



## Oral Component

### GENERAL COMMENTS

All students were familiar with the assessment criteria in both sections of the oral examination and responded with confidence and fluency. Students were generally well prepared and had obviously enjoyed studying their topic.

### SPECIFIC INFORMATION

#### Section 1: Conversation

Almost all students demonstrated a high level of linguistic ability and communicative competence and were willing to expand on the topics of home life, family and friends, and interests and future aspirations. Students interacted well with the assessors and were keen to go beyond a minimal response. There were a number of grammatical and pronunciation errors. Some of the basic errors included incorrect use of tenses, genders, adjective declension and a number of anglicisms where a Dutch word(s) was not known.

#### Section 2: Discussion

All students adhered to the prescribed guidelines set out for the detailed study. 'The popularity of the Dutch monarchy' was an excellent choice of topic and many students researched it well. In a few cases there was not enough substance and depth to the student's discussion, and greater emphasis could have been placed on researching the actual background of the monarchy. In choosing a topic such as this, it is important to research in depth the Dutch monarchy itself, as a few students were not able to carry on the discussion and express ideas and opinions. A number of students concentrated only on the current popularity and problems surrounding the Dutch royal family.

Linguistic fluency was generally high despite a number of grammatical errors and inaccuracies. Some students used complex grammatical structures as well as a broad range of vocabulary. Students maintained good eye contact with the examiners. In preparing for the examination, it was pleasing to note that students used a wide variety of resources such as articles, DVDs, the Internet and interviews.

The oral examination this year was of a very pleasing, high standard and all students presented well and confidently.

## Written component

### GENERAL COMMENTS

Students were familiar with the requirements of all three sections of the paper and performed well, expressing themselves in clear and concise Dutch. The range and quality of the responses were good, but a number of students were penalised for not adhering to the required word limits.

### SPECIFIC INFORMATION

#### Section 1: Listening and responding

Students were able to select and use relevant information from the five texts, but must learn to omit irrelevant information. In Text 4, a few students did not understand the punch line of the joke and therefore could not see the connection between the joke and the discussion in the interview in Text 5. Not all students were able to give the four arguments required for Text 5 (d).

The control of language varied, with many students demonstrating considerable ability to use clear and accurate expression but failing to incorporate more complex linguistic structures and a broader range of vocabulary into their answers. Some students expressed themselves poorly, often using only the most basic language with numerous linguistic errors, which resulted in a loss of marks.



## Section 2: Reading and Responding

### Part A

Most students were able to understand, select and use the relevant information from the two passages correctly and coherently in their English responses. A few students did not always expand on their answers, which were sometimes incomplete. In Text 6 (d), students did not give a sufficient number of reasons why parents have reacted to this new classification. In Text 6 (e), students obviously enjoyed finding a suitable title for the article, and some titles proved to be most original. Questions on Text 7 were very well answered by students, but almost all had difficulty with 7 (e) where they were asked to give an example of the language used to indicate the writer's passion about the issue.

### Part B

Students need to read questions very carefully to be certain they know what is being asked of them. This section was generally poorly done, with students often writing over or under the prescribed word limit. Some students completely omitted to outline their qualifications for the job and only spoke about interests and hobbies. There were numerous careless spelling and grammatical mistakes involving word order, adjective endings, incorrect vocabulary use, genders, plurals and relative pronouns.

## Section 3: Writing in Dutch

Of the four topics offered, one student chose Question 9, five chose Question 10, two chose Question 11, and one chose Question 12. In this section, a few students did not adhere to the word limit of 200–250 words. Students produced some original and interesting writing, but in one or two cases they did not adhere to the appropriate text type. Students need to determine which text type is required for the topic they have chosen and must develop their writing logically with an introduction, body and conclusion. Students need to be very aware of how a letter begins and ends and that *goede vriendelijke gevoelens* is by no means a suitable Dutch phrase for 'kind regards'.

Some students had excellent control of language and sentence structure and were able to draw on a wide range of interesting vocabulary. Other students had not sufficiently revised grammatical structures and their written style subsequently contained a large number of elementary and careless errors and a minimal range of vocabulary.

A number of spelling mistakes were evident, including:

*schon (schoon), ik vindt (ik vind), ik will (ik wil), heele (hele), weeken (weken), maneer (meneer), praaften (praten), peppernoten (pepernoten), groote (grote), success (succes) and organiseeren (organiseren).*