

Assessment Report

Level 3 Sāmoan 2017

Standards [91563](#) [91566](#)

Part A: Commentary

Many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the concepts presented in the texts. Candidates who structured their ideas and showed selection in the words and phrases used to formulate these ideas were more successful.

Part B: Report on standards

91563: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken Sāmoan texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed a basic understanding of the text
- gave adequate examples
- offered no extension of the ideas and concepts required in the answer, but stated the obvious
- made little attempt to “read” the provided contexts in order to help them make further meaning of the text
- used language and vocabulary which could have been clearer and more specific.

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

- showed very little or no understanding of the ideas in the texts
- made little attempt to develop a point in their responses.
- did not give meaningful responses
- did not give examples.

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

- showed a good level of understanding of the texts, and used this understanding to expand on ideas and concepts in their responses
- showed understanding of concepts, but did not fully explain them
- gave examples to illustrate their points, although these were not always used consistently throughout.

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

- discussed ideas that were in the texts, supporting their discussion with examples
 - went beyond the text, often including their own experiences
 - gave responses that were in depth yet concise.
-

91566: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and/or visual Sāmoan texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- stated the obvious already given in the texts
- showed superficial understanding of the concepts
- offered no extension of ideas and concepts
- made little attempt to “read” the provided contexts to help them make further meaning of the text
- used limited vocabulary
- gave few examples.

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

- showed very little or no understanding of the ideas in the texts
- made little attempt to develop a point in their responses
- did not give meaningful responses
- did not give examples.

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

- demonstrated a good level of understanding of the texts, and used this understanding to expand on ideas and concepts in responses
- showed understanding of concepts, but did not fully explain them
- gave examples to illustrate their points, although these were not used consistently throughout.

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

- discussed ideas that were in the texts, supporting their discussion with examples
- went beyond the text, often including their own experiences
- gave responses that were in depth yet concise.

[Sāmoan subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)
