## Assessment Type 3: Comparative Analysis

Students independently compose a 2000 word, written comparative analysis of two texts and evaluate how the language features, stylistic features, and conventions in these texts are used to represent ideas, perspectives, and/or aspects of culture, and to influence audiences. These texts can be extended texts, poetry, drama texts, film texts or media texts. It is important to remember that all assessment design criteria are assessed in the comparative analysis.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* chose texts which provided opportunities for comprehensive depth of analysis and evaluation of complex ideas, perspectives, and aspects of culture. Often this involved analyzing two texts of different text types. e.g. written and visual, to provide greater scope for discussion of ideas and acknowledging how authors all use different ways to create imagery, impact audience, express emotion and show ideas.
* made comparisons of films, novels, poetry, songs, You Tube clips or articles etc with a clear narrative and a range of text features
* included a question which was clearly stated at the beginning demonstrating greater focus on analysis
* addressed aspects of culture and context, showing understanding of the contextual elements of author and text placement in revealing how they position an audience, especially non-narrative text types
* focused on two or three key features
* not only compared, but also contrasted texts in sophisticated ways so as to make a critical analysis of similarities and differences of both texts’ ideas, language features, purposes, and contexts
* included integrated analysis of the two texts that alternated with parity and complexity within the same paragraph, rather than basing separate paragraphs on each text.
* had balance in relation to the comparisons and contrasts made between texts
* used connectives throughout the response in addition to explicit acknowledgement of differences allowing students to demonstrate analysis of An3
* used correct and sophisticated terminology to analyse and evaluate language features, stylistic features and conventions
* supported their analysis with clear and relevant evidence from the text and tended to be more specific than broad in the evidence provided
* seamlessly entwined quotations within the body of the response, illustrating higher order ability. Students tended to communicate their strengths as writers where the structure of text type they had chosen to prouce was clear and each paragraph began with a strong topic sentence, linking holistically to the chosen texts.
* took the form of a well-structured essay, reports, articles and blogs. In some cases the use of headings or clear topic sentences reduced the repetition of ideas and evidence by focusing the analysis on specific aspects of the texts.
* included diverse vocabulary
* showed evidence of careful proofreading and editing to produce a polished final comparative analysis.

The less successful responses commonly:

* obligated the whole class either to analyse the same texts or to base their text choice on the same theme or to discuss the same text features
* were overly scaffolded.
* compromised the authorial integrity/genesis of student work by enabling multiple students to undertake the exact same text pairings
* chose to focus on aspects of the texts that were too similar, for example: comparing overly similar and or repetitive ideas and or language features
* attempted to cover too many aspects, reflecting a need for well-crafted questions and thoroughly planned responses
* discussed an entire television series rather than a single episode
* had no question or limiting questions, often meaning the focus was on plot or ideas rather than features and effect on audience
* demonstrated a lack of organisation with no order or structure that related to the question in the body paragraphs
* were too thematic and or plot focused in their analysis, focusing predominantly on ideas and perspectives, but failing to analyse language features, stylistic features, and conventions
* made no reference to audience or context
* included implicit or superficial reference to purpose as broadly being ‘to entertain’. There was also some tendency to reference KU3 in the introduction and or conclusion, but not address it in the body of the response.
* focused only on similarities and not differences as well
* wrote about film and novel version of the same narrative as though they were the same text
* said nothing of significance in the last few hundred words when struggling to meet the word count. In such cases, students would be better served by submitting a shorter piece.
* incorporated no evidence to support points or quoted lengthy chunks of text, instead of integrating short key words and phrases
* lacked cohesiveness due to a lack of conjunctions and or comparative phrases
* simply listed text features used without giving specific examples of where they were used and what effect they had, resulting in generalised re-telling of plot
* made didactic explanations of basic terminology and common concepts to the marker such as using many sentences to explain what ‘symbolism’ or ‘similar’ means
* demonstrated a lack of awareness that audience, context, themes, ideas, conventions are not techniques
* discussed ideas in the texts separately from techniques. This did not demonstrate that they understood how “language features, stylistic features, and conventions make meaning”. More successful students were able to explain how the techniques made the ideas clearer, stronger
* failed to identify the creators of media texts, writing ‘the author’ without naming the writers of the newspaper or on-line articles.
* devoted too many words to describe the context of the media texts, much of which was not relevant to the texts being compared.
* spent too much time explaining what the lyrics meant when comparing two songs, rather than analyzing them (e.g. rhythm, rhyme, internal rhyme, use of colloquial language, etc.)
* showed little evidence of proofreading and editing by including errors such as misspelling names of authors, directors and titles. In addition, incorrect conventions were also used such as not using italics for the text titles or not referring to the author/director by surname.
* were as low as half the available word count, at times in contradiction to the figure cited on the cover sheet, which severely limited opportunity for success.