

## Modern Greek A: Literature

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 16	17 - 32	33 - 44	45 - 57	58 - 69	70 - 81	82 - 100

#### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 15	16 - 29	30 - 43	44 - 56	57 - 67	68 - 80	81 - 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

The texts were well chosen with good potential for textual analysis and interpretation. On few occasions the poem selected was too long. Teachers should be careful to take into account the length of the poem and not exceed the prescribed length – 30 lines.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criteria A and B: Knowledge and understanding of the poem and Appreciation of the writer's choices

Although in many instances it is obvious that candidates have understood their extract, quite often their analysis was superficial and displayed a lack of proper understanding of the poem. Analysis in some cases was descriptive and the shaping of a composite argument was poor. As a result, the use and discussion of the literary features was superficial and mechanical and their association with interpretation was shallow and unconvincing. In the case of weaker candidates, features were presented as a list of characteristics without any attempt at understanding or any link to the meaning of the poem or the purposes of the poet. Their

separation from the interpretation and their presentation as a separate list was also at the expense of the structure of the commentary.

It cannot be over emphasised that unless candidates have *fully* grasped the meaning of the poems they study, no amount of theory or technical knowledge will make up for this lack of understanding and the analysis will always be problematic.

### **Criterion C: Organization and presentation of the commentary**

An important point that affected candidate performance was the structuring of their commentary. Candidates were keen to stick to a pre-organized structure that included an introduction and then an analysis of their extract. They should be aware of the following:

- The introduction should never be a general presentation of the poet's life and works, his/her ideological affiliations or theoretical preoccupations. It should be an introduction to the commentary based on the text at hand. Any other matter from the author's life and ideas may be used *if it is relevant to the interpretation of the poem*. Extra marks will not be awarded for the mention of such extraneous information.
- Candidates do not make appropriate use of the allocated time and their commentaries are either too short (and are usually poor) or too long (and are sometimes badly structured and uneven because they try to cram as much as possible in the allocated time). In either case, they often forget the conclusion. It is very important to bear in mind that a good commentary must use the last minute or two to conclude appropriately and round up the observations and interpretations explored during the analysis.
- There is, occasionally, a lack of consistency between the initial observations and what the candidate says they will be addressing and the ensuing analysis. This is to be explained by the lack of understanding of the terms used and a general linguistic predicament (see below).

### **Criterion D: Knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion**

Candidates were mostly well prepared, although it was easier for them to make general statements rather than develop a specific and convincing discussion of the other work.

It was apparent however that this aspect of the assessment task had not been practised sufficiently in class, resulting in either a mechanical type of discourse or unattainable expectations by the teacher; there did not seem to be a genuine engagement between the candidate and the teacher. More time should be devoted to practising this aspect of the task to create a more effective communication between the two.

### **Criterion E: Response to the discussion questions**

Some of the discussion questions were not helpful and some were misleading as they resulted in responses which were far too general and sometimes irrelevant. Teachers are advised to formulate questions which are specific to particular aspects of the work under discussion.

**Criterion F: Language**

Mistakes were observed in the use of terminology. There was a lack of confidence in the linking of form and ideas, a difficulty in demonstrating how a specific formal choice supports a specific interpretation or an idea. Often this is due to a lack of proper understanding of the terms or the text or both. Candidates often learn things by heart without assimilating their meaning and function. Memorizing terms and ideas can only hinder candidates because rather than demonstrating independence of thought by delivering their own analysis, they are trying to remember what they have learned in class.

**Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates**

- Candidates should be aware that it is important not to memorise but to *understand* and offer their own thoughts on the poem in front of them. Lack of understanding is obvious even when they use elaborate terms.
- Candidates should also avoid "didactic" or moralising analyses, which are out of place at this level of study.
- Whilst teachers are understandably anxious to help their candidates, it was apparent that they interfered too much, to the degree of interrupting the candidate or trying to steer them towards a specific answer. This created extra stress for the candidates who forgot what they were saying. Teachers should only interrupt when a candidate is clearly struggling.
- The questions asked by the teacher were often confusing and disorienting and occasionally did not support the candidate's analysis, but took it in a different direction confusing the candidate further. They often did not focus on the text and its interpretation rather, they encouraged the candidate to give further factual information or compare the text to other texts which, in the end, left the analysis unfinished.
- Teachers are urged to be fully acquainted with the criteria and their interpretation, because at times the marks awarded were far too generous, reflecting perhaps how they would like the candidate to be, not what he/she really is. This can cause big differences in the marks awarded by the teacher and the moderated marks.
- At times the quality of the recording was poor. Teachers are urged to pay more attention to this as well as to the time limit for the task as a whole.

**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

Overall the texts selected were suitable and gave candidates ample opportunity for commentary. However, the length of some of the texts selected was deemed inappropriate (see comments on IA feedback forms). Some poems by Cavafy (for example, *Myres*) are much too long for a 10 minute commentary especially when other candidates received much shorter poems (for example, *King Dimitrios*). A couple of extracts from Yannis Ritsos' long dramatic monologues were also felt to be shorter compared to the average.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

In **criterion A** most candidates commenting on extracts from novels or short stories or on poems performed satisfactorily, receiving marks of between 5 and 7, but that was not the case in extracts from plays, where the marks awarded were lower – 3-5.

In **criterion B**, some candidates managed to achieve adequate to good marks (6-7), but the appreciation of dramatic techniques was problematic for many candidates.

In **criterion C** the majority of candidates followed the line by line approach. Many candidates reached a conclusion within 8 minutes, but in many cases it was not meaningful. The majority of candidates received a mark of 3 in this criterion.

Finally, a mark of 3 was the norm in **criterion D**.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

It cannot be emphasised enough that teaching candidates a rote learned pattern of delivering their commentary is not productive. Furthermore, spending a couple of minutes on biographical information of the author/poet, is not helpful as it impinges on the length of time they have to deliver their commentary.

## Further comments

In a few instances teachers were anxious and interrupted their candidates in order to extract from them the "correct" answer. This does not really help and candidates should be left to present their commentary without undue interruption.

## 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

## Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

The "advance notice of works studied" form should be filled in on time by centres. This will allow examiners to acquaint themselves with the works prior to receipt of the assignments.

## The range and suitability of the work submitted

The general impression leaves a lot to be desired in terms of understanding and implementing the aims and the requirements of the new syllabus. With precious few exceptions, the new philosophy of assignment writing was not adequately espoused.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

**Criterion A:** Unfortunately, with a few exceptions, neither the nature of the interactive oral nor the requirements and pedagogical aims of the newly introduced reflective statement were clearly understood. The reflective statement is based on a specific guiding question – it is not a general introduction to the work. According to the IB instructions, it is a way of revealing that "the candidate has processed the knowledge" acquired in the interactive oral "in a way that leads to a deepened understanding of elements of culture and context". Candidates must realize this immediate connection between the interactive oral and the reflective statement and become creatively involved in the procedure of developing a critical perception of the work and its context.

Unfortunately, in many reflective statements there were no signs of this "clear development of appreciation" of culture and context. Theoretical generalization on history, superficial reasoning about a vague cultural milieu, summaries of the plot and biographical trivia are not among the demands of a successful reflective statement. To enhance the candidates' perception of the requirements of the reflective statement, it is vitally important that its guiding question should be translated into Greek. The English version of the guiding question should be translated, not just mentioned.

**Criterion B:** It is vitally important that a certain proposal should emerge from the knowledge of a certain text—"The mere display of knowledge and understanding is not enough". Moreover, it must be emphasized that broad essay topics will not achieve high marks. Perceptive insight into the work demands a topic with narrow focus. It is vital that the essay topic should be narrowed down; otherwise it cannot be considered for discussion within the word limit.

**Criterion C:** Appreciation of the writer's choices was largely completely ignored. In a few cases it was lightly touched on.

**Criterion D:** There should be effectively integrated supporting examples. Carefully chosen textual data must, according to the IB instructions, "shape and advance the argument". Footnoting, though not obligatory, assists in throwing light on segments of the argument.

**Criterion E:** A ray of light this year; there was good use of the terminology of literary theory. Stressing and punctuation, on the other hand, need more attention. Proof-reading the assignments before submitting them would be helpful in this direction.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers need to thoroughly familiarize themselves with the new assessment standards. Additionally, a lot of work is needed in the requirements of criterion C.

### Further comments

This was a difficult year for the written assignment as a new assessment task was introduced, not without problems. Given the nature of some of the nuances, and, perhaps the rather awkward connection between theory and practice, or, even the tentative phrasing of some of the novelties, some centres did rather poorly. Confidence in the subject guide and adherence to the IB explanatory texts will provide teachers with the support that they need in order to fulfil a challenging task.

## 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

## Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

The "advance notice of works studied" form should be filled in on time by centres. This will allow examiners to acquaint themselves with the works prior to receipt of the assignments.

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

The general impression leaves a lot to be desired in terms of understanding and implementing the aims and the criteria of the new syllabus. With precious few exceptions, the new philosophy of assignment writing was not adequately espoused.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

**Criterion A:** The function and nature of the interactive oral and, indeed, the requirements of the reflective statement that follow it were not clearly understood. In quite a few cases, the reflective statement was an account of the personal contact between candidate and teacher, or, just a superficial, first person experience stemming from the reading of a text. More importantly, some candidates concluded at the end of their reflective statement that the title of their written assignment followed directly from the interactive oral, thus ignoring the role of the prompts.

It should be emphasized that the reflective statement is neither an isolated experience nor, as many candidates treated it, a general introduction to the work. According to the IB

instructions, it is "a personal statement, likely to be written in the first person, on the evolution of understanding of context and culture". A demonstration of a "deepened understanding" of elements of culture and context is essential for a reflective statement to achieve its goals. The close connection between the interactive oral and the reflective statement secures the continuation of a procedure based mainly on the development of the critical understanding of culture and context.

Additionally, the guiding question of the reflective statement should be translated in order to serve as an illuminating gloss on the nature and philosophy of the reflective statement. Simply mentioning the English version of the question is not enough.

**Criterion B:** It is truly important that a certain proposal should emerge from the knowledge of a certain text. The "mere display of knowledge is not enough". A proposal must follow it. Moreover, it must be emphasized that broad essay topics will not score high marks. Essay titles must be narrowed down in order to be treated adequately within the word limit. Perceptive insight into a work demands a topic with a narrow focus.

**Criterion C:** The response to this criterion was either non-existent or minimal.

**Criterion D:** the use of integrated examples is essential. The argument should be supported with carefully chosen textual data which will, according to the IB instructions, "shape and advance" the development of ideas. Moreover, bibliographic references must be more consistent.

**Criterion E:** It must be stressed that the prerequisites for a high mark in language have become rather more demanding.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Close reading of the assessment criteria and adherence to the subject guide as well as all the IB accompanying instructions are essential.

## Further comments

This has been a difficult first year for the assessment of written assignments. Unfortunately some of the directives in the subject guide and the nature of this assessment task have not been fully understood which has led to some difficulties.

## 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 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

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

From the two texts set, one prose extract by Frangias and a poem by Skarimbas, the prose extract was by far the most popular. This was due to the fact that the poem was apparently more complex with a great amount of literary features very closely linked to the intricacies of the meaning which, in itself was quite dense and subversive.

Therefore, candidates who chose the poem struggled with the demanding literary features. Although they are very well taught and prepared in class, the extraction of meaning from the features or their exploration in more demanding contexts remains a challenge.

This became evident also in the prose text. Although its analysis was much more straightforward, it did not produce as many excellent responses as one would have expected mainly because the candidates kept to the more superficial and mechanical repetition of the content rather than a genuine exploration of how techniques contribute to the production of meaning.

The fact that the criteria relating to content and form have now been condensed into one, candidates could no longer collect points for their understanding irrespective of the exploration of the literary features. This made them miss more points.

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

Candidates are always very well prepared in terms of knowledge of literary features and their use. They are well equipped to deal with a commentary (organization of ideas and content) and the fact that the text is unknown allows for more creative responses with brilliant ideas (even, at times, in the case of weaker candidates).

As always, the difficulties are related to how each candidate is able to assimilate and respond to this knowledge.

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

Candidates are always well prepared in matters of structure, organisation of the commentary and in their knowledge of literary techniques, which allow them to approach and analyse a text. This is why in the cases of strong candidates the results are impressive. The comments and recommendations included in these reports are for the improvement of the weaker candidates.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates



- Explore a variety of texts that are distinguished for their language, their features, and their genre. The wider the variety, the better the candidates will be prepared.
- Aim at a more creative and deeper understanding of the literary features. It is not always easy, but such an essential assimilation will enhance the candidates' performance irrespective of the text.
- Unfortunately, candidates' language becomes poorer by the year. This is an important issue to reflect on as far as the teaching is concerned.
- Please make sure that candidates do not confuse the polytonic system with the katharevousa.

## 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 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

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

Candidates appeared to find the prose passage more difficult than the poem and the majority chose to respond to the poem.

The prose passage consisted of a description of a haunting setting in which the protagonist was trying to control his feelings of horror and fear. This appeared to present a few difficulties, namely candidates found it more difficult to structure their answers; they offered interpretations which were not based on the extract; they failed to explore the wealth of literary features that the author used to create his nightmarish atmosphere.

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

As for HL, candidates are always well prepared in matters of structure, organisation of the commentary and in their knowledge of literary techniques, which allow them to approach and analyse a text. This is why in the cases of strong candidates the results are impressive. The comments and recommendations included in these reports are for the improvement of the weaker candidates.

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

It is obvious from some of the strong responses received that centres are working hard to teach candidates the techniques of literary analysis. Many candidates produced impressive analyses with extremely original ideas, thoughtful and sensitive comments. They displayed an insight into the text that is to be congratulated.

The following comments should be read with the weaker candidates in mind:

Despite the fact that the poem appeared easier both in form and in content, and in spite of the fact that the questions set were extremely helpful in guiding candidates towards the salient features of the piece, many candidates restricted themselves to the superficial aspects of the poem and did not venture towards a deeper analysis. Their ability to associate form and meaning and explain how the choice of rhyme, metre, vocabulary and other techniques produces meaning and strengthens the overall feeling and message of the poem, was also limited. Their knowledge of literary devices was superficial and mechanical.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is obvious from a large number of scripts that teachers are doing a very good job, so it is hard to think of any recommendations that they do not know already. One suggestion may be to expose candidates to more modern texts and to encourage a deeper understanding of the meaning of the text before proceeding to the exploration of literary features.

## Further comments

It appears that year after year candidates have more issues with spelling, language use, expression etc. The overall level of the language was poorer this session.

## Higher level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 3	4 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 25

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

Responses received revealed many shortcomings, both with respect to the understanding and interpretation of the works as well as to the answers to the questions posed. Weaknesses in understanding and interpretation of the texts are directly related to teaching, where the following observations are made:

- a. Many centres have for some years now been teaching the same works, thus, resulting in a narrow selection of texts.
- b. Candidates are given material that deals with the *theory* of literary analysis without, the necessary training on its application and the treatment of works using such theories.
- c. It appears that candidates are encouraged to learn by heart various pieces of information and, as a result, many scripts resemble each other to an alarming degree—more than one would expect, even from candidates from the same class.

Consequently, it appeared that candidates were incapable of articulating a *personal*, authentic opinion and attitude towards the works, neither, of course, did they treat them *in depth*. The major difficulties related to the comparison itself between two (or more) works and were even more evident in criterion B where the comparison should also have included an evaluation. For a mark of 4 or 5 to be awarded in criterion B, the response must include “some evaluation” (4) or “an effective comparison” (5). Most candidates presented a parallel assessment of the works with respect to what they had been asked, adding a paragraph at the end, where they supposedly compared the works.

The majority of candidates also appeared ill prepared to write about the literary conventions of the genre studied. Some failed to make any kind of comment, some simply referred to some literary features without, however, connecting them to the question, while others examined a few and others cited pre-learned theories which they did not subsequently employ; only a few attempted a serious examination of the requirements of the question.

Candidates also faced problems relating to the use of language. Unfortunately, some demonstrated that they do not possess the level of language that is required to produce a comparative essay, both from the viewpoint of linguistic adequacy, as well as from the viewpoint of the conventions of this type of essay work.

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

The candidates appeared well prepared, but, as has been noted, this proved to be problematic in the sense that they were so well prepared that there was no room for something personal, original, novel or unexpected.

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

Although candidates were well prepared on some topics, they did not manage to respond to the questions which were a little trickier, which necessitated a critical approach or a combination of two or more parameters.

Most were carried away and responded to just one part of the question. Indeed some showed that they did not even understand the question which they attempted to answer.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is obvious that the teaching of Modern Greek A: Literature must be governed by the principles and philosophy of the Diploma Programme. It must satisfy the subject aims and objectives and must support and encourage candidates to acquire the characteristics of the IB learner.

### Standard 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 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25

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

One might have expected candidate performance in this component (the requirements being very similar to that of the former A1 course) would have been better this session. Unfortunately this was not so, since scores were not particularly high. The key difficulty was due to the fact that the candidates failed to assume a critical stance towards the works studied. They were not able to treat them in the manner required by the question. This difficulty may be due to two reasons: (a) the rescission of the comparative essay in the written assignment and (b) the way the course is taught.

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

It is obvious, not only from the strongest responses but also from the good moments in weaker ones, that teachers are doing a good job in preparing candidates for this component. The wealth of information given, the variety of aspects discussed, the detail in the knowledge and analysis of literary techniques proves that, even in the weaker examples, teachers have invested time and effort in providing their candidates with the best possible material.

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

Due to the difficulties mentioned previously, candidates faced problems in treating the question as a whole. They had difficulties in being accurate and in responding to the question's requirements, especially for those questions which required assessment of one element (e.g. question 7: description) under specific conditions (e.g. the shaping of the ambience) most candidates got carried away and wrote all that they had been taught about

description.

It is again evident that the teaching of poetry is a difficult task indeed. Candidates who chose to answer questions on poetry seemed to have greater difficulty in this component.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is essential that teachers become involved in training and attend workshops and seminars in order to become fully cognisant of the demands and requirements of the new Literature course. The principles of the Diploma Programme course must be fully embraced in order that candidates can demonstrate the knowledge and the critical skills they have been taught.