

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

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

*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.*