



2003

English (ESL) GA 3: Written examination

GENERAL COMMENTS

In 2003, the examination paper consisted of two Sections: Section 1 required a response to one text, while Section 2 required completion of three different tasks in response to given material. In Section 1 the quality of responses was similar to previous years, with very few students submitting no response, more than one response or a very short response. In Section 2 most students responded to all three tasks.

Marking policies

Assessment is holistic, using the published criteria. The process requires assessors to relate student performance directly to these criteria. These judgments are assisted by the use of a set of descriptors. Both the criteria and the descriptors are fully explored and directly related to the range of student responses during intensive assessor training before, as well as during the marking process. Teachers and students should be aware of both the assessment criteria and the descriptors. For 2003 these were published on the VCAA website in Supplement 2 to the February 2003 VCE Bulletin, No. 185. This supplement also contains an explanation of the allocation of marks for Parts 1 and 2 of the Writing Task.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Section 1 – Text response

Students were required to produce one piece of analytical or expository writing in response to one text. There were two topics for each of the prescribed texts. The layout of the English (ESL) paper remained similar to previous years and did not appear to have created any misunderstanding about task requirements, even for the many ESL students who are taught in mainstream classes.

Students' understanding of the task and confidence in writing appeared to be comparable with previous years. More successful responses were carefully crafted to respond to the key words in the question and supported with appropriate use of examples from the text. Most students limited the use of direct quotes to short phrases which were appropriately chosen to support their responses. Students generally displayed very good knowledge of the text even when they had difficulty writing to the requirements of the question set (for authenticity, all examples of student work included in this report still contain the student's errors in spelling and grammar).

Most responses were limited to a small number of texts, with a third of all responses being on *Gattaca*. Responses to *Night*, *The Wife of Martin Guerre*, and *The Divine Wind* together made up a third of the total. All four texts produced a wide range in the quality of responses. *Oedipus Rex*, *First They Killed my Father* and *The Outsider* accounted for a further fifteen per cent of responses. Twelve other texts attracted very few responses.

The most popular texts and their mean scores were:

<i>Gattaca</i>	33.59%	6.1
<i>The Wife of Martin Guerre</i>	13.55%	5.9
<i>Night</i>	9.17%	5.7
<i>The Divine Wind</i>	9.17%	5.6

At 5.96 the overall mean score was 0.3 higher than in 2002.

Both questions on *Gattaca* produced a range of responses; the more popular was Question 1. Most students understood 'genetic perfection'; the idea that Vincent was successful and were able to attempt a relevant response, even though many overlooked the word 'most' in the question. Some wrote about Vincent's dreams, or twisted the question to give accounts of who helped Vincent. The most successful responses did more than talk about Vincent's success, addressing the implied comparisons in the word 'most'. In the second question some students appeared to have difficulty with the concepts of 'individuality' and 'conformity' and had little understanding of the values of the society in *Gattaca*.

In both questions on *Night* students showed good knowledge of the text but did not always focus clearly on the question. In Question 1, as well as having a clear view on whether it was 'luck' or 'inner strength' which saved Elie, most responses acknowledged that both these elements were important. Some appeared to mistake 'inner strength' for 'physical strength'. In Question 2 'hopeful' was sometimes confused with 'hopes'.

Both topics on *The Wife of Martin Guerre* were well understood although sometimes Bertrande was the only character discussed in Question 2. In addition, some responses interpreted the question as relating to women only. Question 1,

about 'betrayal' and 'trust', allowed discussion of relationships and the central themes of the text. Both questions allowed students to structure their essays clearly – the first by character and the second by aspects of society.

The questions on *The Divine Wind* produced a range of responses. Some responses to Question 1 focused only on Mitzy but many picked up the fact that the question also called for an examination of other characters. Some responses did not fully address the possibilities raised by the description of Mitzy as 'strong, loyal, decisive' in the question. In Question 2 there appeared to be some misunderstanding of the term 'self-preservation' – interpreted either as 'keeping things unchanged' or 'selfishness'.

Some texts which attracted only a small number of responses also worked very well for ESL students. Both questions on *The Third Man* produced successful answers and the second question allowed students to display their knowledge of film as text. The *Triage* questions also produced good responses, possibly as both had a number of entry points. Students also responded well to the comparative aspects of the first question.

Overall, students demonstrated engagement with the ideas of the texts, good essay structure and obvious confidence in how to approach the task. However, there was still an over-reliance on story telling and regurgitating practice writing which has only some relevance to the topic on the paper. Such responses insufficiently analyse the set question or focus on only one aspect of the question. In planning, students need to brainstorm all the key words as well as pay particular attention to modifying words and comparatives within the question. Most students showed good knowledge of the text but were selective in using it as a key discriminator.

Example 1: Is Mitzy the only strong, loyal, decisive character in *The Divine Wind*?

The introduction accepts the accuracy of this description of Mitzy but challenges the word 'only', clearly indicating the perspective from which the student will respond.

In his novel, "The Divine Wind", set in Broome during the time of the Second World War, Garry Disher shows us that the character Mitzy, a young Japanese girl living in Australia, is not the only strong, loyal and decisive character. Even though she is the most remarkable character, one that changes least throughout the book, one that does not change her mind about her friends by the start, nor during the war, she is not really alone in doing so.

In the second paragraph the response examines another character, Alice, and provides evidence of why the descriptions in the question also apply to Alice.

Hartley Penrose's sister, Alice, is also a character that exhibits her strength, loyalty and decisiveness. Compared to Mitzy, who is passionate, supportive and full of strength, Alice seems a bit withdrawn in expressing her emotions, but nonetheless she is very loyal and strong deep inside. That is evident in the incident, when Alice, Mitzy and Hard find Derby Boxer, the head stockman at Hartog Downs, drunk in the cinema and bring him back to the Penrose's house, where they meet Alice's and Hart's mother, Ida Penrose, coming back from the market. Ida, a lady, who can not adapt to Australia and still lives a classy British lifestyle, insults Mitzy by saying "What are you doing here? Do not you think....." In that she turns all her anger, that a drunk "black" is being brought into her house, towards Mitzy. On which Mitzy flees. Hartley does not say anything. Alice is the only one that has the guts to oppose her mother and stay loyal to her friend, by running after Mitzy.

The response continues to provide evidence of Alice's strength, loyalty and decisiveness by examining how she ended her relationship with Carl Venning and her help in Hart's rehabilitation. The essay concludes by reasserting that Mitzy and Alice both have these qualities.

All in all, Alice never shows racism towards anybody, nor does she ever do anything to hurt somebody for no reason. To stay like that during the time of war, shows us just how strong, loyal and decisive Alice is, that her character is just as glorious as Mitzy's.

Example 2: 'In *Night*, those who remain hopeful are most likely to survive.'

This response has the following characteristics:

- relevance
- strong knowledge of the text, including the values of the text, and good use of the text to support points made
- awkward and clumsy expression in a number of places
- links hope, faith and survival with evidence from the text
- clear structure
- clear links between paragraphs
- awareness of 'hopeful' in the context of other factors that contributed to survival
- simple, straightforward expression but a rather abrupt conclusion
- lacking in the engagement and variety of language needed to gain the highest marks.

It is an example of a competent response, achievable by students who, with an understanding of the question, can structure an essay, use the text selectively and communicate their ideas adequately.

The book 'Night' tells us a true story about Elie's experience in concentration camps in WWII. The Jews were kept in the camps and suffered the horror that they never suffered before. Only few people survived because

they remained hopeful. Some people had faith in God and some people had faith in themselves or their family which all gave them hope and keep them survive. However, other people's help and support were also important to survive.

First of all, the faith in God gave some people hope and kept them survive. In the enclosed hell, the Jews were treated like animals. But, they still prayed and believed God deeply, which gave them hope to survive. It was a way of escaping from reality. When the young Jews were going to revolt, the elders told them, 'never lose faith even when the sword hangs over your head!' They believed that God would help and save them. Akiba Drumer, who believed God was keeping, said 'God is testing us. We have no right to despair.....And if He punished us, it's a sign that He loves us all the more.' When people lost the faith, they lost their hope and died quickly. Poor Akiba Drumer, if he could have kept believing God, he would not be taken at the second selection. So, people survived because they had faith in God, which gave them hope.

Secondly, some people remained hopeful because of their family members. They survived because they hoped to gather together with their family one day. Elie's father could survive because he always hoped to live with his wife and children. He said to Elie, 'Your mother is still a young woman. She must be in a labour camp now.' Elie also survived because of his father. When he was going to give up, he always thought of his father. 'What would he do without me? I was his only support.' And, there were two brothers, Yossi and Tibi, they lived both 'body and soul for each other'. Therefore, those who had hope of their family had more strength to survive.

Also, people still had faith in themselves, which gave them hope and kept them survive, even if they lost their faith in God and family. Elie was such an example. After he suffered so much as saw lots of evil things, he lost his faith in God. But he did not give up. He still had hope of himself. He believed he could survive with his great inner strength, saying, 'Yes. men are strong. Greater than God.' That's why he struggled till the last. His father was also the one with strong faith in himself. When his friend was going to give up, he encouraged him. 'Do not let yourself go under. You should resist. Do not lose faith in yourself.' So, it was important to keep the hope of oneself to survive.

Although, these hopes could give people strength and kept them struggling, other people's help and support was also important to survive. When Elie and his father arrived at the camps, a prisoner told them to lie for their ages, so that they could be kept as labour forces. Without the valuable advice, they could have died. When Elie was beaten by the German soldiers, a French girl took a risk to look after him and encourage him. 'Bite your lip, little brother.... The day will come, but not now. Wait....' What the young Pole said was quite right. 'We are brothers. We are suffering the same fate... Help one another. It's the only way to survive.'

In conclusion, in such a bad condition, those who remain hopeful are most likely to survive, no matter it's the faith in God, in their family or in themselves. However, without a lot of people's help and support they could not survive.

Familiarity with the assessment criteria and how to develop the skills to meet them is essential. Every avenue to get students familiar with the text and the major themes and issues should be used. Students may be less inclined to just retell the story if they have developed some ideas about the text. Planning also assists students to stay on the topic and not just retell the story. Lots of detailed plans as opposed to writing actual practice essays, e.g. plan eight but only write three can be a useful approach. Choosing texts that have concrete issues for ESL students to grasp and discuss is an important part of making these skills accessible to all ESL students.

As well as knowledge of the text, students need to understand the requirements of a well-structured essay; in particular how to develop a point of view with one main point in each paragraph, directly linked to the topic and supported by text examples. The introduction should address the prompt and not be a generic summary of the text. Teachers need to give the basics of analysing the question, focusing on key words, awareness of words which modify and how to use them in planning the response, teaching students to 'unpack' the prompts and to take into account all parts of the question. ESL students will often need assistance in acquiring a range of vocabulary appropriate for discussing the text they have chosen and which they can draw on to write expressively and effectively in examination conditions. Students also need to be taught how to recognise and decode the different types of questions asked on texts, e.g. Discuss, Do you agree?, questions which include 'why' or 'how'. Many students are not clear about the difference between 'discuss' and 'do you agree?'.

Section 2 – Writing task

Students were presented with a number of items related to one topic. They were required to complete three tasks in response to this unseen material. The tasks were:

- a note form summary of a section of the material
- an analysis of language used in another section of the material
- a response to the main issue raised by the texts.

Each task is of equal value and three separate scores are given. There were clear instructions which, together with the layout of the paper, assisted students to complete these tasks on the correct sections of the material.


The topic was very accessible and, although it appeared simple on first reading, it provided opportunity to explore complex ideas. In task 3 many responses showed only a limited understanding of ‘breaking the law’ and concentrated too much on animal liberation and animal rights.

Assessors commented very favourably on the quality of the note taking responses this year. The wording of the material was accessible and provided two clearly varying positions. However, many responses missed the obvious opportunities to link the ideas from these two pieces. Some had difficulty coming up with an appropriate heading. The overall quality of the responses showed that students had been well prepared for the note taking task but it was easy to pick those who had no idea of how to approach it. There are several mistakes made by those who do not understand the task – writing a separate summary of each piece, listing unconnected words (as if one word on its own was note taking), writing in whole sentences, repeating all the information, not using headings – just points in a vacuum. While it is acceptable to use conventional abbreviations, including arrows and dots, this is a language, not an art, task so students should be discouraged from using diagrams instead of words. Students should write one summary with an ‘umbrella’ heading, making links between the articles so that information is not repeated. As it takes time and practice to develop note taking skills, students need to be introduced to the skills before entering Year 12 and encouraged to use them as a regular part of their work.

These examples show something of the variety of approaches used by students.


Example 1

This concise example is structured around a contention extracted from the material and uses arrows to highlight the contrasting viewpoints expressed in the material.



Example 2

This example concisely worded, uses a flow chart approach rather than setting up a contention with two points of view.



Example 3

This more verbose example makes a statement from which to judge the viewpoints expressed but makes only limited connection between the two pieces.

AFAR – Jeremy Bentham

- ⇒ must protect all animals – need our help
- ⇒ responsibility – must defend less fortunate

Farm animals – treat bad
 – caged
 – bred for food

AFAR – found help

Continue work for welfare

opposing views on welfare



BAD-should be respected

The welfare of chickens – How Are they Treated?



Assoc of Chicken Producers

- ⇒ Chickenwelfare – top priority
- no health concern ✓
- feed on natural grains ✓
- animal housing ✓
 - comfortable
 - clean
- vet – reg. checks ✓

∴ produce animals – happy
 – healthy

- ⇒ industry – employ many people
 - farmers
 - others
- produce chicken for consumers

Chickens – multi-million \$\$ industry in Vic.

∴ chickens liberated – was a wake up call

cannot abuse animals as if no feelings

not break law if YES – law change

Free animals –

justified

as treated bad

BUT

There are some quality responses to task 2 and it was easier to find a range of responses with fewer very weak scripts. However, some answers still focused on explaining the ‘persuasive technique’ rather than how the language works to persuade the audience. Most chose appropriate examples but not all were well explained, with some very rambling responses. There was an awareness of the caller’s and the presenter’s level of manipulation with good responses showing excellent analytical skills and ability to comment critically on the different choices of language. However, there was evidence of some misunderstandings, e.g. ‘poor’ was often only understood as ‘financially deprived’ and therefore to be pitied. ‘Want a free chicken dinner’ led to some very confused explanations, with little understanding of the colloquialism of the expression. Other mistakes included providing five examples from the caller and another five from the presenter; indicating the beginning and end of a sentence but not highlighting the language to be commented on, clustering a selection of words around a technique but not explaining how any individual item of language use was persuasive.

Students were required to select five examples of different types of persuasive language use, and to explain how each example works to persuade the listener. How does this language make the listener feel and why does this persuade the listener to agree with the writer’s point of view? Students are not asked to comment on the success or failure of the examples or present an argument for or against the point being made.

Example 1

The explanations focus on the intended effect on the audience and show clear understanding of the speaker’s use of persuasive language. Some are wordier than necessary but this does not detract from the student’s understanding of the task:

Example	Effect on listener
And what about the <u>poor</u> farmer? ... He lost tens of thousands of dollars overnight. <u>Poor</u> man is still in <u>shock</u> .	The speaker uses emotional words such as ‘poor man’, ‘poor farmer’, and ‘shock’ to try to make the listener feel sorry for the man. In addition, by saying that the farmer lost money, the listener feels sympathetic towards the farmer as he was only doing his job. They feel that the man had done nothing wrong to deserve this and thus agree with the speaker that liberating chickens is selfish.
... these people who call themselves ‘animal liberationists’ are just <u>antisocial bludges</u> .	The speaker uses powerful, angry and provocative words ‘antisocial bludges’ to make the listener feel that these people are selfish, withdrawn and have nothing better to do with their lives than ruin other people’s lives. The listener feels angry and frustrated towards the activists and in turn agrees with the speaker that what these people did was very wrong.
<u>Intelligent listeners</u> know it is not ‘antisocial’ to liberate animals ...	By saying ‘intelligent listeners’ the speaker tries to make the listener feel that if they do not agree with him/her then they are not clever and not thoughtful. The listener feels ashamed of themselves if they disagree and is made to feel stupid. They, however, will not be thought of as smart, clever, intelligent and thoughtful and thus agree with the listener that freeing animals is not a bad thing.
... <u>inhumane</u> conditions, <u>trapped</u> in cages only 450 cm size, <u>unable to move</u> , without proper ventilation.	The speaker uses very powerful, harsh and shocking words such as ‘inhumane’, ‘trapped’ and ‘unable to move’ to describe the place where chickens are kept. This makes the listener feel very shocked and sympathetic towards the chickens. They feel sorry for them and believe that they are being treated cruelly and without respect. The listener agrees with the speaker that liberating the chickens was good as no one should have to live in such bad conditions.
People could’ve got <u>hurt</u> ! But <u>do they care</u> about that?	By playing on the listener’s fear that something bad could have happened and that someone’s life could have been in danger the speaker tries to persuade the listener that what happened was foolish. The listener feels worried and believes that someone could have died, but the activists do not care about the public. They also feel angry as a result and thus agree with the speaker that what happened was a very selfish act.

Example 2

This piece uses two of the same examples and three others to also complete the task appropriately.

Examples	Explanations
1. ‘chickens are more important than people to them, you see ...’	By saying this, the presenter is trying to persuade the listener by making the “animal liberationists” look idiotic. The listener’s common sense will tell that the ideology that the animal liberationists are holding on to is simply wrong, non-sensical and unacceptable. Of course, human beings are more important than animals. Therefore, the listener will not support the insane animal liberationists, and instead, agree with the presenter.
2. ‘And what about the poor farmer? Poor man is still in shock.’	Here, the presenter is pleading to the listener’s sympathy. The presenter is trying to paint a picture in which somebody suffered a lot from the incident even though he has not done anything wrong in the listener’s mind. Once the listeners sympathise with the farmer, they will agree with the presenter’s view.

3. 'They are full of big ideas – but what happens'	The presenter is trying to persuade the listeners by being sarcastic. It is such an irony that the so called "big" or "brilliant" idea that the animal liberationists came up with brings nothing but disaster and loss. Thus, the listeners will feel angry to the animal liberationists
4. 'Intelligent listeners know ...'	The caller is trying to persuade the listeners by praising them. The caller makes the listeners feel good, as they are called "intelligent", if they agree with him. Hence, the listener will agree with the caller.
5. 'Your views are typical of our society's human-centred view of the world.'	The caller is trying to persuade the listeners by disgracing the presenter. Here, the caller is describing the presenter as well as the people who support the presenter's view as being selfish and neglectful. Thus, the listeners will not want to be part of those selfish human beings and agree with the caller.

Example 3

This example has a further three uses of persuasive language, indicating that there was plenty of choice for students. The challenge for them was to understand the persuasive intention behind the language and be able to explain this:

Example	Effect on reader
1. 'People could've got hurt!'	By suggesting that people's safety was at risk during the incident, the presenter is trying to provoke fear within us. When we feel afraid that lives are at risk, we would strongly oppose the actions to liberate the chickens.
2. 'How would you feel if someone walked into your house and threw your kid's pets out on the road?'	With the use of this rhetorical question the presenter is trying to put the listeners in the farmer's shoes to imagine what he's going through, therefore we would feel sorry and sympathise the poor man, and hence be angered by what the "liberators" has freed the chickens.
3. 'So that's what they call liberation!'	By using sarcasm, the presenter is implying that the actions by the people responsible for the incident was not liberation, hence make us feel resentful towards those people and therefore think their action should be strongly condemned.
4. '... trapped in cages only 450 square centimetres in size.'	The caller is using statistics to create an image in the listener's minds of how horrible the conditions are for the chickens, make us feel sorry for the chickens and angry towards the farmers for treating them like this, hence we would agree with the caller that the chicken need to be liberated.
5. 'Listeners, we must reform ...'	By using the inclusive language 'we', the caller is trying to involve us, the listener's into the issue, and hence feel a sense of responsibility towards reforming our attitude towards animals, therefore agree with him/her on the view that animals should be liberated.

Students need to know exactly what is expected of them in this task. The task is to explain the persuasiveness of the language, not the example itself. Students should be taught sentence stems which will lead them to do this, e.g. "the speaker/writer persuades the audience by ...; the audience is persuaded because they ...; The rhetorical question persuades because ...; When the writer/speaker uses 'we', the audience feels ... Students need to put themselves in the audience's shoes and think about how the language makes them feel rather than just labelling techniques. Students should learn a framework to use with each example, with sequencing and appropriate connectives between the examples, why the writer uses the language and the effect on the audience. Identifying the strategy of the speaker/writer must be followed by an answer to 'why', i.e. what reaction is expected or sought from the audience. Teaching the application of nouns and adjectives which describe feelings will help students do this. ESL students in mainstream classes need to be taught, and practise using, the specific skills for this task. Students who have good analytical skills are able to meet the requirements of the task, even if their expression skills are basic.

Task 3 asked students to write a speech. The speech style was handed well by most, some developing a real sense of voice by clever use of devices pertaining to speeches, good use of counter arguments and synthesis of the ideas provided in the material. The major weakness arose from not reading the question carefully enough and so ignoring the issue of 'breaking the law'. This misunderstanding or misreading of the question led to lots of irrelevant writing about whether or not chickens should be freed from cages. These examples of students' statement of the task in their introductions show how they focussed on 'animal welfare' rather than 'breaking the law':

- should we break the law to free chickens
- today I'd like to talk about animal need our help
- welcome to my quick speech about unfair to animals
- my speech which addressing the issue of chickens in our community
- talk to you about the issue of our lovely animals
- I've been asked to speak to you about animal rights
- I would like to spare my opinion on this current issue – whether the chickens should be set free or not
- let me talk about the latest issue, 'can liberating animals be justified'
- today I will give my oral presentation on my research issue 'should the chicken run free'.

Many responses had difficulty moving beyond the scenario to address the issue arising from the incident described. Only some students made reference to the statistics provided and some thought that the animals had caused the damage listed in these statistics. Students need to think about what each piece of material contributes to the issue – it has been purposefully included in the paper.

Other responses blatantly plagiarised the task material. Students must learn to answer this task in their own words. They should be aware of the assessment criteria printed on the examination paper. ‘Knowledge and control of the material presented’ does not mean writing out the task material. It does mean understanding the information and using ideas from it to support the point of view the student is presenting. Students should be encouraged to use the planning skills they apply to the text response task to plan before writing in this task.

Example 1

This response acknowledges the legitimate concerns about animal welfare but remains focused on whether or not breaking the law is justified. There is some confusion about the role of additional supporting material in the scenario.

Good afternoon fellow classmates! Being the good law-abiding citizens as you are, I am sure you would agree with me that breaking the law in order to help animals is in no way justifiable. “A fair and reasonable outcome cannot justify the way in which a goal is achieved.”

The recent incident of the liberation of chickens from cages on a truck in a Melbourne suburb reminds us that the law cannot be breached no matter what the objective might be. Laws are the very basis of the well being of our society, they are rules and guidelines as to how we should, and must behave in order to live peacefully with each other in our individual communities, as well as the global society. No ends can justify the means. We all do acknowledge the importance of animal rights and their well-being, but this cannot be at the price of the whole communities well-being. The incident of liberating chickens has caused chaos, disruption to our everyday lives, as well as putting our safety in danger. The traffic-jam it would have caused have huge implications, one of the drivers in the middle of the confusion might be sending their son or daughter to hospital, and the family should not have to suffer as a result of some foolish act by fanatics who need to set their priorities straight.

Not only does it disrupt our daily lives, law breaking in order to help animals affects our infrastructure in a negative way as well. The animal (food/pet) industry is a huge part of our economy, both our living standards and our economy would suffer as a result of foolish action such as the liberation of chickens. If these unlawful acts to help animals are justified, think about the massive economic losses and unemployment it would create! Take the poor farmer that lost his chicken for example, he did nothing to deserve a devastating blow on his financial welfare. He was only trying to make a living!

The Chairman of the Danish Council of Ethics, Erling Tidermann commented on the incident “... no matter how good or how urgent the goal appears to us, should not take the actions required to achieve it.” Although some of the animals are bred or kept under horrible conditions, there are other means of solving the problem, and unlawful acts most certainly cannot be justified. Thank you all for listening!

Example 2

This response presents the opposite point of view and uses the supporting material effectively.

Good morning, my fellow students,

I am certain that most of you here today have heard about the incident that happened a few days ago in a Melbourne suburb. Recently, there have been many newspaper articles and media reports about the welfare of animals, especially chickens and if liberating these chickens was a fair act or just selfish. Today, I believe that all of you need to ask yourselves can breaking the law to help animals ever be justified? Surely, you will all agree with me when I say that animals, just like us, have feelings and they should be treated with respect, even if it means breaking the law.

Firstly, I would like you to think about this! Many of us enjoy and are delighted to eat a crispy, freshly fried chicken. But if you all knew where these chickens came from, I am sure your minds would change. You see, although very hard to imagine, chickens are trapped in cages which are only 450 cm big. They are unable to move, unable to turn their heads, to take a step forward nor a step back. The conditions they live in are appalling, as I, myself, have seen a few weeks ago when I visited a chicken farm. They are treated so cruelly and I can assure you that you would all agree with me if you witnessed it for yourselves. My fellow students, chickens, animals, they do suffer, they do have feelings, surely we can say that breaking the law to help these poor animals can be justified, if it means giving them a better life, a chance to be free.

In addition, I must say that the brave and caring people who tried to liberate the chickens nearly risked their lives to save these poor animals, because they really do care more about them than themselves. In USA, in 2001, many animals, including 1047 ducks and ducklings have been rescued by kind people (say, good for them!). Yes, this resulted from broken glass and fires, but how else can we all make it clear that animals are not rubbish that we can just throw away or like dolls that we play with. These urgent goals and actions need to be taken quickly and something needs to be done about it. Breaking the law to help a person in need is sometimes excused, therefore animals should be treated with the same respect. And we all, including you,

need to be allowed to express your opinion. But when no one will listen, what can we do? It is evident that breaking the law is a last chance we have of being heard.

My fellow students and my friends, animals, including chickens should all be treated with the same respect. Animals have the same rights, please do not deny them a chance to breath fresh air and do what all animals want to do. I say, and hopefully you all agree, that breaking the law, in circumstances like these, should be justified.

I thank you kindly for listening.

© VCAA 2003

Published by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority
41 St Andrews Place, East Melbourne 3002

Photocopying: This publication can only be photocopied for the use of students and teachers in Victorian Schools.

