

## Norwegian A

### Overall grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	E	D	C	B	A
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-7	8-15	16-22	23-28	29-36

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

The essays submitted showed a good and impressive variety of topics and interesting research questions. The great majority of essays were Category 1 essays, with only a small number of Category 2 and 3 essays. A Category 1 essay must be based on text(s) originally written in Norwegian. Unfortunately some schools did not follow this regulation and let their candidates base essays on works translated from other languages. Such essays will have points deducted on criteria A, C, D, E and K. For all remaining criteria a full range of marks are possible.

A small number of essays focused too much on philosophical and/or social issues rather than dealing with the texts as literature.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A: research question

Almost all essays scored well on this criterion. The quality of the essay is of course very much dependent on the quality of the research question. Many of the supervisor's reports revealed that hammering out a suitable and interesting research question had been the most important part of the guiding process.

#### Criterion B: introduction

Almost all candidates produced a good introduction and most avoided unnecessary historical and biographical context.

### Criterion C: investigation

Some of the essays relied totally on Internet sources, but failed to evaluate the sources critically. Traditionally many of the extended essays are based on well-known classical works. Some of the most frequently used are typically Ibsen, Hamsun, Kielland, Skram, Sandel and Undset, in addition to contemporary authors like Borgen, Bjørneboe etc. Candidates basing their essay on works by these and similar authors could advantageously have drawn much more on the wealth of available secondary sources.

### Criterion D: knowledge and understanding of the topic studied

Many of the essays revealed an impressive understanding and often a personal engagement with the research.

### Criterion E: reasoned argument

A common mistake was spending far too much time on a summary of the texts instead of spending time on developing their own arguments.

### Criterion F: application of analytical and evaluative skills

Many of the best essays demonstrated very effective and sometimes even sophisticated analytical and evaluative skills.

### Criterion G: use of language appropriate to the subject:

It is worth reminding candidates that the correct use of language is also evaluated under this criterion.

### Criterion H: conclusion

Few of the candidates had problems with this criterion and produced conclusions that were relevant to their chosen research question.

### Criterion I: formal presentation

It is easy to score well on this criterion, but some candidates missed points for not paying attention to details, like missing content pages.

### Criterion J: abstract

Most of the candidates managed to score well against this criterion, but some lost points because they omitted a brief description of how the investigation was undertaken.

### Criterion K: holistic judgement

Many of the essays revealed real enthusiasm and excellent and impressive examples of intelligent and critical thinking.

## Recommendations for the supervision of future candidates

- Practice formulating research questions in class. More training in a critical approach to source material.

## Further comments

The time supervisors reported to have spent with the candidates varied from 0.5 hours to 5 hours, with the average time around 3.6 hours. Candidates/supervisors should mark clearly the category of the essays both on the cover sheet and the front page of the essays. Some supervisors chose not to write any comments, but they should be reminded that comments can be valuable for the examiner, particularly in the assessment of criterion K.