

# 2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	German
Level:	Level 2
Achievement standard(s):	91123, 91126

## General 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. Candidates who accessed higher grades answered the questions comprehensively and accurately, and included more of the text examples and evidence in their answers, rather than making general statements.

Many candidates do not achieve Excellence, not because they did not understand, but because they did not show understanding of the level of detail required to achieve Excellence.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

#### Assessment

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

Question One was a description of three different action days: World Give us a Hug Day, Love your Pet Day, and Car Free Day. The candidates were required to say which day would appeal to them most and why not the other two.

Question Two was about BreakOut – a new way of collecting money for charity. The candidates had to demonstrate understanding of what was involved with this novel idea and what the money was going towards.

Question Three had three young people talking about the activities they were involved with. The candidates were required to describe the activities and then to decide which person would be most deserving of a community service award.

#### Commentary

On the whole, candidates related to the themes of the texts and offered evidence of personal connection with the themes in their answers.

#### 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, including translations of parts of it but occasional irrelevant personal anecdotes
- selected answers from narrow sections of the text
- had a few problems with time phrases, which were very apparent in the third passage (e.g. *seit einem Jahr, oft, schon lange, seit Jahren, and später*), and with numbers in the second passage (e.g. *mindestens 18, zwei Personen, 36 Stunden, 150 Millionen, and 2000 Kinder*).

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

- identified key information – e.g. there was no confusion in the second passage as to who the sponsors were and who the members of the team were
- connected ideas appropriately
- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail
- demonstrated good knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and a sound understanding of relevant grammar points
- showed an understanding of the German school vocabulary with words / phrases like *9. Klasse, Grundschule, die Pause, and der Unterricht*.

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
- justified their answers and made direct references to the passage, with some very interesting answers drawing on their own experiences as well as the material from the texts
- explained that *Autofreitag* is a pun or play on words, in their own words
- 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 challenging sentences like *Ich denke oft über die Zukunft nach und es macht mir ein bisschen Angst, was mit unserer Natur passiert* and *Ich mache in der Freizeit viel mit ihnen, so dass sie sich besser kennenlernen*.

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.
- Incorrectly interpreted the texts
- did not attempt sections

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

### **Assessment**

The assessment covered three different types of source.

Question One was two letters from two very different young people who both were being impacted by environmental issues. The candidates described their present lives and how they might be in the future.

Question Two described Buy Nothing Day from the point of view of two different people as well as some alternative activities for those who didn't want to get involved with the shopping boycott. The candidates gave advice to Max who wasn't taken by the idea of Buy Nothing Day and then described how they would spend the day.

Question 3 described Gauß Fashion – a student-driven, environmentally sound, and fair school “uniform”. The candidates described the new initiative and how the T-Shirts differed from a normal school uniform.

### **Commentary**

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. 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 Buy Nothing Day did cause some problems. Although the vocabulary was at the appropriate level, the text proved difficult for quite a few candidates, and the questions were not read carefully.

Most didn't answer the Question Two (a) directly, and wrote what Max thought of the day and then what Leonie's opinion was.

Then for Question Two (b), the text was often ignored, and some candidates wrote down a vague answer with little relevance to the text or repetitive responses.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated they had understood the gist of the texts, but occasionally included some irrelevant personal anecdotes or relied too much on glossed words
- made some general points based on the text with some textual reference in their answers
- understood the text well, made very good assumptions, and came 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. *Die Menschen bekommen wenig Geld und haben lange Arbeitszeiten ohne Pausen.*

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

- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail, e.g. describing well the Gauß-T-Shirts and how they were manufactured, but omitted to answer the question about the comparison between these T-Shirts and a normal school uniform with good justified examples
- demonstrated good knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists, especially where a word can have more than one meaning
- demonstrated a sound understanding of relevant grammar points, e.g. *Denn bei uns ist es viel zu kalt, um Obst und Gemüse anzubauen.*

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

- displayed a thorough knowledge of the NCEA vocabulary and structures
- expressed themselves eloquently and insightfully
- gave multiple reasons in their answers and showed comprehensive understanding of the content and underlying meaning of the text
- inferred and showed understanding of nuance and meaning not obviously stated in the text.
- demonstrated comprehensive understanding of the text by writing very full answers with most or all details correct, e.g., in Question One (b) candidates often provided very interesting, well-justified answers, making direct references to the passage
- understood more challenging sentences with ease.

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 or false interpretations as to the meaning of the texts
- did not show understanding of the vocabulary, or did not know enough of the language in the text to understand the general meaning, e.g. *einem Haus mit Blick auf das Meer* became a brick house, instead of a house with a sea view
- left responses incomplete or provided incorrect information
- relied on the glossed words to make meaning, but sometimes used them incorrectly.