



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Spanish - L2

Assessment Report

Level 2 Spanish 2016

Standards [91148](#) [91151](#)

Part A: Commentary

At this level, candidates are required to respond to texts on familiar matters. This encompasses an understanding of some aspects of the Spanish-speaking world and the peoples living within it. Some candidates failed to realise that Mexico and Spain are situated in different continents and that Madrid is not the capital of Mexico. This knowledge would avoid the confusion displayed in some Not Achieved answers.

Straight transcription of a text does not constitute evidence of clear (Merit) or thorough (Excellence) understanding. Answers that consisted of transcription tended to be much longer than was required to answer the question. Relevant information and ideas have to be selected and communicated clearly so that questions are answered. Candidates who achieved at the highest level expanded upon information and ideas from the texts and used the same information and ideas to support answers.

Candidates must realise that quoting directly from the texts does not constitute an answer unless making it clear that the meaning of this quoted material is understood. If answering in Spanish, it is important therefore to re-word the text, as copying sections does not constitute understanding.

Highest achieving candidates conveyed accurate information and detail in an articulate fashion, making required inferences from the text.

Part B: Report on Standards

91148: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken Spanish texts on familiar matters

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed general understanding of the idea of the passage
- successfully identified key phrases
- did not generally support ideas with detail from the text

- demonstrated a fair understanding of the level 1 and 2 appendices.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- made false assumptions
- guessed answers based on their own personal knowledge of a topic rather than the information in the text
- failed to answer at least one part of a question.

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

- understood the main ideas and developed these with some detail
- showed some ability to draw inferences from the passage
- made successful connections between the questions and the content of a passage
- wrote logical answers that were easily followed.

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

- understood detail and nuance
- communicated information clearly
- supported answers with detail from the text
- provided all, or nearly all, of the possible material from the text in answer to a question.

Standard-specific comments

Overall, a good understanding of the vocabulary and a good grasp of structure was displayed by candidates.

Candidates are encouraged to read questions carefully and answer what is required of them based on the passages heard. There is a clear example in question 1, part (a), where some candidates transcribed the text, giving a description of Shazia's trip to Spain but did not talk about how she must have felt, many of these ideas inferred from the text.

Candidates must try to heed detail, including it in support of their answers. Some candidates are making errors with numbers.

In this listening examination, many candidates showed evidence that they processed the information they heard, but some focused on only one or two basic details.

High achieving candidates made good use of the listening boxes and generally took their notes in Spanish, using them later to form an articulated response.

91151: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual Spanish texts on familiar matters

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified most of the main ideas in the texts
- omitted detail in support of their answers
- failed to make inferences.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- provided some information but failed to use it to form a valid answer
- produced answers inconsistent with the text
- made up answers based on their own understanding of a topic.

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

- wrote answers without using direct translation
- selected key ideas and information and articulated them well
- selected key details in support of answers
- based answers on many possible factors in the text.

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

- fully justified answers with material from the text
- articulated answers that showed understanding of nuance and implied meaning
- wrote clear, detailed explanations.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates are encouraged to read texts and questions carefully before providing answers. For example, in question 1, many candidates translated elements of the text rather than talking about what tourism will look like in the future.

In question 2, some candidates ignored the material in the visual text.

In question 3, some candidates failed to explain how it is that a “selfie” helps us to control our image.

Finally, candidates should realise that their ideas and opinions do not form part of a valid answer unless they support them with ideas and information from the texts.

[Spanish subject page](#)
