

## Modern Greek A: Literature

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 17	18 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 55	56 - 66	67 - 77	78 - 100

#### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 16	17 - 29	30 - 42	43 - 55	56 - 66	67 - 78	79 - 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

### General Comments

The texts were well chosen with good potential for textual analysis and interpretation. In few cases the poem selected was longer than the prescribed length-30 lines.

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

The analysis, when superficial, did not develop the key points of the poem, leaving several of them unresolved.

The reference to the poet sometimes took the form of introduction / biography lasting two minutes or more.

Sometimes the comments were vague and did not indicate deep understanding, but rather a mechanical performance.

Often, the technical comments were not related to their function. The separation of analysis and style is not an effective approach, because the poet's techniques are not studied in terms of the effect on the poem as a whole. An attempt to connect them in the conclusion is not enough.

Candidates appeared to be guided in the comments by what had been said in class, rather than offer their own personal, independent insights into the poem. This led to a mechanical and superficial commentary, which indicated a mastery of techniques, but uncertainty regarding the content and interpretation. The candidates' limited reading experience often led to misreading, particularly in the beginning (e.g. title).

In some cases, the formalist close reading over interpreted or misunderstood, and sometimes a commentary's conclusions were not derived from the smoothly shaped commentary.

In reference to the **discussion**, a long introduction is unnecessary. The information provided in this part could be included in the responses as a whole, which should not be limited to stylistic or technical material. The knowledge of the texts discussed often appeared uncertain in relation to the context, anachronistic and mechanical with comprehension gaps revealed in incorrect answers.

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

The commentaries indicating knowledge of the context and historical/ cultural background of the poem were eligible for high marks. The discussion was more thorough and effective, showing absorbed knowledge and analytical ability.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of the poem

In many cases candidates demonstrated only a superficial knowledge and understanding of the poem.

### Criterion B: Appreciation of the writer's choices

Many candidates could not analyze in depth the ideas or feelings expressed in the particular poem and they spoke in general about the themes of the poetry of Cavafy or Karyotakis. The analysis in some cases was descriptive and the shaping of the composite argument was poor.

The analysis of the way in which the use of particular literary features shape the ideas/feelings expressed in the poem was rather poor. In the case of weaker candidates,

literary features were presented as a list of characteristics. Their separation from the interpretation and their presentation as an independent list was also at the expense of the structure of the commentary.

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

In a few cases candidates spent a couple of minutes or more speaking of the poet's life or works, at the expense of the structure of their commentary. The allocated time is 8 minutes and the candidates must deliver their commentary within this time limit. A good commentary must use the 7th and 8th minute to reach to a meaningful conclusion regarding the particular poem (*not* the poetry of Cavafy / Karyotakis / Ritsos in general) and to round up the observations explored during the analysis.

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

Many candidates were ill-prepared for this task probably because this aspect had not been practised sufficiently in class.

### Criterion E: Response to the discussion questions

Many of the discussion questions focused on the content of the works discussed while the writer's choices were completely ignored. Teacher must formulate questions which are specific to particular aspects of the works, including questions regarding technique, language, style, structure. Please see page 66 of the *Language A: Literature* guide, for examples of suitable discussion questions.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Guiding questions for HL candidates should relate to poetry specifically, addressing such aspects as:

- The relationship between the title and the poem
- The link between the stanza structure and the development of the poem's subject.

However, guiding questions should not:

- Refer to fine detail, or any particular interpretation of the extract or poem
- Restrict the candidate's ability to explore independently all significant aspects of the extract or poem.

It should be remembered that candidates are not required to address the guiding questions and no marks should be deducted if they do not. Guiding questions are there to use if the candidate wishes. It is not compulsory to answer them.

After the delivery of the commentary teachers must ask subsequent questions (2 minutes) to probe further into the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the work. Teachers must be satisfied that candidates understand specific words, phrases and allusions and appreciate their importance within the extract as well as the significance of the extract within the whole work or, in the case of a complete poem, the relationship between the poem and others

studied.

Finally, the teacher must be satisfied that higher level candidates understand, and can comment in detail on, the writer's technique.

Regarding the discussion, prepared questions will be a starting point, but the discussion need not be limited to those questions. Candidates should be given every opportunity to demonstrate their independent understanding of the work under discussion.

As previously mentioned, sample HL discussion questions can be found on page 66 of the *Language A: Literature* guide. An example of a drama question could be:

*What, for you, was the most exciting or satisfying moment in the play? Can you account for how the playwright managed to achieve that effect?*

The nature and emphasis of any commentary depends, to a great extent, on the extract chosen. In the case of HL candidates is expected to identify and explore all significant aspects of the extract given. These include:

- Situating the extract of the poem as precisely as possible in the context of a poem from which it has been taken (for example *Romiosini* by Ritsos)
- Commenting on the effectiveness of the poet's techniques including a detailed account of the use of stylistic devices and their effect(s) on the reader. However, candidates are not expected to use the extract/poem as a springboard for a discussion of everything they know about the work in question. The commentary should focus on the extract of the poem or the poem itself, relating it to the whole work only where relevant (for example, to establish context or the relative importance of different aspects of the passage or poem).
- The length of the extract or poem chosen will depend on its complexity, but be between 20 and 30 lines. Only in exceptional circumstances, for example, where the loss of a couple of lines would seriously distort the meaning of the extract, can it exceed 30 lines. In the case of HL commentary, teachers are expected to use a single complete poem, if possible, or a significant extract from a long poem.
- A commentary should be well structured. It should neither be delivered as a series of unconnected points nor take the form of a narration or a line-by-line paraphrase of the extract.

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

In some cases there was limited understanding of the technical functionality of the text. Many commentaries focused solely on form at the expense of content. So the text was understood poorly at critical points and the interpretation was not clear at the end.

In poetry candidates referred to literary features but usually without relating them to the content: e.g. listing the characteristics of the sonnet cannot be rewarded if these characteristics are not linked to the way the particular poet uses them in order to produce meaning in the context of each poem.

The presentation sometimes was descriptive, not analytical or interpretive. Rather superficial, with repetitions and overlaps or very short comments without references to the form. The analysis stopped with the completion of reading, and did not proceed to the full interpretation of meaning. Re-narration or repetition of content could not be rewarded. Analysis should not be superficial or descriptive.

In the case of dramatic extracts the text was used as a starting point for a discussion of the whole work, which resulted in virtually no reference to the way the extract is constructed by the author.

It is also advisable that candidates should show familiarity with theatrical conventions and how the writer uses them in order to produce meaning within the chosen extract.

In reference to the organization of the commentaries, presentation sometimes took the form of a list of unconnected points. In dramatic extracts this criterion was affected by the lack of focus on the text itself.

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

The familiarity with the author's style and "poetics" led to detailed and systematic readings, indicative of substantial understanding of the text. In many cases the text was "lived" by the candidate. Participation and personal involvement of the candidate was of course useful only when it captured the essence of the poet's work. When this was combined with the good use of language and systematic organization, the commentary was excellent. The introduction

acquired functionality only when it was quite short and referred to the abstract. The analysis was diligent and careful when combining in-depth reading with the investigation of the technique. Several times the reading was attentive, but understanding did not go in depth.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

In reference to criterion A, most candidates displayed some knowledge, and limited interpretation and several candidates were adequate.

In criterion B, most candidates appreciated successfully the ways meaning was shaped and several of them were competent.

Evidence of a planned structure (criterion C) was generally shown (3-4), while language (criterion D) was mostly clear and appropriate with a sufficient degree of accuracy.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Time: the candidate's presentation should be kept within 8 minutes and the remaining 2 minutes or more should be used for the teacher's questions. The total delivery time should be 10 minutes (see the *Language A: Literature* guide p. 54). It is helpful to the candidate if subsequent questions initially focus on the text at hand and its interpretation rather than on extraneous information (see the May 2013 subject report, p. 3). It is helpful if the whole 10 minutes is filled with subsequent questions, instead of stopping the recording earlier.
- Guiding questions: there should not be more than two (see Guide, p. 54). "It is highly advisable to provide one question to elicit knowledge and understanding and the other question to elicit analysis of the writer's choices. This will help candidates to meet the requirements of the descriptors" (see the *Language A: literature* teacher support material, general guidance). Another useful point about guiding questions is that they should not refer to fine detail or restrict the candidate's ability to explore independently all significant aspects of the extract. It might be worth considering whether a question on the work's title and/or chapter titles might fall in this category. Moreover, in the case of chapter titles, they could appear on the extract given to candidates, since having to identify the chapter from which the passage has been extracted, might exert unnecessary pressure on candidates.
- Introduction: It should be an introduction to the commentary based on the text at hand." (Please see the May 2013 subject report, p. 2). Moreover, spending a couple of minutes on biographical information of the author is not helpful as it impinges on the length of the time available for the delivery of the commentary (see the subject report, p. 4).
- Shaping meaning: naming literary features is different from appreciation: the use and discussion of literary features should not be superficial and mechanical, while their association with interpretation should not be shallow (see the May 2013 subject

report). The candidate needs to demonstrate how the writer's choices shape/produce meaning throughout the text.

- **Organization:** it is recommended that the organizing principle of the commentary is clear. Any form of structuring will be rewarded if it is effective and appropriate. It seems to increase the effectiveness of the presentation of ideas when this contributes towards a development, makes use of the extract's details, and allows for clear links between the ideas.
- **Subsequent questions:** they should engage the candidate in a discussion about the extract itself, not the literary work as a whole (*Language A: Literature* guide, p. 56). Therefore, questions, for example, on the language of the extract are more useful than questions about the work's political or existential aspect. The former allows the candidate to strengthen his/her interpretation of the extract, whereas the latter draws the candidate away from it (see also the subject report, p. 3).
- **Length:** taking into account that the required length of the extract should be 20-30 lines (see the guide, p. 55), many of the drama extracts were too long and varied between 51 to 65 lines. Of course "the length of the extract will depend on its complexity", but given that candidates only have around 8 minutes for their commentary, it is important that the extract is not overly long, so that candidates can make appropriate use of the allocated time and their commentary can explore all significant aspects of the text.
- **Typed abstract:** it is advisable that when the extract is typed (rather than photocopied), the original format is kept since this might damage the discussion of the writer's choices in relation to the production of meaning. Careful proofreading of the guiding questions is essential. It is also recommended that it is made clear to candidates where the extract to be analyzed begins and ends; for this purpose, any sign (eg. brackets) that indicates the boundaries of the extract will be helpful. In general, the most appropriate extracts are those which are self-contained as that would allow the candidate to build up some kind of argument, with an introduction and a conclusion.
- **Number of works studied:** a reminder that (a) at SL the number of works studied in part 2 is two and (b) teacher's comments on the *reverse* side of form 1/LIA are completed in the target language, i.e. in Greek.
- **Teacher's comments on form 1/LIA:** it is essential that teachers explain how the marks were arrived at, rather than indicating what the candidate has not achieved. There must therefore be some correlation between the comments and the marks awarded. When a candidate's performance is described as "deficient" or "inadequate" by the teacher, it is hard to reconcile such remarks with marks described in the guide as "adequate", "good", "relevant", or "appropriate".

## 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 general impression is that some literary works have been overused by some centres. There was a disconcerting lack of interest in literary works which were handled in less than engaged manner. This could be remedied with the choice of other works from the PLT.

It is also strongly recommended that assignment titles must be crafted more judiciously. Titles such as "the institution of marriage" or, "the role of women" tend to direct attention towards sociology and cannot, therefore, be convincingly explored according to the criteria. Any psychological, social, economical, or historical dissertation is most likely to tread on the slippery ground of failure. Titles must be closely defined and with a tight literary focus. Thorough and well-supported analyses that probe deeply into the meanings of a literary work and show an active interest in accurately conveying how its language, structure and style shape these meanings achieve the highest marks.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A: Fulfilling the requirements of the reflective statement

This aspect was not properly addressed by many candidates. A lot of reflective statements contained thematic or character studies, obscure theoretical assumptions and meaningless generalizations on history and society, showing a lack of understanding as to the nature of this exercise. A large number of candidates saw the reflective statement as an introduction to the work. The reflective statement does not necessarily have to contain the thoughts that appear in the essay; it might include some of them if they are germane to the cultural and contextual elements necessary for understanding a work. What made matters worse this year was the incorrect phrasing of the question of the reflective statement. The formulation "how did the interactive oral help you in the understanding of the work" proved erroneous as it misdirected candidates towards the content of a literary work and not its cultural and contextual elements. Another phrasing disguised the interactive oral as a bibliographical seminar and resulted in convoluted discussions of ideas. The reflective statement must respond to the following prompt (see page 30 of the Language A: Literature guide):

*How was your understanding of the cultural and contextual considerations of the work developed through the interactive oral?*



The developed grasp of context and culture that stems from a well constructed, thoughtful and inspiring interactive oral did appear in a number of reflective statements which were personalized, "honest accounts of the evolution of understanding". Biography, the setting of the work, literary era, history, local tradition, linguistic background and political hue were effectively linked with the literary work.

### Criterion B: Knowledge and understanding

The topic of the assignment must be understood clearly in all its dimensions and subtleties. In this sense, the Supervised Writing prompt plays an essential role as it provides clear, literary orientation. This year, the candidates' performance lingered mainly on the superficial side with descriptions of the content claiming the lion's share. There was a large number of assignments that reflected a degree of ignorance as to how a literary essay is crafted. Assertions without textual evidence cannot achieve high marks. Precise references to the literary works offer a convincing basis for the display of knowledge. Understanding, on the other hand is demonstrated, according to the criteria, via 'some sort of proposal' the candidate makes based on pertinent textual data.

### Criterion C: Appreciation of the writer's choices

This criterion was generally ignored. Stylistic techniques, structure and linguistic construction were unappreciated. The majority of assignments contained one or two references to the depressive atmosphere of a play or rudimentary observations about characters. There was hardly any discussion about the effects of literary features, or exploration of how artful theatrical language, stage directions, costumes, props or lighting shape meanings.

However, in a small number of assignments, there was "probing and extensive" discussion of how ideas are portrayed via authorial choices. These assignments based the interpretation they proposed on the meaningful explanation of punctuation, wording, structure, or, theatrical language and conventions.

### Criterion D: Organization and development

The integration of examples was rather problematic this year. What some candidates did was to put large pieces of the literary texts in footnotes that did not follow closely the assertions made in the analysis. In some other cases, footnotes were elliptic sentences that provided little or no assistance to the construction of an argument. According to the criteria, there must be clear links between the ideas expressed in the assignment and the quotations from the text used in footnotes. Textual references must be well-integrated and meaningfully chosen.

Criterion E: Language was, by and large, marked highly this year.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be made aware of the assessment criteria for the written assignment. Some centres did care for the gradual "digestion" of the knowledge the criteria provide. The four stages of the writing process of an assignment as described in the Subject Guide are essential for the production of a successful essay.

## 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

Some of the topics used by candidates were inappropriate for a literary assignment. Titles such as "political and social conditions during a certain historical period" or "colonialism during the 20th century" are most likely to tread on the slippery ground of failure. Topics of a sociological, psychological, economical or geopolitical orientation cannot be considered for a high mark.

Titles that embrace a whole poetic collection cannot attract high marks: essays must be based on a small number of poems of a similar nature or orientation. The analysis of a literary work as a whole as opposed to the analysis of a literary topic associated with a certain work is not acceptable and teachers play a crucial role in advising against it.

The philosophical orientation of titles such as "the perennial theme of love" or "motherhood and religion" present candidates with problems in the effective development of their thoughts.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A: Fulfilling the requirements of the reflective statement

On many occasions, the requirements of the reflective statement were not properly addressed. A large number of reflective statements seemed to have been created in a void. The working process of the interactive oral that would have provided a thoughtful orientation apparently had a minimal or no effect. The reflective statement was, in many cases, viewed as a general preamble to the work, or, as a synopsis of its content. The reflective statement does not have to contain the ideas of the assignment that follows it; it might include some of them if they are germane to the cultural and contextual elements necessary for understanding

a work. Descriptions of a vague or obscurely defined historical environment, persistent references to international relations and geopolitics, thematic presentations and characterizations do not provide convincing grounding for a successful reflection on the literary work. The rigid differentiation between author and poetic voice, albeit legitimate in terms of theory, created a problematic basis for the writing of a successful reflective statement as it clearly limited the role of the author. Pertinent material on authorial biography, literary or other artistic affinities, historical and linguistic information, social trends or upheavals and traditions must be specifically connected with relevant parts of the literary work.

This year, the incorrect phrasing of the question of the reflective statement created additional problems: the erroneous disguise of the interactive oral as a "bibliographical seminar" resulted in convoluted discussions of ideas. The reflective statement must respond to the following prompt (see page 30 of the Language A: Literature guide):

*How was your understanding of the cultural and contextual considerations of the work developed through the interactive oral?*

Template reflective statements cannot achieve high marks.

### Criterion B: Knowledge and understanding

The weaker performances ranged from unreasonably vague delineations of characters to political dissertations on ethics and morals. Textual data barely made an appearance or two in essays that were lacking in specific literary focus. Textual references must be carefully chosen in order to offer a convincing basis for the display of knowledge. Understanding, on the other hand, must be demonstrated via a certain proposal the candidate makes, based on pertinent, precise examples from a work. The exploration of the topic, the relevant discussion of examples from the text and the insightful observations were rewarded in assignments firmly grounded on the careful use of the Supervised Writing prompt that provided clear, literary orientation.

### Criterion C: Appreciation of the writer's choices

This criterion was generally ignored. There was generally "some mention but little appreciation" of authorial choice. Despite the ample opportunities literary works give for demonstrating how the writer's techniques shape meanings, candidates, in their majority, did not respond to this criterion adequately. In stronger performances, candidates illustrated how artful language, punctuation marks, symbols, or, in the case of theatrical plays, stage directions, props, costumes and lighting affected or shaped the meanings of a literary work.

### Criterion D: Organization and development

Introductions were generally too long. In some cases, the epilogue contained a new idea that had not been discussed in the assignment. The structure of the stronger assignments, however, did "reflect the interpretation stated in the introduction" according to the criteria.

The integration of examples needs special attention. There must be clear links between the ideas expressed in the body of the analysis and the quoted material used in footnotes, according to the criteria. Textual data is essential, either incorporated in the analysis, or in footnotes, as long as it is pertinent and carefully selected. Bibliographical support is welcome as long as it promotes the argument.

### Criterion E: Language

This criterion was, by and large, marked highly this year.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates must be made aware of the assessment criteria. Some centres did care for the gradual "digestion" of knowledge the criteria provide. The steps of the writing process of an assignment as described in the Subject Guide are crucially important for the production of a successful essay.

## 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 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 20

## General comments

The prose passage by Eleni Giannakaki this year appeared to be quite demanding in comparison with last year's paper 1 text. The poem by Andreas Embiricos was not chosen by the majority of candidates, this year, probably due to its eccentric surrealism.

With only a few exceptions, candidates this year approached the unseen texts rather superficially. This should concern teachers as it raises the issue of whether the principle idea that underlies this course, that is "the study of literature as an exploration of the way it represents the complex pursuits, anxieties, joys and fears to which human beings are exposed in the daily business of living" was adequately served. Indeed, the performance in paper 1 reflects the candidates' limited ability to develop independent and genuine critical thinking and their inability to put themselves in a process of meaningful consideration of feelings and experiences that transcend their own. A detailed consideration of content is the basis of a successful discussion on how the writer's choices shape meaning. In any other case the approach is merely technical and sterile.

Beyond the difficulty of the texts, candidates in the specific component were not adequately prepared to achieve high marks. The demands of Paper 1 are clearly stated in the

assessment details for each criterion so it is the responsibility of the teachers to guide their candidates in a better and more efficient way as to the high demands of this component.

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

Candidates appeared to find the poem difficult because of its length and surrealist nature which often obscured meaning. On many occasions candidates misinterpreted the poem, resulting in a discussion that was often incorrect or irrelevant. Personal response cannot be independent from the actual meaning of the text.

Teachers must explain to the candidates in a clearer way the transition from literal to symbolic meaning, but also how and why a metaphor can be more effective in communicating internal or existentialist workings than literalness.

Very few candidates were familiar with the basic principles of surrealism so as to identify them and explain their function in the poem. It is therefore necessary for teachers to broaden their teaching horizons to include more modern and demanding literary movements and techniques.

On the other hand the prose passage was much more accessible but included some very demanding techniques such as the free indirect monologue, the multiple narrative perspective and the way the self-sarcasm of the heroine was presented. The apparent clarity of meaning was not enough for the candidates so as to discuss effectively the text beyond its literal meaning. In addition, the last paragraph of the prose, where meaning was less clear, proved the candidates' inability to go beyond the literal as most of them avoided commenting on it. To the contrary, the difficulty of the poem often gave rise to more creative responses.

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

In most cases candidates were prepared and able to identify the literary choices but these were for the most part technical or superficial without a clear awareness of how these choices shape meaning. Knowledge of theory is essential but candidates should be trained to use theory as a tool of analysis of the text rather than merely a tool of recording literary choices.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A: Understanding and interpretation

The importance of incorporating quotations into the body of the literary commentary cannot be stressed enough. This is a specific requirement of criterion A and yet many candidates seemed to ignore it. The use of quotations must be insightful and systematic so as to allow a better discussion of content. The connection between the criteria must also be noted as the actual embedding of detail is evaluated in criterion C. Quotations therefore are not just proof

of understanding but also evidence for any interpretation and analysis. In relation to interpretation comments have already been made.

### Criterion B: Appreciation of the writer's choices

The attention given by most candidates to this criterion has been acknowledged. It is important however for candidates to be able to connect the writer's choice to its function in the text; how it shapes and affects meaning. The writer's choices must be recognized not only as a means by which meaning is communicated by also as a tool for a deeper analysis of content.

More often than not knowledge of literary theory in the identification of literary choices was mechanical and superficial and was not used to appreciate and evaluate their use and effect in the text as whole. The weak link between technique and content often resulted in general and vague comments about their function, with no real connection to the actual text. In some cases the literary commentary resembled a dictionary of literary terms and a list of literary choices. Knowledge of literary terms and their meaning is not in itself enough; it should be the basis for analysis and appreciation of the text.

Even though few candidates seemed to completely ignore this criterion, this should still be a cause of concern for teachers.

### Criterion C: Organization and development

In quite a few cases, and not only the weaker ones, knowledge of the function of paragraphing and its structure was completely lacking. In these commentaries paragraphs lacked both coherence and a sense of internal connection; they were merely listed with no sense of development of ideas.

It has to be noted that what is also assessed under this criterion is the candidates' ability to form deductive logical arguments. Many candidates presented their views and opinions as conclusions rather than as interpretation. Teachers must make it clear to candidates that what is required in this task is not the solution to an equation but rather the process by which one arrives at this solution. For this reason it would be useful for teachers to explain to the candidates some basic concepts of logic; of what it means to form reasoned arguments based on evidence.

The structure of many literary commentaries was awkward with some being completely focused on literary choices and others being divided into two parts, one for content and the other for the literary choices. Neither structure was effective for the task at hand.

The greater weakness in structure however was the fragmented approach of the unseen text. Many candidates just commented upon words or sentences with no real connection to the text as a whole whereas others only attempted to incorporate quotations into the body of the analysis. In both cases coherence and consistency were lacking resulting in lack of clarity which often affected criterion D too.

## Criterion D: Language

Year after year language seems poorer in terms of vocabulary, something that should be a cause of concern for teachers. Literary commentary demands both a high level of comprehension but also a rich enough vocabulary for both a high level of analysis and clarity of meaning to be achieved. Use of the appropriate terminology is essential. Candidates should not confuse the polytonic system with the katharevousa.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should start teaching Paper 1 by informing the candidates of the assessment criteria and the expectations of the course. Every criterion must be discussed and its importance explained. It is important to start teaching Paper 1 early on in the first year of the course so that candidates get plenty of practice and have enough time to overcome any difficulties or limitations. This should be done in class so that candidates get instant feedback. Teaching should focus equally on both prose and poetry. More variety in the choice of more demanding unseen texts for practice in terms of style, genre and language, would also better prepare candidates for more challenging texts.

It is not correct to confuse prose narrative theory with the techniques used to discuss poetry. It would be particularly useful for candidates to spend more time on structure and organization. Teachers should remind the candidates to pay particular attention to hand-writing and overall presentation of their work.

## Standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

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

### General Comments

This year's paper was generally accessible. The candidates were better prepared and produced decent answers. The poem led to many misunderstandings and several infelicitous "wild guesses". The majority of the candidates chose the prose extract which offered many opportunities for detailed analysis and interpretation.

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

In reference to the prose, although most candidates appeared to have understood the text and appreciated its style and techniques, only a handful of them went as far as to analyze the ways in which erotic awakening was combined with emotional maturation. In extract, love was presented as a constant quest from top to bottom, from the outside to the inside, from logic to desire, from the present to the past, from light to darkness, from air to water and earth, and vice versa, thus extending the reader's suspense. Sexuality is therefore a movement concealed in the passage from the obvious to the hidden, from nature to body, which is the place of a combination of sanctity and desire.

In addition, fewer candidates analyzed the element of "play" and "game" which is central to the interpretation of the passage: the two characters play a game which is half childish and half erotic. This is how the kite, riddles and teasers, hidden treasure etc. acquire additional meaning through the process of sexual maturity.

In reference to the poem, the passage from description of figures to meaning and interpretation was not conducted very successfully. Very few candidates managed to analyze the metaphoric, or even allegorical quality of the poem, the title of which is so meaningful (from mythology to history to even Ioannis Sykoutris' personal drama), and present the poem as the poet's self-referent romantic struggle with inspiration.

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

In reference to the prose, most candidates managed to highlight the main subject, which is the emergence of love, and its literary attribution through the function of certain meaningful objects. Therefore, the red ribbon, as an indication of hidden love, the heart as a motif of erotic internalization and the stone as a symbol of stability and combined qualities were presented and treated accordingly. Candidates commented on the structure, narrative techniques (3<sup>rd</sup> person narrator), anachronisms (movements in time), imagery, syntax, and figurative language.

In reference to the poem, candidate responses were mostly descriptive, and commented on the features of the sonnet, presented the metaphors, personification and metonymies, imagery and colors, oppositions, dramatic and rhetorical figures.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A: Understanding and interpretation

Most candidates provided an analytical and systematic response, which did not reach deep interpretation, identifying, however, the necessary points.



### Criterion B: Appreciation of the writer's choices

In general, most answers referred to the text's important technical means; yet, there was little indication of a deeper understanding of their function.

### Criterion C: Organization

The ideas were usually presented in a well-organized structure.

### Criterion D: Language

The use of language was usually very good.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Apart from helping candidates familiarize with the writer's choices, i.e. the technical part of the literary texts, teachers should also help them realize their functions, and understand the way meaning is delivered through them. Imagination is necessary in the interpretive process, yet, the ideas are not created in vacuum; they are constructed by language. Candidates should therefore realize that the first stage towards interpretation is close reading.

The choice of the text is also important. Many candidates chose the poem, not because they understood its meaning so much as because it was shorter. Teachers may advise the candidates to first read the text carefully and then decide which one they prefer. That may help them avoid unfortunate choices.

## Higher level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

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

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

It appears that the requirements of this assessment task as detailed in the *Language A: Literature* guide have still not been fully appreciated.

There is still a problem with criterion B: (Response to the question) and criterion C: (Appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre). The comparison and/or contrast between the works examined, as well as appreciation of the literary features of the works'

genre were often lacking or they were superficial and with loose or no connection to the question answered. Many candidates seemed not to have in mind that they should evaluate the differences of the works, and including an additional paragraph with general information about the works, their differences, and their literary characteristics left no space for articulating an individual and successful treatment of the question.

This fact reflected on the structure of the essays, since though they were sometimes well-organized, lacked development.

Some candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge of the works discussed, composing a felicitous interpretation, but this should have been supported by references to the works suitable to the question answered. This prevented them achieving the highest marks in criterion A.

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

It seems that some centres have read and fully appreciated the information contained in the May 2013 Subject Report, and have familiarized themselves with the *Language A: Literature* guide. Most candidates appeared to know the works examined, some of them in depth, and some of them managed to appreciate the interplay between content and form convincingly, independently and in detail.

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

It proved easier for some candidates to treat certain specific topics, but many of them responded to only one part of a two part question.

Some candidates tended to misinterpret the question selected, even ignoring the information given in the question, due to ignorance of terminology or for the purpose of using material they had studied and learnt by heart.

Question 1: It was impossible for some candidates to see the difference between language and style.

Question 2: Most candidates failed to explore all aspects and uses of irony, tending to identify irony with mocking / sarcasm.

Question 3: All candidates failed to identify the term “form”.

Question 7: Some candidates treated the question about imagery only by exploring descriptive images.

Question 8: Some candidates gave excellent approaches to non-realistic works, attempting no connection to the question.

Question 9: It was common for the candidates to confuse the term “conflict” with the term “contrast”, not always justified.

Question 12: Some candidates identified authenticity with realism.

For candidates who had studied poetry in part 3, the most common weakness was the superficial approach both to the question and the works. There was almost no textual evidence, no detailed analysis, no comparison, evaluation and appreciation of the literary conventions, not even in general, regardless of the question. There were sentences or even paragraphs repeated among the responses, revealing no attempt at probing or to provide a personal response to the topic.

For candidates who had studied novels in part 3 there were quite a range of responses. The most difficult thing in this case appeared to be, within the time limit, to select textual evidence that established a relevant and convincing answer to the question, while showing a perspective knowledge and understanding of the works.

For candidates who had studied short stories in part 3 there were also different qualities of answers. Some scripts were very similar to each other, revealing that some candidates were given prepared answers to learn by heart, which seriously undermines the IB spirit and the aim of this task. A number of other scripts were mainly a narration of the content of the short stories with no attempt to answer the question.

The common weakness between all scripts was *mutatis mutantis*, the use of Greek language both in terms of linguistic adequacy and register.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are encouraged to pay attention to the *Language A: Literature Guide* and the on-line available relevant material. Centres are encouraged to allow teachers to attend relevant seminars and workshops.

Candidates should be encouraged to explore a broader sense of what literature is, its connection to the historical and cultural moment and the way this affects literary content and conventions.

Candidates should be encouraged to articulate a personal response, instead of trying to recall class notes and prepared answers.

It is important that literary theory material, when used, is used as a tool applicable to different works, so that the candidates acquire, as much as possible, a personal perspective on the works and so that there is space left for their initiative and critical approach.

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 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 25

The comments made for higher level are equally applicable to standard level.

### Further comments

From the responses submitted by candidates in this component, a number of observations and recommendations can be made:

- Candidates who register for literature subjects in group 1 must be “academically competent” in that language.
- The IB across all of its courses and especially in the context of the DP promotes both by means of teaching and examinations, the qualities of the IB Learner.
- The teaching Part 3 of Language A: Literature must be performed in accordance with the guidelines presented in the *Language A: Literature guide* and candidates have been informed by their teachers regarding the specifics of Paper 2.
- Many candidates are simply not aware of the concept of literary terms and are in no position to respond to the requirements of the question selected. They appear unable to take a critical stance against what is requested in the question and they cannot apply all that they have so far learned to document their position and argue for their view. They regurgitate all the information they have learned (and remembered) in class with no sense of whether such information is relevant to the question at hand.
- Therefore, candidates’ analytical skills appear very limited, both with respect to their understanding of the works they have studied and with respect to the treatment of the question. Most of the responses received in this component were “average” which meant that the analysis was merely superficial and the scripts lacked reference to important points in relation to the question. The majority of responses remained on the descriptive level and barely thought out argument, while the writing ranged from inept to downright simplistic.
- There were far fewer excellent scripts this year, another result of the mechanistic manner in which candidates treated the questions.