

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: Lea Faka-Tonga
Level: 3
Achievement standard(s): 91682, 91679

General commentary

The examination results show that a good percentage of candidates demonstrated a clear and in-depth understanding of the texts. These candidates were able to interpret the implied meanings effectively. Their responses were well-structured, concise, and provided clear justifications for their conclusions with relevant supporting evidence. Candidates displaying these type of responses typically earned Merit or Excellence grades.

Candidates that drew only general conclusions about the texts typically gave answers that were vague and lacked the necessary details to achieve grades above the Achieved level.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91682: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and/or visual Lea Faka-Tonga texts

Assessment

The examination featured three passages of distinct text types. The first text examined the diverse experiences of two students regarding the water supply in their village. The second text offered a dialogue between friends discussing the pressures associated with a Tongan engagement. The third text was an article profiling a musician. All three texts addressed broad themes such as societal issues, community, relationships, education, and employment, making them appropriate for Level 3 Lea Faka-Tonga. Each passage provided sufficient information for candidates to achieve grades of Achieve, Merit, or Excellence. The vocabulary used was consistent with Level 8 of the New Zealand Curriculum, with any terms outside this level being glossed for clarity.

Commentary

This year only a small number of candidates attained the high excellence score of 23–24. Many candidates lacked the necessary fluency in the target language to comprehend implied meanings within the texts and to formulate justified conclusions.

A number of candidates submitted lengthy responses that included contradictory information, demonstrating a limited understanding of the material. Consequently, these candidates frequently received an Achieved grade.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided very brief factual responses with no explanation or supporting evidence
- demonstrated general understanding of the information in the texts.

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

- demonstrated clear understanding of the texts and questions
- demonstrated development of information and ideas with relevant supporting evidence
- provided clear grammatical language and vocabulary
- provided appropriate responses to all or most parts of the questions.

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

- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts and questions
- included implied meanings and knowledge with relevant supporting evidence in their answers
- provided complete and succinct answers that were well structured in a logical manner.

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

- demonstrated lack of understanding of the texts
- provided incomplete answers with irrelevant details to the questions
- did not provide answers to all parts of the question
- included information that was not relevant to the texts.

Achievement standard 91679: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken Lea Faka-Tonga texts

Assessment

The examination was appropriate for the Level 3 Lea Faka-Tonga standard, featuring passages of different text types on community, health, and education. The reading pace and passage lengths were suitable for this level, and the language matched the Level 8 New Zealand Curriculum. Any vocabulary that was too advanced was glossed.

The first text was a direct conversation between a grandfather and granddaughter on a health benefit for Tonga. The second text was a phone call conversation between two friends about a film “Lea Tupu’anga” or Mother Tongue. The third text was a podcast about Malohi’s dream.

The questions provided the opportunity for candidates to achieve grades from Achieved to Excellence, asking candidates to support their ideas with evidence from the texts. Many candidates showed a lack of understanding by repeating information or giving long, irrelevant answers. Their responses were often too general and included details not present in the texts.

Commentary

Candidates that used the space for their listening notes but did not apply this information to answer the questions did not achieve to a level that their knowledge suggested they could. Some candidates showed they understood the text in their responses but did not provide evidence to support their answers. Those who scored well in this exam demonstrated a clear understanding of the texts and included detailed evidence to support their statements.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided answers that were related to the questions
- did not provide answers with detailed supporting evidence
- did not use the correct vocabulary relevant to answering the questions.

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

- demonstrated clear understanding of the texts with supporting evidence
- demonstrated development of information and ideas with sufficient supporting evidence.

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

- provided complete answers to all questions
- demonstrated thorough understanding of the text by providing clear responses with relevant supporting evidence
- provided clear and appropriate use of vocabulary at curriculum level 8
- provided detailed answers with implied meanings and supporting evidence to the questions.

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

- demonstrated lack of understanding of the questions
 - provided answers that were not relevant to the questions
 - provided incomplete and irrelevant answers to the questions.
-