

Polish A: Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 19	20 - 35	36 - 46	47 - 59	60 - 72	73 - 84	85 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 17	18 - 32	33 - 44	45 - 57	58 - 69	70 - 81	82 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

This year schools downloaded their examination materials by the due date. Generally the sample recordings were of good quality, with candidate and teacher voices clear, although every time after having it uploaded it is good to check whether the recording is accessible or not. The passages were well chosen, their length and difficulty were proper and very reasonable. In a few cases some guiding questions were connected more with the whole work, than with the extract itself.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: In general the candidates confirmed their very good or good knowledge of the work. In a few cases they still tended to provide some additional information not connected directly with the passage and its context (for example about the author's biography or history of literature) which is disturbing when this becomes quite a vital part of the examination.

Criterion B: This could be better approached. Quite a large number of the candidates still confuse blank verses with contemporary verses free of rhythm and rhymes. However they

generally identified and analyzed the effects of literary features in a proper way, with quite frequent references to readers' perspective. Some candidates seem to repeat teachers' ideas and opinions without their own awareness, especially when the teacher is close to forcing the candidate to finish the sentence they had just started. Only a few teachers had not noted that the candidate had already stated the expected thought and so demanded it once again. The responses were generally supported by relevant references to the extract.

Criterion C: This aspect was one of the weaker points of some commentaries or in a few cases, the weakest one. There were too many repetitions. The axis of the commentary is usually effective, but in some cases commentaries were erratic. Usually the beginning is really focused and well-organized. Candidates often begin their commentaries with a very general introduction (about writer's biography, history, and so on), so they did not have opportunities to make an in-depth analysis within the first part of the examination. In a few cases candidates had no idea how to summarize their presentation.

Criterion D: The majority of candidates were well-prepared for the discussion as they all know the discussed works very well from their schoolwork. Their knowledge of the context is frequently even excellent. Here is their real strength.

Criterion E: When answering, the candidates also seemed to be well-prepared (and informed) as to how to present their independence of thought.

Criterion F: The candidates' language was generally clear and coherent but they made some stylistic, vocabulary and grammar lapses. (Some of them must have been caused by site conditions of the examination. Open classroom windows and even doors can be a very bad idea.) The most frequent factor making the mark lower was using colloquial register in some part of the response. The candidates generally knew the literary terms.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It would be very useful to underline how important the awareness of literary features is. The candidates should always remember that they are commenting on a literary work, not a movie or an event from their experience.

Teachers and schools should always provide proper conditions for the examination. Even the sound of the bell ringing can be distracting, not to mention the noise caused by crowds of other candidates waiting close to the class door for their turn.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

It is hard to confirm that all the extracts were properly chosen as some of them seemed to be too difficult for the candidates. The length of the extract was appropriate. In most cases the guiding questions were suitable for the extract. It would be better if one of the questions did not concern interpretation but analysis. (Both questions should aid candidates to focus on analysis.) The quality of recordings was very good or good enough.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: In general the candidates understood the content of extracts but sometimes they had some problem with situating the passage within the context of the larger work and quite frequently they tended to summarize the whole work. In most cases the candidates recognized the extracts properly, placed them in a wider context (for example psychological, philosophical, historical, social) and answered both guiding and teacher questions.

Criterion B: Although interpretations are usually (at least) good and thoughtful, sometimes candidates are just summarizing passage content. In some commentaries interpretations are almost ignored. Literary features are in some performances treated as a different part of the commentary; candidates are able to list different metaphors but without describing their role in the passage and influence on a reader. Candidates are often insufficiently aware of what these features are. They can more rarely recognize structure, syntax, punctuation or other effects. Some commentaries are not focused on the passage but are looking more like a general presentation of every thought, problem and feeling presented in the prescribed literary work.

Criterion C: Quite a lot number of performances were poor when it came to their coherence or logic. Repetitions were frequent, sometimes even encouraged by the teachers. Some candidates were unable to build a commentary of adequate length or even focus on the given extract and tended to speak about the general content instead. The majority of candidates use a typical structure for their commentaries by going through the extract in a very simple way, line by line, stanza by stanza. Candidates can also decide what the main point or significance is, but candidates infrequently approached the task in this way.

Criterion D: In most cases language used was suitable for a commentary, usually quite clear and varied. Some lapses did occur, especially those typical of contemporary spoken Polish. Sometimes candidates have difficulties with using phrases.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Unfortunately if teachers are reading frequently used books with students, there is a temptation for students to use popular clichés and to follow a pattern. So it could be more effective to present to the students how they can use their independent thoughts to discuss a literary work or to comment on a poem. It would be useful to advise candidates to write an outline of the commentary during preparatory time but not an essay which will be read during an examination. The subsequent questions should fulfil less of a guiding role and not possess

within themselves a suggested answer, even if a candidate is a weaker one. Some work (by Boleslaw Lesmian for example) may seem to be too difficult for this level. More emphasis should be placed by teachers on the structure of oral commentaries and the logic of their composition. Even more important is to alert students to avoid using informal language in their speech (not only) during the examination. There is a need to underline – by teachers – the role and meaning of the language and literary features of the passage. It is not enough to list the literary features, the candidates should be able to show how they are situated in the passage and with what effects.

Higher level and standard level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most assignments were submitted in proper format – both in form and content. Accidentally, there were some based on (quite famous) works that do not figure on the current PLT (prescribed list in translation).

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: As one could have expected, a significant number of candidates (and supposedly teachers) have not yet understood the nature of the reflective statement. Even if context has been noted it was hardly used to show how it had influenced understanding of the message of the work. 3 marks therefore could not be awarded.

Criterion B: To turn to descriptiveness is a natural tendency of candidates with weaker knowledge of the context. (Introducing the reflective statement may help candidates avoid this). Most of the answers deserved 2 or 3 marks for this criterion. (As in the examination sessions of the previous course), there were a significant number of assignments on topics that were too broad for effective treatment within the specified word limits.

Criterion C: Only a significant minority of candidates addressed authors' artistic choices directly, consequently and clearly. Here, similar to above, most of the answers with regard to this criterion deserved 2 or 3 marks.

Criterion D: Here candidate performance was better because all assignments had appropriate structure. However, quite often reference to works was very general, for example noting the character or event without explanation of how this is linked to the interpretation discussed. Most of the answers with regard to this criterion were in the area of 3 or 4 marks.

Criterion E: The register was generally well chosen for the nature of an essay on literature.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

1. Of course it is necessary to pay special attention to criterion A for it can deepen understanding of works. However students should remember that the reflective statement does not need to be directly linked to the topic chosen.

2. Topics that are too broad still seem to be a serious problem. Candidates need to mind the breadth of the aspect chosen. If a candidate wants to show their competence the aspect should not encompass the whole novel, for example the totalitarian mechanism in Orwell's "1984".

3. To improve performance with regard to criterion C, it is necessary to stress that the mere fact of using words like 'narrator' or 'plot' does not equal 'an appreciation of the writer's choices'.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

Commentary of unseen prose / poetry was difficult for the candidates for several reasons.

Candidates:

- Could not apply an appropriate context to the passage.
- Tried to simplify the sense of the text. (Maybe the reason is that not every candidate is mature enough to discuss complicated questions about God's nature or human nature.)
- Sometimes started to write without fully understanding the text, and they changed interpretation of the crucial elements during their writing of their work.
- Struggled with literary devices and how these features shape meaning.
- Wrote commentaries divided into paragraphs but coherence inside a single paragraph was often lost. The development of ideas was also often lost.
- Often repeated or paraphrased the content instead of interpreting it (both prose and poetry, but in prose more frequently).
- Did not support ideas by adequate use of examples from the text.
- Enumerated literary devices without showing their function in the text, consequently most did not explain the mechanism of literary devices.
- Omitted important parts of the text or tried to comment on everything (i.e. each verse).

- Could not find an adequate language through which to discuss literature issues and used colloquial register instead or made many mistakes of syntax, vocabulary and idiom.
- Omitted commas in complex sentences and quotation marks in titles.

In summary, candidates repeated the introduction or presented a simplified conclusion, with inadequate evaluation of the text. The text was used as a springboard to show their beliefs and worldview, consequently there was little real analysis and interpretation.

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

In general, candidates:

- Knew literary features.
- Tried to keep in mind the prescribed time limit and were able to finish the commentary within the 120 minutes.
- Showed interesting ideas in interpretation; (some showed independent, original thinking about the text).
- Could select and discuss the most important and significant parts of the passage (as it was not possible to say something about everything).
- Used theory of literature terminology.
- Were aware of main parts of organization of the commentary.

In addition, some candidates:

- Used diversified, fluent language, with individual tone and register.

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

Prose

The prose passage seemed to be the more difficult of the passages for the candidates. It was difficult for them because:

- The genre of the text was not obvious, and consequently they did not identify the voice of the speaker in the text in acceptable way.
- Sewing, as very ordinary activity, was confusing and many candidates tended to read the passage literally, without looking for figurative meanings.
- In many cases the candidates were not able to find the main thought, idea in the passage. In consequence their works were not coherent, with many inconsistent elements.
- In weaker responses important details from the text, like different kinds of dresses and the tucks, were omitted.
- Sometimes the text was treated as a starting point for unsubstantiated reflections about the nature of contemporary society.

In good responses, the following was observed:

- Interesting and useful contexts (references to social, philosophical or literature issues).
- The finding out of irony.
- Defining symbolic role of the tailor.
- Defining symbolic role of the costumes.
- Finding out autothematic elements in the passage.

Poetry

The poem by Rymkiewicz seemed to be easier for the candidates than the prose passage. Candidates' responses showed several areas that were problematic for the candidates:

- Identifying the type of speaking person in the poem (direct or indirect way of showing the speaking person in the poem).
- Role of God in the poem. (The candidates tried to work out whether his sleep was something acceptable or whether it means that God has forgotten about the world.)
- Consequently, in weaker responses inconsistencies in interpretation were observed.
- Organization of the commentary: some candidates repeated content of each stanza, others wrote about literature devices in a separate paragraph, without real connection to the meaning.
- Some candidates made common mistakes with types of rhymes, their names and functions.
- In general, the weaker responses did not convey a holistic point of view of the text; hierarchy of validity of individual elements from the text was omitted; no strong conclusion was offered.
- Conclusions were replaced by simple judgments about the text (for example 'it was a very interesting passage and everyone should read it'), or unsubstantial generalizations.

In strong responses, the following was observed:

- References to many different ideas of God presented in culture.
- Identifying roles of animals.
- Identifying role of sounds and rhymes in the text.
- The interpretation of the culminating point ('pointa').
- Identifying the role of God's sleeping.
- Finding out the role of repetitions and tautologies.
- Defining role of the mood in the poem.
- Using existential context during interpretation of the text.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are encouraged to remind students that the main aim of the commentary is finding out the meaning of the text and then how it is shaped by literary devices. Consequently,

making visible connections between language of the text and meaning/sense of the passage should be looked for by the candidates as they compose their commentaries.

As in contemporary prose and poetry sense is not so obvious, teachers should try to encourage students to take into account the distance of the speaking person to the text, which often results in irony.

Detailed knowledge about literary devices and their functions will be helpful in effective writing Paper 1 commentaries.

Unclear and careless language as well as accidental composition of the commentary, affect communication in the response. Please encourage students to use varied, fluent and proper language as well as purposeful organization.

As to choosing adequate examples from the passage and making purposeful, reasonable use of them in the commentaries, this seemed to be very challenging for many candidates. By paying more attention to this aspect during the preparation of students for the examination higher levels of achievement will be reached in candidates' commentaries.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

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

Commentary of unseen prose / poetry was difficult for the candidates for several reasons.

Candidates:

- Could not apply an appropriate context to the passage.
- Could not identify the important parts of the text.
- Struggled with literary devices and how these features shape meaning.
- Wrote commentaries divided into paragraphs but coherence inside a single paragraph was often lost. The development of ideas was also often lost.
- Often repeated or paraphrased the content instead of interpreting it (both prose and poetry, but in prose more frequently).
- Did not support ideas by adequate use of examples from the text.
- Enumerated literary devices without showing their function in the text, consequently most did not explain the mechanism of literary devices.
- Omitted important parts of the text or tried to comment on everything (i.e. each verse).
- Could not find an adequate language through which to discuss literature issues and

used colloquial register instead or made many mistakes of syntax, vocabulary and idiom.

- Omitted commas in complex sentences and quotation marks in titles.

In summary, candidates repeated the introduction or presented a simplified conclusion, with inadequate evaluation of the text. The text was used as a springboard to show their beliefs and worldview, consequently there was little real analysis and interpretation.

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

In general, candidates:

- Knew literary features.
- Tried to answer the guiding questions, as well as incorporate additional issues in the commentary.
- Tried to keep in mind the prescribed time limit and were able to finish the commentary within the 90 minutes.
- Showed interesting ideas in interpretation, (some showed independent, original thinking about the text).
- Used theory of literature terminology.

In addition, some candidates:

- Used diversified, fluent language, with individual tone and register.
- Proved their understanding of the passage by adequate use of examples from the text.

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

Prose

The prose passage seemed to be the more difficult of the passages for the candidates. It was difficult for them because candidates:

- Could not identify the nature of the narrator (who was also the main character in the text).
- As the position and character of the narrator had been changing in the passage, found it difficult to find the main aim of this structural element of the text.
- Generally mentioned the contemporary context of the text, (but only a few candidates were able to use this context during interpretation).
- Even if they recognized humour in the text (an element suggested by one of the guiding questions), they did not point out its role in the meaning of the passage.
- Often omitted the role of irony.
- Tended to repeat the content instead of interpret the passage.
- Did not understand the title of book, from which the passage was taken; consequently tried to interpret the title of the passage (“Koniec sezonu”) and in many cases failed in

doing so.

- Generally did not recognize that the passage is a game playing with the convention of the novel.
- Omitted important details from the text (weaker responses).

In good responses, the following was observed:

- Interesting and useful contexts (references to cultural, mass cultural or literature issues).
- The finding out of irony, humour, exaggerations, and their role in the passage.
- The finding out of autothematic elements in the passage.
- Personal response and independent thinking about the nature of the main character.
- Well-developed, coherent interpretation, which was purposeful and well organized.

Poetry

The poem seemed to be easier for the candidates than the prose passage.

Candidate responses showed several areas that were problematic for candidates:

- Finding out the three main parts of the poem and identifying their role.
- Using the broader context in explaining the sense of the text.
- Adapting the language of the commentary to the existential problems of the text.
- Weaker candidates read the text literally, without looking for figurative meanings.
- Date under the text (1989) encouraged some candidates to write about historical and political meanings of the text, but all unsubstantiated.

In strong responses, the following was observed:

- The finding out of the connection between title of the poem and title of the volume.
- Identification of the situation of the person speaking in the poem (the end of life, summary of life experiences).
- The finding out of the role of metaphors, symbols in the text, as well as the part of the poem which was written in italics.
- Well chosen, functional and useful examples from the text.
- The finding out of the distance of the speaking person to his life.
- Recognizing interesting and meaningful composition of the poem (decreasing number of words in each verse).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are encouraged to remind students that the main aim of the commentary is finding out the meaning of the text and then how it is shaped by literary devices. Consequently, making visible connections between language of the text and meaning/sense of the passage should be looked for by the candidates as they compose their commentaries.

Please encourage students to read the passage several times and make notes/plan of the commentary before they start writing. Choosing the best way of interpretation from a number

of ideas and then to deepen this is a better strategy than writing about many completely different ways of making sense of the passage.

It is important to remind students that in coherent, clear paragraphing there is a clear opening sentence, which indicates the content of the paragraph.

Detailed knowledge about literary devices and their functions will be helpful in effective writing Paper 1 commentaries.

Please encourage standard level students to read and answer the guiding questions. However for higher marks more detailed and complex commentaries are expected. Unclear and careless language as well as accidental composition of the commentary, affect communication in the response. Please encourage students to use varied, fluent and proper language as well as purposeful organization.

As to choosing adequate examples from the passage and making purposeful, reasonable use of them in the commentary, this seemed to be very challenging for many candidates. By paying more attention to this aspect during the preparation of students for the examination higher levels of achievement will be reached in candidates' commentaries.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

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

The area that proved to be most difficult for the candidates was poetry once again. Candidates who wrote about poetry often forgot that form and literary features cannot be separated from the content itself.

The most common problem was weak presentation a propos criterion C. Many candidates forgot about the appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre. Others gave some examples of literary conventions, but did not relate these to the question. Within criterion C, instead of detailed analysis of the genre conventions, candidates concentrated on enumerating some formal features of the works. There were only a few responses in which the examples of the literary conventions were perceptively identified and persuasively developed and with clear relevance to the question.

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

Candidates showed their good preparation a propos criterion A. There was good knowledge and understanding of part 3 works in relation to the question answered. Candidates managed to produce responses which were effectively organized, with a very good structure, coherence and development. Their writing was clear and the paragraphs were separated. The candidates' essays were good or at least satisfactory a propos criterion E. In most cases language was clear, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and the register was well suited to the task.

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

Strengths were shown within answers to questions related to short stories, modern prose and autobiography. Candidates made a good choice of works, were able to take into account the main implications and some subtleties of the question, and explored the ideas carefully and in the right directions. The weak responses occurred within drama and poetry. In these cases candidates summarized works rather than analysed and interpreted them.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In particular, teachers are encouraged to practise two aspects of paper 2 with future candidates. First of all, many exercises should be done to show students how to incorporate the appreciation of literary conventions of the genre in the comparative essay to improve the presentation with regard to criterion C. The second point is to teach students how to read the question and use all implications of the question in the essay. This will result in a better presentation a propos criterion B.

Teachers need to ensure they inform students which part of the examination paper they can choose from. Students should realize that they are allowed to choose only texts from part 3. In addition, candidates should try to write clearly, avoid changing genre category during the examination itself and not base their answers on the world literature work of the previous course.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 25

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

The area that proved to be most difficult for the candidates was poetry once again. Candidates who wrote about poetry often forgot that form and literary features cannot be separated from the content itself.

The most common problem was weak presentation a propos criterion C. Many candidates forgot about the appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre. Others gave some examples of the literary conventions, but did not relate these to the question. Within criterion C, instead of detailed analysis of the genre conventions, candidates concentrated on enumerating some formal features of the works. There were only a few responses in which the examples of the literary conventions were perceptively identified and persuasively developed and with clear relevance to the question.

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

Candidates showed their good preparation a propos criterion A. There was good knowledge and understanding of part 3 works in relation to the question answered. The literary conventions criterion ('C') was better met than in the previous course. In most cases examples of literary conventions were satisfactorily identified and developed, with relevance to the question and the works used. Candidates also structured their essays properly. Their writing was clear and the paragraphs were separated.

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

Strengths were shown within answers to questions related to short stories and modern prose. Candidates made a good choice of works, were able to take into account the main implications and some subtleties of the question, and explored the ideas carefully and in the right directions. The weak responses occurred within drama and poetry. In these cases candidates summarized works rather than analysed and interpreted them.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In particular, teachers are encouraged to practise two aspects of paper 2 with future candidates. First of all, many exercises should be done to show students how to incorporate the appreciation of literary conventions of the genre to the comparative essay to improve the presentation with regard to criterion C. The second point is to teach students how to read the question and use all implications of the question in the essay. This will result in a better presentation a propos criterion B.

Teachers need to ensure they inform students which part of the examination they can choose from. Students should realize that they are allowed to choose only texts from part 3. Teachers

are also encouraged to pay more attention to the teaching of grammar and correctness of writing and make students more familiar with the assessment criteria. In addition, candidates should try to write clearly, avoid changing genre category during the examination itself and not base their answers on the world literature work of the previous course.