

Subject: Spanish

Level: 3

Standards: 91568, 91571

Part A: Commentary

Successful candidates read the questions carefully and planned their answers, so they addressed the question directly. They showed their understanding of the texts by backing-up their inferences and arguments with specific evidence from the texts rather than including their personal understanding of the subject matter. They organised their arguments logically.

Candidates can answer 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. They tried to address the questions directly but tended to summarise information and omit important details. They sometimes failed to make inferences. Candidates who offered an exact transcription or summary of the texts and passages in Spanish failed to show their understanding.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Examination

The examination consisted of three questions. Candidates were required to respond to all three. The texts related to concrete and abstract matters of social interest. Candidates listened and responded to recordings of three spoken texts with a total duration of up to 45 minutes. Candidates could listen to each spoken text once as a whole and twice in sections. They could make notes in the listening notes spaces provided.

Observations

Candidates who achieved with Merit or Excellence tended to make extensive listening notes. They addressed the question in a structured manner and incorporated all relevant supporting detail from the passages in a meaningful way, instead of merely listing details.

Grade awarding

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 provided insufficient detail to support their responses.

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

- did not address questions properly and merely listed details, which were only partially correct
- failed to understand the main points of the texts or misinterpreted the passages and basic details
- offered their own opinion instead of basing their answers on the passage
- formulated answers based on isolated lexical items.

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.

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

- justified fully their ideas with a wide range of specific and detailed evidence from the passage
 - developed well-articulated answers that were comprehensive with comparisons, opinions, and conclusions, that clearly showed understanding 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.
-

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

Examination

Candidates were required to respond to all questions in the examination. They read and responded to three written texts, relating to concrete and abstract matters of social interest.

Observations

Successful candidates addressed the questions by using wording in the questions as a starting point for their answers. They built their answers around information in the text and used all the relevant information.

The questions could not be directly addressed by merely translating sections from the text. Candidates needed to process the information, group it in a logical way and draw conclusions.

Some candidates produced very coherent responses and made some valid inferences but failed to gain Excellence as they omitted detailed and specific information from the texts.

Candidates are encouraged to always make explicit and clear links with the text. Careful and accurate translation of sentences or short sections is appropriate when used purposefully as part of an argument. It is important to use the information from the texts to justify answers.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified key vocabulary
- provided relevant information and demonstrated a general understanding of the texts, but also included some inaccurate or misunderstood details
- confused false friends such as *experimentar*, *realizar* and *quitar*
- wrote only about the positives of technology rather than the negatives as well or based the negatives on their own experience rather than on details from the text.

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

- produced answers which were logically inconsistent with the main ideas of the texts
- produced answers totally based on their own opinions of the topics and omitted any information from the texts
- based their answers on the recognition of single lexical items or cognates
- provided some valid information but failed to encapsulate the gist of the texts.

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

- provided detailed responses that directly answered questions and identified key points from the text
- included specific evidence from the texts when justifying their responses
- made reference to the legend of weaving and acknowledged the economic support it would give the communities in Question One
- made evidence-based arguments for both the positives and negatives of technology in Question Two
- made links between not having money and voluntourism not requiring as much money and wrote about the activities in the advertisement in Question Three.

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

- responded fully to each part of the questions, using all relevant pieces of information from the text as evidence
- showed understanding of nuances in meaning
- showed understanding of the fine detail of the texts in a comprehensive manner, at times impressively, with justifications for their responses
- made links to environmental benefits and the importance of preserving indigenous culture, or explained the benefits of having a website and global reach in Question One
- understood the nuance of artificial cars being beneficial to disabled or elderly people, and made links to technology affecting our lives since the start of the industrial revolution in Question Two
- made links to why volunteers worsen the situation and how Rafael addressed his friends' concerns in Question Three
- showed correct understanding of false friends, such as *experimentar*, and were able to select the correct meaning in lexical items with more than one meaning, such as *ganar*
- demonstrated understanding of NZC Level 8 vocabulary that enabled them to encapsulate the nuances of the texts, such as *perjudicial*, *destino*, *bondad* and *disponible*.