

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	German
Level:	1
Achievement standard(s):	91970, 91971

General commentary

Both assessments for 91970 and 91971 allowed sufficient scope for candidates to demonstrate their understanding of written and spoken German, respectively. Candidates were required to answer in English or te reo Māori, yet some responded partly or wholly in German, suggesting unfamiliarity with NCEA Level 1 assessment requirements.

Some candidates supported their answers by quoting the German text rather than providing an explanation. Quoting the text, with or without an English translation, did not demonstrate understanding or interpretation, limiting access to higher grades.

Overall, the examination was set at an appropriate level, allowing candidates to demonstrate their understanding across all grades, and there was a strong number who excelled. Candidates who supported answers with relevant details, stayed focused on the text or passage, and produced well-organised, articulate, and thoughtful responses achieved the best results.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

This assessment was found to be accessible for most candidates. It involved three texts set in everyday contexts, followed by a range of question types, including short-answer and opinion-based, as well as questions requiring discussion of advantages and disadvantages. Candidates were required to demonstrate understanding by interpreting the language and using it to construct meaning, as well as by supporting their answers with relevant detail from the texts.

Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated good understanding of the texts. Strengths included detailed responses from those with strong vocabulary and the ability to convey personal preferences clearly, as seen in discussions of shopping habits and Lasse's train journey. Sharing relevant personal details often strengthened responses. For some candidates, limited vocabulary sometimes restricted the detail they could provide.

Common challenges included confusion between subjects, omissions of key points, and vocabulary misunderstandings. For example, some candidates confused the person and the dog in the kindergarten text, or wrote about two dogs. Vocabulary difficulties included misinterpreting "Chef", "Büro", and "fahren", or translating "sympathisch" as "sympathetic" rather than "likeable." Some

translations were inaccurate, such as “vor einem Monat” rendered as “for a month”, or “Ich habe viel Freiheit” as “I have a lot of free time.” A few candidates included details not supported by the text, quoted the German rather than explaining ideas, or made up responses based on limited understanding.

While candidates generally understood the main ideas, some struggled to express contrasts or advantages and disadvantages clearly, particularly in discussions of online versus in-store shopping. Consideration of wider implications, such as environmental impact, was sometimes overlooked.

Overall, responses reflected strong engagement with the texts and a positive command of the language.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated some understanding of elements of the text
- communicated brief answers with limited supporting detail
- showed some vocabulary knowledge, albeit sometimes limited.

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

- selected and connected relevant ideas from the text
- communicated fuller answers supported by relevant details
- did not demonstrate the vocabulary knowledge to capture finer points to get Excellence.

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 the text
- wrote very brief answers and sometimes made up information
- did not demonstrate basic vocabulary knowledge
- answered only some sections of the questions.

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

Assessment

The assessment required candidates to demonstrate understanding of everyday spoken German in everyday contexts and included three questions. Some questions required candidates to answer directly from the texts, whereas others required them to interpret the information and justify their answers using supporting evidence.

Commentary

Candidates who utilised the space given for listening notes, used the tables and prompts, and considered all parts of each question were more successful. Responses were strongest when candidates explained ideas in their own words rather than translating literally or quoting the passage.

Sharing personal details to support answers was positive and often strengthened responses. By contrast, some candidates misunderstood justification and relied on direct quotations rather than explanation. There was a rise in made up or unrelated answers, with some candidates weaving imaginative responses around the few words they understood or writing material unrelated to the passage.

Vocabulary gaps affected some candidates, particularly where understanding depended on grammar, such as recognising the comparative in “eine kleinere Stadt” or distinguishing “mit meiner Freundin” from “mit meinen Freunden”. Misunderstanding key words, including “Fußgängerzone” and “Nachbar”, sometimes led to incomplete or illogical responses. The expression “Ende gut, alles gut” was not well understood and was rarely translated correctly as “all is well that ends well”.

Stronger answers explained why paying with cash in Germany was surprising or why smaller towns supported language learning. It was pleasing to see many candidates demonstrated understanding of overall messages, particularly in the text about Max, where stronger answers explained the idea of control and addiction rather than repeating lines verbatim.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of the gist of the listening passage
- wrote brief answers with limited or incorrect supporting detail
- understood a limited range of vocabulary.

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

- selected and connected relevant ideas
- demonstrated good knowledge of the prescribed vocabulary
- supported answers with relevant details, though not always the finer points to be awarded Excellence.

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

- communicated a clear, accurate, and thorough understanding
- wrote full, well-organised, and articulate answers
- justified responses with full supporting detail
- demonstrated an excellent command of vocabulary.

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

- demonstrated understanding of only a basic range of vocabulary
- showed little understanding of the listening passages
- wrote brief, or sometimes made-up, answers
- did not attempt some parts.