

Subject: German

Level: 2

Standards: 91123, 91126

Part A: Commentary

These standards require candidates to show understanding of the texts and passages, and to display their understanding with information, ideas, and opinions from the text. Successful candidates read the question and then answered it comprehensively and directly with no unnecessary information and without going off on a tangent. They included more of the text examples and evidence in their answers, rather than merely making general statements.

Higher achieving candidates read their response through to ensure their answers made sense, that no crucial words were missing, and spelling and grammar were accurate.

Part B: Report on standards

91123: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of spoken German texts on familiar matters

Examination

The examination was made up of three passages with questions relating to each passage. The questions allowed for differentiation of candidate responses.

Question 1 was about four band members talking about their favourite free time activity. The candidates were required to give their opinion on which band member would make an ideal flatmate.

Question 2 was about an online forum to help young people being bullied and candidates had to demonstrate understanding of how the website functioned.

Question 3 had two reviews from people who had spent the weekend in a hotel perched above a wolf enclosure – one enthusiastic and the other not so.

Observations

On the whole candidates were able to relate to the themes of the texts and offer evidence of personal connection with the themes in their answers.

However, the text about bullying provided fewer opportunities for success. Although the vocabulary was at the appropriate level, the text proved difficult for some students, and many showed little understanding of what helpful suggestions Alexander offers on the website. Some candidates wrote down what they thought should be the answer, rather than what they heard in the text.

Most candidates were not aware of who the “*Bundespräsident*” is – those who turned him into the Prime Minister were not penalised, however.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated basic knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and a basic understanding of relevant grammar points
- provided some accurate but simple information from the passage
- selected answers from narrow sections of the text
- provided a mere translation of the text heard, relevant to the question
- included irrelevant personal anecdotes in their responses, which had nothing to do with the text.

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

- showed little understanding beyond simple vocabulary, obvious cognates, and loan words
- provided inaccurate chunks of information
- misinterpreted significant details of the text
- answered the questions with minimal and superficial information.

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

- identified key information
- connected ideas appropriately
- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail, e.g., describing what the four young men did in their free time, but omitted to answer the question about a possible flatmate with good justified examples
- demonstrated good knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and a sound understanding of relevant grammar points
- had problems with words like “*Glück*” – only knowing the meaning of luck and ignoring the more likely option on this context of “happiness (and freedom)”.

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

- demonstrated comprehensive understanding of the text by writing very full answers with most or all details correct, e.g., in the question “*If you had the chance to share a flat with any of the members of Tokyo Hotel, who would you choose?*” there were some very interesting answers that drew on their own experiences as well as the material from the texts. They justified their answer, making direct references to the passage

- wrote some imaginative responses to “*Imagine you are the owner of the “Tree Inn”.* Write a brief response to Helga’s review.” Although some were far too brief, the excellent student wrote a well thought out reply – some more polite than others
 - justified their ideas unambiguously using evidence from the passage
 - did not repeat information already written in a previous section but used new information understood from the text
 - demonstrated excellent knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and an excellent understanding of relevant grammar points
 - had no problems with more complex sentences like: „*Ich brauche Filme, wie andere Menschen Familie und Freunde brauche.*“, „*Sie bringt mich jeden Tag zum Lachen*“ and „*Wenn es gerade Wochenende ist, und wenn Bayern München spielt und gewinnt – umso besser.*“
-

91126: Demonstrate understanding of a variety of written and/or visual German texts on familiar matters

Examination

The assessment covered an interview and two articles. Question 1 introduced a TikTok star, and candidates described the skills and qualities that had helped her to become so successful.

Question 2 described favourite books from childhood – from the point of view of three different people.

Question 3 described how on Angela Merkel’s retirement several companies have made replicas of her. The candidates had to make a judgement of how suitable these items were in honouring her.

Observations

The standard requires candidates to read the resource material carefully to select only the relevant text evidence as part of their answer, rather than giving direct translations. Successful candidates paraphrased the German text references and quotations, and incorporated these into their answers in English, not in German.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated they had understood the gist of the texts
- had read the question and realised that the text was talking about a TikTok star and not someone on YouTube
- made some general points based on the text with some textual reference in their answers
- understood the text well and were able to make very good assumptions and come to some very astute conclusions, however, their responses lacked the text evidence to back up their ideas

- showed understanding of the vocabulary and structures in the texts e.g., “... *ich habe heimlich unter der Bettdecke gelesen. Mit einer Tachenlampe*” was not somebody reading under the bed with a table lamp
- relied too much on the glossed vocabulary but did not show that they were able to select relevant information, ideas, and/or opinions from the texts by answering the question
- arrived at great conclusions but did not include supporting evidence from the text, e.g., they mentioned that the bear is cute but did not take the next step to consider that it is making a lot of money out of her (expensive, handmade, for collectors not kids).

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

- did not include enough supporting evidence or examples from the text to justify their answers
- did not show understanding of the text(s) but made assumptions based on visual resources provided which were not mentioned in the text, e.g., using the pictures in Question 3 rather than the text to back up their answer
- misunderstood the vocabulary or did not know enough of the language in the text to understand the general meaning
- left responses incomplete or provided incorrect information
- relied on the glossed words to make meaning
- interpreted the texts incorrectly.

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

- understood the text well and were able to read between the lines, but lacked text examples to justify their answers to go that one step further to show thorough understanding of the text
- referred to specific details and examples from the texts to justify their answers
- displayed a thorough understanding of the text but found it difficult to show how we can benefit from reading children’s books, even when we are older.

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

- displayed a thorough knowledge of the NCEA vocabulary and structures
 - expressed ideas fully and insightfully
 - gave multiple reasons in their answers and showed comprehensive understanding of the content and underlying meaning of the text
 - were able to infer and understand nuance and meaning not obviously stated in the text.
-