

## Danish 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

This session there were a lot of good essays submitted. The books chosen varied from the traditional and often-investigated, to the most modern. Emil Aarestrup, Hans Christian Andersen, Søren Kierkegaard, Herman Bang, Henrik Pontoppidan, J.P. Jacobsen, Karen Blixen, Benny Andersen, Michael Strunge, Søren Ulrik Thomsen, Helle Helle, Naja Marie Aidt, Jens Blendstrup, Erling Jepsen, Janne Teller, Yahya Hassan, and others were investigated by candidates this session.

Yahya Hassan is of contemporary interest at the moment, and popular with candidates. While a work however can be very popular and have a high amount of interest, candidates and their supervisors must ensure that in the pursuit of originality in their text selection, candidates do not select work that is so modern that scholarly criticism does not yet exist. There are assessment criteria that reward the careful source selection as a basis of research, and also in order to substantiate the candidate's reasoned argument. The lack of such sources sometimes impedes the ability to critically analyse a text in an academic way. Most of the works that were chosen were fiction. One candidate submitted a strong category 3 EE that investigated the Danish Queen's New Year's Speech, using new theories about media.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A: research question

The research questions were often appropriately phrased allowing for sufficient focus that was not too broad for the 4000 word task.

**Criterion B: introduction**

Often there were omissions in the introduction. The component parts of an introduction are referenced in the EE guide, and all should be present.

**Criterion C: investigation**

This criterion was often well-achieved, as it was in light of a focussed research question which made the investigation appropriate and sustained.

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

Normally the candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding, but there were exceptions to this. Knowledge and understanding cannot solely be demonstrated through synopses of works.

**Criterion E: reasoned argument**

An unfortunate number of candidates did not produce a reasoned argument. This was sometimes down to text selection and the lack of published criticism on some of the more modern texts selected.

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

Generally the texts studied by a candidate were able to be well analysed and evaluated in the body of the EE.

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

Most of the times the language was appropriate to the subject and was in keeping with terminology associated with literary and linguistic investigations.

**Criterion H: conclusion**

Normally the conclusions were adequate, but sometimes they were too vague. As with the introduction, what needs to appear in the conclusion is detailed in the EE guide, and all component parts must feature.

**Criterion I: formal presentation**

This criterion rarely posed a problem for candidates.

**Criterion J: abstract**

Many candidates were unable to understand the purpose of the abstract. For some it was a version of the introduction, and for some the conclusion. Writing an abstract is an academic requirement and its component parts are detailed in the EE guide.

**Criterion K: holistic judgement**

This criterion varied. Many supervisor comments were not detailed in a way that allowed the examiner to understand the process that the candidate had been through above and beyond what was evidenced in the body of the EE. The supervisor should use the wording of criterion K as a basis and template of what to mention in a supervisor report.

## Recommendations for the supervision of future candidates

- Candidates should be careful about writers that are modern and lack established literary and linguistic criticisms to support an investigation. The introduction, abstract and conclusion must all include the necessary component parts as detailed in the EE guide. Not doing so is self-penalising in the respective criteria.