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**Conduct of the test**

This test is conducted correctly, and the teacher-examiner demonstrates examples of good practice. During the exam the teacher-examiner develops a good rapport with the candidate. He is encouraging and friendly.

**Part 1 (Debate: A favor de los cyborgs)**

Part 1 is a debate that requires candidates to present and to take a clear stance on any issue of their choice.

The total time for the WSP03 test is 11-13 minutes. Timing begins when the teacher-examiner asks the first question in Section A. This exam lasts 12minutes 25 seconds.

This candidate starts her introduction saying: I am going to talk about cyborgs and continues explaining what cyborgs are. It is only after her explanations that we know that the candidate is in favour of using cyborgs.

**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. The questions asked must show progression from AS to A Level.

In this test, an example of good conduct of the exam is that the teacher - examiner asks questions which are challenging and at an appropriate intellectual level for A Level.

If many unconnected topics are covered in this section, the discussions result in a Question-and-Answer session. Consequently, candidates are unable to explore the topics in sufficient scope and depth.

**Assessment commentary**

**Spontaneity and development**

**Mark awarded –11/20**

*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. Therefore, it is very important that teacher-examiners give candidates the opportunity to demonstrate the ability to be spontaneous and the chance to develop their answers showing the knowledge and understanding of the topics debated and discussed.

This test is clearly spontaneous, and the conversation develops naturally. The exam is teacher-led. The candidate can develops her responses, but her answers are sometimes short, straightforward, and repetitive. The candidate regularly requires some prompting from the teacher -examiner.

Examples of good practice is the way the teacher interacts with the candidate.

Talking about euthanasia: The candidate says: *la gente que decide tomarse la eutanasia es valiente .. pero si no estás muy mal o sabes que podría haber una posibilidad de sobrevivir, no debe tomársela ya que tiene familiares que pueden sufrir.* The teacher examiner picks up on what the candidate says and agrees with her: ¡*Claro! Esto es lo que dice la gente que se sitúa en contra de la eutanasia*. ¡Que hay esperanza! The candidate continues*: si la enfermedad es terminal o estás sufriendo mucho, cada uno debería ser libre de hacer lo que quiera*. The teacher examiner responds to the candidate and prompts her to clarify and expand her response by saying: *Sí, así es en España, pero tampoco es algo tan fácil como lo que tú dices* ¡*Ahora ya está! Hay un procedimiento, ¿no?*

This performance fits the descriptors of a mark of 11/20 for Spontaneity and Development.

**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 2/5**

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

The teacher-examiner demonstrates good practice when he challenges the candidate’s views and gives her suitable opportunities to demonstrate her ability to argue her case and justify her opinion.

This candidate has ideas and opinions but there is little evidence of reading and research into her chosen topic. During the initial outline of her stance there is an explanation of what cyborgs are, and towards the end, the candidate mentions the fact that in Sweden there are four thousand people that have cyborgs in their bodies.

Candidates need to provide supporting evidence for their arguments during the whole debate. It is not good practice to include a big part of their information and research when they are outlining their stance. This information could have been used in the actual debate.

The initial presentation of the stance can be short, one or two sentences is enough.

This candidate does not mention any sources.

This performance fits the descriptors of a mark of 2 for Reading and research.

**Critical analysis**

**Mark awarded – 2/5**

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, there is partial explanation of key issues. Little evidence of deeper thinking or ability to evaluate, the candidate mainly provides points of view and some facts.

An example of good conduct of the exam is: Talking about immigration, the candidate says: *… es difícil integrarse porque es dejar todo atrás.* The teacher-examiner seeks the opportunity to ask a challenging question that gives the candidate the opportunity to analyse this issue: *¿Tú, qué crees qué supone integrarse? cuando vas a otro país.* The candidate replies: *Pues, la cultura, tienes que integrarte y hacerte a la cultura ya que podría ser diferente a la cultura de dónde vienes y … ya está … bueno, pues … encontrar trabajo y todo.*

This performance fits the descriptors of a mark of 2 for Critical analysis.
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