

May 2013 subject reports

Danish B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 32	33 - 51	52 - 64	65 - 77	78 - 89	90 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 27	28 - 44	45 - 58	59 - 73	74 - 87	88 - 100

Higher Level and Standard Level Internal assessment

HL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

General comments

Most centres used the new form 2/BIA, although a few did not. Almost all pictures and forms were uploaded digitally on IBIS, which eased moderation tremendously. However, one or two teachers did not fill in the form in full – please ensure that this is completed correctly before uploading.

The digital recording had significantly improved the sound quality of samples. Those that were

difficult to hear were mainly due to either poor positioning of the microphone, or from background noise. A note: if the candidate makes a continuous noise (for example, tapping their feet or rustling paper) to the point where it could interfere with the quality of the recording, the teacher should point this out to the candidate.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The individual orals submitted were generally suitable. Teachers were supportive of the candidates and asked suitable questions. A few teachers seemed to find this last point difficult, in that their questions came with long preambles expressing their own opinions on the topic. There were also examples of candidates clearly not "getting" what the teacher wanted the candidate to respond to, and instead of changing the path of questioning, the teacher simply continuing to repeat the questions/opinions. This did not help the candidates.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Productive skills

The level of Danish was of very high quality. However, this could be due to the presence of candidates who were in reality native or near-native speakers, who should not have been entered at B-level.

Criterion B: Interactive and receptive skills

Most of the candidates successfully took part in the discussion.

The presentation and discussion on the photographs worked well for the most part. However, while most candidates successfully presented what was on the photograph depicting images relevant to Danish culture, they did not always go beyond this to offer an analysis of the topic/image, or to *reflect* on the image/situation, putting it into a wider context. Thus they were more summaries than analysis demonstrating more complex ideas.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Make sure that it does NOT sound as if the candidate is reading aloud from a script. This is especially important with the weaker candidates. They are allowed to look at the points that they have written down in preparation, but it must be stressed that even though they have this support, it must not sound as if they are reading these points aloud.

The photographs used for the individual oral generally stimulated good presentations and discussions. However in a few instances the candidate did not have wider contextual ideas and/or understanding relevant to the image/scene to go on beyond simply describing what was on the picture. Teachers should make sure that the photographs selected are sufficiently linked to the Options studied in class so that it can be fully understood by a candidate NOT having grown up in Denmark.

Some questions posed by teachers seemed to probe into levels of understanding of particular cultural or factual knowledge. Such questions restricted the candidate's opportunity to respond, which reduced the opportunity to score highly against Criterion B. Please note that the candidate's factual

knowledge of the options is not tested. Such information is relevant only in so far as how they are used to support what the candidate wishes to communicate.

Higher level and Standard level written assignment

HL Component grade boundaries

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

SL Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

General comments

On the whole the assignments received were appropriate, but the cover sheet was not always in order, and the candidates sometimes had the rationale at the front, sometimes at the back. The rationale should be placed after the coversheet, before the assignment. Word count stated for the rationale was often inaccurate. Sometimes the rationale was lacking entirely. However, these issues were still in the minority and the assignments were mostly in order.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

This was the first examination session for this component, which perhaps explains the extremely varied range and suitability of work submitted. This was especially the case for SL written assignments. It appeared that some of the candidates had misunderstood the nature of the written assignment as some were entirely "fictional", with little or no connection to the source texts.

Rationale was often weak lacking the explanation of why the topic and approach for the assignment were chosen. Candidates also often failed to identify the text type they would be using.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A - Language

Performance under this criterion was very widely spread, from well written to the nearly incomprehensible. Among the common issues noted were:

- The use of anglicisms, such as *karakter* instead of the Danish *hovedperson*, or *mennesker* instead of *folk*. This was a significant issue and requires attention.
- Lack of understanding of the difference between *når/da*, *man/ens*, *tror/synes*

- That it is *et* essay, not *en*
- Lack of understanding regarding what inversion is and how it functions
- Lack of punctuation: some assignments had sentences that ran for almost a page with no commas
- That the personal pronoun is not just, for example, *din*, but needs to follow the correlating noun to either *dit* or *dine*.

Criterion B - Content:

It seemed that many candidates did not understand what it meant to “show appreciation of the literary work” at HL as many assignments had only a very basic connection with the text, their writing reading more like a Paper 2 response than what is expected in the written assignment. Similarly, candidates did not seem to know what was needed in terms of “use of sources” at SL. It is not enough for the task produced to be on the same topic as the source texts, there must be evidence of ideas, references, arguments and attitudes, or tone that can be traced back to the source texts.

The tasks also often lacked coherent sequence of ideas, and were not well organized.

Criterion C - Format:

Most of the candidates appeared to be familiar with the text types produced and were able to perform adequately against this criterion. However, many scripts simply looked like rough drafts. It is worth taking care over the presentation of the written assignments.

Criterion D - Rationale:

Many candidates appeared unclear on the concept of the rationale and what a good and effective one should contain, as they failed to cover the aspects specified in the Guide. At HL, the rationale must state the purpose or aim of the task, and give some indication of how these have been achieved, as well as a brief mention of the aspects of the literary work that are relevant to the task. At SL, the rationale must state the purpose or aim of the task, and some indication of how these have been achieved, as well as what aspects of each of the three sources were used.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers should ensure that their candidates are familiar with what is expected in the rationale, and practice producing these in class prior to completing the written assignment.
- Please stress that the rationale must be at least 150 words at HL and 100 words at SL. Rationales that are shorter than this is unlikely to be sufficiently detailed.
- Please stress to the candidates that the assignment should have a specific focus, and that this focus allows them to demonstrate understanding of the literary work at HL, or allows them to use the three source texts at SL.

- At HL, remind the candidates that tasks that are not sufficiently linked to the literary text (for e.g. tasks containing many ‘invented’ facts) or are mere retelling of the plot will not score highly.
- At SL, remind the candidates that tasks which use the topic in the source text as a springboard for their own views and message, without reproducing at least some of the original ideas, information, arguments and attitudes, will not score highly.
- Please note that while the tasks must be linked to the literary / source texts, it is not appropriate for candidates to copy large sections of the original texts. Such use of texts would not be considered ‘good’ or ‘effective’ and therefore will result in low marks for Criterion B.
- Please remind candidates to be mindful of the word count limits. If the task is below the minimum word count, a one-mark penalty will be applied to Criterion A. If the task exceeds the maximum word count, examiners are instructed to stop reading and to base the assessment on the first 600 (HL) or 400 (SL) words. This will affect the marks awarded for Criterion B as well as C.
- While candidates may choose any text type, please remind them that the text type chosen should be stated in the rationale as part of ‘how the aims have been achieved’.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 23	24 - 36	37 - 42	43 - 49	50 - 55	56 - 60

General comments

Candidates appeared very well prepared to handle the amount and length of texts presented. The biggest issue, however, was that many of the candidates seemed to lack the necessary vocabulary to understand the texts in depth. This was particularly evident in questions that required candidates to write out the answers (for example, short answer questions); the language was often extremely poor, wrongly quoted and/or was clear the candidate failed to understand some key aspects of the text.

However, all in all the level of both the texts and the questions seemed suitable for the level, and it must be said that candidates performed very well on the whole.

There were regrettably a number of linguistic inaccuracies in the May 2013 Danish B examination papers. However, a number of steps were taken to ensure that candidates were not disadvantaged.

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

Texts A and C appeared to be the most demanding for the candidates. These texts presented some challenging language, and some of the vocabulary, although are part of the Core topics, may not have been familiar to candidates.

Performance of candidates in Text D was very much split in two; they either answered very well or extremely poorly. There was very little in terms of a 'middle' group.

Texts B and E did not pose significant problems for the majority of the candidates, most probably because the topic of Text B may have been very familiar to candidates of this age group and the topic of Text E would most likely have been familiar to many, regardless of in which language it was written.

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

Text A was a text from a magazine describing how song and singing positively influences people. In questions 1-3 the candidates needed to find the answer directly in the text: a large number of candidates found this very difficult. Questions 4-7 were true/false with justification questions where answers had to be substantiated with quotes from the text. In general the candidates did not do well in this type of question. Questions 8-11 were multiple choice questions and the candidates generally did very well here.

Text B was a text about how it is possible to work as a charity volunteer on the Roskilde Festival; the text is from the festival web page.

In questions 12-15 the candidates could answer quite freely and most did very well. Neither did question 16 in which the candidates were to choose 4 correct sentences out of 9, seem to pose any significant problems.

Questions 17-19 which tested vocabulary seemed quite difficult for about half the candidates.

Text C was an interview about the New Nordic Kitchen adapted from a restaurant web site.

Again, the candidates found questions 20-24, which were true/false with justification questions, extremely difficult. Many candidates tended to copy out large sections of the text rather than identify and quote specific phrases/sentences which justified the statement. This, more often than not, does not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the text and/or the statement to be awarded the mark. Questions 25-28 in which the candidates had to find synonyms were one of the examples of poor vocabulary knowledge. Many of the candidates were simply not able to answer the questions. Question 29 was a question in which the candidates needed to have quite a good knowledge of both grammar and vocabulary; only about half of the candidates were able to answer this question correctly. In questions 30-33, the candidates generally scored well.

Text D was the literary text, comprising of an extract from a diary written in 1985 about a trip to the USA.

Questions 34-40 were multiple choice questions and apart from question 34, which admittedly is quite an archaic expression, the candidates generally scored very well in them. In questions 41-44 the

candidates were asked to find to whom or to what the word given in the text referred. Most of the candidates scored well here and of those who did not many seemed not to have understood the purpose of the questions as the answers were far from correct. Questions 45 and 46 again were multiple choice questions and again most of the candidate scored well.

Text E was a review of a book about the Titanic.

Questions 47-50 were short answer questions, where the answers could be quoted from the text and in general the candidates scored quite well. Questions 51-53 were the true/false with justification type of question; again the candidates generally scored quite low, the quotes being often either too short so as not to justify the statement fully, or too long, so as to not show precise enough understanding. Questions 54 and 55 were multiple choice questions and, as always with this kind of question, the candidates scored well.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is necessary to make sure that the candidates read a lot of different text types and that they work intensively with them in many different ways throughout the two-year course. Many of the candidates appeared to have considerable difficulties in understanding even simple questions or pieces of text.

In general the candidates would seem to benefit from more vocabulary exercises.

Make sure that the candidates in Higher Level are given sufficiently demanding texts to read (ideally original texts only). Adapted texts or Easy Readers simply are not good enough for HL candidates to learn from.

Make candidates fully aware of what is expected in each type of question, for example the true/false with justification questions, or questions testing structural features (to whom or to what the words refer), so that they do not lose marks unnecessarily.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 45

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

Many candidates were challenged by True/False with Justification questions, many failing to provide the exact and/or complete justification. Some ticked the correct box but provided extraneous details that resulted in them losing the mark, while others ticked the correct box.

There were regrettably a number of linguistic inaccuracies in the May 2013 Danish B examination papers. However, a number of steps were taken to ensure that candidates were not disadvantaged.

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

Text A was about how you could come and follow a student at a university in a subject that they were interested in.

Q1-5 were short answer questions, and Q6-8 were multiple choice - only Q8 challenged the candidates in regard to this text. They did not always grasp the subtleness of the text to understand the intended audience were "future" students.

Text B was a blog entry of a Dane living abroad, and this text was more challenging.

Q9-10 were short answer questions, with Q9 being to find a synonym. Q11 was to find 4 correct statements, Q12-14 were matching words exercise, and Q15 was multiple choice. Qs11 and 15 proved a little challenging for candidates. For Q13, both options B and H were accepted as a correct answer.

Text C was about wind energy.

This text appeared a little easier for candidates than Text B. Candidates appeared to have found Q16-17 (match two halves of the sentences), and Q18-21 (short answer questions) fairly easy. Q22-25 (True/False with justification questions) did not cause much difficulty either, except in the case of Q24. Q26-29 required candidates to find appropriate paragraph headings. These were demanding, and intentionally so, although Q29 seemed a bit easier for the candidates.

Text D was about the amount of time we spend watching TV.

Q30-33 (true/false with justification) actually did not challenge as much as the previous questions in this paper of this type. However Q32 responses often had the right box ticked, but the wrong justification. The multiple choice questions, Q34-36, did not present any problems, but Q37 was difficult. Q38-40 were gap-fill exercises and proved surprisingly challenging.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Familiarise candidates with the types of question that might appear in an IB examination paper 1, and what the expectation are for each. In addition, train them to adhere to the following general rule when answering questions that require them to write down an answer:

- If a question asks for a word or a phrase, only a word or a phrase should be given. If the candidate provides multiple word or whole sentences, the mark will not be awarded even if the correct answer is found amongst the words, as they will not have succeeded in showing that they have understood the text or the question sufficiently.
- If a question asks for 'one' item, and the candidate gives more than one, all the items given must be correct in order for the candidate to receive the mark. Therefore, please instruct them to read the question carefully and only to provide as many answers as has been asked for.
- In short answer questions that ask candidates to identify particular details in the text, or for true/false with justification type questions, candidate must ensure to give a full answer but

without including extra details. If the extra detail provided is irrelevant or nullifies the correct statement already given, they will not be awarded the mark.

- For the true/false with justification questions, candidates are to be reminded again that both the correct tick and the brief, and precise, quotation must be provided to attain the mark.

Finally, please continue to expose candidates to a wide range of texts to develop their text handling skills and to expand their vocabulary.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 19	20 - 27	28 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 41	42 - 45

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

Language was often most problematic as well as matching the right language with the text type, thus not achieving the highest marks in Criterion C (format).

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

Question 2 – Customs and Traditions – was the most popular choice with around 45 responses, and led to many interesting responses. It was about "Allemandsretten". Criterion B (message) was the most challenging aspect as not everyone who chose the questions fully grasped the concept of Allemandsretten, nor fully develop their ideas with appropriate details to support it. Some candidates used the question as a springboard to give their opinion about politics or about rights in general. Such answers will not score highly against Criterion B. The text type required was an email to a friend.

Question 3 – Health – was also popular with around 35 responses, and required candidates to write a brochure giving advice on how to deal with stress. Most responses were good, but some were more like a diary entry.

Question 4 – Leisure – required candidates to write an article for a youth magazine on the phenomenon that some movies creates a cult around them. There were many good responses that showed the candidates, even those who recognized that they themselves indeed did this, could reflect on the topic neutrally.

Question 5 – Science and Technology – attracted around 10 responses, and involved writing a speech reflecting on the need for politicians/ministers to have a certain base knowledge of science in today's society. There were many very good responses, showing depth of thought and understanding of the issues.

Section B: This was the area that caused the most difficulty, and many candidates, especially the weaker ones, struggled to develop a response that had a high level of coherency in the discussion of the topic.

Although no particular text type is asked for, some candidates who chose to write in a particular text type, for example "a diary entry", got lost in personifying the answer too much that they lost the development of a higher level discussion and reflection on the stimulus. Although candidates are encouraged to adopt particular text types practiced in class as a way of helping to organise their ideas and produce appropriate language, there are no marks available for achieving effective text types in Section B. Therefore the candidates' focus should remain on the content and quality of their arguments.

On the positive side, there were many well written and intelligent answers, and almost all the candidates had at least some interesting reflections.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should pay attention to text types in Section A, and also be made aware that seemingly simple text types also make demands on the author in terms of register, style and content.

Also, stress that the format of the text type is important, as is the tone and approach.

For Section B, give the candidates the tools to reflect and engage with the stimulus text as "academics" – i.e. to focus on the central point of the stimulus and to discuss in it depth, rather than simply agreeing or disagreeing generally with the idea.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

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

'Message' seemed to be the most difficult aspect in writing. Some candidates were not sufficiently focused on the task set - they appeared to be writing spontaneously without attention to whether they were covering the aspects specified by the question, or to a plan or structure for their response. For the weaker candidates, general language production was also a challenge.

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

The most popular choice was Q5, which attracted over half the candidates. This was followed by Q1 and Q3. Q2 and Q4 were the least popular choice, being chosen only by a few candidates each.

Question 1 – Cultural Diversity – was to interview a teacher about cultural relevance of "small talk." These responses were mostly well written. A few had misunderstood "small talk" to mean youth slang and/or youth language.

Question 2 – Customs and Traditions – was a speech for a presentation either agreeing or disagreeing with the proposal of reducing national holidays in Denmark. This question did not inspire many candidates to respond. However, those who did wrote well thought out, and very good, responses.

Question 3 – Health – was an essay debating both the pros and cons of tattoos. This question was obviously one that the candidates could relate to and there were many good and considered responses.

Question 4 – Leisure – was a brochure on how to use a municipal training path. Only a few candidates responded to this question, but those responses were well done. The text type of the brochure was clear and the language was well chosen for the specified purpose.

Question 5 – Science and Technology – was an email to a family member on how to use social networks. Again, many responses were received for this task, and performance varied. Some were very well done, however, others not quite so. The main problem with the weaker responses was a lack of clarity that the task was about providing help on using social media, rather than how to use the computer itself.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be encouraged to think before they write. If they have a rough structure and an idea of the points they want to make before writing, it is less likely that they will get carried away with the task, writing too much, with too little focus and depth.

They should also understand that a good response must be interesting and have an element of inspiration as well.

When approaching text type conventions, please reiterate to candidates that text types mean more than mere layout. It also involves aspects such as register, tone, awareness of audience, rhetorical devices etc. Therefore, it is not enough that a brochure looks like a brochure. The approach and tone must also be convincing for the text type and the specific context mentioned in the question.

Please give plenty of basic guidance and practice in language production. A very high percentage of the mistakes noted were in a category of lacking elementary language proficiency. Further work in the following areas are recommended:

- The difference between når/da, man/ens, tror/synes, de/det, lige/ligesom.
- What inversion is and how it functions.
- The use of punctuation and paragraphing to structure a response.
- The correct use of the personal pronoun - that it is not just "din", for example, but that it needs to follow the correlating noun to either "dit" or "dine".
- Replacing anglicisms with Danish words – in general this seems to be on a sharp uptake.
- General spelling issues - there seemed to be an increase in the number of "phonetic" spelling, for example 'midster' for 'mister', 'hadge' for 'havde', 'sadge' for 'sagde' etc.
- In addition, please discourage the excessive use of æ, ø and å. There were several instances of 'mør' or 'får' instead of 'mor' and 'far'.