

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Spanish Level 3 91568, 91571

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

The different types of listening passages and texts in this examination provided candidates with a fair range of language and contexts from which to distinguish the key messages and extract appropriate information for the answers. Successful candidates gave varied yet relevant ideas and explanations according to their interpretations of the questions and the messages of 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 mostly provided valid information from texts and passages and tried to address the questions directly, but generally displayed a tendency to summarise information, omit important details and failed to make inferences, thus failing to show clear or thorough understanding. It is advisable that candidates who respond in Spanish select relevant information from all parts of the texts and include a wide range of supporting arguments to their responses. Candidates who offered an exact transcription of the texts and passages in Spanish also failed to show their understanding.

Some candidates opted for a direct translation of the texts, particularly in Questions 1 and 2 of the reading examination. These candidates showed their clear understanding but failed to achieve Excellence for their responses as they did not go beyond the text by making inferences or expanding on implied meanings.

Candidates need to remember that the purpose of this examination is to show their understanding of the listening passages and texts. Therefore, all inferences and arguments need to be backed up by specific pieces of evidence from the texts rather than the gist or their own understanding of the subject matter. This was particularly apparent in Questions 3 and 4 of the reading examination.

Candidates who achieved highest 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. The successful candidates read the questions carefully and planned their answers so they addressed the question directly and were able to organise their arguments logically and support them with information from throughout the texts.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91568: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended spoken Spanish texts

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated a general overall understanding of the passages • included little or no detail to support their answers • provided some valid information but did not always address questions directly • in Question 1, identified three aspects in which the new technologies have an impact but provided little supporting evidence or concentrated on one section only • in Question 2, outlined some of the 5 environmental issues that Luke and Victoria referred to, but did not support their answer with details from the passage, or based the explanations around limited understanding of lexical items. When comparing both countries, candidates concentrated on the aspects that each was doing better at (i.e. New Zealand has more natural spaces but Spain has cleaner rivers), rather than analysing their performance on each aspect • in Question 3, focused on either the players or the fans but not both and substantiated their feelings with isolated pieces of evidence from the text.
-----------------	---

<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempted few questions • failed to show understanding of the passages and the vocabulary expected at this level • did not address the questions at all • in Question 1, based their answers around a few lexical items understood from the passage, some cognates and their own experience with social media and new technologies • in Question 2, identified few or none of the five environmental issues mentioned in the passage and understood but misinterpreted some lexical items, particularly in regards to New Zealand being a young country, the pollution in New Zealand rivers and the situation of Spanish beaches • in Question 3, provided some basic emotions, mainly around the understanding of the lexical item “intimidado”, but failed to provide any detail from the text thus showing no understanding.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were able to select information, messages and key points from throughout the text • developed their answers in more detail to show understanding, according to what the questions required • in Question 1, understood complex detail from a range of sections • in Question 2, were able to identify most of the environmental issues and some of the detail to support their arguments, but failed to understand enough nuance to conclude that both countries were caring for the environment in some way but could improve their performance • in Question 3, provided both attitudes and substantiated them with details from the passage, developing on their evidence for either one or both of them.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were able to fully justify their ideas and show evidence of thorough understanding of the texts • developed explanatory and comprehensive answers with comparisons, opinions and conclusions that showed understanding of nuances and implied meanings • were articulate in their expression and clear in explanation • in Question 1, crafted their responses with a wide range of arguments from the passage, were able to identify overarching themes and used the information from the passage to infer positive or negative effects that were not obviously stated • in Question 2, were able to develop their answers with nuances from the passage that helped them construct a balanced argument and could compare how each country was performing in each of the five aspects identified and make suggestions for improvement • in Question 3, were able to explain both attitudes and used details to infer reasons why they would feel this way or added nuance to the emotions stated in the text.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>Parts of a question are not designed to correlate with sections of a listening passage. Rather, the entirety of the question is designed to correlate with the entirety of the passage. Questions are designed to be answered holistically, therefore a candidate who has listened to all sections of the passage should be able to answer all parts of a question. Candidates, however, should follow specific instructions where given, as these are designed to make the listening examination easier to deal with. E.g. If a candidate is advised to use Section A or Section B to answer a specific question, they should do so.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91571: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of extended written and/or visual Spanish texts [Click here to enter standard number.](#)

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided answers that demonstrated a general understanding of the main ideas of the texts • in Question 1 and Question 2, outlined José and Maddie’s decisions, and in general terms how these impacted on their relationship with their parents and their economic prospects • in Question 3, identified the main traits of the story being narrated by a child using ideas from the text and not just their own personal judgement of what a child narrator would say, and explained how this would be different were the narrator an adult • in Question 4, showed understanding of the existence of an imaginary world created by the girl while something unpleasant was happening in the real world • provided answers to Questions 3 and 4 that were consistent with the text and drew valid conclusions, but failed to include any specific details to support their answers, thus being unable to show clear understanding.
<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided some isolated pieces of information from the text but connected them in a way that did not show understanding of the gist • in Question 1 and Question 2, failed to identify all or some of the key points: that José stayed at home and his relationship with his parents improved; that Maddie did leave home; that José did not have to work and had everything paid for him or that Maddie had to have a job and now has a candidate debt to pay back • in Question 3 and Question 4, provided responses that were inconsistent with the text or based their arguments on common sense rather than the ideas from the text. A large number of Not Achieved responses only revealed understanding of isolated cognates and the glossed vocabulary.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were able to communicate some or most relevant detail from the texts and develop their answers • used information from throughout the text • in Question 1 and Question 2, identified the main ideas in the text and were able to provide some accurate detail, or translated correctly most or all the relevant information from the texts, but failed to draw any conclusions or make inferences of their own • in Question 3 and Question 4, were able to make inferences, as these were directly required to be able to answer the questions, but based these inferences on general information and some relevant detail from the text that was simplified or showed clear understanding of only some sections of the text.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addressed the questions directly • answered all questions completely and were able to express comprehensible and articulate answers often using complex English • in Question 1 and Question 2, provided answers that featured an accurate account of most or all the relevant ideas and offered conclusions and inferences of their own (for example, José and Maddie started off in a similar situation but developed differently, José’s relationship improved thanks to living at home as an adult, José’s good grades will enhance his ability to obtain a job or him living at home might impact him negatively as he has not developed the skills to be independent) • in Question 3 and Question 4, based their inferences and conclusions on a wide range of supporting detail from the text or accurately translated sections from the text (specific information on what the fairy world involved, the context of the Civil War, Ofelia’s family situation, Vidal’s personality and what he does, etc.) to support their arguments.

Standard specific comments

It should be emphasised that the key to success in this examination is to address the question directly, providing a clear argument based on supporting evidence accurately translated from the texts and using this information to infer meanings not obviously stated in the text and draw informed conclusions.