

INTUITION EDUCATION

HSC 2026 · PREDICTED PRACTICE PAPER

2026 HSC English Advanced — Paper 2: Modules

*Answers & marking notes***Paper total: 60 marks**

Sit the paper first. These are worked answers with the marking notes behind them — what earns the mark, and the traps the marking centre has flagged in past years. Where a note names a band, it describes what a top-band response does, not a guaranteed mark.

Published Aug 2026 · intuitioneducation.com.au/hsc-2026 · ai.intu.com.au

Independent Intuition Education material built from publicly available NESA documents. Not affiliated with or endorsed by NESA.

Answers & marking notes

Marking notes

Question 1 — Module A

Band	Descriptor
17–20	Skilfully evaluates how BOTH resonances AND dissonances between the texts shape understanding of the textual conversation; integrated, balanced treatment of the pair; perceptive analysis of context, purpose and form for both composers; sustained personal judgement
13–16	Effectively evaluates the relationship between the texts with mostly balanced treatment and sound contextual analysis
9–12	Explains connections between the texts; treatment may be unbalanced or sequential; limited evaluation
5–8	Describes both texts with limited connection
1–4	Attempts to describe one or both texts

Marker priorities from the clusters: (1) BOTH halves of the dyad — echo *and* friction — must be argued; scripts that find only harmony (or only critique) miss the question's structure; (2) integration is the perennial discriminator: two sequential single-text essays cap around 12 (flagged every year 2019–2025); (3) 'evaluate ... your understanding' requires a personal judgement about what the conversation *achieves*, not a catalogue of similarities; (4) context must do causal work — why the later composer's moment produces the dissonance — not sit as biographical preamble.

Question 2 — Module B

Band	Descriptor
17–20	Skilfully evaluates the extent to which the claim matches an informed personal judgement of the text; perceptive analysis of construction (form, style, structure) across the WHOLE text; the say/made relationship explicitly negotiated
13–16	Effectively evaluates the claim with sound analysis of the text's distinctive qualities and appropriate whole-text evidence
9–12	Explains features of the text with some reference to the statement; limited judgement of extent
5–8	Describes the text with limited reference to the question
1–4	Attempts to describe the text

Marker priorities: (1) the statement opposes content and construction — the strongest responses complicate the opposition (what the text 'says' is inseparable from how it is made) rather than simply agreeing; (2) form-specific metalanguage is the named discriminator in six of seven years' feedback: the verse suite treated as a whole, staging and dramatic structure, documentary construction, narrative architecture — not character study; (3) evidence must span the text entire, not two rehearsed passages;

(4) a delineated personal and intellectual voice (2023 feedback) — the judgement should be the essay's spine, not its last sentence.

Question 3 — Module C

Band	Descriptor
17–20	Skilfully crafted writing in the selected form; the stimulus idea functions as the piece's conceptual core; controlled, sustained voice with register and modality matched to audience and purpose; deliberate structural choices
13–16	Effectively crafted writing in the selected form; the stimulus is meaningfully integrated; controlled voice
9–12	Sound writing with some control; the stimulus is referenced but not developed; form features uneven
5–8	Limited control of the form; token use of the stimulus
1–4	Attempts to compose

Marker priorities from the clusters and 2019–2025 feedback: (1) **form discipline** — 2025's guideline added 'write in the form stated'; discursive means an idea explored from several angles with anecdote, a personal conversational register and an open-ended resolution; persuasive means a controlled public voice, a clear position and rhetorical build; a short story in discursive clothing is penalised; (2) **conceptual stimulus use** — the unfinished/draft idea should structure the piece (a motif, a governing metaphor, a return), not appear once as quotation; drawing on more than one idea in the stimulus (unfinished ≠ failed; life as draft) separated bands in 2024; (3) clichéd school-set narratives and literal readings are the chief flagged weakness of seven consecutive years.

Practice part (b), if used: quote your own part (a) at least twice; tie each quoted choice to an intended effect on the reader, not to a device name alone (2023 and 2025 feedback); no plot summary, no negative self-critique, no long introduction.

Prediction provenance

Which consensus prediction each part of this paper realises. Full evidence panels:
intuitioneducation.com.au/hsc-2026

Paper item	Prediction	Agreement
Q1 (common question mode)	EA-P2-a1-common-question-reversion	0.58 · 5 (deepseek, fable, gemini-3.1-pro, gpt-5.6-sol, grok; opus contrarian for per-pairing)
Q1 (resonances/dissonances phrase)	EA-P2-a2-resonances-dissonances-verbatim	0.51 · 3 (fable, grok, gpt-5.6-sol)
Q2	EA-P2-b1-common-whole-text-question	0.54 · 5 (fable, gpt-5.6-sol, grok, opus, gemini-3.1-pro; deepseek contrarian for extracts)
Q3 (discursive/persuasive from print stimulus)	EA-P2-c1-discursive-persuasive-returns	0.54 · 6 (all)
Q3 (single task, no reflection)	EA-P2-c2-reflection-rested	P(rested) ≈ 0.45–0.66 · 3 rest it (grok, gpt-5.6-sol, opus); 3 keep it (deepseek, fable, gemini-3.1-pro) — panel P(examined) 0.58
Optional part (b)	EA-P2-c2-reflection-rested	0.55 (fable's part-b question p) · 3

Built by an AI panel and backtested against the hidden 2025 papers before publication — method at intuitioneducation.com.au/hsc-2026/how-we-did-it. Scored publicly in November 2026. Independent Intuition Education material from publicly available NESA documents; not affiliated with or endorsed by NESA.