

**English 12: All Domains  
Item-Level Response Reports (Provincial Level)**

**British Columbia**

**All Schools**

**June/2009**

Provincial English 12 Item-Level Response Reports include data for all BC students in Grade 12 who wrote the exam in June 2009 (about 27,145 students). Both public and independent schools are included. The English 12 June 2009 provincial Item-Level Response Report (All Domains) contains:

- a) three Multiple Choice reports (Stand-Alone Text, Reading Comprehension - Synthesis, Reading Comprehension - Analysis of Synthesis) that display the proportion of students who made errors on each test item and a description of the misconception;
- b) one Written Response report that displays the proportion of students in each scoring category.

**1. Question type: MC**

**Domain: Stand-Alone Text**

<b>Form</b>	<b>Cognitive Process</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Question type</b>	<b>Number of Students who Responded to the Item</b>	<b>Percentage of Students who Answered Incorrectly</b>	<b>Specific Curricular Aspect that Needs Attention</b>
A	Interpret Texts	1	MC	27117	41%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not correctly interpret the type of scene depicted in the opening lines of the poem.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	2	MC	27097	54%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize which literary device was used in a given quotation.</li> </ul>
A	Retrieve Information	3	MC	27115	33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize the referent for a given metaphor.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	4	MC	27104	37%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not correctly identify a quoted phrase which contained a metaphor.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	5	MC	27123	52%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize the meaning of a short quotation.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	6	MC	27120	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not correctly interpret the speaker's attitude to the subject.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	7	MC	27109	33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not correctly identify a specific quotation which best suggested a central idea.</li> </ul>

**2. Question type: MC**

**Domain: Reading Comprehension – Synthesis Texts**

Form	Cognitive Process	Item #	Question type	Number of Students who Responded to the Item	Percentage of Students who Answered Incorrectly	Specific Curricular Aspect that Needs Attention
A	Interpret Texts	8	MC	27104	17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize which short quotation from the informational passage was a statement of opinion.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	9	MC	27073	52%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize the predominant device used in specified paragraphs.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	10	MC	27098	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize the word which best described a specified person in the passage.</li> </ul>
A	Retrieve Information	11	MC	27132	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not correctly identify a person's motivation, as explicitly stated.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	12	MC	27109	81%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize the primary method of development.</li> </ul>
A	Retrieve Information	13	MC	27107	37%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not retrieve a specific piece of information stated.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	14	MC	27116	23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not identify the source of humour in the cartoon.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	15	MC	26933	23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not identify which given quotation from the literary prose passage contained an example of a specified literary device.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	16	MC	27118	14%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not understand a defining event.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	17	MC	27105	17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not interpret the symbolic meaning of a key object.</li> </ul>
A	Recognize Meaning	18	MC	27029	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize which given quotation contained an example of a</li> </ul>

						specified type of language.
A	Interpret Texts	19	MC	27114	28%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not identify the word denoting an important characteristic of a key character.</li> </ul>
A	Interpret Texts	20	MC	27071	51%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not recognize which statement best expressed a primary theme.</li> </ul>

### 3. Question type: MC

### Domain: Reading Comprehension – Analysis of Synthesis Texts

Form	Cognitive Process	Item #	Question type	Number of Students who Responded to the Item	Percentage of Students who Answered Incorrectly	Specific Curricular Aspect that Needs Attention
A	Analyze Texts	21	MC	27107	41%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not identify the word denoting a character trait shared by two characters in the synthesis passages.</li> </ul>
A	Analyze Texts	22	MC	27100	24%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did not identify which of four given phrases could serve as the best alternative title for the synthesis passages.</li> </ul>

### 4. Question type: Written Responses

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	Stand Alone Text	1	27145 (100%)	1080 (4%)	1072 (4%)	4417 (16%)	5107 (19%)	8901 (33%)	4842 (18%)	1726 (6%)
A	Analysis of Synthesis Texts	2	27145 (100%)	468 (2%)	320 (1%)	2579 (10%)	4618 (17%)	11074 (41%)	6060 (22%)	2026 (8%)
A	Composition	3	27145 (100%)	276 (1%)	109 (0%)	1283 (5%)	3355 (12%)	13276 (49%)	6926 (26%)	1920 (7%)

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.

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

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

### **1. Stand-Alone Text**

#### **Areas of Strength**

- Recognition of literary devices and the integration of quotations were evident in strong responses.
- Upper level responses were able to make connections between the poem and universal themes, showing real insight.
- Stronger responses used personification as a basis for a thorough discussion.
- Upper level responses provided a fully developed analysis.

#### **Areas of Weakness**

- Some students did not seem to have read the footnotes which provided important information.
- Some responses attempted to address the question but were often underdeveloped.
- Some responses were on a personal level, using first person as if they knew the poet.
- Weaker responses would concentrate on one line in the poem and as a result the response was a complete misinterpretation.
- Weaker responses resorted to summarizing the poem when they did not understand it.
- Weaker responses were sometimes personal narratives.

### **2. Analysis of Synthesis Texts**

#### **Areas of Strength**

- Many responses demonstrated true synthesis; students wrestled with the complexities of the topic and came up with many original ideas.
- Many students took a strong stance in reaction to the question, and used evidence from both pieces to support their ideas.
- Strong response provided good character assessment.
- Upper level responses provided a sophisticated weighing of issues, understanding that there did not exist a simple right or wrong answer.
- Upper level responses drew logical substantiated conclusion.

### **Areas of Weakness**

- Many responses relied on lengthy quotations with little discussion.
- Many students responded rather informally.
- There were many personal responses which were not appropriate to the question or task.
- Some students adopted a persona (mother, author, and son); the task is meant to be a literary essay.
- Some responses were merely a summary of the two pieces.

## **3. Composition**

### **Areas of Strength**

- Strong expository and narrative responses; the narratives were, by and large, more compelling to read.
- Good use of prior knowledge.
- Responses had a sense of purpose.
- Content was appropriate.
- Some upper level responses were succinct.
- Some upper level responses had an effective narrow focus and provided a more insightful analysis of the subject.

### **Areas of Weakness**

- There were many single-paragraph responses; some students clearly had trouble structuring an essay.
- A number of responses consisted merely of several loosely connected anecdotes, rather than a single, unified essay.
- Some expository essays were vague and underdeveloped. They often relied on generalizations rather than concrete examples.

