Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Assessment Resource

English Level 2

|  |
| --- |
| This resource supports assessment against:  Achievement Standard 91101 version 2  Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing |
|  |

6 Credits



Conditions

* Students can read texts, collect information, and develop ideas for their writing both in- and out-of-class time.
* All writing must be prepared in class time. No work may go out of class in hard copy or electronic form, such as email. See the Conditions of Assessmentguidelines in order to ensure good assessment practice.
* You will need to schedule checkpoints during the year to ensure the authenticity of your students’ work. Drafts should be regularly emailed, stored, and/or printed by you to document the process.
* Students should have the opportunity to receive feedback, edit, revise, and polish their work before assessment judgements are made. You can validly make suggestions about areas where further development is needed but constructive feedback should not compromise the authenticity of students’ work.

Additional information

You may also connect your crafted writing to the assessment of other internal standards such as Achievement Standard English 91106 *Form developed personal responses to independently read texts, supported by evidence.*

Wherever such integration between different parts of the programme occurs, teachers must ensure that the work presented for each assessment is developed sufficiently in order to meet the criteria for each standard. In all such cases, teachers should refer closely to each relevant standard, including the Explanatory Notes and the Conditions of Assessmentguidelines*.*

**Internal Assessment Resource**

Achievement Standard English 91101: Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing

Resource reference: English 2.4A v2

Resource title: “… yeah, write”

Credits: 6

| Achievement | Achievement with Merit | Achievement with Excellence |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing which develops, sustains, and structures ideas. | * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing which develops, sustains, and structures ideas convincingly. | * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing which develops, sustains, and structures ideas effectively. |
| * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing using language features appropriate to audience and purpose to create effects. | * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing using language features appropriate to audience and purpose to create convincing effects. | * Produce a selection of crafted and controlled writing using language features appropriate to audience and purpose to command attention. |

Student Instructions

Introduction

Throughout the year, you will create a portfolio of writing around the theme of endurance. Your first piece of writing will be a Film Review of the movie Schindler’s List.

Task

Submit **at least** two pieces of writing from your portfolio for assessment. See Resource A for a process you might use.

Make sure that each piece of writing:

* develops, sustains, and structures ideas appropriately for the text type
* makes connections between ideas
* uses language features that are appropriate to the audience and purpose (for example
* uses text conventions accurately so that the writing contains only minor errors.

State the purpose and aims of your writing in a statement of intent before you begin. This will help your teacher to understand what effects you are aiming to achieve in your writing.

You will be assessed on the quality of your structured ideas and writing. Length is not the primary consideration. However, it is unlikely that pieces that are shorter than 500 words will give you the opportunity to demonstrate your skills in crafting and controlling writing.

Resource A - A possible process

This is a process you might follow in preparing and completing each piece of writing.

* Decide on what aspect(s) of the theme of endurance you wish to write about
* Consider what is the most appropriate language for the text type you should use to communicate your ideas.
* Plan your writing carefully.
* Discuss your plans with your teacher.
* Write your draft.
* Review and revise your draft.

Assessment schedule: English 91101

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evidence/Judgements for Achievement | Evidence/Judgements for Achievement with Merit | Evidence/Judgements for Achievement with Excellence |
| The student presents a selection of drafted and revised written pieces.  At least two pieces develop, sustain, and structure ideas and craft controlled writing using appropriate language features. This means that the student:   * builds on ideas by adding comments, explanations, details, or examples appropriate to the selected text type and audience * makes connections between ideas * deliberately uses language features appropriate to the selected text type and purpose to create meaning and effects * uses text conventions accurately so that the writing contains only minor errors. | The student presents a selection of drafted and revised written pieces.  At least two pieces develop, sustain, and structure ideas convincingly and craft controlled writing using appropriate language features to create effects. This means that the student:   * builds on ideas by adding comments, explanations, details, or examples appropriate to the selected text type and audience * makes connections between ideas * develops ideas and structure that are reasoned clear and relevant to the purpose of the text * deliberately uses language features appropriate to the selected text type and purpose to create meaning, effects, and audience interest * uses text conventions accurately so that the writing contains only minor errors. | The student presents a selection of drafted and revised written pieces.  At least two pieces develop, sustain, integrate, and structure ideas effectively and craft controlled writing using appropriate language features to command attention. This means that the student:   * builds on ideas by adding comments, explanations, details, or examples appropriate to the selected text type and audience * makes connections between ideas * uses ideas and structure to create text that is compelling, persuasive, innovative, and/or striking * deliberately and consistently uses language features, vocabulary selection, distinctive personal voice, dimensions, or viewpoints to create meaning and effect * uses languages features that sustain audience engagement and are inventive or articulate * uses text conventions accurately so that the writing contains only minor errors. |

Final grades will be decided using professional judgement based on a holistic examination of the evidence provided against the criteria in the Achievement Standard.

#### Task 1: Close Reading

Read the review (Resource A) written by Helene Wong in *The Listener* [Oct 18, 1998] about the film Saving Private Ryan, directed by Steven Spielberg. Also read the annotations about the **content and structure** and the **language and style** of the review.

**CRAFTING AND STYLE**

* pun on ‘detail’ –military terminology for delegated task
* alludes to another war film (*The Last Detail*)

“last” refers to main story line – saving the last son

**IDEAS AND STRUCTURE**

* pun on ‘detail’ –military terminology for delegated task
* alludes to another war film (*The Last Detail*)

“last” refers to main story line – saving the last son

***The Last Detail***

*By Helene Wong*

*SAVING PRIVATE RYAN*

*Directed by Steven Spielberg; R16 contains graphic and realistic war scenes.*

*Do we really need another World War II movie? Even if it is according to the hype, the “ most accurate and realistic depiction of war on screen”? As challenging and satisfying as that might be from a film-making point of view, it’s hardly going to tell us anything we don’t already know about the hell of war, so there has to be some other compelling reason. A fresh insight, at least. This film would like to believe that is what it’s offering, but, in the end, insight comes a distant second to action.*

*Make no mistake – Spielberg’s realisation of the D-Day landing in 1944 is a truly graphic experience. From the first images of choppy, vomit-inducing seas bearing landing craft that look like nothing so much as over-designed rubbish skips, and just as unprotected, through the relentless mowing-down of the troops in the water and on the beach, the hand-held camera ducking and diving, to the fiery flushing-out of the gun emplacements, it’s a half-hour opening sequence that both compels and repels.*

*Dialogue is unintelligible but superfluous – no one seems to know what they are doing anyway – and how the hell a captain, even if he is Tom Hanks, can keep track of his platoon in this mayhem is beyond belief. Omaha Beach is America’s Gallipoli, a shooting-fish-in-a-barrel massacre we can all relate to down here.*

*But, once this set-piece is over, we need a story. It comes based on a true event: when the US War Department discovers that three of four brothers have been killed within 72 hours of each other, the decision is made to pull out the fourth and send him home to his mother. First, though, he has to be found. Private Ryan is a paratrooper who has landed somewhere in France. Captain John Miller* [contd]

**Standing details**

* reviewer, film title, censor rating & guidelines
* different typefaces used

**Title**

* pun on ‘detail’ – military terminology for delegated task
* alludes to another war film (*The last Detail*)
* “last” refers to main story line – saving the last son

Apt title chosen

* pun on ‘detail’ –military terminology for delegated task
* alludes to another war film (*The Last Detail*)

“last” refers to main story line – saving the last son

**Introduction**

* setting established
* writer’s opinion signalled

**Introduction**

* rhetorical question
* use of first person (inclusive)

Commands attention

**Vocabulary**

* colloquial language (‘hype’, ‘nerd’, ‘ducking and diving’, ‘how the hell’)
* hyphenation (‘shooting-fish-in-a-barrel’, ‘over-designed’, ‘mowing–down’,’flushing-out’)
* contractions (‘don’t’, ‘aren’t’)

Creates chatty informal style

**Paragraph links**

Achieved through:

* idea elaboration (paragraphs 3 and 4, and paragraphs 7 and 8)
* question and answer structure (paragraphs 4 and 5)
* using contrast (paragraphs 1 and 2)

**RESOURCE A (CONT)**

*(Hanks) and the remnants of his platoon, having come through the fire at Normandy, get the job. They grumble that this is just a morale-boosting PR exercise for the folks back home. That is the film's moral problem: should the lives of eight be risked for one?*

*By the film’s end, we still have no clear answer. What we get is a conventional combat movie treatment: your bunch of usual suspects – the New Yorker, the Southerner, the Jew, the Italian, the medic, the nerd, the loyal sergeant, the quiet enigmatic leader – who bicker and bond under stress and eventually do the right thing. They aren’t developed much as characters – except the nerd, who transforms agonisingly, but nonetheless in Hollywood fashion – so we never feel close enough to them really to confront the question emotionally. Sure, there are some very gut-wrenching moments, but they are Spielbergian movie moments, telegraphed and engineered. The “realism” has a polish to it that is ultimately distancing.*

*Hanks turns in a workmanlike performance that eschews heroics for the doubts and fears of the ordinary civilian soldier. Unexpectedly, though, it is the nerd who lingers longest in the memory. Jeremy Davies (Spanking the Monkey, Going All the Way) is uprooted from his desk job to become the rescue mission’s interpreter. His Corporal Upham (ironically named for New Zealand audiences) experiences all the extremes you would expect of someone thrown untrained into combat. Of them all, he is the one we most identify with, and yet find ourselves despising as well, which says something about humanity and our conflicting impulses towards aggression, cowardice and survival. (Actually, it’s a more intriguing dilemma to ponder than the “eight lives for one” issue.)*

*Thirty years on from the shame of Vietnam, in a world where certainty no longer exists, it’s perhaps not surprising that this film has been made, and by an American. Past acts of heroism can be relived, values of family, duty and sacrifice can be revisited. Make it clear you are still anti-war, but, instead of a* [contd]

**Paragraph development (paragraphs 4 and 5 as an example)**

Paragraph 4

* link to previous paragraph (‘But once this set-piece is over…’)
* next main idea introduced (‘It comes based…’)
* supporting details (plot and character details given)
* concluding sentence links plot to theme

Paragraph 5

* link to previous paragraph (‘…we still have no clear answer…’)
* next main idea introduced (‘…conventional combat movie…’ ie genre discussion)
* supporting detail given (character types)
* evaluates (‘telegraphed and engineered’, ‘ultimately distancing’)

**Language choices**

* adjectives and premodification (‘images of choppy, vomit-inducing seas bearing landing craft’, ‘morale-boosting PR exercise’)

Creates quick description

* emotive adjectives (‘superfluous’, ‘compelling’, ‘graphic’, ‘poignant’, ‘workmanlike’)

Develops opinion and evaluates

* specialised vocabulary (‘handheld camera’, ‘opening sequence’)

Adds authority to discussion

* sound devices (rhyme: ‘compels and repels’, alliteration: ‘fiery flushing-out’)

Adds pace and rhythm to the style

* variety of sentence structures (eg: periodic, complex, minor; use of dashes)

Shows contrast, provide detailed asides

**Evidence of research**

* references to New Zealand war experience (Gallipoli. Chunuk Bair, Upham)
* other acting roles of Jeremy Davies
* historical and socio-cultural context (Vietnam war)

**RESOURCE A (CONT)**

**Features selected in this review and the order in which they occur**

* setting and technical features
* action and plot
* genre and characterisation
* acting and characterisation

**Other review conventions**

* use of first person plural
* use of surnames only
* actor’s name in parentheses after character’s name
* use of present tense when describing film’s events
* film titles italicised

*radical, questioning stance, let realistic detail be the vehicle of criticism.*

*The trouble is, the quantity of that detail makes one suspect that this is just an excuse for the makers to show off their prowess at war games. What’s more, bookending it with the Stars and Stripes waving in the breeze sends a different message to those of us who don’t happen to be American. It’s not that we have a problem with honouring our dead, or that we can’t relate to the poignant scenes of an old man in a field of white crosses, but we are a bit allergic to such flag-waving patriotism down here. And what we discovered about ourselves on Chunuk Bair seems somehow clearer and more powerful than these unresolved attempts at profundity. Technically admirable yes, but not the morality play it would like to be.*

**Conclusion**

* draws opinions together (technically superb as a war movie but theme comes second, or is lost in, the action)

#### Task 2: Your Close Reading Exercise

1. Read the review by Helene Wong (Resource B) of the two films Shrek and Tigerland and answer these questions. They will help you develop a deeper understanding of review writing.
2. Read the introductory paragraph:

* What information are you given?
* What is the reviewer’s opinion of the work? How do you know?

1. Identify and list the main content of each paragraph.
2. Annotate the review, identifying its language and style features. Use the information on the annotated review of Saving Private Ryan to guide you.
3. What evidence can you find of the reviewer’s research or background knowledge?
4. What specific criticisms are developed at greater length? Summarise them in your own words.
5. Is the review balanced? List the strengths and weaknesses of the films in the review.
6. What overall assessment is made of the films? With what final impression are you left?

**RESOURCE B**

**(LISTENER** June 30 2001)

**After Roald**

BY HELENE WONG

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

***SHREK***

***Directed by Andrew Adamson & Vicky Jenson; PG***

***TIGERLAND***

***Directed by Joel Schumacher; R16 Contains violence, offensive language and sex scenes***

*Since The Simpsons and South Park, animated characters have been getting downer and dirtier. Even Rugrats in Paris pushed the scatological envelope for the teeny tots. Thus far, though, Disney has remained impervious, maintaining its wholesome conservatism despite, for example, the irreverent tone of The Emperor’s New Groove. After Shrek, however, the mouse’s gloves must come off. DreamWorks producer Jeffrey Katzenberg has aimed a fart in the direction of his erstwhile employer (with whom he had a troubled relationship), and that’s entirely in keeping with the spirit of his new animated hero.*

*Shrek (voiced by Mike Meyers) is a grubby, chubby, not-so-jolly green giant (actually an ogre, for the giant spotters out there), whose private swamp is invaded by a host of creatures banished from their home by the evil, vertically challenged Lord Farquaad (John Lithgow). The creatures look remarkably like characters from fairytales – blind mice, dwarves, a little wooden boy and a big bad wolf – and their home, even more remarkably, looks like Disneyland. Shrek does a deal with Farquaard to get his swamp back by rescuing the beautiful Princess Fiona (Cameron Diaz) for Farquaad to marry.*

*Based on a children’s story by William Steig, this is a breezily good-humoured swipe at the classic fairytale conventions that are Disney’s stoke-in-trade. Princesses, dragons, knights and giants are not what they seem; the stereotypes of good and evil, ugly and beautiful are subverted in order to scatter messages of self-acceptance and “It’s what’s inside that counts”. Hardly new, and all very ironic – and unconvincing – coming from appearance-obsessed Hollywood, but hey … their heart’s in the right place.*

*If the story isn’t groundbreaking, the animation was advanced enough to get the film into the competition at Cannes. Nuances of facial expression and simulation of natural phenomena just keep improving with the digital wizadry, and much of Shrek’s success as a character is due to the sympathy his emotions evoke in us as they play across his face. Add Meyers’s comedic improvisation and a hint of Scottish burr and we have no trouble seeing beyond Shrek’s physical unattractiveness. In fact, it’s the homelier characters who most engage us, which I suppose is the point.*

*Voice honours go to Eddie Murphy as Shrek’s garrulous, tenacious donkey sidekick. Eeyore he ain’t. With an eclectic soundtrack (Antonio Carlos Jobim, Neil Diamond, Leonard Cohen) and quickfire allusions to Gladiator, The Matrix and the WWF, this is a highly enjoyable post-modern foray into an alternative Storyland. And co-director Andrew Adamson, who earned his stripes on visual effects in the Batman franchise, is a New Zealander.*

*Meanwhile, Adamson’s Batman director, Joel Schumacher, gets down and dirty himself, producing a low-budget, grainy 16mm feature filled with unknowns, and getting away with it. Tigerland follows a platoon of young grunts through boot camp in 1971 – Tigerland is the “stateside province of Vee-et-nam”, actually a Louisiana swamp (are swamps the location du jour?) – and it’s an intense piece of work that hooks you into what at first glance seems unpromising macho material.*

*It’s not surprising that Irish actor Colin Farrell, who heads a brilliant cast, has become hot property since. As Roland Bozz, a charmer who’s also a cocky anti-authoritarian (we meet him as he is released from another stint in the stockade), he reminds you of Jack Nicholson in One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest. Though his attitude makes him a threat to platoon discipline, he has a pacifist’s compassion and an understanding of the bigger picture that makes him a true leader.*

*Schumacher’s gritty, pared-down style in long hand-held takes transmits an acute sense of improvisation and intimacy. The dialogue feels like a continuous litany of threats involving private parts, and the pacing is episodic, but the truth of the characters is so beautifully captured and (under)played by the cast that you will want to stay through the end credits just to see who these new faces are.*

1. Read a range of other reviews to familiarise yourself with the review writing genre and various styles used by other published film reviewers. When you write your review, you may not include material from existing film reviews. You should avoid reading reviews of the film you will write about for this reason.

#### Task 3: Developing Content

1. View the film several times.
2. Create a *Viewing Sheet* to record details modelled on Resource C.

**RESOURCE C**

***Viewing Sheet***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Director | Actors  \*  \*  \*  \* | Roles | Actors  \*  \*  \*  \* | Roles |
| BRIEF PLOT SYNOPSIS | | KEY THEMES AND EVIDENCE | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| INTERPRETATION OF KEY CHARACTERS | | |
| Character 1 Character 2 | | Other characters |
| \*  \*  \*  \*  \* | \*  \*  \*  \*  \* |
| Evidence and examples | Evidence and examples | Evidence and examples |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| KEY/MEMORABLE SCENES   * Opening   \*   * Other scenes * Final scene | REFERENCES TO TECHNIQUES  \* Use of setting/location  \* Camera work (including editing)  \* Sound track/music  \* Costumes  \* Symbolism  \* Colour and lighting  \* Use of setting/location  \* Camera work (including editing)  \* Sound track/music  \* Costumes  \* Symbolism   * Colour and lighting   \* Use of setting/location  \* Camera work (including editing)  \* Sound track/music  \* Costumes  \* Symbolism  \* Colour and lighting |
| Reference to film genre | Your personal evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, highlights etc. Overall impressions |

**Task 4: Research**

1. An informed opinion comes from researching beyond the film, for example, by:

* reading about the background and the social, cultural and political setting of the film
* reading about the director, other key production personnel, and the lead actor[s].
* viewing other films by the same director or films featuring the same lead actor[s]
* viewing other films in the same genre.

These steps can help establish a film’s critical reputation. It will also enable you to develop a depth of knowledge to support your opinions and to make comments that can enrich your review.

1. Use the *Background Research Sheet* (Resource D) to record research details linked to the film you have chosen.

**RESOURCE SHEET D*****BACKGROUND RESEARCH SHEET***

Film Title:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Director:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Genre:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Lead Actor:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(You may not be able to or need to complete all sections of this research sheet)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Important aspects of this genre I know from viewing other films and reading reviews | How ***this*** film conforms to the genre | How ***this*** film deviates from the genre |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Other films I have seen in the genre  \*  \*  \* | Comparisons I can make with ***this*** film |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Important historical / social / political / cultural background events  \*  \*  \*  \*  \* | How these background events are important to ***this*** film |

|  |
| --- |
| Other setting /location comments I can make |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Other films I have seen by the same Director  \*  \*  \*  \* | Comparisons I can make with ***this*** film |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Other films I have seen featuring the same lead actor  \*  \*  \*  \* | Comparisons I can make with the actor in ***this*** film |

#### Task 5: Developing a Draft

1. In addition to the published reviews already studied, you could also read the annotated student review exemplars which follow, discussing their strengths and areas where they could be improved.
2. Using your *Viewing Sheet* and *Background Research Sheet* and your understanding of the structure and style of film reviews, write the first draft of your film review. Remember to include:

* an apt title
* correct standing details
* an introduction that commands attention. It should signal the opinion or point of view on the film that you will develop
* evaluation of several features (for instance, content/plot, pace, atmosphere/setting/location, characterisation, acting, credibility, structure, film techniques used), supported by selected details and your background research
* clear links between the ideas
* language choices that are appropriate for your audience and the review text type
* a conclusion that ends the review strongly and pulls together the major aspects of the review.

#### Task 6: Developing a Final Version

Develop a final version of your review. It should:

* develop, sustain and support your opinions about the film
* craft controlled writing which creates effects appropriate to the film review text type and an audience of senior students and adults, and which communicates an informed opinion in an interesting style
* structure material in a way that is appropriate to the audience, the purpose and the text type
* use writing conventions accurately (spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax, paragraphing)

Your review will be at least 600 words long. It should be appropriate for a readership of your peers and your English teacher. You may not include material from the exemplars, from the activity, or from existing film reviews sourced from elsewhere.

#### Exemplar A: Excellence

#### *SAVE THIS ONE*

**Deeper features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* ideas
* crafting
* structure.

**Surface features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* conventions.

**Schlndler’s List [1993] M**

Director: Steven Spielberg

Duration: 187 minutes

*Schindler’s List is a powerful film. The story follows the creation of a Jewish ghetto in Krakow, Poland, during World War II and the subsequent arrival of entrepreneur Oskar Schindler (played by Liam Neeson - Rob Roy, Michael Collins). Initially Schindler regards the Jews merely as a source of cheap labour as he exploits the war in order to make his own fortune, but his focus shifts to saving ‘his’ Jews from both random death and concentration camps.*

**Writing is crafted, controlled and fluent throughout and commands attention.** Confidently uses a range of sentence structures for deliberate effect. Eg:

* Balanced structure in sentence beginning: *“Initially Schindler regards the Jews merely as a source… ”*[opening para]
* Triple construction in sentence beginning: *“We are intrigued….* [para 2]
* Simple sentence: *“Schindler’s List is an honest film.”* [final para]

**Writing conventions** **are** **used accurately throughout:**

accurate use of syntax, paragraphing, punctuation and spelling.

(NB: a few random errors, or minor editing lapses, are acceptable).

*Superb performances and skilled cinematography make Schindler’s List unforgettable. We are intrigued by the charming, debonair Oskar Schindler, repulsed but yet strangely drawn to the evil Nazi officer, Amon Goeth (Ralph Fiennes - The English Patient), and moved by the intensity and integrity of Schindler’s dry Jewish accountant, Itzhak Stern (Ben Kingsley - Twelfth Night). Spielberg’s uses lighting effectively to present his central character. Chiaroscuro lighting – using a light and dark contrast to achieve a sense of depth - establishes an air of mystery about Schindler by showing half his face in dark shadow and half in light. Spielburg further builds the Schindler aura through low camera angles to capture the man’s immense physical presence.*

*Technical brilliance heightens the film’s impact. Although this brilliance can be subtle, such as in the use of selected colour through candle flames and ‘red Genia’ in an otherwise black and white film, it is what makes the film such a masterpiece. Spielberg has described the Holocaust as “life without light." For him, colour is the symbol of life in Schindler’s List. Spielberg cleverly symbolises the end of hope and the beginning of the nightmare through a brilliantly crafted image of the extinguished candle [first shown burning in colour], together with the end of the Jewish prayer chant, to be replaced by black and white. Later Genia’s red coat becomes a critical moment for Schindler as he watches the liquidation of the Jewish ghetto. By using colour to focus on the plight of a single defenseless girl, Spielberg highlights the impact of the Holocaust on a self centred individual who has previously been an observer and exploiter. The tragic nature of the film’s subject matter is not overpowered by grandiose camera shots and scene selection. Schindler’s List has been described as the most controlled and subdued of Spielberg’s films for good reason. Spielberg’s film is, in his words: “not so much a motion picture but a document of those intolerable times.” The dominating monochrome helps create more of a documentary look than of a drama, as in the style of a 1940s news reel.*

**Writing is crafted, controlled and fluent throughout and commands attention.** Diction is controlled and varied throughout.

Eg: *“….on a self centred individual who has previously been an observer and exploiter.”*

**Ideas are developed and sustained convincingly with insight.** Relevant material from beyond the film is effectively included.

*Spielberg succeeds in his stated goal to “not make a movie about the Holocaust, but about one man who saved lives." The film is the story of an individual set against one of the blackest episodes of the twentieth century. As we watch we are drawn into not just Schindler’s individual story but several complex relationships. We witness many developing relationships – between Schindler and Stern, Schindler and Nazi officials, Amon Goeth and Schindler, Goeth and his Jewish maid Helen Hirsch (Embeth Davidtz), and the relationship between the Jewish people and their emerging saviour - Schindler. We wonder if Schindler will succumb to his love of money and fine things, or if he will recognise his own opportunity, in a small way, to defeat the Nazis by saving ‘his’ Jews. We deplore Goeth’s treatment of the Jews, of his senseless killings and of his contradictory feelings for his Jewish maid. We are appalled by the extent of the Nazis’ hate, revealed in their killing of an educated engineer simply because she was doing her job and in their desecration of the Jewish faith by using their gravestones to pave roads. Most of all, Schindler’s List compels us to ask how the nightmare of the Holocaust could have ever occurred.*

**Writing is clearly and effectively structured and achieves impact.** Effectively structured throughout. Eg: Skilfully shifts focus from Schindler [paras 2 and 3] to others [para 4]

**Ideas are developed and sustained convincingly with insight.** A range of perceptive observations are succinctly integrated with carefully selected supporting details. Eg: *“We deplore Goeth’s treatment of the Jews…”*

*There is no denying a pervading sense of reality in Schindler’s List. The film is derived from Thomas Keneally’s work, Schindler’s Ark, which is based on Oskar Schindler’s story. Spielberg achieves an overarching authenticity by filming in Poland, even outside of Auschwitz; through meticulous attention to costuming; and by using German, Polish and Jewish actors. Although the main characters Schindler, Goeth and Stern are played by non-German/Jewish actors, they bear a physical resemblance to the characters they play. The ending also confirms the undeniable living reality of Schindler’s List, if there had ever been any doubt about an essential truthfulness of this film. The diagetic barrier is broken and we see the people whom the characters are drawn from - including Helen Hirsch and Mrs Emilie Schindler, Oskar’s wife - laying stones on Oskar Schindler’s grave in Jerusalem, accompanied by the actors who play them.*

**Ideas are developed and sustained convincingly with insight.** Perceptive insights about the film sustained throughout that engage the reader.

Eg: *“The ending of also confirms the undeniable living reality…”*

*Schindler’s List is an honest film. Without skirting around the nastiness Spielberg’s film keeps alive the memory of the Holocaust. What makes this film such a powerful work is that the “hero”, Oskar Schindler, is not the stereotypical flawless character. He drinks, he is a womaniser, he is unfaithful to his wife – yet through him, over a thousand Jews were saved. It is through this “hero” then, that Schindler’s List reveals its central uplifting message, from the old Jewish proverb, about the human spirit: “He who saves one life, saves the world entire.”*

**Writing is clearly and effectively structured and achieves impact.** Conclusion effectively draws together final comments on the central character as an anti hero along with the film’s ‘heroic’ message.

**Exemplar B: Merit**

**Deeper features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* ideas
* crafting
* structure.

**Surface features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* conventions.

***THE FINAL VERDICT***

**The Green Mile [1999] R16**

Director: Frank Darabont

Duration: 180 minutes

**Writing is clearly and effectively structured.**

Introduction engages reader’s interest by including:

* Background on the director
* An indication of the reviewer’s opinion of the film

**Writing conventions** **are** **used accurately throughout:**

accurate use of syntax, paragraphing, punctuation and spelling.

(NB: a few random errors, or minor editing lapses, are acceptable).

*Frank Darabont's adaptation of Stephen King's 1996 serialised novel, The Green Mile, is sure to impress. From the accomplished screenwriter who has worked on films like The Fan, Eraser and Frankenstein, The Green Mile is only Darabond’s second outing as a director. Is it as good as his previous film? With horrifying electrocution scenes, strong underlying themes of humanity and honesty, along with a great ensemble of actors, Darabont's gruesome melodrama will send shivers all the way up your spine. This is Darabont's second prison film, coming five years after The Shawshank Redemption which was also set in this 1930s/1940s time period. However, this film is not "Shawshank Redemption 2: The Return of Andy."*

*The Green Mile is set on Death Row, 1935, at Cold Mountain Penitentiary. The film centres on John Coffey (Michael Clarke Duncan), a prisoner with supernatural powers, sent to death row for the "brutal and icy" rape and murder of two young girls, and his relationship with the head prison officer there, Paul Edgecomb (Tom Hanks). “The green mile” is a stretch of green lino that led straight to "old sparky" (the electric chair) and is a Death Row prisoner's last walk before death, hence the name. Just sitting comfortably through the three hour long movie is a milestone on its own. The film could have done without the beginning, where we find ourselves in a retirement home and instead it should have begun on Death Row.*

**Writing is crafted, controlled and fluent,** but not sufficiently sustained as needed for excellence. Some awkward expressions. Eg: Sentence beginning *“The film could have done without the beginning…”*

after several well crafted sentences [para 2].

*The talented cast is headed by "Mr Reliable and Consistent" himself, Tom Hanks, at his usual best as he plays the professional but humane Edgecomb. Hanks is well supported by his crew of prison guards which includes Brutus Howell (David Morse), Harry Terwillger (Jeffery Derman) and Dean Stanton (Barry Pepper.) What makes this film different from other prison films is how Darabont breaks down that stereotype we have of prison officers who are cruel, tough, brutal and even corrupt. The guards are effectively portrayed as being ordinary men who all lead humble lives outside the prison. They treat the inmates with a certain respect, dignity, and calmness even though they have an inhumane duty to carry out. The prisoners are also shown in the same light which is why they leave a long and lasting impression. Even though they have all been found guilty of horrendous crimes, they are portrayed as humane beings. It is the characterisation of inmate John Coffey who captures our imagination with his childlike innocence: "My name is John Coffey, just like the drink but not spelt the same." At six foot five inches he looks like a bad guy, but turns out to be the exact opposite. He is even afraid to sleep in the dark. His performance enables us to sympathasise with the prisoner on a personal level.*

**Ideas are developed** **sustained and convincing**. Several thoughtful comments about the film are made.

Appropriate reference made to prison film genre.

**Writing is crafted, controlled and fluent.**

Range of diction is used effectively. Eg: *“…treat inmates with a certain respect, dignity and calmness even though…”*

Some vocabulary selection does not ‘command attention:’ Eg:*”At six foot five inches he looks like**a bad guy...”*

*Sympathising with a Death Row inmate is not difficult. The Green Mile’s depiction of what an electrocution actually looks and sounds like is a graphic experience, particularly as we are shown not one but four electrocutions close up. Darabont's craftsmanship is apparent in each of these scenes in his use of precise haunting detail as if Cold Mountain Penitentiary was alive today. These scenes bring us to the film's moral dilemma: how humane are we? Should someone die for a crime they have committed? Even though capital punishment has been abolished here in "God's own," as we have opted for less barbaric measures of punishment with life imprisonment for severe crimes, over 90 countries around the world, including America and many Middle Eastern countries, still carry out different forms of capital punishment.*

**Ideas are developed and sustained convincingly.** Effectively supports comment on the issues raised by the film with reference to capital punishment in today’s world.

*A touch of the supernatural gives balance to the frightening electrocution scenes and sets The Green Mile apart. It seems unthinkable that this inmate with mysterious powers, "one of God's true miracles," should be imprisoned in this place of darkness and of death. Death Row is the last place you would expect to find magical powers, miracles happening and the forces of good and evil at battle with each other. With light bulbs smashing everywhere, a circus mouse that basically can't die and thunder and lightning in the background, this supernatural aspect just adds another dimension to the film giving it that touch of fantasy and the unknown.*

**Ideas are developed and sustained convincingly, but lack insight required for excellence.**

Eg: Some superficiality detracts: *“…just adds another dimension to the film giving it that touch of fantasy and the unknown.”*

**Writing is clearly and effectively structured.**

* Clear overview of main points from review included in conclusion.
* effective link made to earlier capital punishmment reference to close review.

*Overall, The Green Mile has the key ingredients for a great film with strong underlying themes, a talented director and convincing performances from its actors, and don't forget that supernatural flavour. By the end of the film, you are left thinking about the poor inmates who walked “the green mile." You are also left somewhat relieved that you are living here "down under" - without capital punishment.*

**Exemplar C: Achievement**

**Surface features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* conventions.

**Deeper features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* ideas
* crafting
* structure.

***ANTWONE WON***

**Antwone Fisher [1999] M**

Director: Denzel Washington

Duration: 115 minutes

**Writing is clearly structured.**

Introduction

* gives brief background details
* introduces the reviewer’s positive response to *Antwone Fisher.*

**Writing conventions** **are** **used accurately throughout:**

appropriate syntax, paragraphing, punctuation and spelling.

(NB: a few random errors, or minor editing lapses, are acceptable)

*The directorial debut of Denzel Washington's Antwone Fisher is based on the true story of Antwone Fisher, who also wrote the script. It is a`feel good' drama in the same vein as Finding Forrester and Good Will Hunting. The difference is, this film has more 'meat' in it, it gives you more of an insight into Fisher's childhood and why he is an angry young man today. But the question is, do you really need another film like this in the ‘troubled young man who finds hope’ genre? The answer is yes!*

**Writing is sufficiently crafted and controlled,** but some sentences lack fluency needed for merit.

Eg: Sentence beginning: *“The difference is, this film has …”*

[and elsewhere]

*When you first meet Fisher (Derek Luke) he is a young black man who has enlisted in the US Navy. He has a troubled past with uncontrollable outbursts of anger. One outburst leads to a reduction in rank and a visit to the Navy's black psychiatrist Jerome Davenport (Denzel Washington), who must decide whether Fisher is fit to keep serving his country. Fisher and Davenport have a frosty relationship at first, but eventually Davenport's non‑confrontational attitude breaks through Fisher's silence and he begins telling details of his past. The flashbacks reveal a young Fisher (Malcolm David Kelley) who was born in prison to a convicted mother and spent his first two years in an orphanage before being placed with a foster family. where he was physically, emotionally and sexually abused throughout his young life until the age of 13. Kelley gives a remarkably convincing performance for one so young.*

**Writing is clearly structured.**

Develops a number of supported linked points over a series of paragraphs.

*Fisher's horrifying childhood seems to be a recipe for disaster. The generalisation that such an abusive background produces murderers, rapists and troubled young men seems to fit him. Joining the armed forces (a real man's world), in this case, the navy, seems yet another part of that generalisation. In Fisher's case joining the navy is an escape from abuse and living on the dark and mean streets of Detroit. It becomes the family he never had and a place of security. You see a tough young sailor that continues to live his life as he did as a child, fighting when anything hard comes up. It is only when he gets into one fight too many and is sent off to Dr Davenport that he truly begins to understand the cause of that anger and is finally able to confront his past so that he can heal.*

**Writing is crafted and controlled, but lacks fluency required for merit.**

Direct address [*“You”*] used throughout

detracts.

*The two main characters, Fisher and Davenport, are portrayed as two very different people, one aggressive and willing to fight at the drop of a hat, the other very calm and collected. Although the flashbacks of Fisher's appalling childhood horrify you, it is not until Davenport gets under the older Fisher's tough exterior and shows us the insecure person underneath that you feel sorry for him. The inclusion of a love interest in Cheryl (Joy Bryant) adds to his growth and confidence to face his fears. The emotional scene where Fisher meets his mother, for the first time, is a real tear jerking moment. The music, lighting and pure emotion shows Washington's directing power, as well as the moving performance of Luke.*

**Writing is crafted, controlled and creates effects in places, but crafting is not sufficiently sustained and fluent throughout the piece as required for merit.**

Eg: Several well expressed sentences in the paragraph beginning:*“The two main characters…”*; then a sentence with limited fluency - sentence beginning: *“The music, lighting ad pure emotion…”*

[and elsewhere]

*However, you realise that the relationship between psychiatrist and patient is not onesided. Through this relationship the two teach each other things along the way. There are the problems within the marriage of Dr. Davenport and his wife, Berta (Salli Richardson). There are issues in their past too, and Davenport and Fisher are in therapy together. You can really feel the bond forming between Davenport and Fisher and this is how the emotions are conveyed in the film. Davenport becomes a father figure for Fisher, who has lived his whole life with no male figure to look up to, and Fisher becomes the son Davenport and his wife never had. You have seen in the past how well Washington can play the role of a strong male figure in other films such as John Q and The Bone Collector, and he turns in another strong performance in Antwone Fisher.*

**Writing is clearly structured.**

Well structured paragraphs, where the opening sentence clearly introduces the central point to follow.

**Ideas are developed** **sustained.**

Presents a number of well supported ideas focused largely on the two central characters and their relationship.

*Despite the cliched happy ending, Antwone Fisher doesn’t crosses the line to become too syrupy. For most of the film, the movie produces emotional honesty and Denzel Washington has made a solid debut as a director. Some of the events of Fisher's real life story may have been fictionalised in the name of producing a better story, but there's little doubt that this tale of genuine human courage will be enjoyed by nearly everyone who sees it.*

**Writing is clearly structured.**

An appropriate conclusion confirms the reviewer’s positive perspective developed throughout the review.

**Exemplar D: Not achieved**

**Surface features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* conventions.

**Deeper features:**

achievement criteria assessing:

* ideas
* crafting
* structure.

***BEAUTIFULLY MADE***

**A Beautiful Mind [2001] M**

Director: Ron Howard

Duration: 130 minutes

*In the film A Beautiful Mind directed by Ron Howard Howard delivers a sugar coated, happy ever after adaptation of John Nash's life. He forgets the fact that Nash was a bisexual, who beat his wife. But chooses to merely use Nash as a model, to show the effects of schizophrenia and how it affects the people around them. Even with Nash's flaws he was an amazing man and a brilliant mathematician. That's why he is an interesting subject for Howard to use. The film would be nothing unless the main man was brilliant in some way or another.*

*The film starts with a Professor at Princeton giving a speech to the new students. The camera pans around all the smart looking students in the room. Then stops to focus in on a nerdy looking guy wearing very old fashioned, out of date clothing who**is later revealed to be John Nash. Nash, a Mathematical genius doesn't go to classes and believes himself better than others. He comes up with an original idea that contradicts the way economics had always being done. Nash moves on to become a successful code breaker working for the American Government.*

**Writing conventions** **are not** **used accurately throughout:**

Inaccurate syntax.

Eg: several unintended minor sentences*: ”But then just as…”*

(and elsewhere)

(NB: a few random errors, or minor editing lapses, are acceptable).

**Writing is not crafted and controlled.**

Colloquial expressions detract.

Eg: *“ … a nerdy looking guy..”*

*“… makes friends with a guy named…”*

*Throughout this time he makes friends with a guy named Charles and his niece Marcy along with a secret agent by the name of Parcher. The first half of the movie all this seems very normal. But then just as someone who has schizophrenia would, we find out that these people never existed. But were created in the mind of Nash to satisfy his own desires.*

*Russel Crowe gives a very believable performance of the lonely and odd Nash. From the stutter in his voice and hand gestures he picked up himself, to the hunched back and shuffled walk. Crowe makes Nash the strange but compelling character Howard wanted him to be. Jennifer Connolly, who played Nash's beautiful wife Alicia, played a major role in Howard's vision for the movie because as much as it was about schizophrenia, he wanted it to show how it affects the people around them. Connolly showed her frustration when Nash couldn't respond to her in bed because of his medication. But more importantly stuck with him and believed he could fight the disease.*

**Ideas** [development of John Nash’s character and Russell Crowe’s performance as important features in the film] **are developed and sustained in the first half of the review.**

*There is clever use of music in the film. Howard uses short notes on the piano to symbolise the frailness of Nash. There is very dramatic music with a lot of dynamics in times of suspense or creativity. Then at the end there is the soothing opera singer to show that Nash had recovered and broken away from his old self.*

**Writing is not crafted and controlled.**

Limited range of sentence structures / lengths used.

Eg: *“There is clever use of music in the film…. There is very dramatic music…”*

*The lighting is very subtle but effective. When Nash is at Princeton there is a golden glow about things. This shows that it is a very important and intelligent place. As Nash descends into madness the lighting becomes duller and darker to show the hole Nash had fallen into. Slowly when Nash returns to Princeton the golden glow reappears.*

**Writing is not clearly structured.** Several brief, disjointed points made separately over a series of paragraphs.

Eg: Music…

Lighting….

Special effects…

*The special effects are a very important part of the film, They let the viewer get an insight into Nash's mind. When he is breaking the codes and the letters pop out at him. It helps us to see how amazing his talent of seeing patterns and images that others can't. Or at the start where he sees the patterns from the glass bowl reflect through the oranges and on to the persons tie.*

**Ideas are not developed and sustained.**

Superficial treatment of film in second half of the review.

*All in all I think this is a very good movie. But we need to realise that this is not a biography of John Nash's life, because it's not. Ron Howard has done a great job in using Nash as a subject to show that you can beat mental illness with your mind and still be a great and influential member of society just as Nash was.*