

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Spanish
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 schoolwork and assignments, a personal account of an adventurer, and the popularity of chess amongst young people. 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 part of the general information required
- provided short answers using some key vocabulary from the passage
- incorrectly translated some key vocabulary (e.g. *profesores*, *notas*)
- did not use the listening notes section sufficiently
- relied on their own ideas rather than evidence from the transcript
- repeated ideas and gave personal opinions in an attempt to infer meaning.

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

- understood the passages and could communicate the main idea for each question with some detail and a relevant example in partys
- made use of the listening notes section
- understood the idea of climate change being the motivation for the walk in Question Two
- understood the correct years and dates.

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

- provided comprehensive responses, incorporating pertinent details and examples from the transcript to substantiate answers
- showed comprehensive use of the listening notes section
- communicated ideas clearly and effectively
- inferred meaning from what was provided in the passages (rather than from their own ideas).

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

- provided responses with information that was either irrelevant or lacked sufficient detail to address specific bullet points
- demonstrated partial comprehension of basic cognates but responded with incomplete sentences
- left answer spaces blank
- made little or no use of the listening notes section
- formulated responses by inventing information based on personal knowledge and / or opinions
- displayed inadequate subject knowledge expected at Level 2, resulting in an inability to convey essential information – e.g. imperfect tense or *profesores, notas, deberes*.

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. The topics included a curious historical landmark, relationships between dogs and their owners, and young people looking for their first jobs.

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, and 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 overall gist.

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

- identified the main ideas of the texts and developed them 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 (which was particularly evident in responses to Question Two)
- did not use all or most of the information within the texts meaningfully, which was particularly evident in responses to Question Three.

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

- demonstrated understanding of a range of detail, including complex structures and nuances, and communicated them 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 Spanish, 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 responses to 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.