

Report on the Components

June 2007

1921/MS/R/07

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE Dutch 1921

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	
1921/01	Listening	1
1921/02	Speaking	2
1921/03	Reading	4
1921/04	Writing	6
*	Grade Thresholds	8

The examination went well this year.

Section 1

Exercise 1

Hardly any mistakes were made in this exercise.

Exercise 2

Most candidates received full marks for this exercise. Some had difficulties with the position of the *Parkeerplaats* and the *Supermarkt*, which suggests they had trouble with prepositions like *achter* and *tegenover*.

Exercise 3

Most candidates did this question well.

Section 2

Exercise 4

Many candidates did well in this exercise.

Exercise 5

This second exercise of Section 2 was quite difficult. The better candidates did not encounter problems, but the weaker candidates seemed to have a tendency to guess the right answer, which unfortunately for them did not work.

Section 3

Exercise 6

As in last year's examination, the first exercise in this Section was done well. Please note that a word can be misspelt and still receive full marks, since this is a listening test.

Exercise 7

The better candidates did not encounter many problems in this exercise. As was expected, the weaker candidates found the exercise challenging.

Exercise 8

Better candidates managed to score full marks for this exercise.

Conclusion

As in the previous year there were no major problems in this year's examination.

Speaking 2007

This year's examination went well. The candidates seemed well prepared and most Teacher/Examiners were very supportive towards them, which helped them to show their language skills. It is permissible to remind candidates about missed tasks in the role-plays. Some examiners said something like 'I think you need to ask me something', which is allowed and very helpful to the candidates, who sometimes forget tasks because of nerves. The candidates should talk as much as possible, since this is a speaking test. Especially in Section 3 and in the General Conversation, we are looking for an open conversation, not an interrogation (Question – Answer – Question – Answer).

Some candidates meet the Examiner for the first time shortly before the test is taken. It would be very helpful for candidates if they could meet the Examiner before the actual day. If this is not possible, it can still be very useful to meet a little earlier on the day itself.

The administration was handled well. Where the appropriate forms were not available, most Examiners gave details of the candidates on a piece of paper, which was very helpful.

At times the recordings of the speaking tests are not of optimal quality. It is therefore very important to position the candidate as close to the microphone as possible and the examiner a little further away. It can be useful to record a little conversation before the test starts, to determine how much or little the machine picks up. Please remember that it is not permissible to switch off the recorder at any time during the test.

Finally, although it is appreciated that it can be difficult to find capable speakers of Dutch to conduct the test, it is important that the Examiner knows enough of the target language not to confuse the candidates. Examiners who speak South African or German might speak a language that is similar to Dutch, but it is very difficult for weaker candidates to understand.

Role Play Section 1

The Role Plays in Section 1 caused very few difficulties. Most candidates received full marks for their first Role Play. Answers can be quite short and still receive full marks (e.g. *Wat wil je eten? Brood*)

All Role Plays in this section were done well. The Examiners kept to the script very well with the role-plays, which helped the candidates. It is permissible to indicate to the candidate that they have forgotten a task but please make sure the answer is not given away in doing so.

Role Play Section 2

The Role Plays in Section 2 did not cause any problems. It is important that teachers do not give away what the candidates need to say, e.g. in Booklet 1 the candidate had to say *Ik wil een huisje huren*, therefore saying to the candidate *Je wilt een huisje huren* makes it much easier than 'You phone to rent an holiday home' as was stated in the situation. Overall there were no problems in the Role Plays in Section 2.

Role Play Section 3

This narrative Role Play is meant for the candidate to show that he or she can 'narrate a story that happened in the past'. A good way to start the Section 3 Role Play seems to be to prompt the candidate in a natural way (*Ik heb gehoord dat je iets raars/ leuks is overkomen toen je vorige maand naar Amsterdam ging, vertel eens?*), rather than say 'Explain what you see in the pictures'. All candidates who were invited to tell what happened to them last month started off

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

fine and managed to tell a story close to the pictures. The risk of asking the candidate to explain what they see is that they may start giving very brief information (e.g. *Hij staat op, Hij ontbijt, Hij gaat naar het station*) which triggers the Examiner to ask short closed questions as well (e.g. *Hoe laat ging je ontbijten? Waar ging je naar toe?*). It is important in this Section to keep the questions open and invite the candidates to tell as much as possible by themselves (*Vertel maar, wat is er gebeurd*).

A few Examiners still use the prompts in the pictures as questions. They are meant to help the candidate to construct the story and should not be used for questioning the candidate.

Sometimes Examiners did not ask questions at all during this role play. Candidates are also marked on how they respond to questions from the Examiner, so it is vital to ask some questions during the story.

General Conversation

The topics in this part of the examination open up the conversation quite easily. Most examiners were able to hold a conversation with a natural feel to it, which very often brings out the best in the candidates. The questions in the back of the teacher booklet should give examiners some ideas of what can be asked. They are only suggested questions though, and should not be asked slavishly one by one. It is very important here to create space for the candidates to elaborate. They can only achieve higher marks when they make longer sentences and show initiative in the conversation. One way of achieving this is to ask *waarom* questions. (E.g. *Waar woon je liever? In Nederland of in Engeland?* Answer: *In Nederland*. Then: *Waarom? Vertel eens?*) The best conversations were when the Examiner found a topic that was close to the candidate's heart. Asking candidates to talk about their home and family usually does not inspire the candidate to start talking. Many Examiners used the questions in the back of the Teacher's booklet as a 'starter-question' and picked up more personal information as soon as possible to make the candidate talk. This technique worked very well and made the candidate score high marks in most cases.

Conclusion

All in all there were very few problems with the speaking tests this year. Thanks to the good work of many Examiners, most of the candidates were at ease and the conversations sounded natural. Thank you all for the good work!

GCSE 1921/03 DUTCH READING

General comments

The majority of candidates did very well in this year's examination, and both Sections 1 and 2 were generally well done. Sometimes candidates forgot to tick a box, write a letter in a box or ticked a box too many. Careful reading of the rubric and having a good look at the example is always advisable. In Section 3 Exercise 6, candidates had obviously paid attention to the rubric and most did not fill in more than two words. In the final exercise there were four correct statements that needed a tick and again the majority of candidates did exactly that.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section 1

Exercise 1: Qs.1-4

There were four multiple-choice questions, which were usually answered correctly, although in Q.1 some candidates thought the answer was grapes rather than strawberries, while in Q.2 not everyone knew the difference between snow and rain. Q.3 caused very few problems as the majority of candidates knew their school subjects and ticked the box for French. The response to Q.4 was excellent, as very few candidates did not know that this was a bus ticket.

Exercise 2: Qs.5-7

The candidates were asked to put the letters for the various food and drink items in the boxes next to the statements. This exercise was also done very well and answers to Q.5 chicken (K) and peas (E) were usually correct. In Q.6 some candidates wrote the letter T for tea instead of D, which was a little careless as, in the example, *koffie* was J, not K. For Q.7 some candidates chose salad and sausage (H) rather than a slice of bread (F) and sausage, almost as if they would prefer that combination.

Exercise 3: Qs.8-12

Most candidates did well in this multiple-choice exercise, although some chose the farm rather than the windmill (A) in Q.8. In Q.9 there were very few mistakes and bicycle (C) was the correct answer. The sunny weather (B) in Q.10 caused few problems. Occasionally candidates chose the wrong answer in the last two questions. In Q.11 the correct answer was the day after Monday, which was B and in Q.12 some ticked the leisure activity surfing rather than the job (C).

Section 2

Exercise 4: Qs.13-17

In this exercise candidates were asked to look at the station lay-out, read the statements and place the correct letter of each location in the box.

There were few problems with the telephone (G) in Q.13, the snackbar (D) in Q.14, or the lost umbrella (J) in Q.15. Some candidates did not locate the waiting room (H) correctly, although the word *wachten* could be recognised in *wachtkamer* in Q.16. Some candidates wanted to meet their friend at the entrance rather than at the meeting point in the middle of the station (L) in Q.17.

Exercise 5: Qs.18-22

Candidates were asked to place ticks in the grid with the headings 'excellent', 'okay' or 'bad' indicating which statements referred to the kind of day pupils had had at school. If there were any mistakes, they were usually in Qs.21 and 22, but generally candidates coped well with this exercise.

Section 3

Exercise 6: Qs.23-28

The exercises become more difficult in this Section and Exercise 6 turned out to be the most difficult. Candidates had to read a text and then fill in no more than two Dutch words in the following statements. Some of these words, but not all, appeared in the text. Weaker candidates were sometimes tempted to lift more than two words from the text, which was not allowed. In Q.23 candidates had to find the Dutch for 'together', while in Q.24 one or two words conveying 'less' were needed. Q.25 might have been easier as the word *boer* (farmer) was needed, which was in the text, but not all candidates answered this correctly. Similarly in Q.26 the required word *groot* (big) was in the text, but not everyone spotted this. Q.27 stated that the neighbours no longer *lachten* (laughed), although the present tense was allowed. For Q.28 many candidates indicated that the remark about mini-elephants and mini-chickens was meant to be 'funny', 'sarcastic', 'ironic', 'not serious', and all these and similar expressions were allowed. Quite a number of candidates scored no more than two or three marks in this exercise.

Exercise 7: Qs.29-33

This was a text with multiple-choice questions. Qs.29 (B), 30 (C) and 33 (A) appeared to be the hardest. Quite a few candidates scored full marks but, as is usual in a Section 3 exercise, others scored fewer marks and only answered Q.31 (B) and Q.32 (B) correctly.

Exercise 8: Qs.34

Candidates had to read a text about The Beatles and tick four correct statements, which were C, E, G and H. Quite a few candidates thought that D and F were valid answers, while the letter I was frequently ticked too. Some candidates did not attempt to do this exercise or ticked more than four boxes, in which case they lost one mark for each additional tick.

DUTCH GCSE 1921/04 WRITING

General Comments

The majority of candidates did very well in both Sections 1 and 2, while Section 3 was, as always, more challenging.

Most candidates communicated well in Section 1, though an increased number of candidates translated the questions in Exercise 3 from English into Dutch, instead of answering them. It is possible that these candidates have not seen a previous examination paper. The example does not show a translation, but a Dutch sentence fulfilling the task.

In Section 2 many mobiles were lost and cars bought. This year there appeared to be more candidates who answered both questions. Again, this seems to point to candidates not being familiar with the paper. The rubric states that either Q.1 or Q.2 should be answered. In both questions it is important that present, past and future tenses are used. Some candidates forgot to do the last task or answered it in the wrong tense.

In Section 3 candidates wrote either about a cycling trip in the Netherlands or about a birthday visit to an adventure park. Many did very well, although this year there appeared to be more candidates who wrote very little and often in a kind of phonetic Dutch with many English words.

Especially in Section 3, it is important not to forget to give opinions and reasons, which are not only necessary for communication marks, but also tend to produce the complex sentences which contribute to a good mark for quality of language.

Individual Questions

Section 1

Q.1

Most candidates wrote a list of eight good answers, many of which were spelled correctly. Some incorrect spellings were allowed, as well as cognates such as *tram*, but *fish* and 'windmill' were obviously not acceptable. Some candidates wrote more than eight words. However, extra words do not receive any marks.

Q.2

The majority of candidates answered the questions correctly, but in this exercise the correct spelling was also important. The correct sentences were: 1. *Ik fiets naar huis*, 2. *Ik vlieg naar Nederland*, 3. *Ik rij(d) naar de kerk*. Many candidates received full marks for communication, but the spelling sometimes caused problems. *Fiets* and *huis* were usually correct. *Flieg* was very popular as was *nederland(s)* which were incorrect. *Rij(d)* caused problems and frequently became *drijf*, which means 'float' in English. Variations such as *Ik ga met de auto* were acceptable, but *ik ga* could only score once as a correct verb. *Kerk* was also written as *kerek*, *kereck* or *kirk*, which received no accuracy marks. *Museum* and *kasteel* instead of *kerk* were allowed for both communication and spelling.

Q.3

The majority of candidates did very well in this exercise. They asked their friend to go to the cinema, on a certain day or at a certain time, then they met near stations and shops, either cycled, walked or went by bus, watched a film of usually two hours and finally went swimming, played football or had a drink or a hamburger. Most candidates wrote simple sentences and

received full marks for both communication and quality of language. As already mentioned, an increased number of candidates just translated the questions and received no marks.

Section 2

Q.4

Candidates were asked to write about something they had lost or about the new car their parents had bought.

In 1, many colourful mobiles were lost, as well as coats, bags and items of jewellery. They were often left or stolen in trains, sports grounds or parks. Some candidates just lost money, but then failed to describe it, which meant they lost marks. Candidates often described how their parents had reacted and did not produce a future tense.

In 2, many candidates described large, expensive, foreign cars. Unfortunately the cars frequently broke down on the first day, while some lucky candidates became the 'cool' owners of the car. Some candidates forgot to say what they were going to do the following week.

The majority of candidates did very well in Section 2, but marks were sometimes lost by failing to cover all the required elements and not using a past/perfect tense and/or a future tense/future reference.

A number of candidates answered both questions, but only one answer was taken into account.

Section 3

Q.5

In 1, many candidates wrote enthusiastically about their cycling trip in the Netherlands, although some forgot to mention where exactly they went. There were many punctures and broken bicycles, but few major accidents. Some visited an adventure park on the way. Opinions were freely given, but sometimes no reasons were mentioned. As in Section 2, some candidates forgot to deal with the last task, about what they would like to do next time and why.

In 2, many candidates had fantastic birthday parties in adventure parks. However, not everyone gave an opinion about the park, but about the birthday presents, the weather, or the level of sickness caused by the rides.

It should be emphasised that in Section 3 candidates should be careful to write no more than 150 words, which is usually less than one full page. The opinions and justifications in the last two tasks should produce some excellent language, with good subordinate clauses, so it is important that they appear in those 150 words when the marks for both quality of language and accuracy are decided.

Many candidates with the highest marks for communication wrote a separate paragraph for each task, making sure that they did not omit any points.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education Dutch 1921
June 2007 Assessment Series**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01 - Listening	40	34	29	24	20	16	13	10
02 - Speaking	50	41	35	29	24	19	15	11
03 - Reading	40	33	28	24	20	16	13	10
04 - Writing	80	66	57	48	40	32	25	18

**N.B. Component marks are scaled to a weighted mark out of 50.
Each component represents 25% of the overall award**

Overall

	Max	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	188	166	142	119	100	81	63	45
Percentage in Grade		25.59	38.09	14.45	11.33	3.52	2.54	1.37	1.76
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		25.59	63.67	78.13	89.45	92.97	95.51	96.88	98.63

The total entry for the examination was 512

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553