

# 2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

## Spanish

### Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

Candidates seemed to be familiar with the topics covered in the examination and this gave scope to answers that had ample points of view and allowed them to bring in prior knowledge on the topic.

Questions 1 and 2 were detailed and allowed students to deliver thoughtful answers that met the demands of the standard. Candidates demonstrated clear understanding of those questions. However, a large number of candidates failed to fulfil the requirements of Question 3 and simply repeated their answer from question 1. Even though many candidates had good language skills, they became quite repetitive as they concentrated on only one idea. The fact that they only had 5 minutes to plan their answer was not enough for them to prepare to reach the level of Scholarship and Outstanding Scholarship. Within this time frame, candidates were unable to prepare and deliver a valid, well-planned response that showed their ability.

It is of great benefit that in 2016 examination students will be allowed 10 minutes to draft their oral response to Question 3.

Those candidates who showed evidence of planning produced better answers across the board.

### Part B: Report on performance standard

<b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>showed excellent, accurate and idiomatic command of Spanish and employed an appropriate register of language</li> <li>expressed ideas that reflected mature thought processes</li> <li>explained the arguments in the texts and linked them with broader views on those topics as well as bringing in their own insightful opinions</li> <li>manipulated text in a logical manner and summarised information which resulted in confident and polished writing and speaking</li> <li>made connections of prior knowledge with the topic presented.</li> </ul>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>showed excellent, accurate and mostly idiomatic command of Spanish</li> <li>explained the arguments in the texts and incorporated further information and thoughtful personal opinions</li> <li>organised their ideas clearly and in a convincing way.</li> </ul>
<b>Other candidates</b>	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mentioned the resource material without developing or taking it further</li> <li>limited their answers to their own thoughts without referring or connecting it to the stimulus material</li> <li>answered the question as if it was a stand alone essay, giving an introduction that did not answer the question or provide any valid argument</li> <li>stated their opinion without backing it up, as per Question 1, in which candidates said that rules should be put in place to control advertising but then failed to say what these rules could be</li> <li>concentrated on one single issue for the whole answer, as per question 3 in which candidates repeated their answer from Question 1 concentrating on publicity instead of developing the different aspects of being a role model</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• showed limited proficiency or accuracy in the language used</li><li>• answered the questions in a superficial way</li><li>• did not engage the audience – especially in the speaking section- mainly because of intonation or because of constant repetition of the same idea.</li></ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	The Scholarship examination is very specific as to what language should be used in each question, being Spanish for Questions 1 and 3 and English for Question 2. A mixture of languages for any of these questions is not appropriate.