

CONTENTS

FOREIGN LANGUAGE DUTCH	2
Paper 0515/01 Listening	2
Paper 0515/02 Reading and Directed Writing	3
Paper 0515/03 Speaking	6
Paper 0515/04 Continuous Writing	7

FOREIGN LANGUAGE DUTCH

Paper 0515/01

Listening

General comments

In line with previous years, there was a mixture in ability, but, overall, candidates performed well. Most candidates dealt well with the gradient of difficulty in this paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Questions 1-8

Most candidates did well here. The first four questions caused very few problems. Not all candidates were able to answer **Question 5** correctly. Candidates who did not pick the right answer mostly opted for answer B. A very small number of candidates had difficulties with **Questions 7** and **8**.

Questions 9-16

These questions were also done very well by most candidates. For the weaker candidates, **Question 14** proved to be difficult, with most answering *station*, which was an incomplete answer to the question, and could therefore not be credited. A small number of candidates had trouble putting their answers to **Questions 12, 13** and **16** in the right order, all of which required indications of time; these candidates were capable of filtering out the relevant bits of information from the text, but they did not quite manage to put the right answer with the right question.

Section 2

Question 17

Few candidates encountered problems here. Weaker candidates filled in a letter in each box, which showed they had insufficiently understood what was required of them in this exercise.

Questions 18-25

A large majority of the candidates answered **Question 18** correctly; most candidates answered either *Duitsland* or *Berlijn*, either of which was credited. Some candidates misunderstood **Question 19**, thinking it read 'what do you need to do when you are an au-pair' instead of 'what do you need to do when you want to become an au-pair'. Consequently, answers such as 'do the housework' and 'take care of the children' could not be credited.

A small number of candidates misheard the text and answered *planten* to **Question 20**. **Question 21** proved to be quite difficult for some candidates, although the better ones were able to answer it correctly. **Question 22** and **Question 24** were done well. A few candidates answered *in het buitenland*, *in Duitsland*, or *in Nederland* incorrectly to **Question 23**. Some candidates answered *Russische student* to **Question 25**, which indicated that some of those candidates may not have been familiar with the (common) expression *later iets willen worden*.

Section 3

This section is the most demanding part of the exam, aimed at testing the best candidates.

Questions 26-32

Questions 27 and **28** proved to be the most difficult; the subtle differences in meaning between certain adverbs and conjunctions were not understood by all candidates.

Questions 33-40

As in last year's exam, some answers in the final exercise were not accurate enough. Just answering *4* or *4 jaar* to **Question 33** for example, was not enough to score. The correct answer had to indicate 'the last 4 years' (*4 jaar geleden* or *sinds 4 jaar*). Most (stronger) candidates had no problems here. Several candidates misheard the text and answered *een zomerkamer (sic.)* or *een zonnige kamer* to **Question 34**. **Question 36** and **Question 39** were done well by stronger candidates, but proved to be difficult for weaker candidates.

A few candidates answered 'he wants to search the Internet for more rooms' or 'he wants to rent out rooms using the Internet' to **Question 40**, both of which were incorrect. In **Section 3**, it is even more important to listen very closely to the text, as the questions and answers are more subtle than they are in the first two sections (**Sections 1** and **2**).

Paper 0515/02

Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

The majority of candidates scored high marks in both **Sections 1** and **2**. The multiple choice and matching exercises in **Section 1** were generally well done. The writing exercise in this section caused few problems, although a number of candidates did not give the information in accordance with the icons.

The reading exercise in **Section 2** is designed to test general understanding and candidates should identify the main points in short answers. However, a number of candidates gave very long answers which did not always include the required information. In the writing exercise in this section, 10 marks are available for communication. A further 5 marks are awarded for linguistic accuracy. A fairly large number of candidates did not get full marks for communication, and it should also be noted that information which is irrelevant to the task set cannot be credited. It is, therefore, important for candidates to read the tasks carefully before they start writing, which most candidates did.

The reading texts in **Section 3** are longer and more complex than the one in **Section 2** and should be read with extra care. As in previous sessions, weaker candidates usually managed to answer one or two of the first questions in each exercise. In the final exercise, again, short answers were required, but even when only one word was asked for, few candidates only wrote one word. In some answers, whole sentences were lifted from the text, which often failed to show that the question had been understood.

Comments on specific questions**Section 1****Exercise 1 Questions 1-5**

Question 1	B	Almost all of the candidates answered this question correctly.
Question 2	D	There were very few wrong answers to this question.
Question 3	A	Most candidates knew that the answer was A.
Question 4	B	Mainly correct answers, but occasionally A, C or D received a tick.
Question 5	C	Although this was the hardest question, the majority of candidates ticked the correct answer.

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

In this exercise, candidates were asked to match events with various locations. Most candidates answered all five questions correctly.

Question 6 *Ede* A few candidates answered *Den Haag*.

Question 7 *Drenthe*

Question 8 *Amsterdam* Some candidates answered *Texel*

Question 9 *Texel* ... and some wrote Amsterdam here.

Question 10 *Kinderdijk*

Exercise 3 Questions 11-15

Candidates were asked to match the names belonging to different types of shop with statements relating to these shops by writing the correct letter in the correct box. Most candidates did very well, but some confused the butcher's with the baker's in **Question 11**. A small number of candidates scored only 2 or 3 marks.

Question 11 B

Question 12 F

Question 13 C

Question 14 D

Question 15 E

Exercise 4 Question 16

Candidates were asked to write an e-mail of 25-40 words, inviting a friend for a day out in town. Most candidates gave the information asked for in the icons (a) to (c). However, a small number of candidates decided not to go by train, but by bus or car, and/or departed or arrived at the wrong time, and/or did not intend to visit the zoo, but preferred to go shopping instead. Travel by train had to be given using the word *train*, although misspelled *trien* was allowed, but not the English train. Occasionally, potentially better candidates did not give the correct information and only received 2 or 3 marks. However, the majority of candidates received 4 or 5 marks.

Section 2**Exercise 1 Questions 17-24**

Questions 19 and **20** appeared to be the most challenging.

Question 17 (i) *Oppassen (op twee dochtertjes)* and (ii) *voor het eten zorgen/eten koken* were the correct answers, although many candidates lifted most of the sentence in which this information occurred from the text, which was nevertheless correct.

Question 18 (i) *Een vraaggesprek voeren/een interview geven* and (ii) *een vertaling geven/vertalen* were examples of short answers, but, again, most answers were much longer, if still correct.

Question 19 *Danny (Nelissen)* was the answer, but a large number of candidates thought it was the French producer.

Question 20 The correct answer was *(prof)wielrenner*. A few candidates answered 'amateur world champion', which is not a profession, whilst others gave both professional cyclist as well as amateur world champion, which was not accurate either.

Question 21 *Hartklachten* was given correctly by most candidates, although most used more words to say so.

Question 22 *Hij was saai/Het was moeilijk*. Many candidates lifted the sentence *De eerste anderhalf jaar was ik zo saai als de pest*, which was also allowed.

Question 23 *Hij moest tegen een scherm (een tv'tje) praten*. This question caused few problems.

Question 24 *Vertel wat je ziet*. Most candidates answered this question correctly, although the majority first wrote that he had to take his shoes off etc. and then: 'just say what you see'. Again, the lengthy answer was accepted.

Exercise 2 Question 25

This exercise was about an exchange with a school abroad. Candidates were asked to write a letter to a pupil of the other school involved in the exchange. The majority of candidates scored the maximum 10 marks for communication, but quite a few candidates left out at least one of the five tasks.

- (a) Only very occasionally did candidates forget to tell who they were.
- (b) Most candidates usually mentioned the town or village in which they lived (*woonplaats*), but some did not give any further details about the place. A few wrote about their house or room, which was not required, and so only 1 mark could be given.
- (c) Most candidates asked about the size of the school, the number of pupils or the sports facilities and received the 2 marks available.
- (d) Candidates had to ask something about the pupil they were writing to. Quite a few candidates wrote to a *meneer* or *mevrouw* rather than a pupil, and asked something about the pupils at the school, which was incorrect.
- (e) Most candidates thought the exchange was a good idea and stressed the importance of getting to know someone else's culture.

In general, candidates who received (near) maximum marks for communication also received good accuracy marks. Marks were mainly lost, because certain tasks had not been completed. The prescribed length for the e-mail was excellently adhered to, and very few candidates wrote letters that were either too long or too short.

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 26-33**

- Question 26** B Most candidates chose the correct answer, but some chose C or D instead.
- Question 27** D This question was usually answered correctly, but A and C were occasionally ticked.
- Question 28** A is the correct answer, but some candidates went for one of the other options.
- Question 29** A was correct, but some candidates thought the answer was B.
- Question 30** D A was also popular.
- Question 31** C A large number of candidates chose B.
- Question 32** Although the obvious answer was that Hulya and Takeki did not like *drop*, candidates also worked out that they both liked *stamppot*.
- Question 33** Many candidates lifted the sentence about ingredients being expensive, which was an insufficient answer to the question, and was, therefore, not accepted. The point was that Takeki did not want to pay too much for ingredients, as he thought the Dutch prices for some of them were too expensive, and/or that he tries to find cheaper substitutes for such ingredients.

Exercise 2 Questions 34-45

- Question 34** Only one word was needed: *vaste*. *Mijn vaste hotel* was still acceptable, but not the entire opening sentence.
- Question 35** *Heellig gelukkig* was the correct answer, or any other intensifier with the adjective, so merely *blij* or *leuk* could not score.
- Question 36** *Hij ging naar het café* was the correct answer. Many candidates also mentioned that the people danced on the tables. That did not make the first part invalid, but candidates then had to write this again in the next question.
- Question 37** *Ze dansten op de tafels*. The word *bruisend* on its own was not enough.

- Question 38** *Knappe jongens/Jongens die er goed uitzagen.* Many candidates thought they were boys with good eyes, or boys who looked at the girls, but those answers were wrong.
- Question 39** *Ze heeft een Maastrichts accent.* Most candidates answered this question correctly, even though many thought the manager was a man.
- Question 40** *Leedvermaak/Ze keek triomfantelijk naar de schrijver.* This appeared to be the most challenging question of all. Quite a few candidates lifted the sentence about how the receptionist enjoyed the conversation, but this was not sufficient to gain the mark.
- Question 41** *Hij wist niet wat hij gedaan had.* Anything that expressed that the writer was confused, or did not understand what was going on, was accepted.
- Question 42** *Dat je ruzie hebt/krijgt.* A large number of candidates correctly answered that the saying meant that a fight/row and/or problems were likely to ensue. Some candidates thought the saying had to do with dancing and dolls.
- Question 43** *Zijn huwelijk gaat niet kapot, omdat hij z'n overhemden vergeet.* Lifting the sentence about the fact that his wife had not missed the shirts was not good enough to score on its own.
- Question 44** *Ze had zijn overhemden niet gemist.* Quite a few candidates had used this answer in the previous question and tried it again with more success.
- Question 45** *De manager.* Many candidates appeared not to have read the question properly and explained what was meant by *een schat van een vrouw* rather than to whom it referred.

Being the last exercise of **Section 3**, this was the most challenging. Not many candidates managed to score the full 12 marks, but the ones who read the text carefully and wrote answers that were to the point did well.

Paper 0515/03

Speaking

General comments

On the whole, most candidates were fully engaged in the exam, and even weaker candidates managed to show what they knew.

Although, in most cases, the interaction between candidate and Examiner was interesting and rewarding to the candidates, Examiners are reminded they have to try to let the candidates perform to the best of their ability and adjust their questioning to the quality of the candidate they are engaged with.

Generally, the quality of the recordings was high, although it would appear not as high as in previous years. In a small number of cases, it was very hard to make out what a candidate was saying and/or it was almost impossible to hear the teacher. Examiners are also reminded not to turn over the tape halfway through an exam.

In choosing a sample of candidates for moderation, it is essential that the candidates chosen for the tape cover the whole range of marks. Centres which do not conform to this stipulation will be asked to provide further recordings if the original sample is unsatisfactory. In addition, in cases where there is more than one Examiner conducting the speaking exam at a Centre, recordings from each teacher will need to be included in the moderation sample. These requirements are there to ensure that the standard of marking at a particular Centre is consistently applied across all candidates.

On the whole, marking by Examiners was commendably close to the agreed standards and the majority of Centres had only slight, if any, adjustment made to the marks. It should be borne in mind, however, that candidates do not have to be able to speak at native-speaker level in order to have access to top, or even full, marks. It should also be stressed that candidates should not be penalised for using words that are from different parts of the Dutch-speaking world but mean the same (e.g. *kuisen* or *schoonmaken*).

Role Plays

The role plays tested the candidates' knowledge of Dutch as it is used in day-to-day situations. Most candidates performed well in this part of the test. There was a small number of candidates who struggled, mainly because they did not (yet) possess enough idiomatic expressions and/or vocabulary to meet the demands of the situation outlined in the role plays. Such candidates are advised to practise speaking Dutch as much as possible before the exam, and to familiarise themselves with past speaking tests, which, crucially, would allow them to build up their confidence.

A small number of Examiners did not always keep to the sequence of events as outlined in the role plays, or, in a very few cases, invented new questions along the way. Such improvisation is likely to confuse especially the less able candidates, and should therefore be avoided. Very occasionally, it became apparent that some Examiners had not prepared for the role-play situations. It should be borne in mind that candidates cannot be rewarded for answering questions that have nothing to do with the questions set in the Teacher's Notes.

As part of the role-play tests, candidates are required to ask one question in Role Play A, and two in Role Play B. They are not obliged to use the suggestions for questions in brackets, and they should not be penalised for asking (a) valid question(s) that deviate(s) from either or both of the suggestions.

Topic (prepared) Conversation

As last year, there was wide range of topics. Most candidates had prepared very well for this part of the test, but a few spent too much time on showing photographs and/or materials that were brought in, which did not give them the chance to show their linguistic skill. Candidates should not be allowed to talk uninterrupted for more than a minute before questions are asked by the Examiner. Equally, Examiners are reminded not to commence with asking questions from the outset, but to allow candidates time to get into their stride and settle into their topic first. Nevertheless, there were some excellent examples of examining technique, which encouraged candidates to use past and future tenses.

General (unprepared) Conversation

The best performances in this section were those where candidates used, or were encouraged to use, a variety of time frames, relevant vocabulary and different syntactic structures.

A very small number of Examiners did not prepare their questions well enough, which resulted in a few rather stilted conversations. On the other hand, there were some Examiners who had prepared too many questions, which put pressure on their candidates to give very short answers before the next question came along, which prevented these candidates from showing they could handle complex syntactic structures and also from showing the breadth of their vocabulary.

However, on the whole, the exams were handled very well by most Examiners, and it was clear that they had worked very hard to allow their candidates to deliver their best work.

<p>Paper 0515/04 Continuous Writing</p>

General comments

On the whole, candidates were able to answer the questions as instructed.

Candidates were asked to answer either **Question 1 (a)** or **1 (b)**, and **Question 2**.

A maximum of 25 marks was available for each question.

For each question, 5 marks were awarded for communication, 15 marks for language, and 5 marks for general impression.

Most candidates wrote the required number of words for both essays. Only a very few candidates wrote fewer words than required or failed to answer a question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Approximately half the candidates chose option **(a)** and half answered **(b)**.

- (a)** Candidates were asked to write a letter to a friend about a day trip to an amusement park. They were required to address five bullet points in their letter. Most candidates did so successfully, thereby achieving full marks for communication.

Some candidates interpreted the meaning of the word *pretpark* as meaning a local park rather than an amusement park. Although the correct article for *pretpark* was given in the rubric, quite a few candidates used the wrong article (*de*) for *pretpark* and/or *park*.

- (b)** Candidates were asked to write a letter of application for a summer job, and were required to address the five bullet points mentioned in the rubric.

Candidates were required to combine the expression *Ik ben beschikbaar* with an indication of time, which proved to be challenging; the word *beschikbaar* was sometimes used incorrectly as a verb, e.g. *Ik beschikbaar (sic)*. In addition, some candidates struggled with writing dates correctly. For example, some wrote months and days incorrectly with a capital letter, e.g. *Op Maandag (sic)* and *van 1 Juli tot 1 September (sic)*, instead of *Op maandag* and *van 1 juli tot 1 september*. Candidates are strongly advised to make themselves familiar with the conventions adhering to the writing of dates and days of the week in Dutch.

Nevertheless, the majority of the candidates performed well, by clearly introducing themselves, mentioning relevant experience – most citing experience in looking after brothers and sisters – and stating their dates of availability for the job. It became apparent that a large number of candidates had practised writing application letters, and, consequently, performed very well.

Question 2

This question caused few problems for most candidates. However, a small number of candidates did not write in the past tense, as required in this part of the examination.

Candidates were given brief details of an event that happened last year, and were then asked to describe what happened next.

The majority of candidates expressed their thoughts, feelings and opinions well, demonstrating excellent use of vocabulary and syntax.

Some candidates, however, copied part of the question for their answer. No marks could be awarded for repeating information given in the question, as candidates can only be awarded for their own input.

A small number of candidates relied solely only on the verb *was* and/or the verbs that were given in the question (*kwamen* and *begon*), which indicated a lack of confidence in using the past tense in Dutch. Candidates are reminded that they should practice using the past tense thoroughly in preparation for this exam. In addition, Centres are advised to make it very clear to candidates that **Question 2** should be answered in the past tense well in advance of the exam.