

# 2024 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	German
<b>Level:</b>	1
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91970, 91971

## General commentary

For the first time this year, candidates were required to answer in English or te reo Māori and not in the target language. Some candidates wrote double length responses by quoting the German and following it with an English translation. Others just quoted the German and said the German quote was the justification for their answer. Both these scenarios did not demonstrate the candidates understood and interpreted the texts to access the higher grades.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

#### Assessment

This assessment did not produce any issues for most candidates. The assessment involved three texts, using everyday contexts, followed by a mix of question types. Some required short answers and others required more in-depth thinking and responding. Candidates needed to show their understanding by interpreting the language to make meaning.

#### Commentary

A crucial aspect of all questions is always the requirement for candidates to use supporting detail from the text to justify their responses. Some candidates were either not fully aware of this requirement, or their vocabulary knowledge was the limiting factor. International students in particular need to be made aware of this requirement.

Question One about Daisy the dog had three short-answer questions. Candidates with thorough vocabulary knowledge provided detailed answers in all parts. Other candidates with more limited vocabulary knowledge understood the overall sense of the passage, but did not demonstrate understanding of further details. Some candidates experienced difficulties with *müde* (meaning tired but misunderstood as moody) and *Daisy mag mich in meiner Familie am liebsten* (Daisy loves me the most in the family or I am Daisy's favourite). Some candidates also found the reciprocal arrangements in the last paragraph challenging: *Ich weiß sicher, dass ich ihm auch helfen kann, wenn er in den Urlaub fahren will! Sein Hund kann dann ein paar Tage bei uns bleiben. Dann sind alle, auch die Hunde, glücklich!* (I know for sure that I can also help him, if he wants to go on holiday. Then his dog can stay with us for a few days. Then everyone, including the dogs, will be happy!)

In Question Two one sister living in Frankfurt, Germany, described the Museum Riverbank Festival and the other sister living in Wellington talked about Te Papa Museum. In Part A, candidates were required to describe Frankfurt as a tourist using details from the text. Most candidates managed this successfully, but some candidates did not provide much detail. In Part B, candidates were required to say whether given statements were true or false or not mentioned in the text and justify their answer. Most candidates coped well with this. In Part C, candidates were asked to compare the two cultural attractions. This caused the most difficulty in any question. Many candidates did not understand “cultural attractions” and compared Frankfurt and Wellington cities instead.

Question Three explored different ways parents raised their children bilingually. Candidates were required to choose which of four statements in English were true and support their answer with details from the text. This was generally done well, although a number of candidates mixed up the children of the two families described. Candidates mostly demonstrated understanding of at least some of the methods parents used to bring up their children bilingually. In Part C, candidates were asked if they agreed with an expert’s view and to provide their own thoughts on the matter. It was interesting to read how many candidates were bilingual or even trilingual and the countries they had come from. This suggested that several candidates were not native English speakers.

It is pleasing to note that although the number of examination entries was smaller than in previous years, there is still a strong number of capable language candidates who excelled.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated some understanding of elements of language
- communicated brief answers with limited supporting detail
- lacked vocabulary knowledge to enhance their understanding.

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

- selected and connected relevant ideas
- communicated fuller answers supported by relevant details
- did not demonstrate the vocabulary knowledge to understand finer details.

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

- showed detailed and accurate understanding
- responded fully and justified their conclusions
- demonstrated understanding of any implications
- produced well-articulated and well-organised responses.

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

- showed minimal or little understanding of meaning
  - wrote very brief answers
  - did not demonstrate basic vocabulary knowledge.
-

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

### Assessment

This examination did not produce any issues for the most candidates. This assessment of understanding spoken German relating to everyday contexts included three questions. Some questions required candidates to answer straight from the listening passages, whereas other questions required candidates to think beyond the passages and justify the answers using evidence from the text.

### Commentary

Question One Part A required candidates to answer what went well and what went wrong and how they feel about it. Some candidates did not demonstrate understanding of some very basic vocabulary, such as *Sommerferien* (summer holidays), *Ferienhaus* (holiday home), *mit meiner Familie* (with my family,) *keine Lust* (don't feel like), *Zeugnis* (school report), and *Klassenfahrt* (school trip). Candidates with a good vocabulary knowledge answered more fully and included details, such as *nicht weit vom Strand* (not far from the beach), *jeden Tag sonnig* (every day sunny), *ohne Eltern zum Musik-Festival gegangen* (to go to the concert without parents), *meine Schwester mit mir geübt* (sister practised with me) and *in der nächsten Klassenarbeit* (in the next test in class – candidates translated that the sister is in the same class). Part B required candidates to answer what could be learned from Leon's and Emma's experiences and justify with evidence from the text. Some candidates who understood part A well did not answer what could be learned, but simply repeated what they wrote in Part A. An Excellence was requiring what could be learned from their experiences and justification with supporting material from the text, for example: Leon's sister helped him – what could be learned? Ask for help. Leon didn't like learning vocabulary for French – what could be learned? Make an effort so you can improve/ or no good just to say you didn't want to learn, but be more proactive. Emma could play because of an injury – what could be learned? Be patient, it is a team game, be pleased that your team can win without you, encourage your team and look forward to regaining fitness to play again.

In Question Two Part A, candidates needed to answer what they wanted the money for and how they earned it. Most candidates answered the question successfully. Depending on vocabulary knowledge, candidates gave more details. In Part B, candidates had to answer how satisfied the two young people were with their experiences earning money and justify their response. Strong candidates justified their answers. Some common misunderstandings included *meine Mutter is Engländerin* (translated by candidates as he wanted to visit his elderly mother in England), *früh aufstehen musste* (translated by candidates that he had to stand for a long time), and *das war mir wichtig* (often missed by candidates).

Question 3 Part A required candidates to understand numbers. Some candidates did not demonstrate understanding of what the numbers related to. Part B required candidates to answer who would benefit and justify responses. Candidates with good vocabulary managed very well to justify using details from the passage. Some common errors included the pool is 1.5m deep (wave is always 1.5m), not enough detail for number 35 (cost 35 Euros for children under 14 and for 45 minutes), not enough detail for number 41 (cost 41 Euros for adults for 45 minutes), *es ist schwieriger als man denkt, aber es macht total Spass* (it's great fun, even if it's harder than you think), *viele Leute fallen ins Wasser, deshalb muss man ... schwimmen können* (they must know how to swim because many fall in the water), and *schnell und ohne Angst lernen können* (they can learn here quickly and without being afraid).

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed some understanding of elements of language
- communicated some meaning or intent
- answered briefly and omitted details
- did not demonstrate vocabulary knowledge to support answers.

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

- showed thorough understanding
- selected and connected relevant ideas and language to support responses
- wrote detailed responses but missed some vocabulary.

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

- showed thorough understanding
- selected and connected relevant ideas and language to support responses and also showed an awareness of the writer's choice of language
- wrote fluent and accurate responses which established context and purpose.

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

- showed minimal or little understanding
  - did not demonstrate vocabulary knowledge
  - wrote brief answers.
-