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**Conduct of the test**

This test is conducted correctly, and this teacher-examiner demonstrates many examples of good practice. He is encouraging and friendly.

**Part 1 (Debate: En contra de la energía nuclear)**

Part 1 is a debate that requires candidates to present and to take a clear stance on any issue of their choice. At the end of this first part, the teacher-examiner moves to part two.

Examples of good practice in this part of the exam are that the teacher-examiner adopts the opposite view to the candidate and provides strong and meaningful challenges to allow him to defend his views and to use the language of debate and argument. The teacher - examiner argues that renewable forms of energy also have many problems and gives as examples windmills and solar panels.

Also, at the end of the debate, the teacher-examiner indicates that the examination is moving to the second part of the test and moves away smoothly to part two.

**Part 2**

In this part of the examination candidates need to demonstrate their ability to engage in a natural, unpredictable (but not unfamiliar) and meaningful discussion of two or three follow-up issues.

In this test, an example of good conduct of the exam is that all the questions asked by the teacher – examiner are at an appropriate intellectual level for an A Level exam. Also, both A2 GTA topics discussed are set within the context of the Spanish speaking world.

The total time for the WSP03 test is 11-13 minutes. Timing begins when the examiner asks the first question in Section A. The debate should last approximately 5 minutes.

This exam lasts 12 minutes 11 and the debate lasts 6 minutes 40.

**Assessment commentary**

**Spontaneity and development**

**Mark awarded – 19/20**

*This mark is awarded for the candidate’s performance across both parts of the test.*

In the WSP03 Mark Scheme we can see that 20 out of the 40 marks available are awarded for Spontaneity and development.

An example of good practice is that throughout the exam, the teacher-examiner gives the candidate the opportunity to demonstrate the ability to be spontaneous and the chance to develop his answers, showing the knowledge and understanding of the topics debated and discussed.

There is a high incidence of spontaneous and fluent discourse. The teacher- examiner addresses the points made by the candidate responding appropriately to his input and the candidate responds readily and fluently to all the questions asked with extended responses.

At times, it is the candidate who moves the conversation forward.

This performance fits the descriptors of the top box for Spontaneity and Development and the candidate is awarded 19 marks.

**Quality of language (Accuracy)**

**Mark awarded – 5/5**

*This mark is awarded for the candidate’s performance across both sections of the test, Parts 1 and 2.*

Highly accurate with authentic pronunciation and intonation. A high level of fluency throughout.

This performance, therefore, fits the descriptors of a mark of 5 for Quality of language (Accuracy)

**Quality of language (Range of lexis)**

**Mark awarded – 5/5**

*This mark is awarded for the candidate’s performance across both sections of the test, Parts 1 and 2.*

The candidate has a wide range of lexis and a good variety of complex structures.

This performance, therefore, fits the descriptors of a mark of 5 for Quality of language (Range)

**Reading and research**

**Mark Awarded 5/5**

*This box only assesses the candidate’s level of research and awareness of the chosen issue for debate.*

The candidate has excellent evidence to demonstrate that he has undertaken thorough research and wide reading into his chosen issue. He is able to formulate his opinions, justify his arguments and give examples to illustrate his answers. He offers many facts and figures.

To show evidence of the breadth and depth of his research, the candidate mentions three target language articles from two magazines and one newspaper: *Revista Nuclear de España*, *Ecologistas en Acción* and *El País*.

As the candidate has undertaken excellent research and has mentioned at least two sources, this performance fits the descriptor of 5, the top mark for Reading and research.

**Critical analysis**

**Mark awarded – 5/5**

Candidates will be assessed here on their ability to handle abstract concepts, not purely concrete exchanges. There will be a critical analysis of key issues and justified links between ideas, with coherent arguments mostly present that show a developing individual response.

In this exam two A2 GTA topics are discussed. Both topics are firmly rooted in the Spanish-speaking world and this allows the candidate to access the full range of marks.

During the discussion about *Modificación Genética and tecnológica*, when the candidate mentions Neil Harbbison (a Catalan raised British American that was the first person in the world with an antenna implanted in his skull), the teacher-examiner confirms that this topic is firmly rooted in Spain, by saying: *España es pionera y en Barcelona hay muchos activistas como Harbisson que están a favor de esto.* The candidate replies with another example, *Manel Muñoz.*

The candidate presents well-rounded individual responses, showing understanding of different sides to an argument. One example is when the candidate says: *Hay dos tipos de ciborgs, los ciborgs de restauración que buscan recuperar una función perdida … y los ciborgs de mejora que buscan mejorar las capacidades originales del ser humano … yo no estoy de acuerdo con ellos porque creo que llegaríamos a un punto donde todos los humanos no seríamos iguales y conseguiríamos la deshumanización … no habría límites.*

On the topic of *Eutanasia* the candidate expresses his own judgement by analysing the different facts, figures and examples and weighing up the arguments for and against euthanasia.

This performance fits the descriptors of a mark of 5 for Critical analysis.