

FOREIGN LANGUAGE DUTCH

Paper 0515/01

Listening

General comments

This year's examinations went well and overall performance was comparable with the previous years.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1

This exercise did not cause problems for most candidates. Nevertheless, **Question 4** confused a few: a consistent number of candidates find this type of question about giving/receiving directions (left, right etc.) difficult every year. In **Question 5** some candidates answered **A** (sunny weather), which was only the first part of the weather forecast. It is good to remind candidates to listen carefully to the whole statement, and not to answer too quickly.

Exercise 2

This exercise went well. Some candidates stumbled over **Question 10**, thinking the right answer was *september*. Answers like *in de zomer* were not specific enough. The month *augustus* needed to be mentioned. **Questions 13** and **14 (ii)** were found to be challenging, especially for the weaker candidates.

Section 2

Exercise 1

This question was done well. The main confusion occurred with the statement made by Mark, who said that computers would never replace manual work completely (**E**). Some candidates picked the opposite answer here (**F**). Quite a few of the better candidates managed to score the full marks for this exercise.

Exercise 2

Most candidates performed well on this exercise. **Questions 17, 20** and **21** were good discriminators, as the good candidates did not have problems in answering these questions. Some confusion appeared in the last question as in what exactly you can see when you parachute over the *Waddeneilanden*. A few candidates thought you could see lions or other wild animals (misled by the name of the Frisian capital *Leeuwarden*). A large majority of the candidates, however, did give the right answer (*mooi uitzicht*).

Section 3

The two exercises in **Section 3** were, of course, more difficult, as they are aimed at candidates following the Extended curriculum. Even though a number of the weaker candidates managed to pick up a few marks, this section was clearly for the better candidates.

Exercise 1

Only the best candidates here scored 6 to 7 marks in the first exercise. The majority of the candidates scored 4.

Exercise 2

There was a nice build up in difficulty in the last exercise. The first 4 questions were handled well by the majority of the candidates. **Questions 33 and 34** were more demanding. On the very last question, some candidates gave the same answer, but in different words, for both **(i)** and **(ii)**. If two answers are required in an exercise, they should be different in content from each other, needless to say.

Nevertheless, it seemed candidates were well prepared for this type of test.

<p>Paper 0515/02 Reading and Directed Writing</p>

General comments

The majority of candidates did very well in this examination. The multiple choice exercises were not problematic. However, candidates are advised to always provide an answer even if they are uncertain of the correct one. Candidates frequently wrote more than necessary in some of the open ended questions and spent a lot of time copying sentences from the source texts, especially in **Section 2, Exercise 1**. Careful reading of the questions would prevent this.

Many of the writing exercises were excellent. Nevertheless, some candidates did not make use of the icons. It is essential that they do so in order to gain marks for communication.

In **Section 2** candidates often wrote about wonderful school buildings, helpful pupils and excellent teaching.

It is important that candidates keep to the required number of words. They should also ensure that they include the required information as stipulated in the rubric.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1

Questions 1 - 6

This multiple choice exercise was generally well done, although some candidates did not know the Dutch for cloudy in **Question 1**. **Questions 2, 3 and 4** caused very few problems. **Question 5** was harder and not all candidates knew that *zaak* referred to option C, while some candidates lost marks in **Question 6** because they did not understand what 'place' was referred to.

Exercise 2

Questions 7 - 13

In most cases **Question 7** was not a problem. The majority of the mistakes were made in the middle section i.e. **Questions 9, 10 and 11**.

Exercise 3

Questions 14 - 20

Generally, **Questions 14, 15 and 16** were answered correctly. However, not all candidates were aware that 'doing the work for nothing' meant that you did not get paid or that three quarters of an hour is shorter than an hour (i.e. **Questions 17 and 18**). Most mistakes were made in the last two questions, which appeared to be due, mostly, to careless reading.

Exercise 4

Question 21

The majority of the candidates did very well in this exercise and kept the message short and succinct. Although the language was not always accurate, the message was understood. However, some candidates did not receive maximum communication marks as they did not use all the icons, and therefore did not answer the question in the manner required. Those candidates who overlooked some of the icons, and therefore lost marks, were often the ones who wrote the best Dutch.

Section 2

Exercise 1

Questions 22 - 36

Some candidates spent a lot of time copying complete sentences from the text in their answers to **Questions 22, 23 and 24** when only short answers were required. **Question 25** was not problematic, but not every candidate answered **Question 26** correctly, thinking the father was a baker too. The last two questions caused the most problems, probably stemming from confusion over interrogatives. **Question 35** was often answered as if the question was 'where?' rather than 'to whom?', whilst **Question 36** was 'why?', not 'where?'. However, most candidates scored high marks.

Exercise 2

Question 37

Generally, this writing exercise was well done. Most candidates covered all the points specified in the rubric and only a small number of candidates lost communication marks by not providing all the required information listed under **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)** or by mentioning negative rather than positive aspects about the school, which was what was stipulated in the rubric. For instance, if the candidate only mentioned that the school was 'big' in answer to **(a)**, full communication marks could not be given.

Some candidates wrote very short letters, thus making it impossible to obtain all language marks. However, most letters were of the required length.

Section 3

Exercise 1

Questions 38 - 43

Although this exercise was generally well done, not many candidates received full marks. **Question 38** was, generally, answered correctly, but **Questions 39, 40, 41 and 42** were harder.

Exercise 2

Questions 44 - 51

The first two questions were usually answered correctly, but the subsequent questions proved more difficult. The candidates expressed their answer to **Question 46** in many different ways, but as long as they conveyed that the writer disagreed or was upset, the answer was correct. Some candidates thought it was nice for the teenagers to be entertained, but that was not the writer's opinion. **Question 47** was often answered correctly, but some candidates tried to answer this question by lifting chunks from the text, which is not allowed. **Question 48** received many good answers, but some candidates did not know the word *lawaaï* and wrote *stille* and *rust* rather than *schreeuwend* and *keihard*. The question asked for two words only and it was not necessary to write the whole sentence in which these words appeared.

In answer to **Question 50** the candidates had to make it clear that they understood why the writer wanted to leave, and quoting the sentence '*Het weekend stond voor de deur* etc.' was not enough. Many candidates received 1 mark only for their answer. The same problem arose in **Question 51**. The last answer had to convey that the writer was not sorry (that she was using her fame to get preferential treatment) and some candidates found this difficult.

Exercise 3

Questions 52 - 71

A number of candidates struggled with this exercise whilst others did very well, but few candidates received full marks. **Question 52** was usually answered correctly with *van*, but **Question 53** was more difficult with *moet*. **Question 54** was not very difficult, but *om* in **Question 55** and *dat* in **Question 56** were harder. Quite surprisingly frequent mistakes were made in **Question 57**: *op te letten*. Many candidates tried *hoeft* in **Question 58**, but that did not fit in with the rest of the sentence as the word *te* was not there. The relative pronoun *die* in **Question 59** was quite difficult for a number of candidates. In **Question 60** the best answer was *zijn*, but *doen* and *worden* were also allowed. The better candidates did not make grammatical mistakes such as *heeft* rather than *hebben* in **Question 61** or *denk hij* (sic.) in **Question 63**. **Questions 62** and **64** *mee* and *met* were often wrong, as was *er* in **Question 65**. Few candidates had a problem with *maar* in **Question 66**, but **Question 67** was difficult and only *een beetje/keer* were correct. In **Question 68** both *als* and *wanneer* were allowed and in **Question 69** *dat*, *dit* and *het*, but the latter question appeared quite difficult. The candidates were very inventive in **Question 70** and used a number of correct past participles such as *beleefd*, *meegemaakt*, *gedaan*, *gezien*, *gehoord*, *gelezen*, *bedacht* and *ontdekt*. Finally, the word *Het* in **Question 71** was not easily rendered.

Paper 0515/03

Speaking

General comments

The candidates were enthusiastic and did not find the role-plays problematic or the subject matter too difficult. Most had prepared interesting topics, but frequently the intended conversation became a monologue. In part three, the general conversation, the standard was good and most candidates did well.

The quality of the recordings was good, but Centres must not stop the recording during an examination. Centres supplied suitable samples of candidates to illustrate a range of different levels, as required. The examining technique was excellent and it was interesting to listen to the different approaches of the Examiners.

Overall, assessment was fair, the examination interesting and executed to a high standard.

Paper 0515/04

Continuous Writing

General comments

The majority of candidates did well in this examination.

The paper consists of two questions and candidates are required to answer either **Question 1 (a)** or **Question 1 (b)** as well as **Question 2**. **Question 1 (a)** proved to be more popular than **Question 1 (b)**.

The word limit in the Continuous Writing paper is 140 words and no marks are awarded for either communication or language after those 140 words.

Candidates should adopt the Dutch style of combining two nouns to form a single compound noun, e.g. *zomervakantie*, *tuincentrum*. Candidates should also note that separable verbs are no longer separated in the past participle, e.g. *thuisgebleven*, *meegenomen*.

Another frequent error is a double vowel at the end of a syllable, e.g. *beeter maaken* rather than *beter maken*.

A few candidates had problems with the conjugation of the present tense, especially with verb stems ending in d, when they add the letter t to all singular forms indiscriminately, e.g. *ik vindt* instead of *ik vind*.

Most candidates made sure they covered all the required elements in their essays as specified in the rubrics, but it is important that all the tasks are read carefully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates did very well with the correct tenses being used for the different components of the letter. Candidates will not gain extra language marks for repeating the exact words of the rubric, but suitable letter openings and endings will get extra marks. However, it should also be stressed that a long, pre-learnt letter preamble will not gain any more language marks than a short opening line.

Most candidates frequently started their letters with, *Hoe gaat het met jou? Ik ben goed*. The first sentence is fine, but the second is incorrect.

Candidates wrote about a variety of things they did on holiday. Just visiting relatives was not sufficient to get the full communication marks.

If a candidate wrote 140 words before mentioning next year's holiday plans, then the communication marks for this last point could not be awarded.

The rubric specified that the candidate should make the point that they had been to the Netherlands again this year, but that next year would be different. A number of candidates failed to do so.

- (b) Only a few candidates attempted this question, but, generally, did very well. The letters were well structured and communicative.

A number of candidates were not sure whether to use the formal *u* or informal *je*. The formal form of address was the one required here.

The candidates gave many good reasons for wanting to work in the garden centre and asked sensible questions. However, many candidates were not aware that you do not use capital letters when writing the name of a month in Dutch.

Question 2

The majority of candidates wrote interesting essays about their new hobby. A number of candidates did not explain how they acquired their new hobby and, therefore, did not use the past tense as required. Others did not mention how their life had changed.

A number of candidates had reached their word limit before mentioning all the points stipulated in the rubric and therefore communication marks were lost.

A few candidates wrote this essay in the style of a letter, which was not required.