

# Assessment Report

## Level 3 English 2016

Standards [91472](#) [91473](#) [91474](#)

### Part A: Commentary

There is a good range of texts being studied in preparation for Level 3 English. Candidates who unpack the questions and plan before they write tend to achieve well.

### Part B: Report on Standards

## 91472: Respond critically to specified aspect(s) of studied written text(s), supported by evidence

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- engaged with the text
- used a plot driven approach to the discussion
- demonstrated a straightforward analysis of the text
- answered the question fully, even if at a straightforward level
- developed an argument that related to the question
- showed some understanding of the question, and chose a statement that suited their text
- addressed the statement although their interpretation was sometimes quite broad
- attempted to go beyond the text but this information was often tagged onto the end of a paragraph rather than being integrated into the discussion of the text
- included specific evidence although sometimes the discussion of the text was lost and the focus was given to moralising about society today
- wrote conclusions that were broad and often merely a repetition of their opening statement.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not refer to the text sufficiently
- became side tracked by issues beyond the text without making references to the text
- wrote short responses

- focused more on plot than a critical discussion of the text
- were unfamiliar with the demands of the question and unsure about what the statement was asking them to do
- selected statements that did not suit the text they discussed
- used little or no relevant evidence to support ideas
- discussed ideas that were superficial, and showed limited knowledge of the text
- wrote in very general terms “beyond the text,” often making limited, irrelevant or incorrect connections
- wrote an essay with insufficient development.

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

- engaged with a carefully selected statement and wrote confidently about their text/s.
- integrated relevant evidence and critical evaluation with a balanced perspective
- wrote critical personal responses that explored the text convincingly, sometimes including detail and going beyond the text
- used a text that had clear stylistic features; they sometimes chose more than one text and compared and contrasted these for even more critical response
- showed convincing understanding of the text and the question
- understood the setting of the text and related it well to the time in which it was written and/or the present time
- structured a clear argument in the introduction, often with a stylish introductory sentence and they often challenged the statement
- used several pieces of carefully chosen evidence to support each point made, and unpacked it
- incorporated critical texts but sometimes leaned a bit too heavily on them rather than using the text itself.
- structured their essay and wrote with a confident personal voice
- wrote with concision
- focussed on the statement throughout the essay
- used a range of critical response language, both positive and negative.

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

- were articulate in their expression
- wrote succinct and perceptive arguments
- remained focused on the text throughout
- made excellent use of textual evidence
- wrote arguments which contained a strong personal voice
- used a text that allowed considerable personal interpretation, perhaps with critical readings, judiciously applied
- showed enjoyment in discussing the text’s ideas and the writer’s craft
- appreciated the writer’s purpose(s) and how the text was crafted for the intended audience.
- wove critical evidence into their argument
- structured a fluent, sophisticated essay, with a strong personal voice
- took a stance and remained focussed
- used a philosophical discussion

- raised new or original questions, derived from personal analysis
- used critical response language.

### Standard-specific comments

It was pleasing to see a wide range of appropriate texts used that were clearly engaging for candidates.

The vast range of texts used indicates the diverse range of learners. Candidates wrote passionately indicating that they were engaged with the choice of texts.

CHOICE OF TEXTS: Shakespeare is still popular: mostly the tragedies but *Much Ado about Nothing* appeared more regularly this year. It is heartening to see that New Zealand writers are still being enjoyed by the candidates especially poetry (Baxter, Edmond) and short stories (Katherine Mansfield, Janet Frame and Owen Marshall). Other texts that worked well included: *Carol Ann Duffy poetry*, *The Great Gatsby*. *The Handmaid's Tale* was surprisingly not so strong in 2016.

Some Level One texts appeared which are not giving the students enough support to write at Level Three: *The Geranium*, *Flower Girls*, Wilfred Owen's *Disabled*.

---

---

## 91473: Respond critically to specified aspect(s) of studied visual or oral text(s), supported by evidence

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used key words from the statement in their introduction to indicate the statement they were addressing
- employed several key points, supported with evidence from the text
- wrote using a structured essay style
- formulated a basic thesis statement – often agreeing or disagreeing with the statement
- used language accurately much of the time
- used examples that showed an understanding and appreciation of the meaning of the text and/or the director's purpose.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- lacked focus in terms of essay structure; often wrote an incomplete response or did not respond to any statement
- often tried to 'twist' a prepared answer to fit the statement provided
- made significant errors in terms of language usage and/or structure
- retold the plot.
- lacked evidence from the text to support points made
- misinterpreted the statement.

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

- developed and supported an interesting thesis statement
- showed some evidence of an appreciation of the director's purpose and crafting
- demonstrated that the director's intentions were understood
- wrote an argument that was convincing in its use of detail and supporting evidence
- attempted to make relevant connections beyond the text
- used an appropriate academic essay structure
- used well-chosen and accurate language or vocabulary to convey their ideas
- expressed ideas in an articulate manner with evidence of crafting
- engaged clearly with the text and discussed elements with confidence.

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

- created a thesis statement that was often convincing, insightful and/or original which was thoroughly argued and supported with relevant, well-chosen evidence from the text
- wrote a focussed argument that addressed both parts of the statement
- explored the text using judgements and developed conclusions. Candidates often saw the statement as a continuum and placed themselves along this, justifying their stance
- engaged perceptively with the text on a personal level
- showed a perceptive awareness and understanding of the director's purpose and intent.
- used an appropriate academic essay structure
- developed a personal voice in their argument that made the response interesting, engaging and original
- used language precisely and accurately
- clearly crafted an argument and often used sophisticated language.
- moved beyond the text to make links to personal, historical, societal, world issues.

### Standard-specific comments

Choice of film is important to allow students to respond critically, convincingly and perceptively to complex human and societal issues. Student understanding of the film is also significant; in-depth and critical understanding is crucial. Illegible handwriting was more of an issue in 2016; some scripts were very difficult to read and decipher. An understanding of the director's purpose or intentions is critical to writing a sophisticated answer. Many candidates attempted to 'force' the use of techniques into their essay which was not always appropriate – the use of examples needs to support the argument.

---

## 91474: Respond critically to significant aspects of unfamiliar written texts through close reading, supported by evidence

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- wrote answers that evaluated accurately two specific aspects only

- evaluated the aspects but often included unnecessarily long quotes from the texts
- evaluated an aspect but relied on reference to a generic definition of the feature rather than a discussion of the feature in the context of the texts
- wrote about aspects the candidate could identify but did not easily discuss the aspects of it in relation to the question
- identified two aspects and used the basic model of statement, explained and gave an example
- had a straightforward and clear response
- matched aspects of the question in isolation.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- wrote on one aspect only
- neglected to supply an example
- did not explain the aspect or example in the context of the question
- did not comment on the question but instead only analysed the passage
- unable to provide evidence to back up their chosen aspect
- paraphrased the text
- did not have an accurate working knowledge of the features used to craft written texts
- did not read the text accurately projected their own assumptions
- wrote about features they could identify without an attempt to answer the question.

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

- wrote answers that evaluated accurately more than two specific aspects.
- evaluated aspects from early in the text and then compared the use / quality / attributes of these with features that came later in the text.
- identified and discussed 'tone'
- showed evidence of reading the texts accurately
- identified aspects, often more than two and provided a thorough explanation that began to theorise about the text as a whole.
- addressed the piece of writing with judicious personal reflection
- linked ideas together & consistently.

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

- wrote answers that evaluated accurately how several specific features worked together to reflect the author's purpose. These evaluations were grouped into paragraphs that tracked the progression of the text.
- wrote extensively on a particular feature noting how the author's use of the feature changed over the course of the text.
- wrote answers that revealed a genuine engagement with the author's thoughts and feelings. These candidates identified with (or had empathy with) the sentiments of the narrator, or the motivation of the writer.
- established the surface reality but then were confident to explore the deeper meanings about the nature of life, aging, art, family etc.

- discussed many aspects of the text and provided examples through a detailed, interwoven explanation, which examined the entire extract and went beyond the text by theorising.
- integrated commentary on the question and analysis (sometimes to create an argument about the author's purpose).
- wrote fluently and cohesively and discussed aspects in relation to each other.

### **Standard-specific comments**

Candidates must be very explicit with accurate use of aspects of the passages. The evidence illustrating each aspect must also be very clearly presented and fully explained. Candidates should write well on a few chosen aspects rather than write about many aspects with very little coverage. Candidates must try to present their insights and understandings of each text and where possible, compare or contrast their ideas to the ones in the texts. Candidates should also ensure to answer all three questions equally and as much as possible. Many candidates could have scored higher grades if they spent more time on question three.

### **[English subject page](#)**

---

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority