

Assessment Report

Level 3 Spanish 2017

Standards [91568](#) [91571](#)

Part A: Commentary

Candidates who used strategies to prove understanding of the listening passages and texts were successful in these standards. Therefore, all inferences and arguments needed to be backed-up by specific evidence from the texts rather than the gist of the text or personal understanding of the subject matter.

Candidates who achieved at Merit and Excellence made good use of the listening boxes and in the reading examination many had a tracking system, such as colour coding or underlining, which helped them ensure they had included all the relevant details from the text to support their answers. Successful candidates read the questions carefully and planned their answers so they addressed the question directly and organised their arguments logically and support them with information from throughout the texts.

Candidates continued to have the choice of answering questions in English, te reo Māori, and/or Spanish. Those candidates who chose to respond in Spanish generally provided some valid information from texts and passages and tried to address the questions directly, but tended to summarise information and omit important details. They sometimes failed to make inferences. These answers typically showed understanding of the general meaning of the texts, but omitted specific references.

Candidates who responded in Spanish did not consistently select relevant information from all parts of the texts or include a wide range of supporting arguments in their responses. Candidates who offered an exact transcription of the texts and passages in Spanish also failed to show their understanding.

Part B: Report on standards

91568: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken Spanish texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated a general understanding of the passages
- interpreted questions correctly and could give correct, or at least partially correct answers, but were unable to provide enough correct specific detail to support their responses
- provided basic details to justify their answers.

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

- failed to understand the main points of the texts or misinterpreted the passages and basic details
- did not address questions properly and merely listed details which were only partially correct at best
- offered their own opinion instead of basing their answers on the passage
- provided incorrect information
- provided some valid information that failed to encapsulate the gist of the texts.

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

- selected and linked information, messages and key points from throughout the passage
- developed their answers by adding some correct specific detail to justify their responses
- addressed all parts of each question correctly
- omitted or misinterpreted some of the complex information in the passages and were therefore unable to show thorough understanding.

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

- justified fully their ideas with a wide range of specific, detailed evidence from the passage
- developed well-articulated answers that were comprehensive with comparisons, opinions and conclusions that clearly showed knowledge of the implied meanings within the passage
- rearranged evidence from the texts to fit with their answer so that their responses flowed well and directly addressed all parts of the question.

Standard specific comments

Candidates who were more successful made extensive listening notes. Furthermore, they made sure to address the question in a structured manner and incorporated all relevant supporting detail from the passages in a meaningful way instead of merely listing details.

91571: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and/or visual Spanish texts

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of some or most of the main ideas in the texts and provided an answer that in general terms was logically consistent with the gist of the text
- omitted or misunderstood detail when attempting to develop their answers
- failed to draw conclusions or make inferences, or did so based on very superficial understanding of the texts or on their own personal experience
- included words or extracts from the text in Spanish when they did not understand them
- repeated and rephrased the same idea within their answer without adding any extra detail.

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

- produced answers which were logically inconsistent with the main ideas of the texts
- contradicted themselves within their answers thus showing their lack of general understanding
- based their answers on the recognition of single lexical items or cognates
- provided some valid information that failed to encapsulate the gist of the texts.

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

- could identify the main ideas of the texts and develop these with some specific detail extracted from the texts
- attempted to refer to some of the complex information in the text
- drew some conclusions and made some inferences but didn't consider all relevant points from the texts, thus providing an unbalanced argument
- connected some of the information within the texts meaningfully.

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

- understood a range of detail, including complex structures and nuances and communicated this unambiguously
- made good use of connectives to articulate their ideas explicitly
- made meaningful connections within the text
- explored the implications, inferences and possible conclusions of the information contained in the texts
- based all their inferences and conclusions on specific details from the text, showing their understanding or nuance
- produced responses that evidenced careful and thoughtful planning.

Standard specific comments

Candidates who produced very coherent responses and made some valid inferences did not gain Excellence if they omitted detailed and specific information from the texts. Careful and accurate translation of sentences or short segments is appropriate when used purposefully as part of an argument.

Some candidates constructed their answer based on the glossed vocabulary, cognates from the texts and their own knowledge of the subject matter. Those candidates did not mention enough relevant information from the actual texts, thus failing to show general understanding.

Spanish subject page

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority