

Norwegian A: Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 18	19 - 33	34 - 45	46 - 57	58 - 71	72 - 83	84 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 17	18 - 31	32 - 44	45 - 56	57 - 69	70 - 81	82 - 100

Higher level and standard level internal assessment

Higher level component grade boundaries

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

Standard level component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Schools used the uploading option successfully. Most of the forms were submitted as printed versions, but a few were handwritten and scanned. The latter are more problematic to read. It is also helpful when teachers consider the technical aspect of the recordings: equipment,

placing of teacher and candidate, placing of microphone, level of recording volume, finding a good “studio”, avoiding noise from the surroundings areas, and so on.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Generally speaking, the work submitted was very satisfactory in its range and suitability. Teachers need to ensure that one poem, or an extract from one poem, is used. Most teachers are supportive of the candidates. However, teachers are encouraged to ask themselves these questions: What is the role of the teacher during this oral examination? Should I try to support the candidates to perform as best at their best? Or should I try to find the candidates’ weak points? Teachers also need to double-check the time aspects, as it is important that candidates make full use of the time allowed.

Candidate performance against each criterion

As one might anticipate, good candidates did very well in every criterion, and weaker candidates did not. For this latter group, criterion B (Appreciation of the writer’s choices) seemed to be a problem. Mediocre and weak performances seemed to focus on the content of the poem (text) and candidates too often retold or paraphrased the text in their own words. Criterion C was also a problem for some candidates. Candidates’ work should be organized, and have an introduction, a main body and an ending. Some candidates do not structure their work to their advantage. (Please refer to the level descriptors for structured detail.)

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are encouraged to emphasize to their candidates that a good performance in the internal assessment consists of meeting all the criteria. This means that teachers should stress the criteria of “Appreciation of the writer’s choices” during the course and tell the candidates that they have to say something on this matter. The teachers should also emphasize the need to organize the commentary. Even if the candidates are nervous, it is essential that they try to focus on the commentary as a whole and as an oral activity. The latter point should focus on the need to avoid “noises” like “eehh”. Teachers should also focus on the time limit. An oral examination consists of different parts, each of a certain time limit. Candidates should be ready to talk for the time intended, and teachers should not allow candidates to finish short of the stipulated time.

Higher level and standard level written assignment

Higher level component grade boundaries

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

Standard level component grade boundaries

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

General comments

The 2/BWA form was completed well: schools included a good overview of the books studied and the work presented. The reflective statement (criterion A) caused the main difficulty, with a number of teachers struggling with the teaching of this.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

At both higher and standard level there were some excellent performances, and many candidates showed really good understanding of the works studied and displayed excellent writing skills. The general impression is positive with a good number of assignments of a very good standard. There were, however, also a fair number of mediocre and quite weak performances.

Although there are some recurring chosen works, the candidates studied a wide range of different and interesting works in translation, and there were also some new and boldly chosen works this year, such as graphic novels and works from outside Europe/United States and Canada. Works by African and Asian writers are, however, still under represented.

There are two problems that need to be mentioned in connection with the above.

- One examiner wrote: "There is a great difference in quality between candidates who focus on content of the literary work and not on form and candidates who are able to describe literary aspects of the work in connection with the content". The candidates need a focused starting point in order to write a good assignment. The role of the teacher is probably to help and support the candidates more in this initial part of the writing phase; help candidates produce a focused and not too wide research question.
- Although many interesting questions were being pursued in the assignments, one could wish that fewer candidates went for the same or almost the same questions. In some schools there are too many candidates writing almost similar assignments, and it must be the role of the teacher to make the candidates choose a variation of topics, angles and research questions.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: This was a difficult criterion to mark as many candidates displayed limited reflection on cultural and contextual elements and merely reported what had been discussed in the classroom setting. It was sometimes difficult to see the link between the reflective statement and the assignment, and many reflective statements were basic and not well

written. In general, too many candidates did not do too well on this criterion. Teachers must be much more aware of the contents of this criterion and tell their candidates to pay more attention to it. Overall, too many candidates performed below expectation on this criterion.

Criterion B: Many candidates showed good understanding, knowledge and insight of the works studied. Regarding this criterion, the problem was that a fair number of candidates had chosen a research question that was too broad, too general or one that did not invite literary analysis. It is also clear that the performances of the standard level candidates were not of the same standard as that of the higher level candidates. Even though the reflective statement encourages reflection on cultural matters, candidates should probably be encouraged to focus on literary aspects in their assignments.

Criterion C: This criterion is by far the most problematic one for candidates to integrate in their essays. A number of very good assignments did not get more than 4 out of 6 marks. Teachers, and this is the teacher's responsibility, must always remind candidates to focus on literary features which must always be included. It is especially difficult to incorporate literary features in thematic essays, but this cannot be ignored if good marks are to be gained. Many lost 2-3 marks on this criterion and that may have resulted in lower marks than the candidates could have reached.

Criterion D: Many essays were well structured but the overall impression is that there is substantial room for technical improvement, especially in some schools. Candidates should in general pay closer attention to for example, the use of: footnotes, references, quotations, bibliographies, the use of italics, front page. The formal elements of many assignments were below acceptable standard, and this can easily be improved. Some candidates were deducted marks for exceeding the word limit, both on the essay itself and on the reflective statement. Teachers and candidates should pay more attention to this. (Please refer to the guide for the notes placed before the level descriptors for criterion A and criterion D.)

Criterion E: In general this together with criterion B was the criterion in which the candidates did best.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers must help the candidates in choosing a focused topic.
- Teachers must remind candidates to include comments on "writer's choices".
- Be more careful about the technical aspects of the assignment.
- Work more on the reflective statement.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

The prose text, “Min for evig”, was the more demanding text this year and resulted in quite a few insightful responses from candidates who obviously found their imagination triggered. The poem, “Alt dette”, was also quite challenging, but seemed to attract many of the weaker candidates. Many did well, but the weak responses typically consisted of attempts to retell the poem.

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

On average, most of the candidates seemed well prepared for the literary commentary, i.e. that it involves commenting on formal aspects as well as content.

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

Most candidates seemed to have learned to identify at least some of the literary features of texts. However, weaker candidates have a tendency to resort to listing the features they have identified without trying to explain their effects. A fairly common mistake is the faulty use of “strofe” and “vers”.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Make the candidates practise regularly with unknown texts! The combination of time pressure and lack of sufficient practice of producing essays under time pressure means that many candidates seem to run out of time before concluding the essay. Let the candidates practise handwriting! Some scripts were almost impossible to understand because of the poor quality of the handwriting. When the handwriting is illegible, candidates do risk losing marks.

Candidates should be encouraged to practise different ways of constructing the opening paragraphs of a commentary; it is not necessary to start every commentary with a repetition of the title, name of the author and the year of publishing – this is only a waste of valuable time and space.

Many higher level candidates produce very long commentaries that often would have benefitted from better planning before starting to write. This is obvious from all the crossing out of paragraphs (and sometimes whole pages), plus introduction of footnotes referring to additional comments/thoughts added on separate pages.

The use of anglicisms is fairly common and should be avoided. Frequent mistakes are: using “paragraph” instead of “avsnitt”, faulty use of prepositions and confused use of the personal pronouns “hans” and “sin”. It was also interesting to note several examples of the Norwegian

kj, ki and ky letter combinations being spelt sji and sjy and so on, obviously badly influenced by sloppy pronunciation.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

The poem, "Taksameteret går", appeared easier and more accessible, and consequently many of the weaker candidates had a go at this question, often resulting in attempts to retell the poem. The prose text, "Sykkelen", challenged the candidates and resulted in many good and insightful responses from stronger candidates.

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

Many of the candidates had received good training in identifying literary features, but lacked the ability to comment on the effects of such use.

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

Many standard level candidates had problems trying to deal with the literary features of the texts in a proper way. It was obvious that even when they had been trained in identifying literary features, many of the candidates lacked the ability to explain and analyze the effects of the authors' use of such features in the texts.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

To read, understand, comment and analyze an unknown text under time pressure is a very challenging and demanding exercise, and a great deal of practice is necessary to ensure a reasonable result during the examination itself. The candidates should be exposed to a multitude of different unknown texts during the two years of preparation. Quite a few of the candidates did not manage to plan their essays well, launching into the writing process too early, which resulted in unclear and untidy responses, large sections crossed out, insertions of footnotes and pages of afterthoughts attached. It is becoming more and more obvious that a majority of the candidates struggle with their handwriting – more practice is needed! Illegible handwriting can cause losing important marks.

Quite a number of schools seem to teach a standard opening for the literary commentary, consisting of a repetition of the title, the name of the author and the year of publishing. This is unnecessary, and does not add anything of value to the commentary.

There is an increasing prevalence of anglicisms, with the use of “paragraph” instead of “avsnitt”. The faulty use of prepositions is also increasing. The ability to distinguish the personal pronouns “hans” and “sin” from each other seems to be on the decline.

Higher level and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 25

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

The main problems for the candidates were regarding criteria B and C. The “Appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre” (C), formerly known as “literary features” and thus slightly altered from this year onwards, has been an ongoing problem in Norwegian A. It has definitely improved this year, probably because some teachers are alert to the problem and have done some good and necessary work here. But it is, however, still the weak spot for far too many candidates, and the tendency is more that it is quite superficially mentioned rather than properly integrated into the structure. When it comes to criterion B, “Response to the question”, this is most often mentioned, but again not satisfactorily discussed.

The marks awarded for criterion E, “Language”, seemed to be at the lower end of the descriptors this examination session. There is the general problem of deteriorating handwriting, but more important is the recurring problem of “anglicisms” and of orthographic mistakes, which seem to be more widespread.

Among the standard level candidates there are a number of self taught candidates. Some of these are almost impossible to detect as they are good candidates and have probably received good tutorials and advice over the two years. But, on the other hand, there are some candidates that do stand out in a negative way: they are “ill” prepared, have had little training and support, have written very little Norwegian over the last two years, and so on – and some of them do miserably.

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

There were some exceptions, but in general most candidates were in very good control of the works that they had been studying. To a varying degree they could explain the main course of action, present the main characters and explain the main theme of the works.

Their essays were well structured and they seemed to be aware of the assessment criteria and the essays were mainly presented in a well organised way.

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

Some candidates had some knowledge about literary history but used it in a superficial manner, which means that concepts like “naturalism” and “postmodernism” were mentioned but hardly well understood nor well integrated into the argument of the essay. This also raises the question of so called “mechanical answers”, where candidates obviously have been taught to remember certain quotations and certain parameters to follow when writing. This may ensure weaker candidates a passing grade, but it may also limit and hamper the good candidates. This has been raised in reports before but is still a problem. In addition, orthographic problems are more prevalent this year.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Writing practice: candidates definitely need more writing practice. Norwegian A literature candidates need to learn good time management under timed circumstances. Some candidates are obviously outstanding at this, as a good number of very pleasing essays shows, but the conclusion remains: many candidates will benefit from extensive writing training and individual tutorials from their teachers. A substantial number of candidates seem to underperform in examination conditions.
- Literary features have now become literary conventions; which means that all teachers need to focus more specifically on the conventions of the genre they have chosen for part 3.
- Most books chosen for the paper 2 examination are suitable, but there are exceptions. Judicious choices need to be made regarding possible fluctuating qualities in a writer’s output.