

This assessment report is based on assessments for 2023. It may not reflect achievement standards that have been updated.

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	German (RAS)
Level:	Level 1
Achievement standard(s):	91970, 91971

General commentary

A good range of grades was produced with all candidates achieving the reading standard (AS91970), and almost 75% of candidates achieving the listening standard (AS91971). It is pleasing to note that most candidates coped well with answering some different question types in these new standards.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91970: Demonstrate understanding of written German related to everyday contexts

Assessment

The assessment involved three questions on everyday contexts, which were followed by various straightforward questions. A mix of question types more varied than in previous standard assessments, some requiring shorter answers and others more in-depth responses, were able to gather the required evidence.

Some question types required candidates to finish a sentence, fill in a table, write paragraph answers (as in traditional papers), make true-or-false statements (if false, how do you know?), and comment on similarities and differences.

Most candidates coped very well with these question types, some of which were scaffolded. Candidates who gained **Achieved** generally showed a more limited vocabulary.

Commentary

Candidates who did not achieve **Excellence** did not demonstrate understanding of the level of detail required to achieve **Excellence**.

The main vocabulary that candidates had problems with were *Eiscafé* in Question One, which some candidates thought was iced coffee instead of an ice cream parlour, and in Question Two, *Muttersprache* was misunderstood as the language your mother spoke instead of one's first language or mother tongue.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of the gist of the passage, but lacked vocabulary knowledge to show detailed understanding
- wrote brief answers with little, or sometimes incorrect, supporting detail.

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

- communicated a clear understanding
- showed good knowledge of relevant vocabulary
- selected relevant details to support their answers.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence**

- communicated a thorough understanding
- wrote full, well-organised, and articulate answers
- fully justified their conclusions with supporting detail
- demonstrated an excellent command of vocabulary.

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

- did not show basic vocabulary knowledge
- showed understanding of very little of the passage
- wrote brief answers or longer ones that lacked relevance to the question.

Achievement standard 91971: Demonstrate understanding of spoken German related to everyday contexts

Assessment

Candidates listened to three discrete passages with straightforward questions requiring short answers. The first passage was based around the familiar topic of eating habits and featured high-frequency, familiar vocabulary, as this was the first German language item candidates met in the examination. The second and third passages, while possibly new settings, nevertheless contained further known vocabulary.

Commentary

Candidates who used the listening boxes to gather information and read all parts of the question before formulating their answers were more successful. In Question One, *es macht auch schneller satt als Toastbrot* was a challenge to most, who simply wrote that you could toast the bread or ignored the reference altogether. In Question Two, some candidates did not refer to the flower animals in the photo at all; none seemed to recognise Hinemoa's *Freund* as male (the German is specific). In Question Three, it was pleasing to see that most candidates had understood the explanation of clever planning in (a); however, the answers to (b) varied, with the best answers clearly relating back to the passage, while some candidates wrote just about their own experience.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of the gist of the passage, or parts of the passage
- demonstrated less secure vocabulary knowledge

- wrote briefer answers with limited supporting detail.

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

- showed more reliable vocabulary knowledge
- communicated clear understanding of the passage
- supported their answers with relevant points from the passage.

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

- used wide and secure vocabulary knowledge to show thorough understanding of all parts of the passage
- addressed the questions and wrote planned, articulate answers
- supported their answers with full, relevant detail from the passages.

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

- did not demonstrate the vocabulary knowledge to comprehend at a basic level
- sometimes recognised isolated lexical items, but not their context
- wrote very short answers and / or invented when unsure
- did not attempt to answer all parts of the question.