

2022 NCEA Assessment Report



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Subject: Samoan

Level: 2

Standards: 91143, 91146

Part A: Commentary

Overall, most candidates did well. Candidates who had a deep understanding of the prescribed vocabulary in contexts were able to work with the language used in the texts and passages of Level Two external assessments. These candidates justified their opinions by giving evidence from the texts.

The most successful candidates were able to draw justified conclusions from the information provided, while also demonstrating a firm grasp of the language structures appropriate for this level.

It may be helpful for many candidates to reread their own responses, to ensure that they make sense. Candidates are reminded to ensure their answers should be based on information from the text, rather than prior knowledge and personal opinion. Quoting or direct translation alone are not sufficient evidence of thorough and clear understanding of the text.

Part B: Report on standards

91143: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Samoan texts on familiar matters

Examination

The examination contained three passages with questions relating to each passage. The passages included relatable contexts such as preparing for school exams, an interview with a student rugby player, and a poem about prayer. The questions covered the requirements of the 2022 assessment specifications and allowed for differentiation of candidate responses.

Observations

Candidates who made use of the planning notes page tended to answer the questions better than those who relied on memory of the listening passage. Detailed planning notes showed evidence that the candidate had listened carefully to the passage. Some candidates took good listening notes, but did not incorporate their observations in their response. Many candidates answered questions from their own knowledge without referring to the passage heard, this indicated that the candidate did not show understanding of the passage. Many Achievement level responses could have reached Merit if specific details and facts from the passage had been referred to. Candidates also needed to read the questions carefully to ensure their answers were linked to the specific spoken passage.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed basic understanding of vocabulary and structures

- made some reference to the text when giving opinions
- demonstrated general understanding of the gist of the passages / texts
- attempted to provide extended answers not entirely related to the question or based on their own opinion or general knowledge.

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

- provided very little knowledge of the text
- did not answer the question/s
- looked at a key word in the question and answered some (or most) of the question based on their own cultural knowledge but not from the listening passage
- answered one “sub-question” from each question
- did not demonstrate any understanding of the questions or text.

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

- provided more detail and connected relevant information from the text to support their understanding of some complex language
- used relevant prior knowledge
- gave examples from the listening passage
- provided more informative answers, indicating their clear understanding of the question
- were able to give more relevant detail – for Listening Passage One, candidates who answered Question 1c about Loto and Jane’s friendship including giving reasons as to why they thought the two were good friends
- attempted to give implied meanings but these were often based on their opinion or general knowledge rather than from the texts.

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

- demonstrated comprehensive understanding of the text by writing answers with most, or all, details correct
- answered questions with accurate detail
- took what they heard in the listening passage and often elaborated on it, using their own relevant prior knowledge – this was seen mostly in Question Three, where candidates identified the thoughts of the poet from the listening passage and gave their own interpretation with relevance to the last sub-part in Question Three about prayer and technology.
- used information understood from the text that was implied and not directly stated
- justified their ideas using evidence from the text.

91146: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and / or visual Samoan texts on familiar matters

Examination

This examination included three written texts with questions. The texts included topics of personal and / or community interest such as concerns over an upcoming dance festival, Samoan customs, and the effect of technology on Samoan language.

Observations

Candidates needed to carefully read and understand the question. Candidates who received a lower grade tended to offer knowledge, ideas, and opinions on the text without tailoring the response to the question asked.

Candidates who quoted, copied, or used direct translation alone did not show sufficient evidence of understanding the meaning of the texts and received a lower grade. Candidates who were awarded a higher grade demonstrated their knowledge of nuance and meaning implied, but not directly stated, in the text.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated they had understood the gist of the texts
- identified at least one idea from the text
- may have copied a couple of lines from the text but were able to add their own words into the final answer
- answered at least two out of the three sub-parts per question – this showed an understanding of the different texts
- made general points based on the text with some textual reference in their answers
- understood the text well and made accurate general statements and were able to communicate some conclusions, however their responses lacked the text evidence to back up their ideas
- showed understanding of the vocabulary and structures in the texts but did not show that they were able to select relevant information, ideas and / or opinions from the texts by answering the question
- gave some conclusions but did not include supporting evidence from the text.

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

- copied directly from the text. Although they might show an understanding of the question by writing the correct part of the text, it did not show their own thinking
- provided very little understanding of the text
- did not demonstrate any understanding of the question
- did not include enough supporting evidence or examples from the text to justify their answers
- made assumptions based on visual resources provided
- misunderstood the vocabulary or did not know enough of the language in the text to understand the general meaning of the text
- left responses incomplete or provided incorrect information.

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

- provided responses that were more developed and explained compared to the achievement-level responses
- provided valid examples and made clear links and references to the text to support their ideas and explanations
- were able to read between the lines but lacked examples from the text to justify their answers.
- referred to specific details and examples from the text (rather than copying directly) e.g. *“Just like the writer says...”* or *“like the mother writes in her letter...”*
- gave reasons for the ideas they got from the text, e.g. *“The mother wrote the letter because she was concerned that her child was committing a lot of time to dance practices*

afterschool. She writes the reasons for her concerns and is looking for answers from the teacher, how this will impact her child's schoolwork."

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

- justified, with critical thinking, clear links and references to the text to support their ideas and explanations
- used their own knowledge to identify ways to improve language learning and writing without technology AND why this would work AND why it should be done (Question Three)
- gave multiple reasons in their answers and showed comprehensive understanding of the content and underlying meaning of the text
- inferred and understood nuances and meanings not obviously stated in the text.