

English 12

Report to Schools April 2014

The information in this report provides an overview of results from the April 2014 **English 12 Provincial Exam**. The information is based on the **2,469** students who wrote the April Provincial Exam.

Comments from the Markers

Below are topic areas and skills in which students seemed to be well prepared (**strengths**) and those in which students needed improvement (**weaknesses**) according to the examination markers.

Curriculum Organizer	Areas of Strength	Areas of Weakness
Stand Alone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most students were able to discuss irony and were able to distinguish between different forms of irony. Stronger responses were often able to implicitly discuss irony. Stronger responses were well organized and succinct, with well chosen and properly integrated quotations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many weak responses misunderstood the text and the author's perspective. Weak responses sometimes provided a personal response to the text instead of a literary analysis. Weaker responses were often lengthy, with underdeveloped paragraphs. Weaker responses showed a general lack of proofreading, used a colloquial tone, and included poor topic sentences. Weak responses relied too heavily on quotations.
Synthesis of Texts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many students understood the question and were able to discuss both texts in their responses. Stronger responses were able to synthesize throughout the essay, and include a thoughtful introduction and properly integrated quotations. Stronger responses understood the feelings and attitudes displayed in the texts and showed insight and depth of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak responses primarily focused on the similarities and differences of the text, without fully answering the question. Weaker responses were written in block form, with a bit of synthesis in the introduction and conclusion. Some students used personal experiences to synthesize, rather than using the information from both texts. Weaker responses had long quotations that were not necessarily connected to their responses and were not well integrated. Some students were confused about the distinction of the "speaker" in the text versus the "author" of the text.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weaker responses showed a lack of proofreading. • Weaker responses often had unclear thesis statements, or no thesis or introduction at all.
<p>Composition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many students were able to understand the topic which led to a variety of narrative responses and some strong and thoughtful expository responses. • Overall, responses showed improvements in paragraphing. • Strong responses demonstrated superior vocabulary and included humour, wit, and allusions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weaker responses were colloquial in tone and language, with many errors in the conventions of language. • Weak responses lacked cohesiveness, specifically by presenting three ideas in the compositions without clear link between them. • Weak responses tended to overuse hyperbole.

The markers felt that the overall difficulty level of the exam was appropriate. The examination adequately represented the Examination Specifications in terms of topic weightings and cognitive levels.