

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 1 Lea Faka-Tonga 2019](#) ▾

Level 1 Lea Faka-Tonga 2019

Standards [91669](#) [91672](#)

Part A: Commentary

Successful candidates selected relevant information and communicated their understanding of the texts using their own words.

Highly successful candidates were able to understand the inferred meaning within the text and were able to write comprehensive and coherent responses.

Candidates are encouraged to read the questions carefully so that they understand the requirements before writing an answer.

Part B: Report on standards

91669: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Lea Faka-Tonga texts on areas of most immediate relevance

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of the general points of the texts, but lacked detailed understanding needed for a higher grade
- had a vocabulary range that enabled them to understand the general meaning of the texts, even if they missed some detail.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- lacked the vocabulary needed to understand the meaning of the texts
- failed to present enough material to be assessed
- misunderstood the basic meaning of the texts.

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

- made comprehensive listening notes
- included relevant information in their responses
- made connections between different parts of the texts
- included details from the text in their answer.

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

- showed a refined understanding of all or almost all relevant points in the texts
- developed answers that showed inferred meaning by making connections between different parts of the texts
- made comprehensive listening notes and utilised them in their answers
- recognised the different tenses used and their relevance in the texts, as well as more complex connectives.

91672: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of Lea Faka-Tonga texts on areas of most immediate relevance

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- understood the general meaning and some of the key ideas
- recognised basic structures and language
- provided mostly correct information, but it was sometimes vague
- lacked depth, development, and detailed information to reach a higher level.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved**

- lacked clarity in their responses
- fabricated answers that did not fit the questions
- did not provide enough evidence to show basic understanding, nor the general meaning of the texts.

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

- understood more complex sentences and language features
- wrote detailed answers that addressed the questions
- provided relevant and detailed information in an unambiguous way
- attempted to draw conclusions, but did not support them fully with evidence from the texts.

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

- showed logical reasoning through their answers that were supported and justified by relevant details from the texts
- captured nuances within each text and meaningfully included them in their responses
- had an excellent understanding of complex language features and structures
- understood the implied meanings of texts
- differentiated between the various meanings for words depending on the context.

[Lea Faka-Tonga subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2018 \(PDF, 102KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 40KB\)](#)

[2016 \(PDF, 205KB\)](#)