2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: Lea Faka-Tonga

Level: 2

Achievement standard(s): 91674, 91677

General commentary

Candidates performed well in these assessments, with an increase in Merit grades this year.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91674: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Lea Faka-Tonga texts on familiar matters.

Assessment

Candidates were instructed to listen attentively to three distinct audio recordings and answer the accompanying questions in detail, citing relevant evidence from the recordings to justify their responses.

Commentary

Over 80% of candidates used the listening notes section effectively to record detailed, relevant, and purposeful information to support their responses to each listening text. While the listening notes are not assessed, candidates who made use of them demonstrated a coherence of response.

Overall, candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of both the texts and the associated questions, as evidenced by the quality and accuracy of their answers. Very few candidates left questions unanswered or blank.

Many candidates provided brief but accurate responses that met the requirements of the standard; however, a lack of elaboration and supporting evidence limited these responses to the Achievement level. A small number of candidates demonstrated limited understanding of the texts and questions, with some responses being irrelevant or including information not supported by the texts. In some cases, cultural or linguistic factors were identified as barriers for candidates trying to understand contexts.

The results for this standard indicate a positive growth in the level of understanding of Lea Faka-Tonga. Candidates showed a strong understanding of the language used in the texts, which supported the production of well-developed and coherent responses.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- gave short, factual answers to the questions
- did not elaborate on their ideas and lacked supporting details
- demonstrated a sound understanding of the texts
- attempted most questions.

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

- demonstrated understanding of the contents and ideas presented
- used evidence of ideas and information, but not enough details were provided
- showed the ability to connect relevant ideas and information in the text to respond appropriately to the questions
- responded to all questions to varying degrees of depth.

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

- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts and the questions asked
- justified their opinions and conclusions well and were able to connect information with deeper meaning in their responses
- showed adequate development of their ideas and opinions and structured their responses well in a logical manner
- responded to all questions thoroughly.

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

- demonstrated a lack of understanding of the texts
- did not respond to the question accurately
- included information that was not in the texts and answers were unrelated to the questions
- left parts of the questions blank.

Achievement standard 91677: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Lea Faka-Tonga text(s) on familiar matters

Assessment

Candidates were presented with three written texts and were required to demonstrate their understanding by responding to a series of questions in detail, using evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Commentary

Overall, performance in this standard was weaker when compared to the listening standard. While most candidates identified key details from the texts, few effectively used this information to support their responses, which limited achievement at the Excellence level. Some candidates produced overly lengthy responses that included excessive detail not directly related to the questions, while others relied on prior knowledge rather than selecting and using relevant evidence from the texts. Rereading texts and making notes on the resource booklet could support candidates in their planning in future.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified some ideas from the text, partially answering the questions
- provided minimal, vague, or weak links to the text
- responded partly to the text, and partly to prior knowledge
- drifted away from the intent of the question with large amounts of irrelevant detail.

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

- showed a general understanding of the text
- used evidence from the text
- explained the rationale for their responses
- included some unnecessary detail, though the main ideas remained clear
- interpreted key details and applied them to the question.

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

- demonstrated strong understanding of all three texts
- provided details from the text that were relevant and appropriate for the question
- selected accurate and well-chosen evidence from the text to support their response
- consistently stuck to the focus of the question
- integrated evidence to show clear links between the text and the question
- made good use of planning spaces.

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

- showed very little understanding and did not communicate the general meaning of the text
- used evidence that was incorrect or unrelated
- did not address the question in a meaningful way
- left response spaces incomplete, or extermely brief.