

# 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

## General commentary

In both standards, successful candidates built their responses around the audience and purpose of the text. The best responses showed an extensive and deep knowledge of language and how it can be used as a tool to craft a nuanced and insightful response to a range of topics. Candidates who planned their response to the question or prompt, wrote concisely, and edited and proofread with attention to detail, proved to be the most successful.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

#### Assessment

From 2025 this standard will be internally assessed. Candidates were required to develop their writing by employing stylistic techniques appropriate to their chosen audience and text type, whilst adhering to conventions. With six prompts to choose from, candidates had the flexibility to select a topic that aligned with their interests and strengths.

#### Commentary

The prompts were engaging and accessible; “The Arrival”, the Night Market image, and the MotoCross image were clear favourites. Creative writing, including poetry and narratives, proved especially popular, with many candidates utilising vivid imagery, thoughtful language features, and advanced vocabulary to elevate their work. Both creative and non-fiction writing submissions stood out for their exceptional quality, demonstrating impressive writing skills. Notably, candidates who excelled at revising and editing their work often exceeded expectations, showcasing a strong commitment to refinement and excellence.

Some submissions included evidence of AI-generated or copy-pasted content. These responses showed limited understanding of the task, abrupt shifts in tone and language accuracy, weak technical skills, and minimal control over structure, conventions, or audience engagement.

#### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- engaged with prompts in a straightforward way, by focusing on a single idea, scene, or recounting a sequence of events

- responded in a literal, predictable, and often underdeveloped way, with abrupt endings or lack of depth
- structured and paragraphed writing sequentially, although some responses lacked a clear introduction or conclusion
- attempted to use descriptive or stylistic features
- demonstrated limited crafting of language, for example, repeated vocabulary or overused adjectives
- used informal language when formal language was more appropriate for the intended audience and purpose
- made their meaning clear
- contained some technical errors such as: run-on sentences; misuse of capital letters; inconsistent tenses; incorrect apostrophe usage; and incorrect formatting of dialogue
- required further editing and proofreading
- produced readable work with clear organisation but lacked the depth, refinement, and technical accuracy needed for higher levels.

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

- demonstrated a clear understanding of the task by developing ideas with specific details and examples
- included thoughtful exploration of the prompt, creating engaging and sophisticated content
- showed an awareness of the audience and purpose through intentional word choices, well-developed ideas, and effective use of tone and language techniques
- used a range of language features, such as imagery, figurative language, and higher-level vocabulary
- crafted beautiful language and connected moments thoughtfully, though occasionally overused language features
- structured writing logically, with clear introductions, body paragraphs, and conclusions
- combined concise sentence structures with well-planned paragraphing to help ideas flow effectively
- used formulaic structures confidently to support clear and coherent ideas and language choices
- included statistics, factual evidence, and logical arguments, linking ideas effectively in formal writing
- used coherent ideas, descriptive settings, and emotional engagement to go beyond simple recounts in creative writing
- produced engaging and fluent work, however, sometimes lacked depth or refinement
- showed evidence of careful editing and proofreading with only occasional, minor mistakes that did not detract from the written piece
- demonstrated clear development, intentional crafting, and effective communication, with only minor weaknesses in depth or accuracy.

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

- demonstrated an acute awareness of their audience, crafting pieces with a strong and authentic personal voice
- contained ideas that were nuanced, original, and deeply explored, often reflecting on complex themes like human relationships, the brevity of life, or societal issues
- made readers think or feel deeply, often challenging perspectives with bold ideas or unique approaches

- used language, syntax, and structure intentionally to captivate and engage readers, often using rhetorical devices, personal pronouns, or emotional appeals in formal writing
- used sophisticated techniques such as foreshadowing, symbolism, tension, tone, flashbacks, and extended metaphors to create rich, impactful creative narratives
- included a wide range of figurative language and low-frequency vocabulary effectively, enhancing tone and meaning
- balanced creative flair with precision, using imagery and structure (e.g., tripartite structures, motif, anaphora) to create meaningful and engaging content without overwriting
- reflected detailed planning and precise execution, with clear evidence of crafting for impact
- used dialogue, action, and description effectively in creative pieces and provided sophisticated evidence and analysis in formal writing
- wrote purposefully with cohesive introductions, impactful conclusions, and a clear progression of ideas
- employed structural elements like short sentences for tension or varied sentence openers to add depth and impact
- showed technical control over a variety of complex punctuation and syntax
- produced refined and error-free work, with only minor typos demonstrating careful editing and proofreading
- displayed high-level control, creativity, and engagement, with a strong focus on crafting purposeful and refined responses tailored to the audience and purpose.

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

- required further development of an idea
  - showed insufficient meaningful engagement with a prompt
  - retold events without purpose or creativity
  - wrote unrelated or pre-written responses that did not fit the task
  - lacked the basic structural elements of an introduction, conclusion, and paragraphing
  - had ideas that were disconnected, repetitive, or presented in a single block of text, making responses difficult to follow
  - produced responses that were incomplete or too brief to sufficiently develop ideas
  - obstructed meaning and reduced clarity due to intrusive errors such as missing words, tense shifts, and misuse of clauses
  - lacked control over the punctuation rules for dialogue
  - resembled spoken language rather than crafted text
  - showed little to no editing or proofreading, suggesting minimal effort to refine ideas or language for audience engagement
  - contained frequent and significant errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar that impeded understanding, for example run-on sentences, missing punctuation (e.g., full stops, capital letters), syntax errors, and subject-verb agreement problems.
-

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

### Assessment

This standard required candidates to read and respond to a range of text types. Candidates were given three texts: a poem, a short story, and an extract from a non-fiction book. Each text had one broad question, and subsequent optional bullet point suggestions, guiding candidates into a discussion of some of the key aspects of the text. All three questions should be attempted.

### Commentary

The texts this year were very approachable for the majority of candidates. Many candidates found the topics relatable, allowing them to reflect on the language and how they saw these ideas in their own lives. Successful candidates were able to comment on the effectiveness of the language in the texts and link those language choices to the author's purpose and then comment how this related to the wider world.

The poem proved to be the most difficult of the three texts. Many candidates who did not achieve failed to respond to the specific question, but instead discussed easily identifiable language features without linking them to any specific purpose.

Many successful candidates were able to incorporate their relevant understanding of te ao Māori and te reo Māori into their responses. Those candidates who were able to bring their own understanding of concepts such as whakapapa in Question One, and whanaungatanga in Question Three were often able to write thoughtful personal responses and achieve well.

The majority of candidates were able to accurately identify parts of speech or language features in their responses. Some candidates did seem to rely on one or two specific features across all of the texts and commented on them regardless of their relevance. Narrative point of view and verb tense were two aspects which were commonly discussed without candidates being able to link effectively to the specific question.

Many candidates structured their responses by using the bullet point suggestions. While this worked well for some, a large number of Not Achieved responses wrote about these bullet points without addressing the specific question.

Responses at all levels of achievement commonly included definitions of the language techniques identified. Such definitions were redundant as they did not support discussion. Candidates should focus instead on explaining how the examples identified are relevant to ideas in the context of the question.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- responded briefly to the specified question, often providing one or two details from the text
- wrote about aspects of the texts that did not always clearly relate to the question, resulting in a lack of focus
- attempted to use the language of explanation to show how their identified example from the text created meaning
- understood a few key language features and parts of speech, and were able to use them to explain the purpose of selected quotes and / or sections of texts
- wrote separate paragraphs to discuss each aspect of the text individually
- attempted to connect the chosen example(s) to a wider context with a short conclusion or comment

- made comments stating that the examples they had given “worked together” but did not provide any explanation as to how these examples combined to create meaning.

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

- responded clearly to the question, and began to move beyond it by discussing the purpose of the language choices
- included short introductions and conclusions which focused on the purpose of the texts
- included short, well-chosen evidence from the texts
- wrote well-structured paragraphs allowing the candidates to develop a thorough explanation and connect aspects of the text together
- discussed examples together within paragraphs to clearly show an understanding of how the aspects worked together to create meaning
- showed a clear personal response to the texts through their explanation of the use of language
- included a conclusion with personal response or comment on a wider context that sometimes required a clearer connection to the language or explanations given earlier.

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

- responded to the question and discussed the author’s purpose or wider contexts through the detailed explanation of how the aspects of the texts were used
- provided a range of evidence which was carefully selected to support their ideas
- discussed a range of techniques within paragraphs, discussing how different language features worked together to develop the author’s purpose
- wrote fluently in well-structured paragraphs which drew from different examples and built an argument without following a strict writing frame
- identified and discussed a wide range of writing techniques, which allowed them to give detailed analyses of how meaning was created
- commented on wider contexts and author’s purpose as part of their analysis of the evidence so that there was a clear connection between the text and ideas.

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

- followed the bullet point prompts but did not address the question specifically
  - wrote summaries of the texts or paraphrased large sections
  - identified the ideas in the texts without providing specific and relevant detail
  - wrote short responses which did not give enough detail as to how the language created meaning.
-