

**English 12: Written Responses  
Item-Level Response Report (Provincial Level)**

**British Columbia**

**All Schools**

**June/2008**

Provincial English 12 Item-Level Response Reports include data for all BC students in Grade 12 who wrote the exam in June 2008 (about 27,280 students). Both public and independent schools are included. The English 12 June 2008 (Written Responses) provincial Item-Level Response Report displays the proportion of students in each scoring category. All students were required to answer Items 1 and 4, while students could select to answer either item 2 or item 3.

Form	Content Area	Item #	Number(%) of Respondents	Number (%) Scores of 0 (both markers)	Number (%) Scores of 1 (both markers)	Number (%) Scores of 1&2 or 2&2	Number (%) Scores of 2&3 or 3&3	Number (%) Scores of 3&4 or 4&4	Number (%) Scores of 4&5 or 5&5	Number (%) Scores of 5&6 or 6&6
A	Poetry	1	27276 (100%)	1038 (4%)	708 (3%)	4204 (16%)	6692 (25%)	9484 (35%)	4028 (15%)	1082 (4%)
A	Prose	2	7492 (100%)	105 (1%)	53 (1%)	403 (5%)	1430 (19%)	3589 (48%)	1469 (20%)	433 (6%)
A	Prose	3	19782 (100%)	18 (0%)	67 (0%)	877 (4%)	3127 (16%)	10325 (52%)	4370 (22%)	998 (5%)
A	Original Composition	4	27274 (100%)	309 (1%)	156 (1%)	1006 (4%)	3584 (13%)	13992 (51%)	6708 (25%)	1519 (6%)

Note: Two markers scored each response and the score the student receives is the sum of the score from marker 1 plus the score from marker 2. Each of the 7 data categories in the table indicates how to associate results to the written response scoring rubric document attached below. For instance, "Scores of 1&2 or 2&2" should be interpreted as being marked either '1' by one marker and '2' by the second marker, or '2' by both markers.

Score Description
Grade 12 English written response scoring rubric (click <a href="#">here</a> )

## **General Comments - Grade 12 English Written Responses**

### **1. POETRY**

#### **Areas of Strength**

- Integration of quotations was quite good.
- Those students who understood the poem and the task were able to develop meaningful responses of sufficient length.
- Those students who understood the poem and the task were able to develop convincing arguments surrounding the contrasting moods and style.
- Stronger responses moved beyond examples of contrast to the purpose of the poem.

#### **Areas of Weakness**

- Many students referred to "stanzas" as "paragraphs".
- Many responses were off-topic and some students provided personal responses.
- Many students appeared to ignore the question, and instead wrote on such topics as simile, metaphor, and symbolism.
- Many responses focused on summarizing the poem rather than answering the question on contrast.
- Some students over-emphasized/analyzed one part of the poem and ignored significant sections of the poem.

### **2/3. PROSE**

#### **Areas of Strength**

- Most responses indicated an accurate understanding of the text.
- The conflict question allowed high-end students to demonstrate insight.
- Many students employed appropriate essay format.
- Strong responses demonstrated a strong grasp of the conventions of the language (verb usage, sentence structure etc.).
- Strong responses demonstrated fluid transitions and purposeful flow of ideas
- Many students were able to understand the subtlety and irony of the protagonist's actions at the end of the story.
- Many students correctly identified the shift in character
- Upper level responses had strong development of character analysis.

#### **Areas of Weakness**

- Some students' responses contained little story analysis, instead focusing on historical events.
- Many responses consisted of lengthy plot summaries.
- Some students used over-inflated language, which detracted from their discussions.
- Many students failed to thoroughly discuss the quotations which they used in their responses.
- Some students lacked appropriate vocabulary, referring to the central character as "clueless."

- Students should be encouraged to read the text feature such as footnotes.

#### **4. ORIGINAL COMPOSITION**

##### **Areas of Strength**

- Most responses were on topic.
- Most responses demonstrated an acceptable level of fluency.
- Many responses provided good detail and support.

##### **Areas of Weakness**

- For those who did select a narrative, few employed effective dialogue.
- Conversational style proved to be inappropriate at times, and/or ineffective as a writing strategy.
- Few students chose to challenge/disagree with the prompt.
- Weaker papers contained a range of mechanical problems.
- These papers did not display evidence of editing.