

Danish B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 14 | 15 - 31 | 32 - 50 | 51 - 63 | 64 - 75 | 76 - 88 | 89 - 100 |

Standard level

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 14 | 15 - 28 | 29 - 44 | 45 - 58 | 59 - 73 | 74 - 86 | 87 - 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 recordings stayed within the time limits and forms were almost always used correctly. Recordings were generally of good quality, but in a few cases there was a lot of outside noise. While it did not make it difficult to understand the candidate, it could potentially have distracted and disturbed the candidate.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The photographs varied greatly in suitability with quite a few offering only limited material for the candidate to engage with. Some photographs were thematic and showed, for instance, a close-up (related to a theme). While this did work for the strongest candidates, it left the weaker candidates struggling with what to say. In general, photographs with many elements to describe and discuss worked best.

A few pictures were cartoons rather than photographs. This is not suitable for the individual oral.

Some teachers supplied a very descriptive caption, whereas some only gave a single word. Neither approach was ideal as supplying a lot of information made it difficult for the candidate to show off knowledge and independent ideas, whereas a single word often meant that weaker candidates lacked guidance. A few captions were rather labored “exam questions”, apparently aimed at testing the candidate’s factual knowledge about what had been studied in class. This is not what the photograph’s caption is intended to achieve. Teachers are reminded that the individual oral is not the same as a Danish exam in “gymnasiet”.

Some teachers spoke too much in Part 2 of the oral examinations, giving their opinions or explaining something for too long before they came to ask the candidates questions. It would serve the candidates better if teachers could make a brief comment only and then move the conversation on, since time is limited.

Teachers are also reminded to allow sufficient time for candidates to think before a question is repeated. Sometimes the same question was asked in three different ways within a few seconds. Teachers should be reminded that candidates need time to understand and process the question. It is advisable to teach candidates how to deal verbally with such situations where they have not understood (asking to have a question rephrased, repeated, etc.).

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Productive skills

Most candidates spoke well and were able to express their ideas fairly well.

Criterion B: Interactive and receptive skills

Most of the candidates successfully took part in the discussion.

The individual presentations varied in quality, and this could often be correlated with the suitability of the photograph. It is important that the photographs offer something for both weak and strong candidates (often a variety of elements that can be described worked well).

Some teachers asked very specific questions relating to terminology (analytical tools). This is not a part of the exam and should normally be avoided (unless introduced by the candidate).

On the other hand, there was often only limited discussion about the photograph's cultural context. For the stronger candidates in particular, this made it somewhat difficult to differentiate between good candidates and excellent candidates.

On a few occasions, a candidate said something which was very odd or wrong. In these cases, the teacher could have asked the candidate to explain what s/he meant (just as in a normal conversation).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Make sure the photographs are suitable for description. There should be a clear link between the photograph and a topic studied in class. The photograph should allow for reflections on some aspects of Danish culture so that it can be fully understood by a candidate NOT having grown up in Denmark.

Remember that the exam is not marked based on factual knowledge (this does not mean that the teacher cannot ask for factual knowledge as part of the discussion, but it should be limited and only when relevant). Asking for specific terminology is discouraged.

Teachers are reminded that they should ask candidates to explain or elaborate on his/her ideas if it makes sense to. It should be a natural conversation, and asking for more information is not the same as testing factual knowledge.

Higher level written assignment

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 |

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The literature read was suitable. Though not a requirement, it was a great help that some teachers had attached a brief summary of the works used.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A - Language

Performance under this criterion was very widely spread.

Criterion B - Content

It seemed that many candidates did not understand what it meant to “show appreciation of the literary work” and many assignments showed only a very basic connection with the text. It should be stressed that the purpose is not to write a random new ending or a diary entry written years after the text ended; rather, these must be based on the text and use the text somehow (thus the new ending, for instance, must be plausible and clearly related to the text, which also means that it is not a good idea, for example, merely to reverse the ending of a story). Candidates seemed confused as to the nature of the task, and this could be made clearer to them.

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, some 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. 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.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should ensure that candidates are familiar with what is expected in the rationale and practise producing these in class (prior to completing the written assignment). Candidates should be informed that clichés or personal feelings are not relevant (for example, saying that you have chosen to write a diary entry three years after the text ended because it allows you to understand the main character better is not relevant; stating briefly what you seek to understand, how it is related to the text and why it is interesting are relevant).

Candidates should be reminded that tasks that are not sufficiently linked to the literary text (for example, tasks containing many “invented” facts) or are mere retelling of the plot will not score highly.

Standard level written assignment

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 range and suitability of the work submitted

Mostly, the articles chosen were good and varied. They allowed both weak and strong candidates to develop their ideas. In some cases, however, the three articles were too similar, focusing on a single event or related events. This made it almost impossible to determine whether the candidate had used one, two or all three. It also meant that the candidates had less freedom and independence when it came to developing their own ideas and approaches.

Though not a requirement, it was a great help that some teachers had attached a brief summary of the articles used.

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:

- Lack of understanding regarding what inversion is and how it functions
- Lack of understanding of the adverbial positions in both main and subordinate clauses
- Lack of understanding of adjectives and pronouns (correlation)

Quite a few scripts would have benefitted from a proofread by the candidate.

Criterion B - Content

Quite a few candidates did not seem to know what was needed in terms of “use of sources”, and many candidates used only one source.

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 sources.

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, some 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. 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 practise producing these in class prior to completing the written assignment.
- Candidates should be reminded that clichés or personal feelings are not relevant (for example, saying that you have chosen a blog because it allows you to state your personal views to many people is not relevant; stating briefly which views and how they are related to the articles is relevant).
- Please remind 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.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 11 | 12 - 23 | 24 - 37 | 38 - 44 | 45 - 50 | 51 - 57 | 58 - 60 |

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

This year's HL P1 examination proved very accessible to candidates and perhaps more so than would have been anticipated, and particularly in comparison to previous years' papers. As such, the grade boundaries for this component were raised accordingly to reflect the accessibility of the examination. Areas that caused particular difficulty will be outlined further in this report.

The main difficulties experienced were the candidates' understanding of structural features in a text, i.e. what a word or a sentence refers to. In addition, identifying cohesive devices seemed difficult for some candidates. Some candidates did not seem to understand that they needed to do a close reading of a selected part of the text in order to answer the question.

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

The vast majority of candidates appeared well prepared to tackle the questions they faced.

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

Text A

For Question 1, "*Choose 5 right sentences*", many candidates selected option F, which was incorrect. Text A states that "most readings [for the classes] are in English" and option F states that "most classes are taught in English".

Otherwise the candidates did well on the rest of the questions based on Text A.

Text B

Question 9 caused many candidates problems. The statement is *False* and the justification is "in many Western countries" – however, many candidates wrongly chose "many attended kindergardens in Western China" as a justification. It appears that the word "Western" confused all but the very strong candidates.

Text C

Questions 18-20 appeared the most challenging questions for candidates within this paper. Often E was selected for G, and C was selected for D. The most common mistake was to write "nærmeste" for "nær" in Question 25. For Questions 26 and 29 some candidates wrote H for B in Question 26 and B instead of I for Question 29.

Text D

Question 30 was challenging for some candidates, meaning they did not get both the checked box and the justification right. The Question is "right" and the justification that you can indeed

see the ocean, but the word “selvom” [= however] would throw the candidates off and they would select “F” for “false”. In Question 37 a few candidates selected B or C which was incorrect. If there were any deviations from the correct answers in Questions 40-44 it would be the following: in Question 41 choosing “ceriserøde” as the reference, in Question 43 choosing “forfatteren” instead of “fortælleren”, and in Question 44 “harer og pindsvin” (which does not make sense in the context of the story).

Text E

Questions 49 and 50 caused some problems for candidates meaning they did not give the correct justifications. For Question 55, a few candidates selected A or B instead of C.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It remains important that candidates are given ample opportunity to work with different types of questions related to a variety of texts (as set out in the Language B Guide). Teachers should stress the need to focus on details, but otherwise it seems that the candidates are well versed to do well on this kind of examination.

Further comments

Candidates generally displayed a sound ability to apply a range of text-handling skills accurately and efficiently on texts of varying difficulty. In dealing with Text D, candidates generally showed that they had acquired good reading skills in literary analysis.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 8 | 9 - 16 | 17 - 21 | 22 - 27 | 28 - 33 | 34 - 39 | 40 - 45 |

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

Neither of the following caused great difficulties, but candidates should be reminded to be as precise as possible when:

- Asked for a single piece of information (candidates will not receive a mark if they provide a number of answers even if one of them is the correct answer)

- Doing true/false with justification (providing irrelevant justification will lead to no marks being given).

The main difficulties were with vocabulary and inserting the correct words.

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

Text A was an interview and it did cause some difficulty, especially Questions 4-5.

Text B was an article/interview about the first Danish female football coach with the highest European coaching license. Question 9 caused some candidates problems (quite a few got two correct and two wrong). Questions 10-14 were among the most difficult questions in the exam, and even strong candidates got some of them wrong. Quite a few candidates seem to have simply guessed here. Questions 15-19 proved relatively easy, with Questions 17-18 causing some problems.

Text C was about young people's use of media, and it proved easier than expected. Only Questions 27-30 caused most candidates problems, except for the very best.

Text D was about Danish folk high schools. Most candidates handled this text quite well. Questions 31-35 were true/false with justification. There were some candidates who answered correctly but gave the wrong justification, and there were candidates who gave too long justifications. Overall, however, candidates performed well. Questions 36-38 were answered correctly by most candidates. Question 39 caused some candidates problems (answering B).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

If a question asks for a word or a phrase, only a word or a phrase should be given. If the candidate provides multiple words or whole sentences, the mark will not be awarded. Even if the correct answer is found amongst the words, 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 candidates to read the question carefully and to only 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, candidates must ensure they 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.

Please also remind candidates to quote when giving a justification (as opposed to short answer questions, where they state their own answer).

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 8 | 9 - 17 | 18 - 25 | 26 - 30 | 31 - 34 | 35 - 39 | 40 - 45 |

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

Candidates found Section B of the examination very difficult. It was noticeable that some of the weakest candidates missed out this section altogether, whereas others did not attempt to answer the question but rather wrote a more or less random text (which is preferable to a total omission: candidates are awarded points even if they totally disregard the question). Even the strongest candidates, who had scored very well in Section A, scored much lower marks in this part. Often candidates neglected to argue and instead narrated stories and wrote diary entries that only indirectly addressed the question. The vast majority of responses were superficial and rarely in-depth (the marking criteria talk about the development of the argument, especially toward the higher end, and this was rarely achieved).

In Section A, the matching of the right language with the text type and doing more than the bare minimum was sometimes a problem, thus not achieving the highest marks in Criterion C (format). Examples of this could be an interview which was reduced to QnA, or a diary entry where the main genre trait was a date and the opening line "Dear diary".

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

Question 1 – Cultural Diversity – There were many good responses which took the audience into consideration. The main problem with this question was the term "values" which some candidates did not fully understand (some interpreting it as meaning the same as "norms" and others interpreting it as meaning concrete, culturally-related things such as "cycling" or "drinking").

Question 2 – Customs and Traditions – Not many candidates chose to answer this question, and it did cause some problems. The text type was not easy, and often candidates wrote essays or analyses rather than letters to the editor. Candidates were good, however, at structuring their texts and mostly had a nuanced view of the question.

Question 3 – Health – This question was popular, and it led to some very varied responses. The text type caused many problems with candidates forgetting that they were not in charge of the experiment but part of it, forgetting to use formal vocabulary and forgetting to be precise. Many candidates focused on one to two aspects and wrote superficially about them (often about being tired and not being able to focus). For the candidates who understood the text type, however, it elicited some very good responses, both with regard to language and content.

Question 4 – Leisure – This was the most popular question but it also proved very difficult for candidates to handle. The text type (interview) is deceptively easy, which meant that few candidates scored low marks for format, but also that few candidates scored top marks either. Too many candidates reduced the genre to a QnA. Very few candidates addressed the question about social interaction, and as such it would be advisable to stress to candidates how important it is that they fully understand and answer the question. Some candidates got too absorbed in their own personal travel accounts, and it was often the case that after having dedicated much of their response to writing more or less irrelevant things about their travel experiences, they ended with a totally disconnected question on social interaction which was answered superficially, for example by stating “yes, I think travelling can improve your social interactions because you meet a lot of people”.

Question 5 – Science and Technology – This was a question which the candidates could clearly relate to, but some found it hard to find the correct tone. Some candidates were clearly torn between what they “know is right” and what they themselves do (leading to some confusion in the answers). Some responses focused only on the phones while leaving out the cameras, and many responses were quite simplistic and focused only on the pros/cons of mobile phones in the classroom (phones ringing, using it to play games during lessons, its potential as a calculator, etc.).

Section B: This was the area that caused the most difficulty, and many candidates, both the weaker and the stronger ones, struggled to develop a response that had a high level of coherency in the discussion of the topic. The candidates seemed to not understand the purpose of Section B and neglected to argue their points.

Although no particular text type is asked for, some candidates who chose to write in a particular text type, for example “a diary entry”, personified their response so 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 practised in class as a way of helping to organize 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. Candidates should be careful not to spend too many words and too much time on establishing a frame. Instead they should tackle the question and develop their ideas and arguments.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is strongly recommended that candidates make a plan, or at least prepare their response mentally, before they begin to write. Too many responses could have benefitted greatly from a draft of some sort. If candidates 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. This is also important for Section B.

When approaching text type conventions, please reiterate to candidates that text types mean more than mere layout (and if they write articles, please ask them not to make columns). 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. This is especially important when it comes to genres that might seem simple and familiar to the candidates: for example interview, diary and email.

Candidates should be careful not to choose a question just based on interest. At least they should be made aware that it is crucial that they are able to both address and answer the question.

For Section B, the candidates need to become better at argumentation. They need to be able to do more than merely agreeing or disagreeing. Candidates should be reminded to use adverbs and phrases such as “derudover” (moreover/furthermore), “på den ene/anden side” (on the one/other hand), “Selvom” (even though) and so on.

Please remind candidates that their handwriting has to be clear and legible. For example, if there was not a line through the “o”, it has been read as “sovn” instead of “søvn”. Candidates have not been penalised where the meaning was still clear but candidates should understand and be reminded to use the full Danish alphabet, which includes the special characters.

Please remind candidates that a semicolon should not be used as an “either/or” option when the candidate does not know whether to use a comma or not. A semicolon replaces a full stop (candidates should be discouraged from using a semicolon altogether).

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

“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, and without 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

Question 1 – Cultural Diversity – was to write a diary entry reflecting on differences between living in the country and the city. Some candidates forgot the comparison aspect and mainly wrote about life in the country (with some implicit comparisons). Few candidates were able to do actual reflections and mostly described “strange” situations they had experienced. Some candidates forgot that the question was about life in the city/country and wrote about smells, organic food and so on. Candidates should be reminded to read the questions carefully.

Question 2 – Customs and Traditions – was a brochure giving advice to young people going to live with a host family in Denmark. Only very few candidates chose this option, but they did well. It would be advisable to work more with this option in class as candidates seem reluctant to write in it.

Question 3 – Health – was an interview with an ex-smoker. Candidates seemed comfortable with the text type, but quite a few reduced it simply to QnA, which was not suitable as it was for the school magazine (an introduction to the interview and conclusion would have been expected). Some responses were very unorganized and the questions did not form a whole. Even if done as a QnA, there should be some kind of structure.

Question 4 – Leisure – was an email suggesting ideas to an uncle/aunt who is a PE teacher. The main problem with the email text type is that it is so “free”, and some candidates failed to use a consistent tone throughout. Many responses were also quite unorganized, maybe reflecting how students write their normal emails. Candidates should be aware that there is a difference between an email to a friend and a serious email to a relative. Only few candidates came up with truly coherent advice and innovative ideas, and quite a few of the responses were very stereotypical (do X with the girls, do Y with the boys).

Question 5 – Science and Technology – was a speech either in favour or against the school buying tablet computers for all the students. This question was handled very well by some candidates but it also elicited quite varied responses. Some candidates, for example, forgot to structure their speeches which became close to a stream-of-consciousness. Most candidates remembered to argue, but it was clear that this was challenging linguistically.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is strongly recommended that candidates make a plan, or at least prepare their response mentally, before they begin to write. Too many responses could have benefitted greatly from a draft of some sort. If candidates 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.

When approaching text type conventions, please reiterate to candidates that text types mean more than mere layout (and if they write articles, please ask them not to make columns). 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. This is especially important when it comes to genres that might seem simple and familiar to the candidates: for example, interview, diary and email.

There were a number of responses that contained “phonetic” spelling, for example “de” for “det”, “hade” for “havde”, “lissom” for “ligesom”, etc.

Please remind candidates that their handwriting has to be clear and legible. For example, if there was not a line through the “o”, it has been read as “sovn” instead of “søvn”. Candidates have not been penalised where the meaning was still clear but candidates should understand and be reminded to use the full Danish alphabet, which includes the special characters.

Please remind candidates that a semicolon should not be used as an “either/or” option when the candidate does not know whether to use a comma or not. A semicolon replaces a full stop (candidates should be discouraged from using a semicolon altogether).