

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Spanish
Level:	Level 2
Achievement standard(s):	91148, 91151

General commentary

In both achievement standards, successful candidates referenced the question in their answer without directly translating what was read or heard. They used specific, detailed, and relevant translations to justify their responses to the questions. Successful candidates did not grasp for inference by adding unnecessary personal opinion that wasn't connected to the questions or content of the texts, and set out answers in a structured manner.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The assessment was comprised of three listening passages. Topics included in the passages related to Spain and its Muslim history, teenage advice for online gamers, and the tourist attractions of Perú. All topics were at an appropriate level and relevant to Level 2 candidates.

Commentary

Most candidates showed an understanding of the key vocabulary and structures expected at Level 2 and summarised relevant information in order to answer questions appropriately. Some candidates translated sections of the text without inferring meaning from it, which hindered their ability to achieve Excellence. This was a particular issue for candidates responding in Spanish. High-achieving candidates justified their answers with relevant detail and examples from the passages, and demonstrated sound understanding of language nuances. Candidates should be reminded to read questions carefully to answer with what is required. They should also aim to base their answers on what they hear, rather than on their own knowledge and opinions.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated some of the general information required
- provided short answers, using some key vocabulary from the passages
- demonstrated difficulty with some key vocabulary (e.g. dulce, premio, bosque), higher numbers, and verb tenses, such as the past tense in Question Two

- did not successfully translate 'mil', instead referring to it as 'million'
- used the listening notes section sparingly.

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

- demonstrated understanding of the passages and communicated the main idea for each question with some detail and relevant examples
- made appropriate use of the listening notes section
- acknowledged the idea of Perú receiving three specific awards, but failed to grasp the message.

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

- crafted comprehensive responses, incorporating pertinent details and examples from the transcript to substantiate answers
- exhibited an extensive use of the listening notes section
- communicated ideas clearly and effectively
- understood all higher numbers
- inferred meaning from what was provided in the passages, rather than from their own ideas.

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

- did not make use of the listening notes section
 - lacked sufficient detail to address the questions
 - left some answer spaces blank
 - invented information based on personal knowledge or opinion which lacked relevance to the question
 - did not convey essential information.
-

Achievement standard 91151: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and / or visual Spanish text(s) on familiar matters

Assessment

The examination was of an appropriate level and covered a good variety of topics, allowing all candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the written texts fairly and in various ways.

Commentary

Successful candidates addressed the questions by using language from the questions as a starting point for their answers. They built their answers around relevant information from the texts. The questions could not be directly addressed by merely translating sections from the texts. Successful candidates processed the information, grouped it in a logical way, and drew 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 should make explicit and clear links with the texts. Careful and accurate translation of sentences or short sections is appropriate when used purposefully as part of an argument. Candidates should use information from the texts to justify their answers, especially for questions that ask for the candidate's opinion.

Factual information studied in class may not always be relevant for these assessments, which assess a candidate's comprehension of the provided texts. Candidates writing their answers in Spanish should note that comprehension is being assessed. This can be achieved by rephrasing and explaining information rather than copying paragraphs, adding detail and justifications, discussing the text rather than simply summarising it, avoiding personal knowledge or opinions unless they are backed up with information from the texts.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated understanding of some or most of the key lexical items in the texts
- provided answers that in general terms were logically consistent with the main idea of the texts
- omitted, or appeared to misunderstand, detail when attempting to develop answers, especially with the first and second texts
- did not 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 without evidence of understanding them
- repeated and rephrased the same idea within their answer without adding additional detail
- demonstrated understanding of the gist of texts but missed detail, or showed detailed understanding of a section of a text but did not understand the gist overall.

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

- identified the main ideas of the texts and developed these with some specific detail extracted from the texts

- attempted to refer to, but misinterpreted some of, the complex information in the texts and were therefore unable to show thorough understanding. This was particularly evident in Question Two
- did not use all or most of the information within the texts meaningfully. This was particularly evident in Question Three

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

- demonstrated a range of detail, including complex structures and nuances, and communicated this unambiguously
- made effective use of connectives to explicitly articulate their ideas
- made meaningful connections within the various parts of the texts
- explored the implications, inferences, and possible conclusions of the information contained in the texts
- based conclusions on all possible factors of relevance mentioned in the texts
- produced responses that evidenced careful and thoughtful planning
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the vocabulary list for Level 2 as well as a good understanding of the grammatical structures used in the texts to communicate meaning.

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

- produced answers which were logically inconsistent with the main ideas of the texts
 - produced answers based on their own opinions of the topics and omitted any information from the texts. This was particularly evident in Question One as the topic is very well-known
 - based responses on the recognition of single lexical items or cognates
 - provided some valid information but failed to encapsulate the main ideas of the texts
 - formulated answers based on isolated lexical items.
-