

Norwegian B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 28	29 - 45	46 - 59	60 - 73	74 - 87	88 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 26	27 - 42	43 - 57	58 - 75	76 - 88	89 - 100

Higher level and Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Higher level 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

Standard level 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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Timing: The timing of most oral examinations was controlled very skilfully and appropriately. The vast majority of examinations conformed closely to the pattern required by the Subject Guide. Most candidates kept within the time limits given for the presentation (part 1), though a few did go over the

3 to 4 minutes set aside for this part. Please bear in mind that the first part (presentation) should last only 3 to 4 minutes, and that the whole individual oral should last no more than 10 minutes. Some of the samples were closer to 15 minutes long, which is not advisable.

Visual stimuli and captions: There was a good variety of photographs in this year's examinations and the large majority of them were appropriate and interesting, and limited enough to be presented clearly within the 3 to 4 minutes permitted for this part. All photographs were in colour and the texts in the picture (in the cases that had any) was in the target language, complying with the Guide's requirements. It is worth remembering that the photograph should contain enough details for the candidates to describe a scene or a situation, and also to allow them to offer a personal interpretation.

The title or caption given to the photographs varied between the centres: some consisted of one word only, or was the title of the option studied, some simply explained the photograph, while some were phrased as a short provocative question. It seemed that for some candidates having the caption in the form of a provocative statement or question helped them to structure their presentation and to offer their personal interpretation of the photograph.

The Guide states that the same photograph may be used with up to five candidates but the title or caption should be different for each candidate. However, a few centres failed to meet this requirement and used the same photo and caption with several candidates.

Discussion: In Part 2 (discussion) teachers are required to probe more deeply into the candidates' understanding of the culture reflected in the material, encourage them to express opinions and engage in real conversation and challenge their views in order to generate an authentic discussion. Most teachers did, in order to achieve this, ask open questions and tried to make the candidates consider differences and / or similarities with their own culture. Most candidates had the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to interact and communicate in an independent manner, while in a few cases the teacher had a habit of "helping" the weaker candidates, especially at SL, by ending their sentences for them. This is not recommended.

A clear transition between the two parts of the presentation contributes to avoid misunderstandings and to probe more deeply into the candidates' understanding of the topic discussed. This was, in most cases, handled well.

Recording: All recordings were of good quality. Almost all forms were filled in satisfactorily.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Many candidates performed well against both criteria and most candidates seemed interested in their photograph / topic and took part in the discussion in a lively manner. Many candidates were fluent / mostly fluent in their oral production (Criterion A). However, only the best candidates were able to present more complex ideas clearly and effectively (Criterion B).

Some candidates registered at HL were native or near-native speakers of Norwegian. Such candidates should be placed in a more challenging course.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should guide the candidates towards presenting their chosen photograph / topic in a way that can be presented clearly within 3 to 4 minutes. Teachers should also be aware that the entire individual oral should take no more than 10 minutes.

Teachers should continue to ensure that the photographs used for the individual oral allow the candidates to describe a scene or a situation and to offer a personal interpretation, and; enable the teacher to lead the candidate into a wider conversation. The caption of the photograph can be of great help to candidates when focusing their presentation, and should thus be given some consideration by the teacher.

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

There was a wide variety in the range of work submitted, but most of the scripts were suitable. Many candidates had chosen to use the written assignment to write a letter to / from the protagonist(s) in the works studied. Writing a diary for one of the main characters was also a popular option.

Some of the candidates with a near-native command of Norwegian should have been advised to take Norwegian A instead of Norwegian B.

Candidate performance against each criterion

A: Language

Most candidates managed to write the minimum number of words. A great number of candidates showed effective command of the language, with a range of vocabulary used accurately, and with minor mistakes only. The weaker candidates had more problems with sentence structure, and their scripts contained some rather basic language errors.

B: Content

In many scripts there was good use of the literary work, but in some cases the connection with the original work was rather vague, especially if candidates chose to add a lot of new information which did not have any clear link to the literary work. Candidates may present invented details in their task, provided these details show understanding of the original work, and are justified in the rationale. In the absence of this, the task will not score highly against Criterion B.

Some candidates also failed to score well on this criterion as they chose to only re-tell the main essence of the literary work. This was the case for some candidates who chose to write a letter or a diary entry in which they merely explained what had happened previously in the literary work.

Many scripts were well-organized, presenting a coherent sequence of ideas with appropriate paragraphing. Some, on the other hand, were written as one big paragraph, which is rarely recommended, and suffered from bad organization and poor development of ideas. It is advised that candidates make an outline of the task before starting to write, in order to ensure that the ideas are developed well and in a coherent manner.

C: Format

Most text types were recognizable in the scripts, to greater or lesser extent. Candidates should however be made aware that certain text types, such as a diary or a letter, require more than a “Dear diary” opening to be recognizable as said text type. There were some instances of candidates using a text type without being able to express in the rationale which kind of rhetorical devices / register / audience awareness they had applied in order to comply with the conventions appropriate to the text type, and in what way these were suited to the aims they tried to achieve.

Most candidates did not exceed the maximum word count of 600 words. Candidates should be reminded, however, that it is extremely important to adhere to the word count requirements as examiners are instructed to stop reading once this has been reached. As a consequence, text type conventions used after this point (for example closing of a letter, ending to a speech) cannot be taken into consideration in the award of marks in this criterion.

D: Rationale

There was a certain variety regarding how candidates expressed themselves in the rationale. Most candidates explained which text type they had chosen and what their aim was for their script. Some did not, however, give any information which indicated how they had tried to achieve the aims (use of register, tone, rhetorical devices, for example) nor which aspects of the literary work they found to be relevant for the task. In order to score the maximum 3 marks here, the candidates need to state the aims and give some indication of how these have been achieved, as well as give a brief mention of the aspects of the literary work that are relevant to the task. Teachers are asked to remind candidates that if any of these points are left out, they will not score the highest mark for rationale.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates need to know which rhetorical devices and register apply to the various text types and purposes, and how a message can be expressed differently through different text types. Teachers should continue to work with candidates on the interpretation of literary works, as well as the production of creative texts.

Teachers should make candidates aware that a mere re-telling of the plot should be avoided, even if the candidate writes it from a different angle or another character’s point of view. Also, candidates need to be reminded that if they invent details in their task – which they are perfectly allowed to do – they need to justify this in the rationale. Invented details should also reflect their understanding of the original work.

Teachers are encouraged to continue practicing writing rationales with candidates so that they become accustomed to it, and to make candidates aware what constitutes a good rationale and to make them more conscious of the aims they are trying to fulfil.

Finally, teachers should continue to familiarize candidates with the assessment criteria and make sure they have a thorough understanding of the aims of this assignment.

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

The source texts provided were in general suitable for the assignment, and there was a good variety of source texts used between the centres. The source texts were clearly linked to one of the core topics and online sources were provided, where applicable.

The range of work submitted was huge, but most of the scripts were suitable.

Candidate performance against each criterion

A: Language

Most candidates managed to write the minimum number of words. A great number of candidates showed effective command of the language, with a range of vocabulary used accurately. For some of the weaker candidates, however, many basic errors were found in the scripts. The weaker candidates also had more problems with sentence structure.

B: Content

For the most part, there was a clear link between the sources and the script produced by the candidates. For candidates to score the highest marks for this criterion, however, it is worth remembering that the candidate must use the sources effectively and also fulfil the aims stated in the rationale. Some scripts did suffer from bad organization and poor development of ideas, even though the sources were used well. It is recommended that candidates make an outline of the script before starting to write, in order to ensure that the ideas are developed well and in a coherent manner.

C: Format

Most text types were recognizable in the scripts. Candidates should, however, be made aware that certain text types, such as a diary or a blog entry, require more than a "Dear diary" opening to be recognized as said text type. There were some instances of candidates using a text type without being able to express in the rationale which rhetorical devices they had applied in order to comply

with the conventions appropriate to the text type, and in what way these were suited to the aims they tried to achieve.

D: Rationale

There was a big variety regarding how candidates expressed themselves in the rationale. In order to score the maximum mark here, the candidates need to link the rationale directly to the sources - this point was overlooked by some candidates. Teachers are asked to remind candidates that they should do three things in their rationales: introduce the assignment, state their aim(s) and how their aim(s) have been achieved. If any of these points are left out, the candidates will not score the highest mark for rationale.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates need to know which rhetorical devices and register apply to the various text types and purposes, and how a message can be expressed differently through different text types. Teachers should continue to work with candidates on the interpretation of various text types, as well as the production of them.

Candidates need to be able to express three things in the rationale. Teachers therefore need to practice writing rationales with candidates so that they become accustomed to it. It would also be useful to discuss the aim of different texts with candidates in class and how these aims are achieved through the text. It would be helpful if candidates were challenged to consider whether their chosen text type is the best way through which to express their aim with the text, before the text is written.

Finally, teachers should continue to familiarize candidates with the assessment criteria and make sure they have a thorough understanding of the aims of this assignment.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 39	40 - 47	48 - 54	55 - 60

General comments

The responses to the questions in this paper varied, but in general there were some excellent marks. On the whole, candidates handled the pure comprehension questions very well, but weaknesses were more apparent in questions testing other skills.

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

On the whole, there were no particular areas that proved difficult for candidates, although questions asking for idiomatic expressions, such as Q29, and questions on the literary text (Text E) which dealt with literary ambiguity, (such as Q47, Q52 and Q53) proved difficult for some candidates.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

This varied considerably with some excellent candidates and some weaker ones, but in general, candidates seemed to be stronger on scanning text for details than understanding structural features. The overall level of comprehension skills and text understanding was good.

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

Most candidates performed best on Text A, which is as expected as Text A is the easiest of the four texts. Questions set on Text A involved scanning the text for details, as well as a gap-fill exercise towards the end.

Text B was the Nynorsk text and most candidates also tackled this text very well.

Text C proved a bit harder for some candidates, partly because it asked candidates to pick the correct sentences among of list of sentences that were intentionally quite similar, thus requiring a certain language level of candidates, and partly because the second set of questions to Text C required candidates to read the text closely, in more detail, than in Text A, for example.

In Text D most candidates were able to place the headings correctly in Q33-36, but some had some difficulty with the matching exercise in Q37-40.

Text E was the literary text. In Q46 some candidates wrote sentences including the word “see” instead of writing synonyms of the word “see”, as the task asked for. Q47, Q52, Q53 proved to be quite difficult for some candidates, which is understandable as these questions ask candidates to identify specific content items which also requires an overall understanding of the text.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is recommended that more emphasis is put on handling literary texts with ambiguities, so that candidates become more familiar with this type of close reading.

Although the Nynorsk text was handled well this session, it is still recommended that teachers continue to give candidates plenty of practice in reading and understanding Nynorsk texts.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Mark range: 0 - 6 7 - 13 14 - 19 20 - 26 27 - 35 36 - 41 42 - 45

General comments

The responses to the questions in this paper varied, but in general there were some very good marks. On the whole, candidates handled the pure comprehension questions very well, but weaknesses were more apparent in questions testing other skills, such as True/False with Justification and finding words from the text.

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

Some candidates had problems in handling the True/False with Justification question, failing to provide the exact and/or complete justification. Some ticked the correct box but provided incorrect details, while others ticked the correct box and wrote the justification but with essential parts missing. Candidates are to be reminded that both the correct tick and the brief, and precise, quotation must be provided to attain the mark.

Another problematic area this session was identifying the correct words or phrases from the text, for example in Q42, where E was chosen by some candidates instead of the correct answer D. Finding the correct information in the text was generally handled well this session, apart from Q32, which proved difficult for many candidates, as they tended to copy from the original text without including the words necessary to show understanding of the text.

Handling references was something many candidates did well in Q25 and Q26, while the same exercise proved more difficult in Q18 and Q20. Some difficulties in matching and gap-fill questions were also noted, particularly in Q28 and Q38.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

This varied considerably with some excellent performance and some weaker ones, but in general, candidates seemed to be stronger on scanning text for details than explaining structural features. The overall level of comprehension skills and text understanding was good and there seemed to be a high level of coherence between the scores achieved across all texts, with some exceptions, however.

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

In general, the more able candidates seemed to tackle all texts equally well, while the weaker candidates seemed to perform better in Text A, which is not surprising as it is the easiest text. Q32 was one question where many candidates failed to get a mark, as they chose to quote lines from the text instead of answering the question. Q21-24 proved difficult for some candidate, as they either did not tick the correct box, or failed to give a relevant quotation from the text.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Close reading of texts is one thing the candidates might profit from. Further instruction as well as giving instruction and practice on organizing their time in an examination context is also recommended. The Nynorsk text (Text B) was handled well this session, but it is still recommended that teachers continue to give candidates plenty of practice in reading and understanding Nynorsk texts.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 13	14 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 45

General comments

The wide variety of tasks appeared to have allowed all candidates to find a topic that they felt comfortable with. In Section A, Task 1 was the most popular, with Task 3 and Task 5 in shared second. Tasks 4 and 2 were selected by almost equal numbers of candidates. All candidates wrote the required number of words in Section A. There was a big variety in performance levels, bigger here than in Paper 1.

In Section B, there was a variety of responses to the stimulus text. Most candidates were able to give a personal response to and/or reflection on the topic, and some did so in a well-structured and coherent manner. Two-thirds of the candidates did not attempt any particular text types nor specify which text type they were writing (nor are they required to do so). Of the one-third of the candidates who did specify a text type, the most common was a blog entry or a letter (personal, letter to the editor, e-mail), but text types such as speech and article were also used. Although candidates are not expected to produce any particular text type (there are no marks available for this), this may still be helpful for them in organizing their ideas and delivering the message successfully.

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

The strongest candidates did not have any difficulties with any areas. Weaker candidates, however, often had problems communicating clearly because of their lack of language, and sometimes because of lack of knowledge regarding the requirements of a text type. Most candidates were able to communicate the message in their response well or fairly well.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

All candidates understood the tasks and provided relevant responses, but the level varied widely from excellent to poor. Generally all candidates answered using register appropriate for the task selected, yet conventions appropriate to the text type were sometimes limited even if command of the language was good and message communicated well.

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

Section A:

Task 1 asked candidates to give their opinion on whether Norwegian would be an extinct language in the future, and many candidates argued their case well, using effective arguments.

Task 2 was to write an interview with co-students for a school paper. Some of the interviews were closer to being “transcriptions” of a conversation rather than an interview, but since interview is a genre with certain variations, this was taken into consideration when marking this task also.

Task 3 asked candidates to design a brochure for co-students to help them avoid stress. Most candidates were good at organizing the brochure into clear arguments, often in bullet point, and gave sound advice in a structured manner. Some candidates did become a bit too personal for the text type, but in general the responses were good.

Task 4 was to write an article about how young people identify themselves with fantasy worlds from films. Some of the articles did veer a bit off-topic, but others managed to give a balanced view on the topic.

Task 5 invited candidates to give a speech to the school leaders regarding the use of internet sources. Most candidates who chose this task clearly had strong opinions on the topic and were able to give their argument in a formal and coherent manner, resulting in some very good speeches.

Section B:

Most candidates managed to write the required minimum amount of words. In general, candidates expressed their thoughts and ideas related to the stimulus text, yet the way the argument was structured varied a great deal, and some were not always clear. As mentioned above, some candidates wrote clearly which text type they attempted to write, others opted for more of an unspecified “statement”. In either case, the way the argument is structured is important for Criterion B, and some candidates would benefit from having planned their argument more clearly before starting to write.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Continue to practise writing skills in class, including spelling. The most common error in the texts appeared to be the use (or non-use) of inversion of verb-subject (“I morgen skal jeg” instead of “I morgen jeg skal”), as well as errors related to the gender of nouns and verb tenses. These are elements that would be advisable to work on in class.

Give plenty of practice producing language using different registers, from formal to informal. Practice writing different text types, and make candidates conscious of the conventions of different text types. For Section B, practice organizing the argument of the response.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was good. In terms of take up of questions, Task 5 was by far the most popular, being chosen by over 60% of the candidates. Tasks 2 and 3 were each chosen by 15% of the candidates, while tasks 4 and 1 were the least popular tasks in this session.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Many candidates showed good and even very good language skills. However, weaker candidates tended to have a lot of basic language errors as well as a less visible development in their texts. Often these errors were basic, even though the language was fluent and varied. They also showed difficulties keeping focused on their issue as well as on the text type the task asked for, and the argumentation was not always clear.

A good few of the basic language errors (verb tenses, verb forms, inversion) were errors that might have been avoided had the candidates set aside time to proof read their texts before the end of the examination.

The candidates' enthusiasm was clear in many answers, particularly for tasks 2 and 5, but in a few of them they became too enthusiastic about the stories they were presenting that their control over language accuracy faltered.

Most candidates met the word limit of 250 words, but not all, for which a penalty of one mark was applied to criterion A. In all doubtful cases the words are actually counted, and so candidates must make sure that they do not fall short of the limit by a few words.

Some tasks ask for a number of elements to be covered, such as in Task 3 which asked for arguing both 'for' and 'against' getting a tattoo. In such cases candidates must cover both areas in order to receive the highest marks under Criterion B.

In weaker scripts there was no logical step-by step development, which is something that is required in all the tasks. Paragraphing is one of the key ways in which to structure a response. While some candidates wrote texts that clearly divided into paragraphs, some candidates did not divide their answers into paragraphs at all.

In most answers the text type was recognisable, and most candidates used the appropriate register and the relevant style and tone. Candidates appeared to have found this the easiest to achieve in less formal contexts such as the e-mail in task 5, but also with the semi-formal context of a speech in task 2.

The best candidates were at ease with the text type and also used effective rhetorical devices. Some candidates seemed unaware that any particular text type was required and produced a neutral text that might serve as an essay or an opinion column, particularly in tasks 3 and 4. Weaker candidates must consciously choose a text type and then use the format, register and style associated with it.

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

Task 1 was chosen by only one candidate.

Task 2 format required (speech) was clearly observed by most candidates, and the topic seemed to engage them, as many good arguments were produced either for or against the introduction of school uniforms.

Task 3 format required (essay) did prove problematic for some of the candidates, which resulted in texts looking more like an opinion column rather than an essay. Some candidates also failed to provide a balanced opinion on the topic, even though it was clearly expressed in the question that the essay should contain arguments both for and against getting a tattoo.

Task 4 format (article), in some cases worked very well, while other responses lacked a clear development, making the text more of a list of thoughts rather than an article.

Task 5 was by far the most popular task. Clearly, the topic is one the candidates felt familiar with (use of social media) and most were able to write a response adhering to the format required (e-mail). Measures taken to ensure the text complied with the format included both visual ones (introducing an e-mail-looking headline, including "Subject" and "Sender", for instance) as well as adapting an informal register.

It seemed that the tasks where candidates were to address a clear recipient (task 2 and 5) were more successful in terms of format, while in texts where candidates were to write to an unknown recipient, the format was sometimes less clear.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It is recommended that candidates read the question at least twice, underlining or highlighting essential aspects that must be covered, and then read the question again half way through the examination to ensure they are a) producing the text type convincingly and b) dealing with all required parts of the task.
- It is also recommended that teachers make candidates aware of their most common errors in due time before the exams, so that they can keep an eye out for these kinds of errors when proof reading the texts. This should eliminate unnecessary language errors which would affect the marks awarded for Criterion A.
- Candidates should use the format and register demanded by the text type and task, but beyond this, they should consider whether it is effective for the situation indicated by the question. This should help the candidates achieve the appropriate format, style and also the rhetoric that is required.

- Candidates should be taught how to organise their work effectively and to use paragraphing through regular practice in class.