



## THE SCHOOL FOR EXCELLENCE (TSFX)

### VCE ENGLISH UNITS 3 & 4

### WRITTEN EXAMINATION 2018

Reading Time: 15 minutes

Writing Time: 3 hours

Student  
Number:

--	--

--	--	--

--	--	--

Letter

--

### TASK BOOK

Section	Number of Questions	Number of Questions to be Answered	Marks
A – Analytical interpretation of a text	20	1	20
B – Comparative analysis of texts	8	1	20
C – Argument and persuasive writing	1	1	20
			60

- Students are to write in blue or black pen.
- Students are permitted to bring into the examination room: pens, pencils, highlighters, erasers, sharpeners, rulers and an English and/or bilingual printed dictionary.
- Students are NOT permitted to bring into the examination room: blank sheets of paper and/or correction fluid/tape.
- No calculator is allowed in this examination.

#### Materials Supplied

- Task book of 14 pages, including assessment criteria on page 14

#### Instructions

- Write your **student number** in the space provided above on this page.
- If you choose to write on a multimodal text in Section A, you must not write on a text pair that includes a multimodal text in Section B.
- All written responses must be in English.

Students are **NOT** permitted to bring mobile phones and/or any other unauthorised electronic devices into the examination room.

## SECTION C – ARGUMENT AND PERSUASIVE LANGUAGE

### Instructions for Section C

Section C requires students to write an analysis of the ways in which argument and language are used to persuade others to share a point(s) of view.

Read the background information on this page and the material on pages 9 to 13, and write an analytical response to the task below.

For the purposes of this task, the term ‘language’ refers to written, spoken and visual language.

Your response will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on page 14 of this book. Section C will be worth one-third of the total marks for the examination.

### Task

Write an analysis of the ways in which argument and written and visual language are used by both James Pattison and Vanessa Leoncelli to try to persuade others to share the points of view presented.

### Background information

*EXCEL Equity* Pty Ltd (referred to in short as “EE”) is a multi-national financial organisation specialising in property and share portfolio management. In a bid to improve the organisation’s appeal and image, the company’s Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Conor McLaughlin, is investigating the possibility of implementing in-house childcare at all of EE’s city offices. This initiative would see a fully accredited childcare centre built into EE’s existing infrastructure, and its services would be offered to all EE employees. With the Annual General Meeting (AGM) soon approaching, McLaughlin has established a confidential email thread with his nine company Directors in order to ascertain their thoughts on whether such a policy would be in EE’s interests.

**From:** Conor McLaughlin  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 July 2018 8:22 AM  
**To:** EE\_Directors  
**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL: In-house childcare: policy discussion.

Dear Directors,

As I have indicated to you over the phone and/or in person, I am looking into the viability of implementing in-house childcare for all EE employers. At this stage, the policy is just an idea, but I would like your honest (and confidential) opinion on whether or not, in principle, you believe that such an initiative would be good for the company and its stakeholders.

At your earliest convenience, please “REPLY ALL” with your thoughts. This matter will be raised as an agenda item at September’s AGM.

Yours sincerely,

Conor McLaughlin  
Chief Executive Office  
Excel Equity  
Sydney, Australia

Not to be Republished

**From:** James Pattison  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 July 2018 3:22 PM  
**To:** EE\_Directors; Conor McLaughlin  
**Subject:** RE:CONFIDENTIAL: In-house childcare: policy discussion.

Hi all,

Well, I'm happy to kick things off with what I anticipate will be a somewhat controversial opinion. Such proposals are certainly not new; in fact, if I'm not mistaken, I remember a former boss of this very company mooted the possibility of a similar service back in the early 90s. But despite being talked about and talked about for decades, in-house childcare – as a core policy for large-scale organisations like EE – has not taken off, and for good reason. I think of this idea in the same way I think of those “All-You-Can-Eat” restaurants that were all the rage back in my teenage years (bear with me, please!!): they sound appealing on paper, and the idea might have worked for one or two businesses, but on the whole, the concept almost always does more damage than good. Good on paper, bad in practice.

Any successful business needs to have a structure and working environment that values all its employees equally. This is one of EE's greatest assets, Conor, and I applaud you for all the work you've done to make certain that this company remains a “pin-up boy” for transparency and for treating all its workers the same, regardless of any differentiating factor such as race, religion, sexual orientation and gender. If we were to establish the kind of in-house childcare centre that you have alluded to, I fear we will compromise our image as a company that treats all its employees with an even hand. We will drive a wedge between two kinds of workers: those with kids, and those without kids. For those with children, and who may no longer bear the logistical and financial burdens of childcare, the message we are sending is a decidedly affirming one: we value you and your family. But what about the hundreds (thousands, perhaps) of employees without children? What message are we sending them? That in order to truly enjoy the spoils of this wonderful organisation, you've really got to have kids?

Think about how much the provision of free, in-house childcare would save an employee over a five-year span. The figure would certainly be in the thousands of dollars – perhaps even the tens of thousands for those with multiple children. If one of our employees without kids were to insist that her salary be increased to offset that fact that she does not enjoy the benefits of the company policy, what would our response be? And as someone who knows a thing or two about employment litigation, if such a matter ended up before the courts (touch wood!), I'm not sure we'd have a legal leg to stand on. Oh, and spare a thought, too, for our fellow employees who have kids, but not of childcare age. Imagine having juggled the economic and organisational demands of putting kids through crèche and kinder for all those years, only to see that free, in-house childcare is now a company policy for our younger parents. What a whack that'd be! I wouldn't be surprised if employees in that boat asked for EE to make an equivalent contribution to school fees, in lieu of the childcare benefit. Floodgates = opened...

The thing is, such a policy seems, on the surface, to be quite a progressive one. But it isn't. It's the opposite, actually. It harks back to a time when society only valued a certain kind of person and a certain kind of family unit. And unless I've been sitting in a different board room over the past decade, that isn't what EE is about. But if that's not enough of a reason to think twice about this proposal, take a look at this:



That exhausted young lady, as some of you may recognise, is my gorgeous daughter, Chloe. Much to the consternation of her family, Chloe decided to keep working as a consultant from home, while also trying to look after a newborn baby girl. Let me tell you this: she didn't last long before she was completely and utterly burnt out. She described it as trying to drive a car while cooking a stirfry! Now I know in-house childcare is not exactly the same as working from home, but they have something fundamental in common: they both blur the lines between work and home. When a workplace is a vibrant, supportive, challenging one like it is here at EE, it can actually provide a welcome, healthy break from family/home life. This is not to say that men and women are counting down the minutes before they can flee home and find sanctuary at work. Of course not! But it would be helpful to be honest and upfront in acknowledging that a clear distinction between our work and home spheres is a good thing. No hardworking, committed employee likes to feel as though their family life is encroaching upon their work, and EE certainly does not want to intrude upon the personal lives of its workers. In-house childcare will dismantle that crucial barrier, and the company's output and the work-life balance of our people will suffer.

<https://woman.thenest.com/advantages-disadvantages-child-day-care-workplace-8829.html>

So my view in a nutshell? Good on paper, bad in practice.

Looking forward to discussing this further at the AGM.

Warmly,

James Pattison  
Director – Melbourne Office  
Excel Equity.

**From:** Vanessa Leoncelli  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 July 2018 8:36 PM  
**To:** EE\_Directors; Conor McLaughlin  
**Subject:** RE: CONFIDENTIAL: In-house childcare: policy discussion.

Evening all,

I am typing this email on my couch, having just sat down after a 9 hour working day that involved rushing across town during peak hour to collect my twins before their crèche closed– so yes, I am slightly conflicted...!

I, too, look forward to a full and frank discussion about this at our AGM, and it might surprise you that I agree with a lot of what James has had to say; I adore my colleagues, many of whom do not have children, and I would hate to think that anyone, for any reason, felt under-valued or under-appreciated at EE.

The interesting thing is that I actually don't think that employees without children would actually feel this way. The tricky thing about James' characterisation is that it makes the provision of childcare seem like a "zero/sum game" – that is, one group gains (e.g. those with young children) to the extent that another loses (e.g. those without young kids). But I'm not sure this paints an accurate picture of the proposal. Does providing a service to one group of staff members necessarily amount to taking away from another? We all know that, as part of EE's commitment to staff development, we often contribute to employees' further education (I just signed off on a staff member's Master of Finance approval!). Does making such a contribution to those seeking to extend their skills and knowledge mean taking something away from those who are not? It's a tough one, but I'm not convinced it does.

Anyway, lots to think about. ...

Enough work for me for one day – It's one episode of "Grey's Anatomy", then bedtime for me!

Regards,

Vanessa Leoncelli  
Director – Sydney Office