

2023 Scholarship Assessment Report

Subject: English
Performance standard: 93001

General commentary

The 2023 examination results indicate that across the country, candidates are engaged and excited by the study of English.

Candidates embraced the texts in Section A and appeared to relish the discussion of the merits of a life in art. Those who identified layers of irony and humour were more likely receive a scholarship grade.

In Sections B and C it is vital that candidates read the statements carefully and respond to the specific terms and demands of their eventual choice. There were some responses this year that showed little relevance to the chosen statement, and which therefore could not be considered incisive or compelling. The statement is designed to prompt candidates to create an argument with added edge and direction. The ability to synthesise a response is essential, and successful candidates were able to weave together an argument acknowledging the connection or contrast between various texts.

The statements in Section B relate to specific genres, and responses must relate to texts in an appropriate genre in order to be successful.

New and original texts are always welcome, especially if it is apparent that the texts are of personal interest to the candidate. However, some texts this year, including the films *Frozen*, *Grease*, and *Kung Fu Panda*, were questionable choices.

It is recommended that the appropriateness of text choice to the curriculum level be considered similarly to the way it is for the “wide reading” achievement standards. While, this should not discourage a rigorous academic discussion of issues like representation in Hollywood films or Netflix sitcoms, candidates who choose to use popular children’s texts must support their response with a critical argument (which might, for example, include a discussion on cultural imperialism, or an insight into diversity). A discussion of ‘lighter’ works must incorporate reference to literary theory, critic’s quotes, or wide references beyond the text to other texts or literary trends. Discussion of the plot alone will not suffice.

Similarly, candidates should take care that discussion of interactive texts does not result in just a summary of the gameplay.

Paragraphing remains as important as it ever was to signal the direction a discussion might be taking.

Report on performance standard

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with **Outstanding Performance** commonly:

- wrote fluent and lucid arguments
- commanded attention with a confident thesis

- supplied ample evidence to support their thesis
- wrote rich essays that showed an independence of thought
- wrestled with the statement indicating a sophisticated level of perception
- problematised the statement provided rather than agreeing with it outright
- incorporated literary theory, critic's quotes, or wide references beyond the text to other texts or literary trends
- used at least some canonical / critically acclaimed literature – sometimes in conjunction with less traditional choice
- wove a wide range of relevant sources into their discussion, demonstrating an excellent knowledge of the context of the text.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- wrote an essay for each section
- clearly addressed the statement with a thesis that was developed throughout the essay
- chose texts that were appropriate to address the statement
- provided a synthesised discussion
- balanced their discussion of both texts in Section A
- closely engaged with the statement.

Candidates who were **not awarded Scholarship** commonly:

- relied on plot summary
- made no attempt to synthesise their argument
- lost control of the statement
- provided an unclear thesis
- wrote an illegible paper
- chose inappropriate texts for the statement
- chose texts that did not fit the genre in Section B
- repeated texts in Sections B and C
- wrote an unbalanced response by addressing only one part of the statement.