2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Spanish
Level:	3
Achievement standard(s):	91568, 91571

General commentary

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

Candidates should make sure they select relevant information from all parts of the texts and include a wide range of supporting arguments in their responses.

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, and sometimes did not make inferences. These answers typically showed understanding of the general meanings of the texts, but lacked specific references.

Candidates are encouraged to practise completing these standards in exam conditions to ensure they plan their time appropriately to allow time to answer all three questions.

Candidates should make use of all available resources when answering questions, including information such as titles, images, and captions.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The assessment was comprised of three listening passages. The topics included in the assessment included fast fashion, protest action, and the use of artificial intelligence in schools. All topics were at an appropriate level and relevant to Level 3 candidates.

Commentary

Candidates who were more successful tended to make 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.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered the questions using some of the available information as evidence
- noted the key points and details of the passages
- provided responses that reflected the general meaning of the passages.

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

- answered the questions giving clear evidence from the passages
- provided responses that reflected the general meaning of the passages and also included additional evidence and details
- were able to expand on the details of passages, demonstrating understanding of the more complex vocabulary items and language structures.

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

- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the passages by providing detailed answers to the questions, with explanations and nuanced details
- were able to infer meaning not explicitly stated in the passages from the details provided, or linked information together to form conclusions based on the evidence
- had a strong lexical comprehension and were able to interpret vocabulary items contextually, enabling them to provide the most accurate meanings in their response
- provided answers that reflected understanding of different grammatical structures relating to a range of time periods and situations.

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

- included prior knowledge about a topic in their response instead of referring to evidence from the passage
- did not provide enough key points or details, or provided irrelevant information
- misunderstood the general meaning of the passage
- translated individual words, cognates, or glossed vocabulary, but did not demonstrate sufficient evidence that they knew how these related to the passage or question.

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

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 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 should be 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.

Candidates should always be reminded of the importance of using the information from the texts to justify their answers.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated the main points of each text unambiguously
- translated and / or paraphrased parts some parts of the texts to justify their answers, but omitted or mistranslated detail

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 text and were therefore unable to show thorough understanding
- failed to demonstrate thorough understanding as they misunderstood some sections or lexical items in the texts.

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

- wrote clear and correct answers that identified all main points covered within a text
- added a substantial amount of correctly interpreted specific and complex detail from the text
- correctly inferred the underlying themes of each 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 that failed to encapsulate the main ideas of the texts
- formulated answers based on isolated lexical items
- failed to complete part of the exam.