2025 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. Candidates who achieved higher grades answered the questions directly and thoroughly, without adding unnecessary information. These candidates 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. Candidates must expand upon and clarify the meaning of the quotation within the context.

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 an interview with Luca Flachenecker who is a young German sandboarder. Candidates had to demonstrate understanding of how he started the sport, how sandboarding differs from snowboarding, and whether the candidate would try the sport.

Question Two was an interview with Mirai, who has a blog about reading and who leads an action against gender marketing in book shops. Candidates had to demonstrate understanding of why Mirai liked reading so much and also with the issue of gender marketing – why she was against it and what she did about it.

In Question Three, candidates heard three students talking about German cities. Candidates had to demonstrate understanding of what the cities were like and therefore explain which of the cities they would prefer to visit and why the other two cities were less appealing.

Commentary

Candidates coped well with the questions and seemed to enjoy the challenge of trying to understand and interpret the spoken text.

On the whole, candidates related to the themes of sport and gender issues, although only few candidates provided answers of a high quality to Question One (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 descriptions of the German cities were hindered by vocabulary mistakes, with many candidates being under the impression that they were choosing a city that they would like to study in, not merely visit.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** passage and included details

- misunderstood some key vocabulary, for example, "kurze Skier" translated as "small skis"
- demonstrated a limited linguistic and sometimes cultural knowledge, for example, "Bundesland" thought to be the name of a German city
- 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 passages
- selected answers from narrow sections of the passages
- went beyond translation of the passages.

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

- showed that they understand the information, ideas, and opinions in the passages well
- selected most of the relevant information and worded their answers accordingly
- made extensive listening notes but did not incude higher-level details in their response
- identified key information, for example, Dürer in the third passage being an artist ("Künstler") (sometimes misunderstood as the chancellor –"Kanzler")
- connected ideas appropriately
- demonstrated good knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and a sound understanding of relevant grammar in the passages
- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail, for example, describing that they would like to visit Marburg because they would like to get to know and socialise with other students
- identified plurals, for example "Kaufmannshäuser", "Spaziergänge", and "Türen"
- demonstrated some problems with vocabulary, for example, some translated "spannend" in the third passage as "rich" or even "interesting" instead of "exciting".

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

- demonstrated excellent vocabulary knowledge of the NCEA vocabulary at Level 2 German and relevant grammar points
- answered the questions using passage-based evidence to fully support their answers
- demonstrated comprehensive understanding of the passages by writing very full answers with most or all details correct
- justified their answers, making direct references to the passages, and added their own suggestions or drew on their own experiences
- justified their ideas unambiguously using evidence from the passages
- used new information from the relevant passage. rather than repeating information already written
- demonstrated understanding of more complex sentences, such as "bis letztes Jahr" ("up to last year") in the first passage
- came to conclusions in a personal response and provided substantial detail to justify these conclusions

- included nuance and meanings not obviously stated in the passages.

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

- showed little understanding of key vocabulary
- misunderstood and misinterpreted significant parts of the passages, for example, "vor zwei Wochen" misunderstood as "for two weeks"
- left some parts blank – especially the parts (c)
- lacked passage-based evidence to support their points
- showed little understanding beyond simple vocabulary, obvious cognates, and loan words
- provided minimal, superficial, or inaccurate information.

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.

In Question One, two young people are writing about their opinions of theme parks. Candidates had to explain why Simon liked them so much and give advice to Eva on how to get over her negative impressions.

Question Two described laughter yoga based on information from an article. Candidates had to demonstrate understanding of what laughter yoga is and whether or not they would like to try it.

Question Three was based on article about the life of Margarete Steiff. Candidates were required to describe how her childhood had been affected by her having contracted polio, how her family had helped her to be successful, and how her personal qualities had also helped her.

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 in their answers.

In Question One (b) (i), most candidates wrote too much, including evidence for (ii) with this answer and then repeating it. For (b)(ii) some candidates found it difficult to give Eva sensible advice that was justified using evidence from the text.

Text B posed challenges for some candidates. Only a few provided high-quality answers to Question Two (b), with most candidates extracting only the obvious information and not basing their answer on evidence taken from the text. "Dann lachte jemand plötzlich ganz laut und konnte nicht mehr aufhören" was understood by very few candidates, and the issue was with the verb "aufhören".

It was stated at the beginning of Text C, "Read about Margarete who, with her nephew Richard, created the very first teddy bear", however many candidates had clearly skipped over this fact and had many different versions of both who Richard was and who actually came up with the idea of the teddy bear. In Question 3 (a), many went on to give details about when she was 17 or older. Part (c) was misunderstood by some candidates, who provided irrelevant adjectives or other details from the text. However, there were some original ideas, for example, "Margarete was both creative and innovative. This was shown by the fact that she and Richard came up with a teddy bear which had movable limbs whereas she had limbs that either could not move or only to a limited amount."

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated understanding of the gist of the texts
- made general points based on the text, with some textual reference in their answers
- demonstrated understanding of the texts, made good inferences and come to some astute conclusions, however, some responses lacked the evidence to back up their ideas
- showed basic knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and a basic understanding of relevant grammar points in the texts
- 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:

- demonstrated understanding of the text and read between the lines, referring to specific details from the texts to justify their answers
- produced answers that included significant amounts of accurate detail, for example, recognising that Fritz was selling not buying the soft toy at the Christmas market, and understanding that it was Margarete's siblings (not her sisters) or the teacher (not teachers) who carried (not took) her
- correctly identified parts of the body in Texts B and C, such as "die Beine", "die rechte Hand", and "unsere Bäuche", and time phrases in Text C, such as "im Alter von 18 Monaten", "mit 17 Jahren", and "mit 30 Jahren"
- demonstrated sound knowledge of the Level 1 and 2 vocabulary lists and relevant grammar points, for example, "sie wollte lernen und in die Schule gehen" (imperfect tense of modal verbs), "meine besten Freunde habe ich dort kennengelernt" (plurals).

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

- displayed a thorough knowledge of the Level 2 NCEA vocabulary and structures, enabling them to demonstrate comprehensive understanding and answer questions succinctly and insightfully
- gave multiple reasons in their answers and showed comprehensive understanding of the content and underlying meaning of the texts
- inferred nuance and meaning not obviously stated in the texts
- demonstrated understanding of more complex sentences.

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

- lacked supporting evidence from the texts to justify their answers
- demonstrated a lack of understunding of the vocabulary that impeded understanding of the general meaning of the texts
- left responses incomplete or provided incorrect information
- relied on the glossed vocabulary to make meaning
- interpreted the texts incorrectly
- misunderstood words close to English, such as "elektrisieren", "kostenlos", and "ungestresst".