

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: Samoan
Level: 3
Achievement standard(s): 91563, 91566

General commentary

Candidates who provided detailed explanations and supported their answers with relevant details demonstrated a strong understanding of the material. Successful candidates were able to express their ideas clearly and concisely, using examples to reinforce their points. It was crucial for candidates to address all aspects of the assessment to provide sufficient evidence for achieving high grades. A solid grasp of Level 8 vocabulary and structures was essential for higher achievement, as it allowed candidates to express their ideas effectively and demonstrate a deeper understanding of the material.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91563: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken Samoan texts

Assessment

The assessment required candidates to answer questions based on three different spoken passages. Each passage was played once as a whole and then separately in sections. Each question required candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the passage and provide supporting evidence.

Commentary

Candidates who made detailed notes while listening to the passages were able to refer to these notes to support their answers and demonstrate a sound understanding of the material. Many candidates articulated their points clearly and concisely, backed by relevant examples from the passage. However, a common issue was that some candidates relied too heavily on paraphrasing, often using wording too close to the original text instead of expressing ideas in their own words. This affected their overall grade, as their responses lacked the personal engagement and analysis required.

To achieve higher grades, candidates should focus on answering all parts of the assessment thoroughly, providing original explanations and analysis, and ensuring their responses are both structured and reflective of the material. A deeper engagement with the content, rather than merely listing facts or paraphrasing, would significantly improve the quality of responses and demonstrate a more thorough understanding.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated a general understanding of the texts, showing they could identify key ideas and relevant vocabulary, even if their understanding was surface level
- interpreted questions correctly, though their responses often lacked full depth or analysis
- provided partially correct answers, but these answers sometimes needed more elaboration or critical engagement with the material
- did not fully analyse or integrate the information in a detailed or highly structured way, limiting their ability to reach higher marks.

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

- provided clear opinions that were well supported by specific evidence from the passages, demonstrating a deeper understanding
- used supporting evidence effectively to back up their answers, ensuring their responses were grounded in the material
- connected ideas appropriately, showing an ability to analyse and relate different points from the passages to the broader question or context
- provided responses that reflected stronger critical thinking, although there was still room for more depth or further refinement in their analysis.

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

- developed well-structured answers that were comprehensive, incorporating comparisons, opinions, and conclusions
- demonstrated an excellent understanding of implied meanings within the texts
- utilised valid and relevant evidence from the passages to support their answers, ensuring their responses were cohesive and well organised
- directly addressed all parts of the questions, linking ideas together effectively
- provided a sophisticated level of analysis, showing an ability to interpret both explicit and implicit content, with responses that were thoughtful, nuanced, and well rounded.

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

- offered their own opinions rather than basing their answers on the passages
 - did not connect their responses to the information provided in the passages
 - showed recognition of limited individual words from the passages but were unable to fully answer the questions, often providing responses that were too vague or lacked relevant detail
 - provided answers that typically lacked depth or context
 - struggled to demonstrate an understanding of the key points or how the information in the passage directly related to the question.
-

Achievement standard 91566: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and / or visual Samoan texts

Assessment

The assessment required candidates to answer questions based on three different written texts. Candidates were expected to find information from the texts to answer the questions and justify their conclusions.

Commentary

Candidates demonstrated varying levels of understanding, with the strongest responses clearly engaging with the text and its implied meanings. One of the significant challenges was the ability to read between the lines and provide deeper analysis, particularly for questions that required cultural or social inferences. While many candidates were able to identify basic details, others struggled with more complex aspects, such as interpreting the implied meanings behind actions or words.

Successful candidates went beyond summarising the texts and providing analytical responses that were supported by specific examples. However, common areas for improvement included clearer response structure, more effective use of text evidence, and avoiding personal opinions or assumptions that were not based on the text. Many candidates rushed through the text, which hindered their ability to identify subtle meanings. Taking the time to re-read the text multiple times would help in grasping deeper nuances.

Additionally, some candidates misinterpreted the questions, leading to responses that were based more on personal opinions than on text evidence. A thorough understanding of the full scope of each question is essential to ensuring the responses align with the material. Another frequent issue was the failure to link evidence directly to conclusions or relying on quotes without analysis. Effectively using text evidence is crucial for justifying answers and demonstrating a deep understanding of the content.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated some of the general meaning of the text
- identified the main ideas
- justified their responses with basic details, but often lacked specific or in-depth analysis
- provided some evidence from the text to support their points, but these details were often insufficient or not fully explained, making it difficult to demonstrate a clear understanding of the text.

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

- provided responses that were more developed and clearer compared to those at the Achievement level
- offered more meaningful explanations and demonstrated a good level of understanding of the text
- gave examples to support their points, though their use of evidence was occasionally inconsistent or lacking depth
- communicated most of the main points but did not fully explore some aspects or provide comprehensive support for all conclusions.

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

- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the text, capturing the nuances and implied meanings
- provided detailed supporting evidence from the text to fully justify their conclusions
- showed a deep understanding of the finer details, connecting ideas clearly and effectively
- provided responses that were comprehensive and well organised, demonstrating insightful analysis and critical thinking.

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

- gave little or no correct evidence to support their answers
 - did not provide meaningful responses, often missing key details from the text
 - failed to communicate the general understanding or meaning of the text, making it difficult to gauge their comprehension.
-