

This assessment report is based on assessments for 2023. It may not reflect achievement standards that have been updated.

## 2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	English
Level:	Level 1 RAS
Achievement standard(s):	91926, 91927

### General commentary

Candidates were well prepared for both assessments. They followed instructions and were motivated to demonstrate skills learnt throughout the year. The majority of candidates were awarded grades at Achievement level or higher.

### Report on individual achievement standards

#### **Achievement standard 91926: Develop ideas in writing using stylistic and written conventions**

##### Assessment

Candidates selected one of six prompts (three visual and three written) to produce either a creative or formal piece of writing.

##### Commentary

Because the standard requires candidates to write only one piece, this may be seen as an opportunity for specialisation in a preferred text type at all levels of achievement.

When considering which prompt to respond to, candidates may need to be encouraged to challenge their skills and areas of interest, especially as these relate to the quality of their ideas. By exploring a range of more complex writing types and structures, rather than relying on simplistic structures (such as recounting an experience), candidates may develop ideas more thoroughly and authentically.

Candidates who appeared to have initially spent time considering the quality, development, and structure of their ideas before committing to writing and crafting in full paragraphs tended to produce more successful pieces.

Responses that greatly exceeded the recommended word-length tended not to showcase a candidate's ability to develop and control ideas and language convincingly and effectively.

Candidates who extracted part of the prompt as a focus rather than attempting to address the entire prompt were better able to demonstrate control over their ideas and language selections. For example, for Prompt 5 ("High five!") many less-successful candidates wrote about an entire sports game, rather than focusing on a specific moment such as the climax.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- engaged with their chosen prompt in a basic and straightforward way
- used some of the conventions of their chosen genre
- used simplistic structures to separate and advance ideas
- used straightforward vocabulary and syntax
- wrote with reasonable accuracy
- wrote the minimum amount required to present an idea with some details.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- used their chosen prompt to stimulate exploration of a viable idea
- used the conventions of their chosen genre appropriately
- used a range of appropriate syntax and diction
- showed consideration of structure, ideas, and the quality of word choice
- showed awareness of an intended audience
- presented work in which a personal voice was beginning to emerge
- presented work containing only minor errors.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- showed engagement with their chosen prompt by taking ownership of a relatable aspect in a mature way
- appeared to have planned to explore ideas in a deliberate way
- wrote concisely
- actively sought to engage their audience with a clear personal voice
- deliberately used structure to enhance meaning, purpose, and engagement with the audience
- appeared to have deliberately evaluated their use of aspects of language and syntax with a view to their likely impact on the reader in terms of meaning and engagement.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- presented a literal and simplistic response to their chosen prompt
- wrote about a simplistic idea
- attempted to use conventions of their chosen genre
- chose a simplistic genre such as recount, and wrote a simplistic list-like response
- presented writing that included basic errors of punctuation or structure (such as run on sentences, or no paragraphs)
- presented writing in which ideas were difficult to understand ideas due to the frequency of intrusive errors
- wrote a short or incomplete piece.

## **Achievement standard 91927: Demonstrate understanding of significant aspects of unfamiliar texts**

### **Assessment**

Candidates were presented with three unfamiliar texts, and one question per text. Each question prompted a discussion of one or more significant aspects of the text.

### **Commentary**

Candidates appeared to engage with all three texts with equal enthusiasm, evident through the quality and quantity of responses, and the inclusion of relevant personal experience in many of the responses.

Ideas of tikanga that were part of Text A (“Matariki”) commonly appeared to prompt consideration of related ideas in the responses to the other two texts.

This standard requires the candidate to show understanding of how aspects of a text are used to communicate ideas. Language features are just one of these aspects. Some candidates identified one language feature after another without explaining how the features (individually or together) supported the ideas in the text. Candidates benefitted from being able to offer a convincing explanation of the way aspects of the text worked together to support ideas.

Responses at all levels of achievement commonly included definitions of language techniques identified. Such definitions are redundant as they do not support discussion. Candidates should focus instead on explaining how the examples identified are relevant to ideas in the context of the question. Successful responses used ideas to frame a response that was supported by selection of significant aspects.

Many candidates used the bullet-point suggestions in the question to help scaffold their responses. Candidates should treat these points as suggestions for ways to begin to formulate a response – it is not expected or required that all points are addressed. Candidates are encouraged to take ownership of their own interpretation of the text and their consequent exploration of ideas.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- made brief links to the question
- used key words from the question and the text in the opening sentence of their response
- used the bullet-point suggestions as a checklist to help identify ideas or aspects to write about
- showed they knew the parts of speech, word classes, and some other aspects of language
- recognised that aspects of the text, especially language features, create meaning and some effect to communicate an idea
- supported ideas with quotations and examples from the text that linked to the point being made
- identified (or implied understanding of) a technique, gave an example, and interpreted the effect of the technique in a few words to show understanding
- wrote separate paragraphs for each idea or aspect
- identified and listed multiple aspects or examples at the expense of developing fuller explanation of these to show a deeper understanding of their effect or relevance.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- used the question and a general 'umbrella' aspect, such as connotation or mood, to frame a response
- gave space to explanation of the relationship between use of language and the creation of effect
- discussed texts in a way that demonstrated an understanding of them and how language was used to shape them
- chose supporting evidence carefully
- drew ideas together at the conclusion of the response, or used linking words or phrases, to explain how aspects of a text worked together
- began to show understanding, from looking at the beginning, middle, and end, of how elements worked together throughout a text
- began to show an understanding of the writer's purpose.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- introduced their response with ideas about the text inspired by the question
- developed ideas by showing how aspects of the text built on each other to create a cohesive effect as a whole
- integrated quotations and references to aspects into a fleshed-out discussion of purpose
- confidently considered a range of evidence, or multiple techniques for the same quotation, that clearly linked to the same overarching idea
- considered the position of the author and audience and linked this to their own life or society in a meaningful and logical way.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not meaningfully address the question
- focused on the bullet points without engaging with the question itself
- summarised, paraphrased, or copied the text rather than interpreting it
- presented no supporting evidence
- did not identify significant aspects of the text
- identified and listed multiple aspects or examples without adequate explanation
- gave a definition of the general effect of a technique rather than interpreting and explaining the effect of a specific example.