

Dutch B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 29	30 - 46	47 - 61	62 - 74	75 - 87	88 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 29	30 - 48	49 - 62	63 - 75	76 - 88	89 - 100

Higher Level and Standard Level Internal assessment

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most oral exams were well conducted and instructions were followed appropriately. The work submitted was generally appropriate and there was a good variety of topics covered. There was occasional misunderstanding about the requirement for the photograph to relate specifically to Dutch Culture and indeed a small number of schools submitted a graphic image / cartoon rather than a

photograph as required. The captions were generally appropriate, but again some failed to relate to Dutch culture and some gave more impression of a “guiding question”. Not all of the topics chosen related clearly to the Language B options.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Most candidates performed well under Criterion A. Sometimes (and perhaps too often at HL) it was clear that candidates were native (or very near native) speakers of Dutch. Entering such candidates in a Dutch B examination is not in the spirit of the IB and schools who knowingly do so should consider their Language Policy. However, even amongst those who were true second-language learners of Dutch, very few candidates performed at level less than “good”.

There was a greater range of performance on Criterion B. Very often the success of the candidate depended upon the success of the teacher in the conduct of the assessment. When candidates spent time describing and considering the photo they had been given, the impression they made was better than when candidates simply dismissed the photo with a single sentence and then launched head-first into a prepared monologue on the topic in question. Most candidates were also more successful when asked open ended questions, which led to a natural development of the conversation, rather than when they were quizzed on their general factual knowledge of the topic. Finally the best performances often came when the teacher challenged the opinions expressed by the candidate.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Practise the vocabulary and phrases needed to describe and analyse a photograph.
- Encourage practice of the oral format in class time, but do not encourage candidates to over-prepare and arrive “armed” with a pre-set presentation on the likely topic areas, which is then delivered irrespective of its relevance to the photograph.
- Encourage candidates to engage in more natural and spontaneous conversation.
- Explain to candidates how they can expand on their responses to demonstrates complex ideas.

Higher Level and Standard Level Written assessment

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 25

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

General comments

The written assignments were a new element in the language B course. That being said most written assignments were of a good quality. It seems that many teachers took the time to practise this part of the assessment extensively. Very few candidates obtained all three marks for their rationale. The use of language was generally good.

Most of the forms were filled out correctly, and in most cases the work was received on time. None of the written assignments failed to meet the minimum number of words. A number of them exceeded the word limit. Please encourage candidates to stay within the word limits. More is not always better.

A few teachers gave their SL-candidates more than three texts. The guide clearly states that the candidates should receive three texts (300-400 words each) that are linked to one of the topics taught as part of the core. All higher level written assignments were based on a literary work and followed the instructions given in the language B guide.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Generally speaking the work was of a (very) good quality. In some cases the work was very impressive in terms of originality, text choice and language. The candidates seemed well prepared for this new element of the course, and clearly demonstrated a good understanding of the conventions of various text types. Many teachers were able to find suitable texts for their SL-candidates which helped them to demonstrate the knowledge they acquired. It seems that only the weaker candidates struggled with this course element.

The HL candidates succeeded in writing creative texts, but at times struggled with the application of literary terms. For them the rationale also was difficult at times, but most candidates obtained a good score for this part of the language B course.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Language

In general the use of language was adequate. Virtually all candidates were able to write simple sentences correctly. The sentence structures of complex sentences were clear and effective in many cases.

Weaker candidates struggled with the word order in dependent clauses. A range of vocabulary was used, often in a correct manner. The difference between “de/het” and “die/dat” remains difficult for average and weaker candidates. Frequently this also leads to problems with the conjugation of adjectives, e.g. “die leuke meisje” or “een lieve meisje”. Overall most candidates were able to convey their message clearly.

Criterion B: Content

The content of most SL written assignments was very good. Many SL-candidates made excellent use of the sources that had been provided to them. They were able to identify key statements in the sources and generally used those statements effectively to support their claims. In almost all cases there was evidence of organization.

HL-candidates struggled more with this criterion, more particularly with the use of the literary work. At times the connections with the literary work were rather superficial. Stronger candidates used the literary work to their advantage, and succeeded in writing strong creative assignments in which the use of language was both excellent and effective. As was the case with the SL-candidates almost all assignment showed evidence of organization. It is clear teachers prepared the candidates well for this part of the curriculum.

Criterion C: Format

The candidates' performance against this criterion was very strong at both levels. The candidates showed a good knowledge of the conventions of various text types and were able to apply that knowledge to their own assignments. Most candidates selected an appropriate text type for their assignment and many of them made the text look like a newspaper article or blog for example. Many candidates also adapted their language to the text type and thus audience they selected, which resulted in some excellent written assignments.

Criterion D: Rationale

Out of the four criteria that were set for this task, this was the weakest grading area for both HL- and SL-candidates. Only a few of them were able to obtain all three marks. To get all three marks the rationale must be clear, pertinent and directly linked to the task. Often the rationales were clear in terms of specifying the text type, goal and audience. Weaker candidates did not offer support for the choices they made, but only stated those choices. Explaining why a particular text type and register is chosen helps the examiners greatly with the interpretation of the written task. Stronger candidates offered explanations for their choices but failed to write down the links with the source.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should:

- Review text types and conventions frequently. This clearly was a strong element in the written assignments, so it pays off.
- Review grammatical structures frequently.
- Encourage students to create a list of words they use frequently together with the definite articles that go with the nouns.
- Practise writing rationales and ensure that candidates include all required elements.
- Ensure that HL-candidates link their written assignment with the literary work in order to show their knowledge of that literary work.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Mark range: 0 - 11 12 - 21 22 - 31 32 - 41 42 - 48 49 - 55 56 - 60

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Most candidates handled section A well. As expected text C and D were the most difficult ones. A few weaker candidates struggled with Q3 (short answer). A larger number of students had difficulty with Q19 – Q22 (text C, true/false with justification). Students ticked the correct box, but didn't provide the justification or found the justification but didn't tick the right box. Text A seemed the easiest one out of the five texts. Both weaker and stronger candidates did reasonably well on this part of the exam. Weaker students also struggled with gap-filling and matching vocabulary exercises.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates had a good understanding of the general concept conveyed in the texts. The candidates appeared well prepared for the exam, and were able to select the details in the text needed to answer the questions correctly. As always, the easiest questions were those that referred to a chunk of text. Many candidates also did well on the questions that asked what certain personal pronouns referred to, as well as on the short answer questions.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Text A

Q1 and Q2 were easy for almost all candidates. A few weaker candidates struggled with Q3, as mentioned before. Q4 and Q5-Q8 were also relatively easy for most of the candidates.

Text B

Only weaker candidates struggled with text B. Most candidates were able to select four of five correct statements in Q9. Q10-Q12 (finding detail in the text) was difficult for a few weaker candidates. Most candidates handled Q13-Q16 (matching vocabulary) well. Out of this section only Q16, finding the word closest in meaning to "vanzelfsprekend" proved problematic for some candidates. Average to good candidates did well on Q17.

Text C

A few weaker candidates struggled with text C. Even some stronger candidates had difficulty with this text, particularly with Q19-Q22 (true/false with justification). Q23 and Q24 were answered correctly by most candidates, while some candidates struggled with Q25, which asked them "Welk woord in regel 20–25 vat samen wat bedoeld wordt met "overleggen met docenten en leerlingen, maar vooral ook praten met opdrachtgevers"?. Q26-Q30 were answered correctly by average to good candidates,

Text D

Text D, an extract from the literary work *Oeroeg* by Hella Haasse, was difficult for a number of weaker students. They struggled with mostly with questions 31, 32 and 36. The gap filling exercise (Q37-Q40) proved difficult for both weaker and stronger candidates, although many candidates did manage to score at least one or two points in this section.

Text E

Quite a number of students struggled with one or more questions on text E, mostly with Q42-Q46 (finding vocabulary words in paragraphs 1 and 2). Most candidates did well on the description that had to be found in Q46-Q49. Both weaker and stronger candidates struggled with the true/false questions (Q50-Q52), with Q52 being the most difficult one out of this section.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should:

- Make sure candidates read all instructions carefully.
- Discuss how the context influences the meaning of particular words or sentences.
- Spend time on how true/false question should be approached and make sure candidates include the key words in their answers. The justification should be brief, so there is no need to omit words when dealing with this type of question.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 16	17 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 38	39 - 45

General comments

The general level of performance was very good. The majority of the candidates fell in the medium to high range levels. More and more native speakers of Dutch seem to opt for this course, and this becomes apparent when reading the scripts. There were a number of lengthy responses; even though the instructions clearly state that a response should be between 250 and 400 words. There were only a few cases when language mistakes obscured meaning. Overall, candidates performed well demonstrating a good command of the language.

All questions were covered, but Q1-Q3 were more popular than Q4-Q5. In some cases, poor handwriting and spelling mistakes obscured the meaning of the essays. Generally speaking, though, candidates did well on section A of the exam.

Section B, responding to a stimulus text, is a new element on paper 2. For the most part candidates appeared well prepared for the task. There were some very well written, imaginative and meaningful

responses. Weaker candidates answered in a more superficial manner, but generally speaking the performance on section B was good.

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Successful candidates had a good knowledge of the techniques of essay writing and subject-specific vocabulary. Commonly encountered problems were once again sentence structure (particularly in dependent clauses), subject-verb agreement, and inflexion of adjectives. Choosing the correct definite article or demonstrative pronoun was also difficult for many candidates. Nonetheless many candidates are able to produce essays of a high quality, specifically when they refrain from overly lengthy sentences. Teachers should make the candidates aware of those types of mistakes. Weaker candidates struggle to apply the correct format or diction to the text type requested by the question.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Many candidates chose the correct format for their text type. Stronger candidates frequently attempted to format their response to the prescribed text type. Clearly the stronger students were well aware of the register that is deemed suitable for the task they chose. They used a more formal register in the text types that needed such.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1:

A fair number of candidates attempted Q1, a formal letter to the editor-in-chief of a travel magazine. Stronger candidates formatted their response as a formal letter, including elements such as the address and 'Geachte heer/mevrouw.'. Weaker candidates failed to adopt the more formal register needed for this text type.

Question 2:

Question 2 asked students to leave a message on a friend's blog. This question was the most popular on the exam, and all virtually all candidates attempting this question succeeded in writing a decent to good blog entry. Stronger candidates used popular abbreviations to make their text look like a blog. The response of some weaker candidates remained superficial, simply stating the obvious.

Question 3:

Question 3 was also a popular question of this exam. The candidates were asked to write a diary entry about how the economic crisis affected their health care coverage, and the problems that occurred as a result. Most of the candidates handled this question very well.

Question 4:

Question 4 was the least popular question of the exam. Students were asked to write a review of an exhibition they visited and which should encourage class mates to go see it as well. Both the topic

and the prescribed text type seemed manageable. The few students who attempted this question performed well.

Question 5:

Question 5 wasn't very popular either. Students were to write a proposal to the head of school in which they explained an energy-saving idea. Only a few candidates attempted this question. The responses to this question were well written and included some clever details to convince the recipient.

Stimulus text:

Most candidates had little difficulty with the stimulus text. Weaker candidates wrote a more superficial response, while stronger candidates used examples to support their argument. Since all text types are acceptable for this task, almost all candidates were able to score at least half the points on this section of the exam.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should:

- Encourage candidates to select logical paragraph boundaries and use linking devices to connect these different paragraphs.
- Encourage candidates Include visual elements that define the text type (structure of a formal letter, emoticons in a diary etc.). Criterion C clearly states what is expected from candidates.
- Make sure candidates are aware of subject-verb agreements and read through their work carefully before handing it in.
- Encourage candidates to stay between the word limit of 250-400 words. Lengthy texts don't always result in better grades.
- Make candidates aware of how their first language affects their written performance in Dutch. Knowledge about common L1-mistakes might help candidates to eliminate them.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 8	9 - 15	16 - 24	25 - 31	32 - 36	37 - 41	42 - 45

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

A few candidates had difficulty with vocabulary questions and true/false questions with justification. Another area that proved difficult was identifying the correct words or phrases from the text. Average to good candidates performed well on paper 1.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Text A did not present a huge problem for the majority of candidates who were able to respond successfully to most of the questions set for this text. Most candidates did well on the multiple choice questions, straightforward short-answer questions as well as questions asking what certain words refer to. Now that the written response is no longer part of paper 1, almost all the candidates were able to pace themselves. Only very few papers were returned incomplete. Once again candidates did seem to struggle more with questions that require close reading.

Most candidates had a good understanding of the general concept conveyed in texts A, B, C and D. Candidates generally performed best when questions referred to a chunk of information or when answers could be given in their own words.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Text A

Q1 and Q2 (short answer questions) were answered correctly by almost every candidate. Q3-Q7 (finding equivalents in the texts) proved difficult for quite a number of students, in some cases even the stronger ones. A number of candidates failed to answer Q6-Q7 correctly. Average to good candidates performed well on Q8-Q10.

Text B

Only weaker candidates had some difficulty with text B. Many candidates scored at least 3 points on Q11 (selecting the true statements). Q12-Q14, in which candidates had to identify to what word certain pronouns referred, were generally handled well. Weaker students struggled with Q15 and Q16 (multiple-choice).

Text C

Text C was the most difficult one of the exam. In some cases even the stronger candidates had difficulty with this text. Q17--Q20 (selecting paragraph titles) were answered correctly by most candidates. A number of candidates struggled with Q21-Q24 (matching sentence halves). Weaker candidates lost two or more points in this section. In Q25-Q28 candidates had to find a particular word or phrase in the text. Both weaker and stronger candidates struggled with Q27 (inhaalslag). Q29, choosing the text type, was answered correctly by most candidates.

Text D

Text D proved somewhat difficult for weaker candidates. Average to good candidates handled this text well. Q30 (short answer) was answered correctly by most candidates. A number of candidates struggled with Q31 and more particularly with Q32 (matching vocabulary). Q33, another short answer

question, was relatively easy for most candidates. Q34-Q35 (true/false with justification) and Q36-Q39 (gap filling) proved difficult in some cases for both stronger and weaker candidates.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should:

- Advise candidates to provide complete justifications in True/False questions and never to omit essential parts required to justify the statement given. Teachers should also encourage candidates to read these given statements carefully. Often candidates miss the fact that the statement is phrased negatively.
- Make sure that candidates understand that answers must be confined to the descriptors in the rubric (i.e. “word” or “sentence”)
- Practise the skills that candidates need for the examination, such as vocabulary and language enrichment skills, referencing and subtitling. Old exams often are an excellent tool when preparing students for the upcoming exam.
- Encourage candidates to use the context when they are answering vocabulary questions.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

General comments

In this section of the exam the difference between true second language learners and ‘native’ (or very near native) speakers was most noticeable. True second language learners performed as one expects from Standard Level students. They sometimes struggled with choosing the correct definite article or complex sentence structures. Some papers of stronger students were impressive. They picked the appropriate register and style for the task, used a wide range of vocabulary and provided very imaginative responses. In some cases the response showed influence of English or another native language. All questions were covered with Q2 being the least popular one of the exam.

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

As might be expected weaker candidates sometimes had difficulty writing simple sentences in correct Dutch. Written accuracy together with the use of a wide and varied set of linguistic structures and vocabulary remains a point of attention. A number of candidates struggled with subject-verb agreement, especially when using complex sentences. Weaker candidates failed to adapt for format

and register of the prescribed text type. Teachers are encouraged to look at criterion C for paper 2. This criterion states clearly what is expected from candidates.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates attempted to adapt the register to the text type, and many of them succeeded. Candidates frequently chose the correct style and tone. Good candidates furthermore used effective rhetorical devices and formatted their response according to the prescribed text type. The structure of the responses was generally good. The content was generally relevant, although weaker candidates often wrote more superficial responses. The development of ideas and the overall organization of the response once again made the difference between stronger and weaker responses.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1:

Candidates were required to write an email to their Dutch teacher in which they covered cultural differences. Stronger candidates named not only common differences between The Netherlands / Belgium and their own country (e.g. food), but also focused on topics such as Queen's Day and attitude differences. Stronger candidates also took the time to format their responses as an email, including the to, from, date and subject lines.

Question 2:

Candidates had to write an introduction to a debate on school uniform. While the topic should be familiar to a number of candidates, the more uncommon text type might have led them to choose another question. The candidates who opted for this question did reasonably well.

Question 3:

A number of candidates opted for this question, which required them to write a brochure on exam stress and what students can do to manage it. Again, stronger candidates took the time to format their response as a brochure. Content-wise both stronger and weaker candidates were able to write good responses.

Question 4:

Question 4 was one of the most popular questions on the exam. Candidates had to write the text of an interview with a class mate who combines the IB-programme with a commitment to the soccer team. Most interviews were well written and contained insightful comments on how one can combine the demands of the IB-programme with time-consuming activities.

Question 5:

Question 5 also was a popular question on this exam. The topic, smart phones and other technological gadgets, was one many candidates are familiar with. The responses of weaker students remained more superficial, focusing on status rather than the values of friendship. Stronger candidates structured their response well and used examples to support their claim.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should:

- Advise candidates to split long sentences into two or three shorter ones. This would help them avoid the many errors made in the structure of compound sentences.
- Encourage students to adapt the format and register of the prescribed text type. One criterion (criterion C) is dedicated to this matter, and with a bit of an effort even weaker students can easily pick up a few valuable marks.
- Make candidates aware of L1-mistakes that interfere with their use of Dutch. Such awareness might help students to avoid common errors.
- Spend time as often as possible to broaden candidates' vocabulary.