

DUTCH

Paper 0515/01

Listening

General comments

The overall performance of the candidates was good. By design, there is a steady increase in the level of difficulty of the questions, but there was a sizeable majority of candidates who performed consistently well throughout the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Deel 1

Oefening 1

A very small number of weaker candidates struggled with this exercise, but the vast majority scored full marks.

Oefening 2

This exercise was done well by most candidates. Again, the weakest candidates were able to distinguish a few words here and there, but had difficulty making sense of the context in which these words were spoken. As a result, some of the answers given by this group of candidates were rather random. A very small number of candidates gave answers in English, for which they could not receive marks.

Deel 2

Oefening 1

Many candidates did well in this matching exercise, with most scoring full marks. The level of difficulty had been turned up a notch in this section and some of the weaker candidates were unable to acquire full marks.

Oefening 2

The stronger candidates had few problems with this exercise. However, some of the candidates gave answers that were too elaborate. It is important for candidates to realise that as this is a listening test, the answers should be short and to the point, as writing overlong answers can cost valuable time.

Deel 3

This section is the hardest of the exam and intended to test the best candidates. Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see that nearly all candidates attempted this section as even some of the weaker to middling ones were able to accrue some valuable marks.

Oefening 1

The candidates had to listen very carefully to pick the right answer among the distracters. Only the best were able to score full marks for this exercise. Careful listening followed by close verification of the answers against the text during the second time the text is played was key.

Oefening 2

As is invariably the case, this final exercise is the most difficult in the exam as its aim is to distinguish between candidates at the top. The challenge at this level is to get the gist from the text and to summarise the information in a good response. Many of the better candidates scored full to near-full marks.

DUTCH

Paper 0515/02
Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

The majority of candidates scored high marks in **Sections 1** and **2** of the examination.

The multiple choice exercises in **Section 1** were done well by most candidates. The writing exercise did not cause many problems, but some candidates did not use all the icons.

The open-ended comprehension exercise in **Section 2** asks for **short** answers, but some candidates lifted long pieces of text, without much success.

The writing exercise in **Section 2** carries ten marks for communication with a further five marks for accuracy. Quite a few candidates did not score full marks for communication, for instance because they did not mention the school subject or the teachers. Others wrote about their own autumn half-term holiday, but did not ask about their friend's. As always, it is important to take the time to read the questions properly.

The reading texts in **Section 3** are longer and they too need to be read carefully. Some candidates only answered one or two questions in each exercise correctly. In the final exercise, again, **short** answers were required, but quite a few candidates lifted whole sentences in the hope that these contained the right answer. In some questions, candidates gave two possible answers. However, giving two answers can be risky; if one of them is incorrect, no mark is awarded.

Comments on individual questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1 – 5

- Question 1** **D** Most candidates ticked the correct answer ('bicycle'), but some ticked 'car' in A.
- Question 2** **B** Quite a number of candidates did not know the correct answer ('sausage') and ticked one of the other boxes.
- Question 3** **A** Some candidates did not realise *truitje* is an item of clothing, although the phrases *in de nieuwste kleuren* and *in alle maten* should have helped.
- Question 4** **C** Almost everyone knew the correct answer, 'washing machine'.
- Question 5** **B** A small number of candidates did not know the correct time.

Exercise 2 Questions 6 – 10

Candidates were asked to match people with their hobby. Knitting in **Question 6** and the rabbit in **Question 8** were not always answered correctly.

- Question 6** **F** Knitting was not always known, resulting in some random answers.
- Question 7** **B** The link between Boris and athletics was made by most candidates.
- Question 8** **A** There was some confusion here with the cat in statement D.

- Question 9** C Just about everyone answered this question correctly.
- Question 10** E Most candidates were familiar with the Dutch word for stamp.

Exercise 3 Questions 11 – 15

Candidates had to indicate which people watched which TV programme.

- Question 11** C The chat show caused no problems.
- Question 12** A Most candidates knew that Jeanet liked viewing houses.
- Question 13** G Some candidates incorrectly linked the football match with comedy.
- Question 14** E This question asked what a nature lover would want to watch, i.e. a programme on autumn in the Netherlands. Quite a number of candidates thought it would be the programme on camping in Portugal.
- Question 15** D Most candidates answered this question correctly.

Exercise 4 Question 16

On the whole, candidates did well in this exercise, although many exceeded the 25-40 word limit. Standard openings like "How are you? I am fine" are not required and do not score. The majority of candidates wrote about the French test, while others wrote about a geography test on France or even Finland. Unfortunately, a few candidates did not seem to know what a *proefwerk* was, and although the test was to be held at school, some candidates decided to go on holiday to France. This then caused problems with icon number three where they were supposed to write that they were going to have an ice-cream after school or make this suggestion to their friend. The month of *mei* was given in the icon and should be written with a lower case 'm'; some candidates did not.

Quite a few candidates did not receive the full three marks for communication, but most did get the full two marks for language.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17 – 26

Although many candidates did well in this exercise, there were quite a few who lifted whole sentences without trying to specify the required information.

Question 17

Ze wil niet dik worden (she does not want to put on weight) was the correct answer, but frequently a large part of the sentence containing the word *dik* was lifted, which made no sense.

Question 18

The interviewee ate *in de kantine*, but some candidates picked the word *thuis* (at home).

Question 19

Loretta's favourite food was *Italiaans*; it was not necessary to say that she used to like Indonesian food.

Question 20

Most candidates realised she did not like *sperziebonen* (French beans) as a child.

Question 21

Although she liked most fruit, the food Loretta did not like was *bananen*. She ate little meat, but some candidates decided she did not like it at all.

Question 22

The husband cooked when his wife was not there. Answers such as 'he did not like it', 'he did something for himself' and 'he wanted something different' were incorrect.

Question 23

Ze raakt in paniek (she starts to panic) was all that was required, but most candidates added a further explanation which was not necessary, though not incorrect.

Question 24

Many candidates gave both possible answers to why she did not have a favourite cookery book.

Question 25

Een boterham (a slice of bread) was what she ate in the morning. Answers quoting the complete sentence in which the word occurred in the text, or the addition of *toch beter* made no sense.

Question 26

She could not do without *kaas* (cheese). More words lifted from the text usually rendered the answer invalid.

Exercise 2 Question 27

Candidates were asked to write to a friend about a subject-related school trip. Many candidates scored the maximum 10 marks for communication, but quite a few candidates forgot to mention all parts of the task. In most cases, being aware of what was required through careful reading of the question would have made all the difference.

- (a) A number of candidates mentioned neither the school subject nor the teacher(s) involved. This was not very difficult and a good opportunity to get some marks was lost for some.
- (b) Telling your friend simple things about the trip was another straightforward chance to score. Some candidates wrote at length about what had happened, and then rushed the remaining tasks, which sometimes caused them to omit part of them.
- (c) Some candidates wrote that they had had a good trip, but forgot to mention the second bit of information about the trip.
- (d) Candidates had to ask their friend's about their autumn holiday, not go into details about their own - a fairly frequent oversight.
- (e) The final task needed careful consideration: most candidates mentioned two things they wanted to do on their next holiday, but then did not always go and stay with their friend.

Section 3**Exercise 1 Questions 28-35**

Almost all candidates attempted this exercise, but some only managed to get two marks out of eight. The first and the fifth question in this exercise were most frequently answered correctly. Many candidates received six, seven or eight marks for this exercise.

- Question 28 C** This question was usually answered correctly.
- Question 29 D** Although this question was not always answered correctly, there was no particular favourite alternative.
- Question 30 A** See **Question 29**.
- Question 31 A** See **Question 29**.

- Question 32** C This question was usually answered correctly.
- Question 33** A See **Question 29**.
- Question 34** D Some candidates thought that B was correct.
- Question 35** B Some chose A instead of B.

Exercise 2 Questions 36-47

Almost all of the candidates tried to do this exercise, but some of the weaker ones scored only two or three marks, usually in the first three or four questions in the exercise.

Question 36

Most candidates gave one of the correct alternative answers: either the green landscape and/or the rural smells.

Question 37

Feesten (partying) was the correct answer; lifting of the whole sentence in which the word occurred did not score.

Question 38

The majority, but not everyone, knew that the information could be found on the internet.

Question 39

Many candidates could not choose and gave both possible answers, i.e. 'not near a (main) road', or 'not signposted'.

Question 40

Although many candidates answered this question correctly, some thought there was no café in the village because it was too expensive, which was incorrect.

Question 41

The seven boys were close, not because they went to school together but because of the large number of girls in their class. This last detail had to be mentioned to earn the mark.

Question 42

Quite a few candidates quoted Mrs Franke rather than Mr Franke, which was not correct.

Question 43

Buurten in this context meant paying a visit, not 'a particular neighbourhood', or 'watching a film together'.

Question 44

It took a while to get to the *keet* in Albergen, because it was hard to find, not because it was a colourful caravan in a farmyard, nor because of the fact that the boys had done up the caravan.

Question 45

The sport in question was *schaatsen* (skating), not *training*.

Question 46

Many candidates understood that the phrase referred to the fact that the boys could not understand why there were no *keten* in Amsterdam.

Question 47

Most candidates had understood the final question and thought of a plausible reason why the minibus always remain a pipedream, e.g. lack of money, or the boys' young age. Other candidates quoted various things mentioned in the last paragraph, but did not find a correct answer.



DUTCH

Paper 0515/03

Speaking

General comments

As always, candidates' ability to communicate in spoken language was impressive, and most performed to a very high standard. The interactions between candidate and Examiner were often interesting, but Examiners have to remember to try to let the candidates perform to their ability and pitch questions at the level of the candidate. Therefore it is better not to ask about world events if the candidate finds it difficult to answer straightforward questions but to try to find a subject with which the candidate is more familiar. There were plenty of good examples where candidates started with 'easy' subjects such as sport and shopping and were able to progress to more challenging subjects. This type of examining will not be necessary for the most competent candidates who will be able to start talking about more challenging topics straightaway. The key is to adapt the approach to a candidate's ability.

Generally, the quality of the recordings was high. Please remember that while the teacher should be audible, it is crucial that the candidate's voice is recorded clearly, as it is impossible to award points when a candidate is not heard or heard too faintly. It is therefore absolutely crucial to test the acoustics and recording equipment in advance of the recordings and in the space where the recordings are going to take place. Centres are reminded that they have to ensure that there will be enough space left on each side of the cassette so that the recording is not interrupted by having to change sides. Examiners are also not allowed to switch off or pause the tape after each part of the exam.

When a Centre compiles their sample, it is essential that the candidates chosen for the sample cover the whole range of achievement. In addition, permission has to be sought from the Product Manager to have more than one Examiner per Centre. After receiving permission from CIE, Centres with more than one Examiner should send in a sample of six candidates from each Examiner for moderation. Please remember that CIE may request a further sample, so please ensure that all candidates are recorded to the same standard.

Generally, marking was close to the required standards and the majority of Centres had only a small, if any, adjustment made to their marks. This was usually because it was forgotten that the candidates do not have to speak to native-speaker standard to obtain high or even full marks.

Centres should always include a copy of the MS1 for the whole Centre with the tapes sent in for moderation.

Role Plays

The Role Plays test candidates' knowledge of Dutch as used in day-to-day situations. Few candidates encountered any problems.

Teachers are reminded that they should not launch into the first question but introduce each Role Play so that the candidate feels ready to start the task. Unfortunately, a few teachers did not keep to the scenarios set out in the Role Plays or appeared not to have prepared properly, or asked questions which were not pertinent to the task. The questions to be asked by the Examiner are presented in such a way that the candidate cannot answer with either yes or no, yet some teachers gave away the answer in their question. Another problem arose when Examiners started to improvise on the Role Plays as they went along, which caused some confusion on the part of the candidates. It should be remembered that a candidate cannot be awarded marks for material that has no bearing on the task set.

In the first Role Play, candidates have to ask only one thing about the given situation and in the second Role Play two. Please be aware that the suggestions given in brackets do not have to be used by the candidates.

Most Examiners rose to the challenge of becoming a fire man, zoo keeper or dentist. It was interesting to hear how much detail they were able to use creatively for these roles.

It is important to remember that if a candidate does not seem to understand what is required the Examiner should attempt to steer them in the right direction in Dutch and on tape, without explicitly telling them that their previous answer was wrong. Please remember as well that if the candidate forgets to answer the whole or part of a question they may be reminded gently after a candidate has finished their turn.

Topic Conversation (prepared)

A wide range of interesting topics was heard. Most candidates had prepared their material very well. Candidates should not be allowed to talk uninterruptedly for more than one minute before being asked questions. Spending too much time on looking at photographs and other material brought in does not give the candidates a lot of time to show their linguistic capabilities. At the other extreme, some Examiners started to ask questions from the outset, which did not give candidates time to settle into their subject and to expand. There were, however, some excellent examples of examining, which encouraged candidates to use past and future tenses. Candidates should be encouraged to prepare different topics within a Centre and should not be allowed to present 'myself' or 'my life' as topics, as these are too general and can often pre-empt the general (unprepared) conversation.

General Conversation (unprepared)

The best performances in this section of the test were the ones where the Examiner encouraged the candidates to use a variety of time frames, relevant vocabulary and appropriate structures. However, some Examiners did not prepare adequately for this part of the test and the conversations became quite stilted. Other Examiners had a few too many questions to ask the candidate; such dialogues tended to force candidates to give very quick and short answers before a conversation could properly develop and any advanced linguistic competence on the part of candidate could be shown. Candidates should be given ample time to construct complex sentences.

DUTCH

Paper 0515/04
Continuous Writing

General comments

Overall, most candidates found this paper to be fairly straightforward and were able to answer the questions as instructed.

Candidates were asked to answer either **Question 1 (a)** or **1 (b)**, and **Question 2**. 25 points were allocated to each question, with a maximum of 50 marks for the paper.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Question 1 had a choice of **(a)** or **(b)**.

(a) This question caused few problems for most candidates.

Candidates were asked to write a letter to a friend and talk about a party they had been to. Their answer had to refer to the five bullet points given in the question. The majority of the candidates referred to all 5 bullet points and achieved full marks for communication.

A few candidates did not understand the adverb *vroeger* and/or had problems with the use of the adjective *volgende*. As a result, such candidates struggled to supply the information required for *wat je vroeger met deze vriend/vriendin hebt gedaan*.

A few candidates had problems with word order and wrote for example: *Vroeger ik zag mijn vriend op school elke dag*. Examiners refer to the grammatical term Time Manner Place (TMP) to assess such constructions. In this particular case, the candidate should have written: *Vroeger zag ik mijn vriend elke dag op school*.

Some candidates wrote as if the party had not yet taken place. However, the question was written in the past tense. Candidates are therefore reminded that they should read the task very carefully before starting to write to ensure, among other things, that they place their essay in the appropriate time frame.

(b) Most candidates performed well in this question.

Candidates were asked to write a letter to a friend about their camping holiday. As for **Question 1(a)** candidates had to refer to the information asked for in the five bullet points.

Nearly all candidates mentioned where they had gone on holiday (bullet point 1). However, some candidates had difficulties answering the question *wat er gebeurde toen je de tent ging opzetten* (second bullet point). Not everybody understood the verb *opzetten* but most candidates knew that this verb related to the tent and used their imagination to provide information relating to difficulties experienced with this object. The best candidates invented small problems with the tent, e.g. *Toen*

we de tent gingen opzetten, merkten we dat we de tentstokken vergeten waren and hard regenen en alles werd nat, voordat de tent klaar was!

A small number of candidates interpreted the word *buren* as *buurt* and described the place they had gone camping instead of their neighbours on the campsite (third bullet point). Most candidates dealt well with the fourth bullet point, giving reasons why they liked going camping, or, as in some cases, why they would rather stay in a hotel!

As mentioned under **Question 1(a)**, a few candidates had problems with the word order of sentences which included a time element like *de volgende maand*. Candidates should be reminded of the correct word order in sentences with elements of time, manner, and/or place.

Question 2

Candidates were given brief details of an event that they had to imagine happened to them in a busy shopping centre, and were asked to describe what happened next.

Most candidates expressed their experiences and feelings quite well and demonstrated good use of vocabulary, past tense and syntax. Some candidates answered the question extremely well and gained full marks. Quite a few candidates met their long lost friends or parents in the shopping centre.

Other candidates described some frightful experiences such as a kidnapping: *Ik keek om en achter me stond een grote man met een zwarte jas aan. Hij fluisterde in mijn oor, terwijl ik een pistool tegen mijn rug voelde.*

Some candidates copied part of the question in their answer. No marks were awarded for repeating information given in the rubric (*Je liep door een druk winkelcentrum. Opeens voelde je een hand op je schouder. Je keek om en...*) Candidates were only awarded for using their own words and conjugating the verbs from the rubric with the personal pronoun *ik*.

A very few candidates answered this question solely in the present tense. For example: *Ik keek om en ik zie een meneer. Ik zeg: wie ben je? De meneer zegt niks.* Candidates were only awarded marks for quality of language if they could demonstrate the use of the past tense, as this is an integral part of the task. Candidates should therefore be reminded that all narratives for **Question 2** must be written in the past tense.