

Swedish A: Language and Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 42	43 - 56	57 - 68	69 - 83	84 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 30	31 - 45	46 - 58	59 - 70	71 - 83	84 - 100

Higher level and Standard level internal assessment

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 30

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 30

General comments

All texts and extracts used on the whole worked well. Where they worked less well, comments have been made in the individual centre's IA feedback forms. Strindberg, Tunström, Fröding, Gardell, Rydberg continues to be frequently and successfully employed and give rich

opportunity for a variety of analytical scope, while other moderators also noted a high frequency rate for Södergran, Gullberg, Ekelöf och (Torgny) Lindgren.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

On the whole all IAs were well executed by both candidates and teachers and seemed well prepared. The feedback below refers primarily to aspects that could be improved where relevant:

- Some extracts used were too long, and exceeded 40 lines. Please try and avoid excessive length – even if it may give candidates more to discuss, it may also disadvantage them if it takes them longer to get through it or the excess material makes structuring the presentation more of a challenge.
- Please adhere to time limits. Some orals extended to 20 mins – please note that moderators are instructed to disregard anything beyond 15 minutes. The candidate (and the teacher) **MUST** operate within these criteria. Being able to present the analysis within the given timeframe is part of the skills being tested. Teachers must keep an eye on the time, and perhaps have ‘warning notices’ at hand (3 mins, 1 min etc) so that the candidates can be made aware of the time they have left. Equally, a very short IA is unlikely to score very highly in both Criterion A and B so teachers might wish to encourage further discussion with any candidate that seems to falter very early.
- There should be two guiding questions. These are for guidance only and the candidates should not be expected, or prompted, to answer them directly. Please refer to the instructions in the Guide if the nature and/or role of the guiding questions is unclear. Please make sure to include the guiding questions in the upload – the moderators need to be able to see these too.
- Please remember to insert line numbers, both for the candidates’ and the moderator’ sake.
- In individual instances the copy of the text was hard to read for the moderators – please consider quality and legibility when uploading. Missing forms, miscalculations and missing comments occasionally also occurred. Although these are likely to be oversights (rather than misinterpretations of instructions), please be aware that they all need to be dealt with individually both by the moderators and the IB when they occur, and slow down the overall marking process as a result.
- Please remember to start each recording with candidate name and number, so that moderators can be absolutely certain the intended candidate is being assessed. It can also be helpful to have the extracts marked with candidate name and number, for further certainty, though this is not a requirement.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Overall, candidates often substantially demonstrated extensive, in-depth and perceptive understandings of both extracts and source texts. Although performances varied depending on individual abilities, it is evident that all candidates, almost without exception, came very well prepared to the IAs, and built their presentation and subsequent discussion on a very thorough understanding both of the text in question and the technique needed to analyse and discuss it.

Criterion B: With great variation from candidate to candidate, this remains the most challenging aspects of the analysis for some. There was great variation between candidates who confidently and competently were able to discuss various aspects of textual techniques and features, and those who struggled to make relevant comments on these aspects. Perhaps it would be useful for teachers to be aware of the potential challenge this criteria constitutes, and take particular care to construct a guiding question that, as much as possible, help point candidates at a way in, and if possible try to steer the subsequent discussion towards areas the candidates could usefully explore, or explore further (many tutors very helpfully already do this). One moderator remarked that some texts with dialectal material often had this aspect overlooked in the commentary.

Criterion C: Although structural approaches varied, most candidates seemed to have a good sense of where they were heading with their analysis and what they wanted to achieve, and set out confidently. This again shows that candidates on the whole were very well prepared for the task, and had a good understanding of how it is expected to be carried out. It is not possible to recommend any structural approach over another, as a variety of them can – and do – work well. However, it might be worth highlighting to candidates that their analysis needs to contain both areas represented by Criterion A and B to achieve the best potential mark. Digressions into aspects of the work as a whole, or discussion thereof, were much fewer and further between than they have sometimes been in the past, which again underlines that the candidates came well prepared to the task and with a good understanding of how they needed to engage with it.

Criterion D: Although most candidates spoke clearly, fluently and at an appropriate level, there was perhaps on occasion an overall tendency to shy away from technical terminology. Although inclusion or usage of such is not a criterion in itself, it might be worth noting that candidates who were able to include this in their commentaries tended to be able to make more perceptive, detailed and nuanced analyses, and as a consequence scored overall a higher mark.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

As mentioned above, candidates seemed on the whole to come with a comprehensive and nuanced understanding both of the work they were given to analyse, and with the analytical engagement with literary texts the IAs are designed to test. Where they were more uncertain, it seemed primary to relate to seeing and discussing literary (technical, stylistic) features. More focus could perhaps be given to these in class discussion, to make candidates more

competent, and confident, in knowing how to look for them, and give them practise in vocabulary for analysing them.

Higher level and Standard level written tasks

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 18	19 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 40

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

Areas of programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Written task 1 HL, and SL

“The written tasks demonstrate the candidate’s ability to choose an imaginative way of exploring an aspect of the material studied in the course. It must show a critical engagement with an aspect of a text or a topic.”

(Language A: Language and Literature Guide, p.30 and p.40)

Where candidates did less well, it was primarily because the two aspects above – exploration of, and engagement with, a particular aspect – were not sufficiently attempted. Although candidates overall took great care to link their task to material studied (and this is to be commended), it was frequently less clear how they intended their texts to explore a particular aspect and/or add to the original material. This needs to be much more carefully considered. It is relatively easy to come up with some kind of text that is somehow related to, or can be made to link to, material studied: the challenge here is to not just make it vaguely inspired by a text or a topic, but to make sure that the task and text type chosen give good opportunity both for demonstration of detailed and extensive understanding of the material the task refers to, and independent comment on some aspect of the same. Further chapters, for example, may contain the same characters and settings as the original, but unless the narrative also shows specific understanding of (some or all of) main themes, settings, character development, stylistics etc., it is hard for the examiner to assess to what extent the above criteria is achieved. Diary formats are also popular, and this is a relatively straight-forward

text-type, but the content needs to go beyond being a summary of an original narrative, and needs to add independent exploration.

These examples highlight two types of engagement with the task which are likely to make it less successful: in the first instance the links with the course material are too weak, in the second it relies too heavily on summarising or re-telling the original, without enough independent analysis or comment. There were several WT(1)s this year which were in themselves very accomplished texts, but which scored low marks in Criterion B (in particular) because what was included in the task, or how it was set up, did not in itself demonstrate understanding of the original, and/or ability to engage with a particular aspect, in an independent way. Please remind candidates that this criterion is central to the WT, and that tasks that avoid it or leave it out will lose marks for it.

Written task 2, HL only

A large number of responses to the WT2 rewrote or reinterpreted the set question to such an extent that the task could only be said to have partial or limited understanding of the question (Criterion B). Please note that while the candidates are supposed to use their own material (i.e. from the course) for the discussion, they are not supposed to re-write the actual question. Very few candidates on the whole managed to engage with the selected question without reinterpreting it, so this is clearly an area where candidates need to be reminded of, or helped to understand, the actual task. In some cases the candidate's own question was so far removed from the intended one that it must be assumed that they have not paid sufficient attention to the instructions for the task. In others it seemed to be a case of finding the set question difficult to handle, and instead veering off on an argument that felt easier to make. Engaging with the questions as they stand is of course one of the main challenges of the WT2, and it may be that the candidates need more help with understanding this. It is also in part a question of essay writing technique, and it may be that candidates would be helped by some guided practise or instruction in this area.

A handful of candidates submitted two task based on either the language OR literary part of the course. This is NOT according to instructions for the task, and NOT acceptable. Please ensure candidates understand this requirement, and select appropriate course material for both WT1 and WT2.

Areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

HL and SL

At both HL and SL, candidates seemed overall to have a very sound and thorough knowledge and understanding of the material they had studied. Although the choice and execution of the tasks did not always provide the further exploration asked for, it was nevertheless clear that most, if not all candidates, understood the material they were basing them on very well, being able to both coherently summarise it (where necessary) and draw out the main aspects of or in the relevant material.

Choice of text-type was overall appropriate – candidates often tended towards the ‘safer’ or more obvious types, but there were also many imaginative and interesting uses of the primary material. It also seemed that very few, if any, WT(1)s fell into the ‘essay-trap’, which suggests both that good instruction was given across all centres, and that candidates took care to construct tasks according to the given criteria.

Structure and organisation of the tasks were mostly well considered and successfully created, and with a few exceptions candidates seemed overall well aware of the difference in registers, and aimed well for one which was appropriate for their task.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Please address the issues highlighted in the sections above, which includes the following points:

- Ensure that candidates are clear as to how their texts will explore a particular aspect and/or add to the original material.
- Remind candidates that their tasks must show an understanding of the original topics or texts, and that the content must go beyond being a summarising exercise.
- Stress the importance of using the WT2 set questions as they are published in the Language and Literature Guide. Rewriting or reinterpreting them will result in low marks for Criterion B.
- Give candidates plenty of instruction and practice in general essay writing techniques.
- At HL, ensure that candidates understand the requirement that one of the tasks submitted must be on parts 1 or 2 of the course (i.e. Language) and the other must be on parts 3 or 4 of the course (i.e. Literature).

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

Overall the weakest aspect of most papers was the discussion around, or analyses of, textual/stylistic features. Some candidates managed an extensive, sustained, and detailed analysis, to great effect, but a large number also struggled with identifying textual detail

and/or finding the most efficient way, and vocabulary with which, to discuss them. Where marks came in below the top grades, this aspect (as well as general language skills) was most often the reason.

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

Without exception all candidates seemed to be very confident about how they needed to approach the task of the paper, setting out an introduction and then moving on to commentary, and - if they had time - providing a summarising conclusion. Even when the discussion of the texts was weak or ineffective (as per above), or the internal structure less effective, all commentaries showed a clear and confident understanding of how to approach the task and to structure their response.

Many candidates also provided very engaging and perceptive commentaries to and comparisons of the texts, with some finding an impressive range of aspects to include. This suggests that candidates have on the whole been very well prepared in how to approach and discuss a text, and that the variations in marks reflects primarily their own ability to use these to their best potential.

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

The tendency to keep to or veer into discussion of the topic rather than the texts was much more frequent with the second text pair, which dealt with English in Sweden/Swedish. With topics such as this, there is perhaps always the potential risk that they might too easily make candidates digress from the textual analysis and instead comment on the issues. However, the paper instructions make it very clear that this is not the task set, and that the candidates should be aware of the focus of this paper. The texts in question were also rich enough in textual features (of a variety of kinds) that the candidates should have plenty to discuss focussing on these alone. There were however several responses to this text pair which seemed primarily to focus on the candidate's own, sometimes very emotional, thoughts around the texts' topic and opinions – with low scores in Criterion A and B (and sometimes C) as a result.

As a general tendency, though not without exceptions, candidates who chose to engage with the first text pair stayed closer to the task as set and on average tended to get better results. Therefore, it might be worth highlighting to the candidates that the best chance of showing all they can do with a text might not necessarily lie with the most familiar topic, and that if they chose texts that cover an issue that they have strong opinions about, then they need to be particularly careful not to let this influence or dominate the textual analysis Paper 1 requires.

There was a partial predominance of answers that engaged with Section B texts, as these presumably seemed to be more familiar in both type and topic. The successful analyses of these texts drew successful comparison of the texts' similarities – use of rhetoric, purpose, and topic – as well as their contrasting features – format, voice, standpoint, audience (though this was not such a dividing feature as some candidates tried to make it into). Less successful

responses fell mainly into discussions of the topic and failed to look sufficiently at how the respective texts were composed, and what effect their different techniques had. The best discussions on the second text in the Section B pair picked up in particular on the personal voice and address which is one of its most powerful aspects, while successful analyses of the first text in the pair provided detailed engagement with the text's (very overtly) aim to persuade, and how it attempted to achieve this.

For Section A texts, many candidates gave very competent analyses of the first text, detailing its characteristics as an advert. The most successful responses also attempted to discuss its more subtle attempts to persuade, such as the way it tries to utilise collective ideas around nature. Although the two texts were different – and they differed on almost all categorical and technical levels – they did share personification of their 'objects' as one of their main features. Most (though not all) analyses picked up on this, and utilised this aspect well to compare and contrast the texts. This seemed to help them in particular to find ways of focusing on various technical details and aspects, and their various effects. The humoristic tone of the second text is one of the hardest aspects of all texts to pin down and explain, but several responses managed this with commendable success. It was also very good to see that candidate who chose these texts on the whole seemed unfazed by the slightly older style of the second text, and in many instances made relevant and perceptive remarks about the use of a vocabulary that is not very familiar to them. This suggests a very comprehensive command of the language, and a flexibility which enables understanding of a wide variety of texts and voices.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates seemed well prepared on the whole for Paper 1 – the very vast majority showed confidence, fluency, adaptability of skills and a generally good understanding of how closer analysis of a text can be undertaken and what it might find. Key to a discussion around aspects such as purpose and effect, voice and audience, is however the ability to 'dissect' the text into its various components, and have confident access to a language that can be used to label them. In the responses to Paper 1, candidates seemed overall very capable at reading both the texts and their purposes clearly, but struggled more with pinpointing details in voice, vocabulary, and the effect of various/other stylistic details. Sometimes candidates would list various aspects, but fail to discuss what effect they had and/or why they had been employed. The most successful analyses for Paper 1 were those that demonstrated capabilities both in seeing (and naming) various techniques (approaches, stylistics etc) *and* in discussing how these combined to a text of specific voice and effect.

Further comments

Please convey to candidates the importance of writing as legibly as possible, particularly as scripts are now marked on-screen. With indistinct or at times undecipherable writing, some exam papers became almost impossible to understand. It is understandable that candidates feel rushed to write as quickly as they can, but if they submit a paper which is very unclearly written, they run the risk of their argument being made less clearly understood than it perhaps deserves.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 17	18 - 20

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

Many candidates were not able to reach the highest marks under Criterion A and B as they did not go deeper into their analyses of the text. Instead of commenting on what the writer had written and what they were trying to achieve with their texts, candidates tended to paraphrase and develop their idea surrounding the topic presented. Many candidates completely neglected to analyze the structure of the texts and the fact that both texts had headings and pictures seemed to have gone unnoticed by most. The legibility of handwriting was an issue and sometimes it was very difficult to read some scripts. Literary features seemed very difficult to identify for most candidates.

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

Most candidates understood the meaning and the purpose of the text they commented on and although they were not always able to analyze the effect of the language that the writer had used, there was good understanding of tone and the message that the writer was trying to communicate. Many candidates had good introductions and endings, with separate paragraphs and a clear conclusion at the end. Evidently, many teachers had taught their candidates how to structure a response to a text well.

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

Both texts seemed to be accessible for the candidates in terms of understanding, and almost all were also able to grasp the purpose of the texts. Candidates were also able to make comments on the type of text that they were analyzing as well as the target audience/s. Many candidates wrote well, although some wrote in a very colloquial tone, very similar to the way young people speak. Extremely few were able to refer correctly to the text they were analyzing and missed either the writer's name or the date that the text had been published. Very few commented on the pictures or titles in the texts. Many candidates were able to use effective quotes from the texts to further illustrate what they were trying to say. In the most well written responses, candidates had looked deeper at the language that was used and were able to identify specific use of words and sentence structures, as well as the use of exclamation marks. Some candidates were able to see the use of literary features, for instance personification: "stupar bergen", "havsvikarna skär", contrasts hav/land, alliteration

"vackraste vägen"; some candidates had identified the use of bold letters in the middle of the McDonald's text and structural elements of the text and the picture that accompanied the text. Many candidates were able to comment on the use of exclamation marks and rhetorical questions, and the effects of using both. Some commented on the use of hyperboles, for instance "den debatt som pågått i över trettio år". The best commentaries commented on the titles and the pictures that were used in the text extracts and how they were important for the overall interpretation/purpose of the texts.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is important to teach candidates to be aware of the provenance of the texts (given in the examination paper) and also to refer to them in a proper way, as when it was written and by whom is very important for the discussion in which context must be considered.

Even though Standard level paper 1 texts are non-literary in genre, it is still recommended that candidates are given more knowledge of general literary criticism (articles, essays and argumentative texts for instance), and how to analyze aspects such as structure and tone, as well as to be able to "read between the lines".

The candidates need more practice in how to get right to the point in an analysis without paraphrasing too much.

Teachers must also encourage candidates to write legibly.

Higher level and Standard level paper two

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25

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

The importance of a correct language use must be stressed, and many candidates would have gained a higher mark for Criterion E if had they paid attention to the following three grammatical rules:

- the word order in subclauses
- the right forms of the possessive pronouns in the third person
- the fact that Swedish has two words for the English "where"

In addition, please remind candidates of the following points:

- It is better to write in Swedish: 'X wrote the novel in 1905' instead of 'the novel was written by X'.
- Do not exaggerate the construction in the passive voice.
- Anglised words are seldom correct, although of course it is different with loanwords.

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

Where candidates combined thorough knowledge and understanding of the works with a solid sense of grammar, they performed well.

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

The vast majority of the candidates opted for either Question 6 or Question 4, with the former being the most popular choice. On the whole, those who chose Question 4 performed better than those who chose Question 6, where many candidates tended to repeat their arguments. This appeared to be, at least in part, due to how suitable the works they had studied were to the questions selected: different works analysed in the context of the same questions (and alternatively the same works analysed in the context of different questions) resulted in different marks.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The idea of 'context' is at the heart of this course and therefore teachers need to select works that are rich in context. The various contexts of the works should then be discussed extensively with the candidates. In addition, stress to the candidates that 'context' should not be mistaken simply as biographical details about the authors, but should be considered in the

light of how the contexts of production and reception adds to an understanding of the text and its range of possible meanings.

Continue to analyse and discuss the literary and language features of the chosen works: this is still of paramount importance.

Advise the candidates to select their examination questions carefully, and emphasise that content, context and literary analysis all need to be addressed regardless of the question, as per the rubric.

Share the assessment criteria with the candidates and make them aware of the expectations of the component.

Ensure that candidates have the language needed to discuss texts in Swedish. All classroom activities related to this subject should be conducted in Swedish, including discussions between candidates.

If a work of literature was originally written in English, ensure that it is read translated into Swedish, and that candidates refer to them using the appropriate Swedish title (*Romeo och Julia*, rather than *Romeo och Juliet*, for example). Frequent writing exercises in class should also help to improve their Swedish.

Make a list of the most frequent Anglezised words or expressions and work with the candidates to replace them with equivalent Swedish words.

Give candidates plenty of practice in writing responses in good order and clear paragraphing. There should be a clear introduction, logical, point-by-point development of arguments, followed by a conclusion.