

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

The Level 2 German 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 making general statements. Candidates should be reminded that they need to use information, ideas, and opinions from the text at hand to back up their answers.

Quoting directly from the text in German without translating into English or explaining the quote does not demonstrate understanding of the text, vocabulary, or structures. The candidate must expand upon and clarify the meaning of the quotation within the context of the text.

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 report about foxes living in German cities. The candidates had to demonstrate understanding of why this was happening and how people's attitudes towards foxes have changed.

Question Two was about energy consumption in wintertime. The candidates had to demonstrate understanding of the suggestions made of how to reduce energy consumption and how they personally felt about those suggestions.

Question Three was a fable about a cat and a mouse. The candidates had to demonstrate understanding of what the fable was about and what the moral of the fable was.

Commentary

Candidates coped well with the questions in the first passage and seemed to enjoy the challenge of trying to understand and interpret the spoken texts.

On the whole candidates related to the theme of energy consumption, although few candidates provided answers of quality to Question Two Part C. They often did not provide much relevant detail from the text and offered evidence of personal connection with the theme in their answer. The fable

was generally well understood. However, there were some confused responses regarding the moral of the fable.

While some answers were well expressed, for example, “the cat outsmarted the mouse”, “the cat impersonated a dog”, “the cat taunts the mouse”, “the cat double crossed the mouse by luring it out”, “ambushed the mouse”, quite a few candidates did not realise that the foreign language the cat spoke was actually “dog” – several candidates mistakenly believed that there was a real dog and did not realise that the barking was the cat pretending to be a dog.

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 little beyond a mere translation of the text heard, but relevant to the question
- had a problem with prepositions, which became apparent in the third passage, e.g. *unten im Keller*, *hinter der Küchenwand*, and *durch ein kleines Loch*.

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

- identified key information, for example, there was no confusion in the third passage as to how the cat finally outwitted the mouse
- 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
- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail, for example, describing what suggestions were made to reduce energy consumption, but might have omitted to answer the question fully about how they felt about those suggestions with good justified examples
- identified plurals, for example *für einen Berliner Fuchs gibt es sogar einen eigenen Instagram-Account* was often understood as all foxes in Berlin having an Instagram account
- had a few problems with the vocabulary, for example *böse* (more likely option in this context of wicked or evil), and *Heizung an* was understood as turned the heating up instead of simply turn the heating on.

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, making direct references to the passage, and added their own suggestions, for example candidates drew on their own experiences reducing energy consumption as well as the material from the texts, such as thermal curtains and double or triple glazing
- 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
- picked up some of the fine details of the language, for example *immer öfter* was correctly translated as “more and more often”

- had no problems with more complex sentences like *es wird kalt, deshalb wollen wir es uns wie immer schön gemütlich machen* and *einmal darüber sprechen, wie wir weniger konsumieren und trotzdem gut leben können*.

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 questions.

Question One was three letters to an online forum about friendship. The candidates described the issues the young people were having with their friends and whether or not (in their opinion) the friendships would last.

Question Two described what micro adventures are, based on information from a blog. The candidates had to demonstrate understanding what the benefits of these mini holidays are and which of the adventures they would like to take part in.

In Question Three, four young people are writing about the importance of appearance to them. The candidates were required to describe the importance of appearance of each person and then to say which person they best identified with and why not the other three.

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

In Text A there was some confusion with Alexa's friendship and quite a few candidates did not pick up on the fact that Paul was Alexa's boyfriend, and her best (female) friend was jealous of this new relationship. Many thought that Paul was causing the problems and not the best friend.

Text B posed challenges for some candidates even though the details required for Question Two part (a) were present in the text. Only a few candidates provided high-quality answers to Question Two part (a), with most candidates extracting only the obvious information from the first paragraph.

For Question Two part (b), many candidates focused on just one micro adventure, neglecting the other three adventures or referring to the other adventures only in vague terms without providing a detailed description. As a result, they did not show a thorough understanding of the whole text.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated they had understood the gist of the texts

- made some general points based on the text with some textual reference in their answers
- made accurate assumptions and came to some very astute conclusions, however their responses lacked the textual evidence to back up their ideas
- showed understanding of the vocabulary and structures in the texts, such as *wenn ich mal keine Zeit für sie habe, ist sie sauer* and *meine Freundinnen wollen aussehen wie Models*.
- selected relevant information, ideas, and opinions from the texts, but did not always answer the question directly.

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
- demonstrated good knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists, especially where a word can have more than one meaning, for example, *dann laufe zu Fuß zurück* was often interpreted as “run back” instead of “walk back”.

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

- displayed a thorough knowledge of the Level 2 NCEA vocabulary and structures, thus enabling them to demonstrate comprehensive understanding and quickly answer questions in a succinct manner
- 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 understood nuance and meaning not obviously stated in the text
- had no problems with sentences like *Jeder ist so in Ordnung, wie sie oder er ist, Hauptsache ist doch, dass ich mir gefalle*, and *Ich mag lieber Freunde, mit denen man auch viel Unsinn machen kann*
- interpreted the texts’ ideas and information and wrote their answers very cleverly, showing an outstanding understanding of German.

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

- did not include enough supporting evidence or examples from the text to justify their answers
- misunderstood the vocabulary or did not demonstrate understanding of enough of the language in the text to demonstrate the general meaning, for example, mixing up *einen See*, thinking it was the sea or ocean instead of a lake, or understanding *Geräusche der Nacht* as the sounds of nature instead of “the sounds of the night”
- left responses incomplete or provided incorrect information
- relied on the glossed words to make meaning
- interpreted the texts incorrectly.