

Croatian A: Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 16	17 - 30	31 - 43	44 - 56	57 - 67	68 - 79	80 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 16	17 - 30	31 - 42	43 - 54	55 - 67	68 - 79	80 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 30

Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

My one recommendation is that in evaluating the performance in this, as in all other assignments, internally or externally assessed, schools whose performance is significantly lagging behind the rest should be informed so that they can take appropriate measures to rectify the situation.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Recordings were of adequate quality. Most commentaries stayed within the time limits or only barely exceeded them, although some commentaries went significantly beyond the prescribed time limits.

There were some instances in which whispers off the main recording were audible. My suggestion is that all communication between teacher and student be clearly audible and that no outside noises interfere with the recording in the future.

Most follow-up questions were appropriate, although on occasion there were some significant distancing from the poetry under discussion.

The second part of the IA HL also generally stayed within the time limit and students were generally given an opportunity to demonstrate their independent understanding of the work under discussion.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Overall, I found most marking to be very close to the original marks assigned by teachers except for one school, where there was more significant disagreement.

Criterion A, knowledge and understanding of the poem was generally good or excellent. Some students did exceptionally well in the category.

Criterion B was noticeably lower in some cases, but still showed excellent results in others.

Criterion C was generally high scoring and only occasionally students presented their thoughts in unorganized manner or with limited structure and focus.

Criteria D and E were often the highest scoring and students demonstrated excellent understanding of the works studied. Responses to the discussion questions were effective, persuasive, and well informed. Independent thought was often quite clear and some students truly excelled in this category.

Language used in both parts of the IA HL was generally very clear and in many cases entirely appropriate with a high degree of accuracy in grammar and sentence construction. The register and style were also very effective and appropriate, with only occasional students faltering in terms of their ability to express themselves effectively and in appropriate register.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

I would suggest that the time and text length limits be respected as per IB instructions.

Some poems were over the outer text limit of 20 to 30 lines or less, which can sometimes affect the performance due to time constraints. I would suggest all poems be strictly within the proscribed length.

Those schools whose students scored in the lower range in Criterion B might need to highlight to their students the significance of addressing these stylistic, linguistic, and structural aspects of the poem more.

I would also suggest that the guiding questions be used to direct students away from strictly biographical interpretations of poetry as was occasionally the case.

Further comments

The follow-up questions should stay focused on the author/poet under discussion (as per instructions).

Some teachers tended to pose some of their questions or follow-up questions in such a form that a very specific answer was being elicited, often just a word or a phrase. I would warn against such practice in the future, as it might limit the opportunity for students to develop their own reading and interpretation.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 30

Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

I found no problems with the procedures, instruction or forms in this session.

My one recommendation is that in evaluating the performance in this, as in all other assignments, internally or externally assessed, schools whose performance is significantly lagging behind the rest should be informed so that they can take appropriate measures to rectify the situation.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Individual Oral Commentaries (IOC) submitted for external moderation were mostly within the time limits. The quality of the recordings was sufficient.

Teachers conducted the IOCs well and apart from the interruptions in the two cases noted below, the recordings followed the appropriate format.

The work submitted was suitable.

There were some instances where teachers submitted both the IOC and the Individual Oral Presentation.

Candidate performance against each criterion

The format was followed except in two cases where candidates were not given the required time for independent presentation, but were prompted for specific answers from the beginning. As per IB instructions: "Students must be allowed to deliver their commentaries without interruption and teachers must not distract students or attempt to rearrange their

commentaries. Teachers may only intervene if a student panics and needs positive encouragement, or if a student is off target or is finding it difficult to continue.” Apart from these exceptions, the students performed mostly quite well in terms of Criterion C.

Knowledge and understanding of the extracts was mostly adequate and supported by appropriate references to the extract. Some students read their poems before proceeding to the commentary, which was mostly unnecessary and wasted time in their 8 minute time allocation. On occasion, students demonstrated excellent understanding and careful interpretation well beyond the Standard Level of performance.

In terms of students’ appreciations of the writer’s choices, students fell into two categories: either they did a good or very good job in this aspect of their commentary or they did very poorly. There were instances where students did not comment at all on the stylistic choices, language, structure or technique. It should be emphasized to students in preparation for this task that Criterion B carries the same weight as Criterion A and should be treated as such in their commentary. In some cases, students once again exceeded the expectations of Criterion B for Standard Level.

In terms of Criterion D, students mostly used language that was clear and appropriate with a high degree of accuracy of grammar and sentence construction. Stage fright was noticeable among some students, although this did not, in most cases, detrimentally effect the commentary overall.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

In moderating the internal assessment, I tended to agree with the teacher’s marks in higher end grades while there was more significant disagreement in the lower end marks. Once again, there was also noticeable difference between schools, suggesting schools should overview the assessment criteria, especially if the external moderation disagrees significantly with the internally moderated marks.

Self-taught candidates did exceptionally well in almost all cases.

Further comments

Subsequent questions posed by teachers were appropriate and only occasionally too general and in one or two cases asked to student for commentary beyond the boundaries of the text and/or literary analysis.

Higher level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

Standard level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

I noticed a possible mistranslation of the RS question in some of those cases where students wrote out the question in Croatian. While I understand that IB is only responsible for providing the instructions in English and not Croatian, I would like to see the procedure changed for when the examiners notice clear translation issues in the instructions. Otherwise, it seems unfair that students' scores suffer because of the schools' or teachers' mistakes in translating the instructions.

Another recommendation is that in evaluating the performance in this, as in all other assignments, internally or externally assessed, schools whose performance is significantly lagging behind the rest should be informed so that they can take appropriate measures to rectify the situation.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The first element of the Written Assignment (WA) - the Reflective Statement (RS) - has been the most problematic element in this examination session. In many cases, students did not reflect on the Stage 1 of the process: the Interactive Oral discussion in their statement, while some did not write their statements reflecting the cultural and contextual considerations of the work as developed through the interactive oral, as the instructions for this task from International Baccalaureate (IB) indicate. This resulted in lower scores on assessment criterion A for not referencing cultural and contextual elements.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Students at both SL and HL showed good understanding of the purpose of the Written Assignment, namely to produce an analytical, literary essay on a topic of their own choosing, even when individual performances did not necessarily satisfy all the assessment criteria.

As already mentioned, Criterion A scores suffered due to poorly translated instructions to some candidates. These students did not reflect on the cultural and contextual elements of the work and mostly produced personal reflection on some moral or ethical aspect of the work under consideration.

Students from one particular school had excellent WAs, professionally presented, proof-read, and well written. These assignments gave proper weight to the way the writer's choices of language, structure, technique, and style help shape meaning, thus achieving the highest marks in Criterion C.

However, most students did not show such appreciation of the writer's stylistic choices, but were instead writing a moral evaluation of literary characters' life choices or destinies and their agreement or disagreement with the characters' choices, often failing to fully appreciate the fictive, literary nature of the text.

Some students composed their WAs in chronological order of the plot rather than the interpretation of the meaning of the work as a literary work of art. It was these students whose marks in Criterion B and D suffered as their analysis often stopped at the point of retelling the plot and their ideas thus seemed disorganized and had no interpretive progression.

While most students showed very good knowledge of the work studied, many were also devoting too much time to retelling the plot of the work in question. It was often that these students struggled with appropriate choice of register and terminology in their written assignment – part of Criterion E: Language. Most students could also improve their writing in terms of clarity, grammatical and even spelling errors.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Schools should double check that the translation adequately translates the emphasis on both cultural and contextual considerations and the way those were developed through the interactive oral in the question. If students lost points on Criterion A: Reflective Statement, it was for this reason, and schools which had such performances ought to improve their translation of the question.

More emphasis on integrating reflection on stylistic elements in literary analysis, especially as they shape meaning, might help many students who had a hard time presenting their ideas in the form of literary analysis. This could be accomplished with guiding questions more focused on this element of WA for Stage 2 of the process – the Supervised Writing exercises.

Students need to be warned against retelling the plot. My suggestion would be to encourage students to rewrite their own essays, first by identifying key interpretive points they make in their draft, then rewriting the essay guided by those key points of their interpretation rather

than the plot of the work in question. This might help those students whose WAs were composed in chronological order of the plot, rather than their interpretation of the meaning of the work as a literary work of art. This would help improve performance on Criterion D: Organization and development as well as Criterion B: Knowledge and understanding.

I would imagine that rewriting WA drafts could also help with the many grammatical or spelling errors and problems with clarity and thus raise performance on Criterion E: Language.

Further comments

No further comments

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

General comments

All students followed instructions in writing Paper 1 and producing a literary commentary on one of the chosen texts. The best exams had clear evidence of planning, often pages of outlining and drafting their arguments.

The best papers approached the analysis of the passages in terms of structure, motifs, possible meanings, and connections between these different elements in the creation of meaning.

While most students are aware that they are to comment on style, linguistic choices, structure or literary technique, too often their comments carry little substance. For example: “the rhythm contributes to a deeper meaning of the poem” or “this stylistic device makes it easier for us to read” and so on. Students should be able to demonstrate some understanding of how language, structure, technique and style shape meaning.

A good number of students also tends to “fill in the blanks” in the passage or poem with their own imagination rather than recognizing that some instability of meaning exists in literary texts. That is to say, students tend to supplant their own suppositions for what some element of the text leaves unclear or unsaid.

Additionally, students sometimes speak of the reader’s response or audience’s response as if it is a factual event.

Students also tend to seek a didactic message, often in terms of a “universal” meaning of the passage. This is especially not helpful at the HL where the highest marks in Criterion A are earned by persuasive interpretation supported by effective references to the passage; whereas didactic interpretations tend to flatten interpretation and leave out the possibility of multiple meanings. A drive for “universal” meaning also tends to flatten interpretations as it leaves out “local” elements or tries to subsume them under those whose meaning could be made to conform to some “universal” standard.

In terms of Criterion D, performances ranged from those by students whose control of Croatian is so minimal that their papers had no grammatically correct sentences to those whose language was very clear, effective with excellent degree of accuracy and highly effective register and style.

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

Relating stylistic choices, linguistic and structural elements of a work to the production of meaning seems a major difficulty for most students.

Supplanting their own suppositions for what is unclear or left unsaid in a literary text is also a major problem for some students. It produces unsubstantiated analysis and must be avoided.

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

Candidates seemed overall to be well prepared in terms of proper terminology for literary analysis, especially the various stylistic choices and effects.

Candidates were also sufficiently comfortable analyzing previously unseen texts.

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

Candidates seemed overall to be well prepared in terms of proper terminology for literary analysis, especially the various stylistic choices and effects.

Candidates were also sufficiently comfortable analyzing previously unseen texts.

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

In answers to the first question, students struggled with the many textual lacunas and tended to supplant their own guesses as to the narrator’s past and present. In addition, students struggled with organizing their commentary in responding to a text whose narrative is nonlinear and often interrupted stream of consciousness. On the other hand, students were often able to identify the complex narrative shifts and the motifs associated with them. The impulse to assign universal meanings to the text was also apparent at times.

In answers to the second question, students most often struggled with connecting the two seemingly disparate parts of the poem, often favouring one of the two parts in their interpretation and therefore limiting their analysis to that part or that interpretive framework. In addition, students sometimes struggled with metaphoric language and the multiple meanings it allows. On the other hand, those students who did well were able to link the multiple meanings of the “flame” in the first part of the poem to the narrator’s identification of his poetic inspiration in the flame in the second part of the poem. It also seemed easier for students to focus on stylistic choices in poetry than in prose.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It should be suggested to all students to take the time to read the passage carefully and then first proceed to draft their response in outline form. This seems to greatly improve performance overall, but especially in Criterion C and D.

A good number of students waste valuable time re-telling the plot of the extract or poem. It might be useful to suggest to them to not structure their commentary in the chronological order of the plot, but rather to organize their interpretive thoughts and write starting from those.

It should be emphasized to students that they need not supplant their own guesses for what is left unsaid. This will also help steer them away from unsubstantiated claims and interpretations. This is often where good initial engagement with the text earns lower marks in Criterion A because it steers into unsubstantiated interpretation.

Rather than speculating on possible reader responses, it might be more useful if their interpretations stayed within the realm of what the text says to them rather than what they think some particular audience might be thinking.

While it is to be expected that handwritten material will have more spelling and grammar errors, students should take care to re-read their answers and attempt to correct the errors they make in grammar and spelling.

Overall, the significance of proper planning and structure of the commentary should be re-emphasized to the students not just for the sake of Criterion C but because the highest scoring papers often also had evidence of such preparatory work. Re-reading their answers and correcting errors in spelling and grammar should be a must. Work on producing substantial commentary regarding style, structure, technique, and language of the passage not just in themselves but how they produce meaning needs to be emphasized.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

General comments

The majority of students followed instructions in writing Paper 1, while some either provided fairly short answers for both extracts or provided short, factual answers to guiding questions regarding a passage, without developing it into a coherent literary commentary.

The best exams had clear evidence of planning, often pages of outlining and drafting their arguments.

While most students are aware that they are to comment on style, linguistic choices, structure or literary technique, too often their comments carry little substance. For example: “the rhythm contributes to a deeper meaning of the poem” or “this stylistic device makes it easier for us to read” and so on. Students should be able to demonstrate some understanding of how language, structure, technique and style shape meaning. This is the standard for Criterion B.

A good number of students also tends to “fill in the blanks” in the passage or poem rather than recognizing that some instability of meaning exists in literary texts. That is to say, students tend to supplant their own suppositions for what some element of the text leaves unclear or unsaid.

In terms of Criterion D, performances ranged from those by students whose control of Croatian is so minimal that their papers had no grammatically correct sentences to those whose language was very clear, effective with excellent degree of accuracy and highly effective register and style.

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

Students had difficulty with leaving multiple meanings stand in their analysis of these texts. The selection might have been too difficult in this aspect as well. Retelling the plot was often a problem as well.

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

Candidates were well prepared to analyze previously unseen texts, showing a developed ability to provide their own literary interpretation and analysis.

Candidates also demonstrated a developed ability to identify literary or stylistic devices.

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

In answering the first question, candidates struggled with the unfinished nature of this passage. The strengths were often in relating specific stylistic choices to the mood of the passage.

In answering the second question, candidates struggled with identifying the “everyday syntactic features” mentioned in the guiding question. Candidates were often strongest in being able to connect emotional tonality of the images of nature with the overall theme of the poem.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Students should take care to carefully read the instructions before proceeding to write.

It should be suggested to all students to take the time to read the passage carefully and then first proceed to draft their response in outline form. This seems to greatly improve performance overall, but especially in Criterion C and D.

A good number of students waste valuable time re-telling the plot of the extract or poem. It might be useful to suggest to them to not structure their commentary in the chronological order of the plot, but rather to organize their interpretive thoughts and write starting from those.

It should be emphasized to students that they need not supplant their own guesses for what is left unsaid, but rather simply state that something has been left unsaid or unclear. This will also help steer them away from unsubstantiated claims and interpretations. This is often where good initial engagement with the text earns lower marks in Criterion A.

The best papers approached the analysis of the passages in terms of structure, motifs, possible meanings, and connections between these different elements in the creation of meaning.

While it is to be expected that handwritten material will have more spelling and grammar errors, students should take care to re-read their answers and attempt to correct the errors they make in grammar and spelling.

Overall, the significance of proper planning and structure of the commentary should be re-emphasized to the students not just for the sake of Criterion C but because the highest scoring papers often also had evidence of such preparatory work. Re-reading their answers and correcting errors in spelling and grammar should also be emphasized. Work on producing substantial commentary regarding style, structure, technique, and language of the passage is also needed.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 25

General comments

All students followed the instructions for Paper 2 and produced comparative analysis of at least two texts in response to one of the genre questions. There was a marked difference in performance between schools and my suggestion is that those whose students scored in the lower range devote time to reviewing assessment criteria with their students, especially Criterion B, C, and E. Those were the lower scoring categories in overall lower-scoring papers.

Most students showed good knowledge of the works in question and scored adequately or well in Criterion A.

Linguistic performance was also lower than average, with many errors in grammar and spelling, on occasion completely occluding meaning. It was rare that language had a high degree of accuracy in all three: grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction. Naturally, overall performance in register and style has also much to do with the overall quality and horizon of students' literacy.

Overall, the students' performance was negatively impacted by misunderstanding crucial terms of the posed questions, especially "social conflict," "literary convention," and "real life." The questions were perfectly clear but were still not understood properly.

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

Linguistic performance, powers of expression, and understanding of key terms were the biggest challenges to candidates in this session.

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

Candidates had good knowledge of the works studied and were able to recall relevant details and relate them to literary conventions where appropriate.

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

The most frequently chosen question was #1 regarding tragic and happy endings of novelistic characters which too often led to plot summary rather than analysis and interpretation. More than half of the students wrote on this question, suggesting it might have seemed easier than it actually was, as only a handful of those answers scored higher than average.

The second most common and just as commonly poorly understood question answered was #2 regarding social conflicts in novels transforming into complicated plots. Unfortunately, a good number of students did not understand the notion of “social conflict” and instead wrote of personal, love conflicts and so on. Considering that the most often used work was one of Croatian Realism with explicit social conflicts between classes and genders, it was all that more unusual to find so many misunderstandings of the concept.

Other questions featured similar misunderstandings which led to poor results: “literary convention” was not a well understood notion in #3. In fact, all papers scoring in the lower range attempted to answer one of these three questions.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Students need to be warned against summarizing the plot in lieu of analysis, especially in terms of short writing assignments such as Paper 2. These problems led to low marks in Criterion B.

In addition, students often failed to develop any meaningful comparison and contrast of the two works, too often simply writing two essays connected by one superficial comparison or, more often, contrast. Practising the proper form of comparing and contrasting works in literary analysis might be called for.

Criterion C: appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre needs to be addressed in future preparation for Paper 2 as it was one of the lowest scoring categories.

Once again, organization and development of the papers was best when students had attempted outlines or some form of drafts. This practice needs to be encouraged in the future for all students in relation to both Paper 1 and Paper 2 as it seems to be the best predictor of good performance overall.

Linguistic performance was also lower than average, with many errors in grammar and spelling, on occasion completely occluding meaning. It was rare that language had a high degree of accuracy in all three: grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction. These errors might be eliminated or greatly reduced if the students re-read their papers prior to submission.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 25

General comments

All but one student followed the instructions for Paper 2 and produced comparative analysis of at least two texts in response to one of the genre questions. The range of questions chosen was very limited, perhaps indicating that some questions were too hard or that some seemed significantly easier than others.

Most students showed good knowledge of the works in question and scored adequately or well in Criterion A.

Criterion C: appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre was very limited in these papers, as only two students scored a 3 or above. Most of the time, virtually no literary conventions were identified and there was no development relevant to the works and the question discussed. This is definitely the lowest scoring category and needs to be addressed in future preparation.

Linguistic performance was also lower than average, with many errors in grammar and spelling, on occasion completely occluding meaning. It was rare that language had a high degree of accuracy in all three: grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction. Naturally, overall performance in register and style has also much to do with the overall quality and horizon of students' literacy.

Overall, the students' performance was especially negatively impacted by misunderstanding crucial terms of the posed questions, especially "social conflict," "literary convention," "real life," and "local ambiance." The questions were perfectly clear but were still not understood properly.

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

Linguistic performance, powers of expression, and understanding of key terms were the biggest challenges to candidates in this session.

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

Candidates had good knowledge of the works studied and were able to recall relevant details and relate them to literary conventions where appropriate.

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

The most frequently chosen question was #2 regarding social conflicts in novels transforming into complicated plots. Unfortunately, a good number of students did not understand the notion of “social conflict” and instead wrote of personal, love conflicts and so on. Another popular question was #1 regarding tragic and happy endings for characters in novels which too often led to plot summary rather than analysis and interpretation. Other questions featured similar misunderstandings which led to poor results: “literary convention” was not a well understood notion in #3 nor was the notion of local ambiance in contrast to universal meaning in question #6. These problems led to low marks in Criterion B.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Once again, organization and development of the papers was best when students had attempted outlines or some form of drafts. This practice needs to be encouraged in the future for all students in relation to both Paper 1 and Paper 2 as it seems to be the best predictor of good performance overall.

The problems in linguistic performance might be eliminated or greatly reduced if the students re-read their papers prior to submission.

Appreciation of the literary conventions in relation to the genres for Paper 2 needs to be emphasized in future preparation as it was the lowest scoring category. Perhaps more emphasis on identifying and relating these conventions to the creation of meaning might be helpful.