

## Dutch A Literature

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 16	17 - 31	32 - 43	44 - 57	58 - 72	73 - 85	86 - 100

#### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 15	16 - 28	29 - 40	41 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 81	82 - 100

### Higher level internal assessment

#### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

Due to the new programme of Literature, higher level students had to comment on a poem and discuss one of the other two works in Part 2 based on a different genre (novel, drama or essay). This meant that there was a bit more diversity in the selected genres, e.g. more essays were studied compared to recent years. However, in some cases the second work discussed was also a poem, but was identified as an essay (Beatrijs). Unfortunately in one case not only the teacher had prepared the discussing-questions, but also the student was given the opportunity to prepare the second work, including a passage! That of course is not the intention of the last 10-minute part of the part 2 assessment: the student must not know on which work the discussion questions will be asked until the time after the commentary. Fortunately this aspect of the new, second part of the oral examination was well understood by most. This also applied to the distribution of time: most commentaries lasted about eight minutes without interruption. In some cases, but less than in previous years, more than two guiding questions were offered; in just one case the candidate received the poem without any accompanying questions. On the whole the nature of the guiding questions was appropriate in order to produce an analysis where content, form and literary features

were addressed. The subsequent questions are intended to be an engagement in which students are encouraged to show their further detailed knowledge or answer questions that they still haven't explored in their comments. That was not always the case: too often subsequent questions were too broad in nature or consisted of meaningless repetition which did not offer the students a lot of opportunities to profile themselves.

Although quite different in the degree of difficulty, most poems were chosen with care and suitable for the task in length and nature. Most poems were modern, some of medieval origin. Less than in previous years, but it still happens that the historical passages are given in the modern translation, which is not the intention: the original text has to be prepared. Probably because of the requirement of a poem it was noticed that most were not provided with a line number. When comparing a verse from, for example, the first and the last stanza, line-numbering is useful.

The second part of the oral examination concerned the 10 minute discussion about a second work of a different genre. The word 'discussion' is essential here: the (starting) questions (prepared by the teacher) must be open and ask for the student's opinion about an aspect of the work (e.g. the profiling of the main character, the way a columnist shows his opinion, etc.). The student must be allowed to demonstrate his knowledge of the work through discussion. This involves open-ended questions, expressing ideas which are based on evidence and justifying the opinions and points of view expressed. Too often the discussion involved a factual question and answer routine.

The technical quality of the recordings was good and most teachers wrote appropriate comments on the IA record form.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

The majority of the candidates were able to show their knowledge and understanding of the selected poem demonstrated by their interpretation of the content and referring to appropriate verses. Most responded in an adequate to good way; however, a significant minority of the moderated candidates showed a superficial knowledge (2 points), by giving a very general summary or paraphrase of the content. This meant that the results for Criteria B and C were poor as well.

Criterion B seemed to be the most difficult one to respond to. The keyword here is 'effectiveness', in what way literary features have a function to create meaning to the interpretation of the content of the poem. In order to discuss this aspect, students must be able to apply literary terms in order to comment on the use of such features by the author and above all what the effect of that use is. Simply naming literary features is not enough.

The majority of students structured their commentary in a coherent way. Some introduced their commentaries by announcing all the parts they intended to examine, others started by reading the whole poem and reciting a lot of facts about the author. Both ways of starting took a lot of time and didn't really contribute to the analysis of the poem. It is probably more effective to start with a very brief statement which states the focus of the poem, then analysing by verse/strophe the use of literary features, emphasizing their function in effectiveness in the course of the poem. The integration of references was better compared to previous years, but in general it could still be improved.

The best results were achieved in Criterion D: knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion. In most cases the selected work was a novel, in a very few cases an essay. Obviously this criterion links directly with criterion E: response to the discussion questions. The quality of the questions was diverse, but most were 'closed', direct questions requiring factual knowledge of the

selected work and its historical background instead of 'open' questions giving the student the opportunity to show their knowledge by stating and justifying their own opinions and interpretations. Questions such as 'can you identify with the main character?' are not very sensible. These questions are more 'sociological' and 'personal', than an introduction to a discussion about the literary components of the work. The marks awarded for these criteria (D and especially E) are very dependent on the type of questions the teacher starts with. Much more attention has to be paid to criterion E. This last criterion is not a matter of a correct or incorrect answer, but of a convincing answer backed up by arguments based on a detailed knowledge of the work studied.

The last criterion (F) concerns the use of language. Most candidates spoke in a clear and appropriate way, but the use of literary terms needs to be extended; students need to be familiar with this necessary skill when discussing literature in an effective way.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

More attention to:

- The analysis of the effects of literary features
- Use of literary terms
- The way the second work has to be discussed
- Structuring and integrating references

## Standard level internal assessment

### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

In general the range of works selected were quite similar to that of previous years, with some refreshing newer choices (non-fiction for instance with Lanoye) and all categories were present. Most extracts or poems were chosen with care and suitable to the task in length and nature. However, using modern adaptations of a medieval text or 17<sup>th</sup> century work are, as mentioned in previous reports, not allowed. Works by authors mentioned on the PLA are to be read as the original works. It does not help the student either, to comment on the (poetic) language or use of imagery by the author, when in the modern version diction, vocabulary, poetic features and most imagery of that author are lost.

Guiding questions were mostly clear and varied, directing candidates to different aspects of the extract, covering both content and form.

Most of the extracts or poems were appropriate in length. Some of the passages that have a less than page filling layout however, – such as dialogue in a play – at times prove to be rather short with 30 lines, in terms of material to discuss. In these cases the guide offers freedom to use more lines at the discretion of the teacher.

The majority of the commentaries was well prepared and followed a planned structure. Some students mentioned in their introduction what they would be treating in what order (enumerating, or using a stylish variation) and their conclusion reflected this planning.

Time management needs some attention. In most internal assessments time management was good and teachers adhered to the 10 minutes' length. Most candidates kept a close timing to the 8' commentary. In the best cases students used their time evenly and were able to discuss (most of) the significant features, incorporating the treatment of their guiding questions in their expose.

Some candidates used up nearly half of their time (3+ minutes), to offer contextual facts concerning the work in general, the period and the author, leaving only just 5 minutes to come to the core of the commentary: a literary analysis of the extract or poem. This should be avoided; the extract should be the focal point of the commentary, though a short referential mention of author, work or period under discussion can of course be included, where useful. With the new format of (only) 10 minutes to discuss the extract (8') and answer subsequent questions (2'), teachers must train their students to use and plan their time well. In most cases there seemed to be more than plenty to discuss effectively based on the extract/poem, within the time span as it is, without a (too general) display of literary historical context. Many students and teachers appeared to regret they did not have more time to pursue their discussion further.

Identical Introductions, obviously learned by heart (by the same school's candidates), denoting facts on theme, author and work, need to be avoided; commentaries should not start with deliveries of learned facts and phrases, even as just an introduction, as this takes away on creativity, ability to structure, formulate and think independently.

Nearly all candidates were allowed to deliver their commentaries without undue interruptions. Even an obvious error you would not wish your student to make should not induce teachers to interrupt. It is better to refrain, and come back to it, as a slip of the tongue, in the subsequent questions, as interrupting takes away the concentration of the student.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

Further to the comments above, most candidates demonstrated an adequate to good knowledge and understanding of the work studied. Most were able to place the passage in correct context, stipulate its significance for the work as a whole and demonstrate understanding and interpretation to a satisfactory to good extent. Some candidates delivered commentaries of exemplary quality.

The interpretation of the meaning of the extract or poem was generally valid and most candidates gave (personal) responses that were supported by relevant and accurate references to the extract or poem, often in relation with aspects of form and language. Quite a few candidates did not justify their interpretations enough or showed difficulties integrating references, thus making their observations more assertions than founded arguments.

Similarly, appreciation of the writer's choices proved to be the hardest part. Assertions, without proof or reflection on effects, on how these choices shape meaning, still occur too often. Teachers could

help the students by asking focused and specific guiding and subsequent questions to enable candidates to respond appropriately to these choices. Rhyme is a well-covered writer's choice, but sometimes its treatment seems to be unconnected to meaning and effects. How tools help shape meaning in both content and form are often not covered, or not enough. Basic, significant deconstruction of contents and structure linked, for instance, to a particular (sub) genre (e.g. sonnet), should be investigated in addition to (mere) observations of rhyme.

Some lack of attention is to be noted for the author's choice of words and word patterns, tone, register and (patterns of) imagery, which enhance and deepen meaning. Whereas these literary tools are often as significant as, or more meaningful than rhyme or alliteration, candidates appear to have little eye for this. Teachers could train students to comment on these aspects. On this criterion, most candidates performed 'adequately'.

Most commentaries were structured at least adequately, some more clearly and coherently, and some (very) convincingly. A lot of candidates have an introduction as well as a short summary at the end.

As far as creating a meaningful sequence is concerned, it should be observed that rhyme is not always the best or most attractive way to start the main body of the commentary, especially if this is discussed before content and meaning. Rhyme is often supportive to meaning and not the incentive to meaning, and should therefore not be presented as such by preceding the essential 'what's it about?'

The use of language was the weakest part in some cases. The use of literary terms was not always appropriate or was, quite often, neglected. Some did not pay enough attention to the vocabulary required when discussing literary topics. Too many candidates have lapses in grammar, especially with prepositions, word order, and in choice of words. Register in general was appropriate.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

More attention to

- Placing extracts in a concise and efficiently delivered context
- Integrating references into the body of the commentary
- Avoid assertions without backing up
- Knowledge of some literary tools and their effects
- Vocabulary, grammar and use of literary terms

## Further comments

### Quality of the recordings and administration

In most of the extracts and poems lines were numbered 1, 5, 10 etc. This greatly aids the student in directing focus to references and quotations, but also helps the teacher to focus his/her questions, and the moderator to follow to the argument. Numbering should be done according to the format of the extract, starting with '1'. Pages and – with longer poetry works- verses should not be numbered according to the original source; it is the task of the student to situate the extract in the work as a whole, without further visual aids.

In most cases the technical quality of the recording was good. Before sending the work, schools should always check its quality and completeness. A growing number however, had Skype like echoes, slamming metal drawers (in the same room?), loud students in the corridor, bells and disturbing background 'music', which made it hard to hear what the student was saying and must have distracted the candidates.

Nearly all schools filled out details on the 1/IAR form correctly. Most teachers supplied useful comments on the form, but some did not write anything at all.

## Standard level internal assessment (self taught)

### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most of the extracts were suitable in length. Most commentaries and presentations were within the set time limits, with some exceptions (up to 31'). Quite a few schools had IOCs that were longer than 14'. Some candidates were done within 6 minutes and showed very limited interpretation, understanding and ability to structure their commentary.

Most of the commentaries were on fiction. Others used non-fiction. In the latter category most choices yielded a good level of commentary. Some choices of extracts did not produce comments of sufficient literary level. Choice of extract remains important. Some of the extracts were not very suitable for the question chosen; most were suitable to well chosen.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

Most candidates were able to deliver a commentary that showed sufficient to satisfactory understanding of the question chosen and demonstrated a similar understanding and interpretation. Some candidates, however, were unable to use and respond to concepts in the question used like voice, imagery, pace, dramatic structure, characterization in a meaningful way. Some candidates did not respond to the part of the question saying: "in what way..?" and for instance only stated a number of themes. Supervisors are advised to make sure that candidates are trained to understand and respond to these concepts and parts of the question.

Some students tend to use a lot of contextual facts in their IOC, (sometimes up to 4'), or summary of the work (up to over 5'), thus not putting the extract at the centre of their commentary. This should be avoided. Context should be part of the commentary on the extract, demonstrated with the extract, not a learned literary historical lesson.

Some candidates were unable to couple paraphrasing with sufficient quotation or reference to the extract itself; it is clear that paraphrasing in itself is not enough.

## Part II, Presentation

A few presentations were very good, most were satisfactory, but some were rather farfetched comparisons between two very disparate genres and disparate content (a column and a poem for instance, comparing the aspects and techniques and style). Whereas the literary means or theme used by a medieval author compared to that of a 21<sup>st</sup> C one can be useful to show a candidate's understanding of culture and context, there were also examples of rather unsuitable comparisons. A comparison between *Tirza* and *Max Havelaar* without a clearly stated focus is an example.

In both part I and II the language quality varied from weak, using many Anglicisms and problematic word order, to excellent fluent speakers employing a wide vocabulary. Some candidates were rather careless in using literary terms.

In the upper mark range there were some exemplary commentaries and presentation that both showed independent thinking and excellent understanding, using very good language. With a wider choice of works in the future self-taught students, can do as well as taught students.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Quite a number of candidates handed in notes used in the IOC and IOP that showed too wide an interpretation of the instructions. Supervisors and tutors should train their students to use notes according to the rules only, and problem cases will be reported to the IB.

### Recommendations

- Bullet points should **not** contain fully written out sentences, sometimes forming a whole paragraph, which are read out. Examiners will look at the amount of spontaneous speaking, rather than the read out sentences. Candidates that use a lot of these do not score high on the language criterion, as it is not a reading exercise, not even partly.
- If slides are used these should not contain more than the one A4 in total as in the instructions (one candidate handed in 21 slides!)
- Two A4 reduced in size on one A4 is not according to the instructions
- It is advisable that notes on both parts of the IA should mention the author and work, as this was not always clear directly.
- Care should be taken in referring to the author's name, title and genre indication ('nouvelle', 'memoires' for Max Havelaar e.g.)
- Some schools failed to submit notes on either part of the oral.

## Higher level written assignment

### Component grade boundaries

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

## The range and suitability of the work submitted

The overall impression of the written assignments of the candidates was one of improvement when compared (indirectly) with previous years. The choices of the topics were less superficial and less farfetched. By focusing on one literary work instead of comparing two, the treatment gave room for a more personal response. The 'four-stage' approach must have been very useful in the process of making a more conscious choice when producing the essay. It was noticed there was a good use of the prompts in developing the topic which formed the starting point for the final version. Most topics were derived from this third stage.

As required more emphasis has been given to cultural aspects, referring to contextual elements in the work studied. Some however didn't quite understand that the essay had to be an analysis of a literary aspect and took 'culture' in its narrowest or widest sense e.g. writing a comparison between the islam and the 'portuguese' religion based on Hosseini's *De vliegeraar* without references to the work. Equally writing about the 'emancipation of women' based on Ibsens *Een poppenhuis* without referring to time, place, cultural and contextual aspects doesn't demonstrate critical thinking and won't get high scores.

The most popular works didn't differ much from those of previous years. Süsskind, Camus and Kafka were again richly represented.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

The weakest criteria were A and C. The reflective statement (A) was too often either a personal response to the work itself, information about the author or the literary genre (in general) or a resume of the content. Comments such as "much learned" (without explaining what exactly) do not say much. For example, writing about *Het parfum* without naming the meaning of the eighteenth-century France (Enlightenment) in order to understand the work from a cultural context is a missed opportunity. Too few students pointed out how their knowledge of culture and context of the work contributed to a better and greater understanding of the chosen work. Very few achieved the maximum 3 points.

In general the response to criterion C, appreciation of the writer's choices, was also rather disappointing. Out of 6 points available the average was less than 3 points. Most students mentioned literary features but not the way in which they shape meaning and contribute to the content and focus of the work. Too few candidates analyzed their usage and the resultant effects of the diverse techniques by the author. This resulted in significant paraphrasing instead of analysis.

The majority of the students showed a sufficient to good knowledge and understanding of the work, some were very detailed indeed leading to a real depth of insight. The latter used textual evidence by giving excellent examples on which they substantiated their assertions and supported their arguments.

With some exceptions criteria D and E were the most successful criteria. Essays were usually structured more successfully than in previous years. Not every student integrated examples (if they used any) in an effective way, but in general an improvement in this area was certainly the case.

Probably due to stage 3 of the process the skill of writing was also improved in comparison with previous years. When combined the use language was mostly to consistently appropriate to task.



## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

More attention to

- The reflective statement
- Analysing, stressing the use and effects of literary features

## Standard level written assignment

### Component grade boundaries

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

## The range and suitability of the work submitted

There were some errors on the coversheets. These need to be more accurate. Sometimes the works studied were not even mentioned on the coversheet. Titles of books should be written in the chosen Language A with the correct author. The students should also understand that this is a Dutch examination. When they read works in translation, they should read the work in Dutch and not in its original language. Paraphrases or quotations should also be made in Dutch. Often there was no bibliography and incorrect quotations or references to pages were used.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

A lot of the essays were vague. Statements were often made in a very general way without any references based on the work. Candidates did not really show their understanding or knowledge of the work.

Too often candidates use phrases like "it is totally different" or "this is much better" or "everything is clear" without explaining what they really mean. Conclusions or assertions are sometimes not supported by the content of the work. Few personal statements showed real involvement.

### Reflective statement

Several students are reflecting only that the interactive orals were important and that their class mates have given good information, but not that their sense of the culture and context of the book has evolved through the oral presentations. Purely reporting or rehearsing factual information does not meet the standard of criterion A. The reflective statement should show the development of the student's thinking and understanding of cultural or social and contextual elements.

The development of knowledge or understanding of the culture, social, historical context of the book is seldom shown.

In many statements there are no or just a few references to persons or events mentioned in the book.

There is hardly any process description of the development of student's personal thinking, feeling. How they were touched by the book. No description of the influence of the culture, social/historical aspects on the events, persons or narrative style.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Avoid topics which are too wide.
- Emphasize a personal, well considered definition of a limited aspect supported by appropriate references to the works.
- Topics should be concrete, precise, clear and compact. Pay attention to grammar and punctuation!
- Teachers should make students more familiar with the regulations of the written assignment.
- More personal answers, involvements and developments
- Allow the candidates to use spell-check
- Avoid summaries. Don't retell the story of the book.

## Higher level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20

### General comments

This year 37 candidates participated in the higher level examination. Most candidates wrote their comment on question 1, the prose extract. A great majority demonstrated a satisfactory to excellent performance.

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

With the criteria of the new programme the evaluation and appreciation of literary features was more stressed than in previous years. Analysing the ways in which features shape meaning to the content of the prose extract/poem was again a problem. The response to the requirements of criterion B remained the weakest area. With a few exceptions most students gained between 2 and 3 points on this criterion. For example just mentioning 'structure' is not adequate enough, the candidate needs to analyse the function of that feature to give meaning to the text.

Although most students understood the text adequately, too many paraphrased and didn't support their arguments by references to the passage.

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

For a great majority of the candidates the use of language showed an adequate to good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction. Most essays were also adequately to effectively organized, with a suitable structure.

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

### Prose

Most students were able to understand the content of *Open dag*, written by Gerrit Krol. Too many however retold this short story by summing-up the places the first person narrator showed to his friends and missed specific details in order to pronounce and to evoke the contradiction between the image of the countryside ('het hoge Noorden', 'het eind van de wereld') by citizens ('m'n Hollandse vrienden', 'Mijn Amsterdamse vrienden') and the I-figure, who lives there. They missed, for example, 'waar ooit' (past tense) as an indication that the poetry of the countryside is only to be found in paintings. Another contradiction: the always 'open' churches and 'closed' pubs, restaurants and even the service station was mentioned by most candidates, but a very few indicated the ironical style.

### Poem

Most students mentioned that *21 November 1981*, written by Jan Eijkelboom had 'something to do' with 'war'. Some had the wrong interpretation as if it concerned a 'peace fight during the war' or saw it only as 'love-poem' mentioning the 'ik' and de 'jij' as most important. The contradiction between 'jij moest nog aan de oorlog wennen' and 'die ik nog niet had afgelegd' was not always mentioned. This was caused by the misunderstanding of the relative pronoun 'die' and not knowing the meaning of the (past participle) verb 'afleggen'. Words like 'stoet', 'leus', 'oproer', 'ransel' as indicators were also often overlooked. The repetition of 'de zachte donder van de vrede' was, however, well seen. Even when the starting point of the interpretation wasn't always realistic, the development of the argumentation was in most cases coherent. Most mentioned literary features, but as already said, the analysis could have been more profound.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

More attention to

- Not only knowing and recognizing literary features, but also being aware of their effects and the way in which they shape meaning to the content of the text.
- Integrating quotations properly and coherently.

## Standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 20

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

Although the prose-text is always chosen more often, this year the poem gained in popularity. Like last year the weakest area was criterion B: the interpretation of the text was not sufficiently illustrated by examples. Although most candidates understood the thoughts and feelings expressed in the text, too many paraphrased and did not refer to it and quote. So, integrating quotations still remains a problem.

The appreciation of the effects of literary features was also an aspect which needs more attention. Very few candidates achieved 4 or 5 points in these areas (criteria B and C). Several candidates lost points because they did not read attentively enough and therefore missed important clues in the text, which could help them to analyse more precisely and in greater depth. Even though the average mark for criterion E, the use of language, was sufficient too many candidates still make mistakes in sentence construction and spelling.

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

With a few exceptions the vast majority of candidates demonstrated a sufficient to good understanding of the text (not analytic), prose as well as poetry; some performances were excellent. The analysis of the content and the structure of the commentaries were the most satisfactory to good parts in almost all papers.

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

#### Prose

As mentioned, most candidates understood the content of '*Hersenschimmen*' broadly well: a man suffering from dementia who overhears his wife and a nurse talking in the kitchen. They discuss the treatment of the man and the frustration of the wife.

It was noticed by almost all candidates that the man ignores the situation by seeking an escape and starting to work (imaginary). That the man doesn't know how to handle the situation and this expression in the extract is also noted. Some noticed that the man himself understands that something is happening with him, and that he feels that he "van binnenuit [wordt] opgesplijt" (20), but most of the candidates did not elaborate on this by explaining how this further comes forward in the text and what the man feels.

The practical understandings as the effects of the man's illness are noticed by most of the candidates (37-38). And some of the candidates explained the effects on both; the hopelessness of the woman and inner fight of the man.

Most of the candidates noticed the structure of used perspectives expressed: the thoughts of the man, the dialogue of the two women in the kitchen, the actions of the man described by himself and the tension that is created by the short dialogues at the end to extract.

## Poem

Most of the candidates were able to understand the basic content and message of the poem 'Het kind': the dream of a man/woman to become mother/father by getting a child, but also the understanding of this lyrical-subject that the dream is not allowed to come true. The lyrical subject speaks in plural form, representing both parents.

Most candidates could not analyse the literature features such as enjambement and the rhyme scheme and the use of grammatical future tense constructions that are connected with the dream of the lyrical subject: "*zullen worden, zouden*".

None of the candidates linked the "suffering" with the year in which the poem was published and written, 1949, which is 5 years after WW II.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Practise the analysis of literary features so that candidates are not only able to recognise features, but also comment on their effects.
- Practise the use of quotations to exemplify and support the argument the candidate is making.

## Higher level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 22	23 - 25

### General comments

All students based their essay on 'novel and short story'. Nearly 85 % achieved a satisfactory to excellent performance.

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

Criterion B and C were the weakest areas in producing the essay. Although candidates respond to most of the main implications of the question and produced some relevant ideas, the problem was

comparing and contrasting of the two works in relation to the question. Another area which can be improved concerned the appreciation of literary conventions. Most students identified examples of literary features, but they were not always developed with relevance to the question.

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

On the whole the majority of the students showed an adequate knowledge and understanding. They produced sufficient, some excellent, textual evidence to support analysis and opinions. In general the presentation of the essays was organized adequately. Most candidates were able to structure their responses in a logical and coherent way and supporting examples were mostly incorporated in a suitable way. The average of the use of language was sufficient.

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

Although there was more variation in the choice of works this year, *De aanslag*, *Karakter* and *Bezonken rood* remained the favourites.

Question 2 about the degree of importance of place and space in developing the plot was the most chosen. Most students noted the way in which these elements played a role in the work as a whole, but not enough in developing the plot. Comparing and contrasting are the key words when responding to every question. That part happened to be difficult, most wrote about the first work, then about the second and failed to analyse similarities and differences in response the required elements. This also applied to candidates answering questions 1 and 3. Most candidates showed knowledge, referred to the content and structured their work well, but the analysis in order to compare and contrast needs improvement.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

More attention to

- Similarities and differences in every respect of the works studied
- Literary conventions and their effects
- Reading the essay-questions with care: more attention to the implications of the command

## Standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

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

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

One of the problems for the candidates was linking the essay to the question as such. Candidates wrote general comments on the works studied and sometimes there was no direct relation to the question chosen. Candidates tend not to know how to comment on the writer's choices or to show appreciation in their essay or have problems with analysing the effects of literature features. They simply don't know how to deal with criterion C. Awareness of the writer's choices or use of language isn't an easy skill. These kinds of skills should be practised more often and discussed in the class room. Maybe it also will lead the student to a better understanding of the work. In that case even the quality of the reflective essay will improve.

More words don't mean a better result. A well written essay is a result of analysis and structure. Avoid summarizing the works; retelling the story doesn't improve the essay. The student will lose his focus on the question. The lack of focus on the chosen topic is certainly one of the main problems.

Candidates still find it difficult to write the conclusion. Sometimes they tried to answer the question in the introduction and repeated this answer in the conclusion again. Even less detailed but still without answering the question!

More and more, students are using all kinds of questions in their essays without answering them. They make statements without explanation or supporting examples.

Handwriting, spelling (verbs), sentence structure and grammar (prepositions) are all serious problems. The formal use of language must improve. The candidates have chosen Dutch as an A language. The literature course is a very demanding course. The candidate should be clear and coherent in the use of his/her A language. His/her use of language should be appropriate for literary analysis. In addition he/she should also read the works on their list intensively.

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

A lot of students demonstrated good knowledge of the works on their list but more depth and insight could still be included. Some of the candidates had a lot of background and received information about the cultural, social and historical context.

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

The students had a good insight into the themes and motives of the works but appeared to lack practice in how to structure and organize that knowledge to answer the question or to illustrate their ideas and opinions in a relevant way.

Students recognized literary features but they don't know how the author is using these to show the reader his ideas, thoughts and messages.

Most of the students based their essays on the first category (Roman and Novel). Very few chose questions from the other categories.

Students should know the differences between imagery and style.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Pay attention to literary features. Students know what literary features are but not (or cannot explain) why and how they are used by the author.
- Teach candidates how to answer the questions in an appropriate way.
- Train them to jot down and record their initial thoughts before starting to write an essay.
- Analysing and criticizing literary texts with students can be very helpful to improve their thinking skills. There is a need for the (careful and precise) close reading of texts.
- Make more room during the study for personal response, thoughts or ideas.
- Please pay attention to punctuation!
- Make students aware that they never should retell the whole story. They have to answer the question. A good examiner knows the story and has read the book.
- Maybe we, as teachers, should look for other books. "*Twee koffers vol, De aanslag, Bezonken rood, Het behouden huis, Karakter*" and even "*Het bittere kruid*" or "*Oeroeg*" are used already so many times in Part 3.