

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Spanish
Level:	1
Achievement standard(s):	91974, 91975

General commentary

Overall, both assessments (reading and listening) gave candidates opportunities to demonstrate their understanding and show evidence of interpretation and analysis as required for Merit and Excellence. The length of the assessments, and the vocabulary and structures, were appropriate for Curriculum Level 6. Candidates should ensure that for Level 1, all responses must be written in either English or te reo Māori. Candidates who responded only in Spanish did not achieve in either standard.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91974: Demonstrate understanding of written Spanish related to everyday contexts

Assessment

The examination of AS91974 consisted of three passages with three questions each. The passages generally worked well, were interesting, accessible, and enabled a full range of grades for each question. The first passage was about a teenage student seeking advice on a health and well-being forum about how to balance school and social life, the second passage was about a student researching suitable accommodation for a trip, and the third passage was an email from a student describing his recent experience attending a concert in New Zealand.

Commentary

Candidates were awarded higher grades when they incorporated aspects of the texts into their response. Including direct quotes, especially in Spanish, was not sufficient to gain positive grades. Full translation of the texts was also not sufficient to demonstrate sound or thorough understanding. Candidates are expected to formulate a response to each question part, using information from each text.

To gain Excellence, candidates must draw conclusions to ensure they are answering the question fully. This often means that the final part of each question is very important and candidates need to allow enough time to address it. This may require candidates to choose the best option and justify why it is the best, but also outline why the remaining options are not the best.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of the overall message and identified the meaning of key ideas, information, and opinions in the texts
- communicated an overall sense, or intent, of the text, but at times left a lot of the information from the text out of their response, or did not write in enough detail.

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

- wrote more detailed responses, which included many aspects from the text
- selected evidence of ideas, information, and opinions to establish a greater meaning of the texts, which connected specific elements to support meaning or the intent of the texts
- attempted to justify their responses, however, these were not well-developed, and they often did not infer meaning from the text as part of their justification
- did not have enough detail in the final part of the question, which was needed to gain Excellence.

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

- demonstrated thorough understanding by writing complex responses which interpreted the language to make meaning, and was precise and fully constructed
- answered each question with justification and included many of the implied meanings, showing a deeper understanding of the texts
- went far beyond simply recording the details of the text in their response.

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

- showed little understanding of the language or meaning within each text and often wrote very short responses
- made information up in their answers or did not select enough information from the texts.

Achievement standard 91975: Demonstrate understanding of spoken Spanish related to everyday contexts

Assessment

The examination of AS91975 consisted of three passages with three questions each. The passages generally worked well, as they were everyday contexts, relatable, and offered a full range of grades for each question. While Passage One was a conversation between a student and a pharmacist, Passages Two and Three were conversations between students about traditional dances and exam preparations, respectively.

Commentary

Overall, marking showed a wide range of candidate understanding of spoken Spanish in everyday contexts. Many candidates were able to identify basic, key information, and were able to communicate a general sense of the gist of what the speakers were saying.

Candidates attaining higher grades were able to go beyond identifying isolated, basic details and showed understanding of more complex details, as well as how ideas were connected.

The most successful candidates, as well as showing thorough understanding of most details from the texts, demonstrated a thorough and precise understanding of both language and speaker intent. Candidates were able to draw conclusions about the texts and / or form opinions backed up by relevant detail from the texts.

Common challenges included relying on single words rather than meaning, misunderstanding verb tenses, and failing to justify responses with evidence from the listening texts and instead relying on prior knowledge and / or opinions to answer questions.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- displayed an ability to identify key elements of the spoken texts and communicate a general meaning or intent, understanding the overall gist of the texts
- recognise familiar vocabulary and expressions related to everyday contexts such as family, hobbies, health, traditions, or travel
- produced responses that showed some understanding of what was happening, for example, identifying that a speaker was talking about needing medication, an important tradition, or expressing an opinion
- produced responses that were often brief and not fully developed
- included correct details but did not clearly link them together
- developed misunderstandings, but the overall meaning was still conveyed.

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

- understood not only the overall gist of the texts, but also added a good level of relevant detail to their answers
- showed sound understanding by selecting relevant ideas, information, and opinions from the listening texts and clearly connecting them to support their answers
- explained meaning with reference to specific parts of the spoken text rather than relying on single words
- made accurate links between details, such as explaining similarities and differences between two dances, or explaining how someone got sick
- produced responses that showed logical development and a confirmed understanding of the text's intent
- included minor inaccuracies which did not significantly affect the overall interpretation.

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

- demonstrated thorough, detailed, and accurate understanding of the spoken Spanish
- interpreted language precisely and constructed fully developed responses that reflected both meaning and purpose
- showed clear awareness of the speakers' language choices, tone, and context. For example, they explained how the characters in the texts 'had a positive or negative experience in the pharmacy' by picking up on small details indicating the pharmacist was being kind / helpful / sympathetic
- produced responses that were well-justified, often drawing on multiple pieces of evidence from the text, and showed insight into why information was presented in a particular way
- gave responses that consistently referred back to the details from the texts to explain opinions.

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

- showed minimal or limited understanding of the spoken texts
- gave responses that relied on isolated words or guessed meanings without demonstrating overall comprehension
- used prior knowledge to answer questions, despite the fact that that information was not part of the text

- identified a small amount of relevant vocabulary, but were unable to communicate a clear meaning or intent
- misinterpreted key ideas or provided responses that were not supported by the listening text
- produced responses that lacked sufficient detail or accuracy to demonstrate understanding at Achievement level.