in the required time frame.  **Time allocation:** One period.  **Conditions:** In class.  **Weighting:** Responding 5%  **Mark: / 30** |

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

Teacher Comment:

**Question 1: (10 marks)**

Analyse how Indigenous Australians are represented in **Text 1.**

**Text 1**

***“The Secret River” by Kate Grenville (2005)***

*Note: this is an extract from the novel The Secret River by Kate Grenville (2005), which outlines the transportation to New South Wales from London of William Thornhill.*

They wandered about, naked as worms, sheltering under an overhang of rock or a sheet of bark. Their dwellings were no more substantial than those of a butterfly resting on a leaf. They caught their feeds of fish, gathered a few oysters, killed a possum or two, then moved on. The most Thornhill ever saw was a silhouette stalking along a ridge, or bending over with a fishing spear poised to strike through the water. He might see a splinter of canoe, fragile as a dead leaf against the dazzle of the sun on the water, with a figure sitting in it, knees drawn up to its shoulders, or a twist of blue smoke rising from some hidden place in the forest. But the canoe had always gone by the time he rowed over to it, and the smoke vanished when he looked at it too closely.

During the day, if a person kept to the settlement and did not look about himself too hard, he would see no one out there in the tangled landscape. He might even imagine that there was no one there at all. But at night, a man out in a boa on Port Jackson saw the campfires everywhere, winking among the trees. Sometimes the breeze brought the sound of their singing, a high hard dirge, and the rhythmic clapping of sticks.

There were no signs that the blacks felt the place belonged to them. They had no fences that *said this is mine*. No house that said, *this is our home*. There were no fields or flocks that said, *we have put the labour of our hands into this place.*

**Question 2: (10 marks)**

Compare how the relationship between identity and the land is revealed in **Text 1** and **Text 2.**

**Text 2**

*The following is an excerpt from Stan Grant's expository text Talking to My Country, published in 2016.*

I want to tell you about blood and bone and how mine is buried deep in this land. I want to tell you of a name that should be mine, a Wiradjuri name that passed down from thousands of years of kinship - taken from us along with our language and our land. And I want to tell you how I came to the name I have: Grant, the name of an Irishman, a name from a time of theft and death.

Australia still can't decide whether we were settled or invaded. We have no doubt. Our people died defending their land and they had no doubt. The result though was the same for us whatever you call it. Within a generation, the civilisations of the Eastern seaboard -older than the Pharaohs -were ravaged.

Across Australia, nations that had not seen a white man - Bandjalang, Kamilaroi, Ngarrindjeri, Arabana, Darumbal, Gurindji, Yawuru, Watjarri, Barkindji, and all of the other hundreds of distinct peoples, each with their own boundaries defined by kinship and trade -in the eyes of the British simply never existed.

Soon we would lose our names, names unique, inherited from our forefathers. Then our languages silenced. Soon children would be gone. This is how we disappear. Now Australians pay their respects to the elders of nations of which they have no idea.

I want to tell you how you have always sought to define us. You called us Aborigines: a word that meant nothing to my people. And in that one word, you erased our identities.

Australians know so little about us. They know so little about what has happened here in their name. Perhaps they can talk about the American west: Sitting Bull and Custer and Little Big Horn. They may know of Caesar and Napoleon and Tutankhamen. But Pemulwuy? Windradyne? Jandamurra? What of these warriors and leaders who fought and died here for their land? What about the massacres of Myall Creek, Coniston or Ridson Cove?

**Question 3: (10 marks)**

Identify how visual conventions are used in **Text 3** to convey an idea about Australian life.

**Text 3**

****

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES** | **Marks** |
| **Question 1: Your response** | **/10** |
| Detailed and sophisticated analysis of text with appropriate evidence and use of metalanguage. Response is succinct, coherent and clear. Minimal errors. | 8 -10 |
| Detailed analysis of text with appropriate evidence related to the question. Response is succinct, coherent and clear with a few minor errors. | 6 - 7.5 |
| Competent response addressing components of the question, supported with some appropriate text-based evidence, with some errors. | 3.5 – 5.5 |
| Limited understanding of text with minimal analysis; retell of text with limited reference to the question, underdeveloped expression, poorly structured response, frequent errors. | 2- 3 |
| Response that does not address the question, minimal control of the mechanics of grammar, spelling and punctuation. | 0 – 1.5 |
| **Question 2: Your response** | **/10** |
| Detailed and sophisticated analysis of text and comparison, with appropriate evidence and use of metalanguage. Response is succinct, coherent and clear. | 8 -10 |
| Detailed analysis of text and comparison, with appropriate evidence related to the question. Response is succinct, coherent and clear with a few minor errors. | 6 - 7.5 |
| Competent response that addresses components of the question, supported with some appropriate text-based evidence and an attempt at comparison, some errors. | 3.5 – 5.5 |
| Limited understanding of text with minimal analysis; retell of text with limited reference to the question, no comparison of texts, underdeveloped expression, poorly structured response, frequent errors. | 2- 3 |
| Response that does not address the question, minimal control of the mechanics of grammar, spelling and punctuation. | 0 – 1.5 |
| **Question 3: Your response** | **/10** |
| Detailed and sophisticated analysis of text and comparison, with appropriate evidence and use of metalanguage. Response is succinct, coherent and clear. | 8 -10 |
| Detailed analysis of text with appropriate evidence related to the question. Response is succinct, coherent and clear with a few minor errors. | 6 - 7.5 |
| Competent response addressing components of the question, supported with some appropriate text-based evidence, with some errors. | 3.5 – 5.5 |
| Limited understanding of text with minimal analysis; retell of text with limited reference to the question, underdeveloped expression, poorly structured response, frequent errors. | 2- 3 |
| Response that does not address the question, minimal control of the mechanics of grammar, spelling and punctuation. | 0 – 1.5 |
|  | **/30** |