

This assessment report is based on assessments for 2023. It may not reflect achievement standards that have been updated.

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Lea Faka Tonga (RAS)
Level:	Level 1
Achievement standard(s):	92038, 92039

General commentary

It is evident that more than 90% of candidates made good use of the listening notes space to record lengthy, useful and relevant information for questions on each listening text.

Generally, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the texts and the questions, as reflected in their responses. It was also apparent that there were very few candidates who did not respond to any question or have a blank answer.

The very able candidates demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts and the questions asked. They justified their opinions and conclusions well and were able to connect information and understand the deeper meaning in the texts and provided appropriate supporting evidence. These candidates were graded in the Merit to high Excellence categories.

Other candidates gave brief but factual answers which were correct, but lacked elaboration or supporting evidence and these candidates were in the Achieved Category.

There were also those few candidates who demonstrated a lack of understanding of the texts and the questions as their responses were unrelated to the questions and sometimes included information that was not given in the texts.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 92038: Show understanding of written Lea Faka-Tonga related to everyday contexts

Assessment

Overall, the reading examination was of good quality, and the three texts were appropriate in terms of the contexts as they were based on current contexts from Aotearoa New Zealand, using topics that the candidates could encounter in their immediate environment. The language used was better suited for learners of the language and the vocabulary was within the Level 1 range except for that which was glossed. The questions were written so that the complete answer could be found in the texts by the candidates. The questions also allowed the candidates to interpret and connect information in the texts to provide quality answers as well as allow them to understand the deeper and implied meaning in the texts.

Commentary

It was generally observed that most of the candidates answered the questions in English and only a few responded in the target language of Lea Faka-Tonga. As such, there were very few, if any, who copied word for word in the target language from the text. However, with regard to the English used, it was generally a translation of the information given in Tongan in the texts.

Successful candidates were able to go beyond and provide deeper meaning answers than others. Responses were well-structured, succinct, and often elaborated on with supporting evidence provided.

There were only one or two candidates who left part of the question unanswered, and overall, the rate of answering all parts of the questions was very high.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided a very general answer to the question
- showed correct ideas and information, but did not build on their ideas and lacked supporting details
- answered only part of the question.

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

- demonstrated a sound understanding of the texts
- showed use of evidence of ideas and information but failed to develop these ideas further
- showed the ability to connect relevant ideas and information in the text to respond appropriately to the question.

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

- provided detailed and accurate understanding of the texts in their responses
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts and the implied meanings and knowledge in their explanation and justifying conclusions
- showed adequate development of their ideas and opinions in response to the question
- provided appropriate supporting evidence.

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

- did not respond to the question appropriately or accurately
- provided answers that were incomplete and lacked details
- demonstrated a lack of understanding of the texts.

Achievement standard 92039: Demonstrate understanding of spoken Lea Faka-Tonga related to everyday contexts

Assessment

The Achievement Standard 92039 is a listening examination and the examination was compiled according to the specifications given for this standard. The contexts of the texts were all from the immediate environment of the learners, using language that is within the Level 1 vocabulary. Any vocabulary that was beyond that of Level 1 was glossed. The language, the topics and the level of difficulty were all adjusted to suit candidates who are learners of the language and not native speakers.

Commentary

This examination was carried out digitally.

Very successful candidates showed a thorough understanding of the texts and questions. They answered all parts of the questions, and had a good grasp of what the questions were asking for. They interpreted the underlying meaning correctly and demonstrated the ability to link information and justify their ideas and opinions effectively as well as providing supporting evidence.

Those candidates who did not usually link their ideas and connect information and did not elaborate on their ideas fully often received Merit.

The Achieved candidates almost always did not elaborate on their responses. They often gave factual answers with no explanation or supporting evidence.

Unsuccessful candidate responses demonstrated a lack of understanding of the texts and what the questions were asking. Because these candidates interpreted the texts incorrectly, they gave answers that were not relevant to the questions.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided a general, factual answer to the question
- demonstrated correct ideas and information, but did not elaborate on their ideas and lacked supporting details
- answered only part of the question.

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

- demonstrated a sound understanding of the content of the texts
- used evidence of ideas and information, but not enough details were provided
- showed a general lack of development of their ideas and information
- showed the ability to connect relevant ideas and information in the text to respond appropriately to the question.

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

- provide detailed and accurate understanding of the texts in their responses
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts and the underlying meanings, while evidence from the texts was included in their explanation and conclusions

- showed adequate development of their ideas and opinions and structured their responses well in a logical manner
- provided appropriate detailed supporting evidence.

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

- did not respond to the question accurately
- provided answers that were incomplete and lacked details
- included information that was not in the texts
- demonstrated a lack of understanding of the texts.