

May 2016 subject reports

Literature and Performance

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-13	14-28	29-43	44-56	57-71	72-83	84-100

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-7	8-15	16-22	23-26	27-31	32-35	36-40

The range and suitability of the work submitted

As usual, a wide variety of sources were used to form the basis and inspiration for this component.

More successful schools are choosing texts that have, above all, theatrical potential. They also, however, are texts that are rich in literary features which allow not only for strong performance ideas, but also lend themselves to discussion and analysis in Criterion E. The genre and style of these vary a great deal. Writers that lent themselves to successful performance this year included: Gogol, Salinger, Lawrence, Hardy and Murakami. Tim Winton, TS Eliot, and Chekov provided opportunities for tension and humour, while literature with a Gothic element naturally lent itself to theatricality. There were also some brave choices that lent themselves to strong pieces, including Neil Hilborn and Syrian poet, Nizar Qabbani.

Texts that offer a strong narrative (such as narrative poems) can be misleading rather than helpful, as the performance can then be driven by the narrative entirely, without developing into interpretation. This task is not a suitable platform for such an approach which can leave the audience bewildered. Novels are often a risk in this regard.

Fairy tales are becoming increasingly problematic in this task. In some ways, they seem an obvious choice, with narrative structure, often strong themes and morals, elements from oral story-telling that seem appropriate. The problem is that, this year, they were often presented in a simplistic manner or transformed into a modern version that fails to draw on the literary features of the original text.

The length of performances continued to be problematic. Performances that are too short allow a marker insufficient time to assess each student fairly (the Guide suggests 5 minutes per candidate) and performances that are too long invariably lack dramatic tension.

Orals that are too short tend to be self-penalising. The unfortunate tendency to allow students to read orals aloud persists. This should be guarded against and is explicitly not allowed in the Guide.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Stronger schools are successful for a variety of reasons. However, good performance begins with strong understanding of the original literature and, if this is not present, it is almost impossible to achieve a performance of any genuine meaning. Stronger performances exhibited this understanding through the way the original literature was clearly present in the final performance. This does not mean a literal performance, but it does mean the clear and recognisable presence of elements of the original. These may include elements of the plot or characters of the original, but may equally include ideas, themes, and specific literary features (such as imagery, use of sound features and patterns, interpretation of metaphors, use of repetition).

Stronger performances showed a clear awareness of the audience and of the theatricality of the piece. This often manifested itself in something that was clearly entertaining and engaging to watch. Stronger individual performances made use of physicality in performance, not just scripted words. This was often extended within a group to strong ensemble work. There was also a concurrent awareness of their relationship (both individual and as a group) with the space in which they were performing. It is this aspect of physicality that often separates the outstanding pieces from the very good.

The influence of professional theatre companies that specialise in devising is becoming obvious in the work of some schools. This is particularly evident in aspects such as: transforming set pieces and props; snapping in and out of role; use of proxemics; achieving common focus to create significance. These features often lead to successful performance. However, schools should guard against allowing this influence to overwhelm the creative instincts of students as working through any sort of formula may detract from originality. This task allows for breadth of creativity – let the students experiment. At the other end of the scale, some schools show no evidence at all of influence from theatre practice. Candidates may set up genuine relationships with the audience that are negotiated through common ownership of the text as it is conveyed by the candidates in their pieces. There is an honesty in this work but a danger of it seeming too naïve. It often appears to have been influenced by one type of theatre (often musicals) or

to be inappropriately influenced by film. Students then find themselves under pressure to live up to a realism in performance that is extremely difficult to achieve and seldom effective.

Weaker performances were often characterised by a lack of the ability to lose a sense of self, so that the performer appeared in the performance simply as themselves. This was often especially clear in the way they moved, and the way they interacted. The students were often painfully self-conscious and the illusion of theatre became impossible.

Weaker performances were often very literal translations of the text into performance and showed very little interpretation. They were almost like hastily thrown together skits. It should always be remembered that the purpose of this task is to transform the text, not stage it.

A note on technical aspects. This is not a requirement of the performance and a poor performance will not be compensated for in marking by fancy technical moments. However, stronger performances were supported by the use of some simple staging ideas. For example, having a clearly designated 'stage' area that was in some way contained helped to create tension and maintain focus. Removing unnecessary items from view and having a clear space around the acting area removed distractions. Keeping costume simple was also helpful, so that the physical movements of performers were clearer. Making sure that students were tidy and that hair is tied up is a simple thing that allows the performer themselves to stay in character.

Criterion B

This criterion is very difficult for the moderator to assess and there is a strong reliance on the teacher to be honest and professional in this regard. However, a lack of commitment in the final performance is highly unlikely to have arisen from commitment during the process and this is likely to be penalised.

Criterion C

Stronger candidates spoke fluently in their oral, both in the sense that the oral was structured well and in their own use of language. Well-structured orals follow a number of different formats but are generally characterised by a sense of purpose and a good pace. They are also evidently planned. The language used is of a suitable quality for an IB student and the register is appropriately academic. Sentence structure is clear and, again, purposeful, but still follows the pattern of oral (not written) communication. Stronger students used appropriate and accurate vocabulary to discuss not only the theatrical elements of their performance but also the literary features of the original text.

Overblown or pompous language is less effective as it simply does not communicate effectively.

Some candidates had a tendency to be colloquial which, although it probably won't garner them top marks, can still be effective if used clearly.

The weakest candidates had obviously not prepared and tried to 'ad lib' their way through the oral, which resulted in poor communication and a rambling structure. They also tended to be distractingly colloquial. It is not appropriate to ask questions to prompt responses in this task; it would be expected that a teacher would only resort to this in extreme circumstances.

A note on preparation for the orals is needed here. Students are encouraged and even expected to prepare for this oral and should receive guidance from their teachers during this process. However, the task is not to prepare an essay on the performance and then read it aloud. Where this was obvious this year, students have been penalised in this criterion. It is entirely against the spirit of the task and teachers are urged neither to encourage nor collaborate in this practice in future.

Criterion D

This is the criterion that many students find the most difficult.

Stronger students reflect honestly on their performance, noting areas in which they feel – dispassionately – that they have succeeded in their personal aims. They also reflect on what they have not achieved, both in terms of not matching original ideas and in terms of what they now notice retrospectively that they might have done. In addition, they reflect not only on their performance but also on the transformation of the original text, showing links clearly. This is important for the external moderator as it helps to make aspects of the performance clear.

Suitable vocabulary can be extremely helpful here; having a grasp of the right terminology, both theatrical and literary, really helps stronger students to convey their ideas and thoughts accurately and succinctly.

Weaker students fall into two categories. The first are those students who simply do not recognise the standard required in this task and therefore think they have done well when they have not. The second are those who do not have the tools to express exactly what has gone wrong or who simply ignore this criteria. There is also another group who blame other students or circumstances for their own lack of effort and this should really be discouraged and reflected in the mark for Criterion B. Students should avoid anecdotal discussion of the process and rather try to be genuinely analytical.

Criterion E

Strong candidates were able to recognise and discuss with insight both aspects of this criterion. Firstly, their knowledge of the original was demonstrably excellent. This was shown by discussion of the literary features that was detailed and analytical, and showed excellent understanding of how these features fit in with the whole text and the themes and ideas that dominate it. The subject guide clearly states “literary features” and the better candidates engaged directly with these features. Secondly, stronger candidates were also able to provide a rationale for the transformation of these features into the performance and were able to make the links between the original text and the performance explicitly, and with detailed and thoughtful insight. The strongest candidates in this criterion showed a strong personal engagement with both text and task, and there is a clear originality about their presentation that suggests a profound insight into the literature.

Good candidates may present one or the other of the two aspects of the criterion more strongly, while slightly neglecting the other. For instance, some were able to discuss with clarity and perception the literature, but seemed unclear as to how that understanding had been transformed into performance, or vice versa. Also, sometimes good candidates may list the

literary features, giving good examples, without actually exploring them. It is then harder to cogently put forward a rationale.

Weaker candidates mostly did little of either. Their presentations often consisted of a step-by-step narrative description of how the performance arose, which is not the same thing as discussion. In this category, students often showed no or little understanding of what a literary feature actually is, which obviously limited them. As their performances were often literal presentations of the text, it was difficult to provide a suitable rationale beyond the obvious. Presentations in this category were often very short so there was a limited amount of time to discuss any details.

This criterion is worth double that of any other in the oral and this should be reflected in the time spent on literary features in the oral.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The role of the teacher in this task is subtle. The need for guidance and assistance will vary from group to group, but teachers should at no stage become directors of the performances. Where a similar scene is repeatedly used by a school, and given a similar treatment, it leads to formulaic and often uninteresting work.

The key is in the choice of literature; challenging, well-written and thought-provoking literature often leads to good work. Also, literature that has some connection personally to students often leads to sincere and meaningful work that lends itself to good theatre. Perhaps this is the problem with fairy tales – they are often familiar without any longer having a strong meaning to students; they need a very subtle and sophisticated approach which is often not within the sphere of experience of students of this age.

Allow time for this component and allow students to experiment and try various approaches. Leave as much as possible to the students and intervene when necessary.

While it is the performance of the students that is assessed, technical elements can give students confidence and help them to achieve the level of performance to which they aspire. It should not, however, take over the performance but should simply support it. Students must learn to use these aspects appropriately – such as getting into the focus of the light. The key is to keep things as simple as possible.

Teachers are urged to read the Guide with care and also to read this and previous Subject Reports before embarking on this task.

Exposing students to appropriate theatrical and literary terminology and encouraging them to use it as early as possible can be very helpful for the oral – and other parts of this course.

Finally, make sure that students are exposed to theatre as much as possible. It is a big expectation to hope that a student who has never seen performance will be able to perform to a high level. While it is fully understandable that live performance can be

expensive and perhaps even unavailable, there is a huge amount of useful material around. There are affordable live cinema transmissions of performances and many free things available on the internet.

Further comments

Teachers are urged to facilitate performance rather than directing. It can be disconcerting as a moderator to see not only a similar performance but even identical choreographic elements to a piece seen two years ago!

Teachers are also reminded that the task must be a piece of theatre and should be filmed very simply – the Guide is clear on this. Performances that look like films, with cameras following through a building, are totally inappropriate to this task.

Standard level Written Assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-2	3-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The range of texts used and the suitability of the work submitted were respectively wide and appropriate. Shakespeare continues to be the most popular choice for this assessment task with work on Othello, Hamlet, Pericles, The Tempest, Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet and The Merchant of Venice. Other authors included Williams, Miller, Wilde, and Synge.

Candidates appear to have understood the specific requirements of the task and some of the work was of a high quality, arguably the best collective performance to date for this assessment component.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A:

The candidates generally responded to the demands of this criterion well. Shakespeare, given the figurative language and the iambic pentameter, really offers candidates many opportunities to focus on literary features. The more effective responses were written by candidates who were careful to connect their analysis of aspects of the speech to the dramatic choices they made as actors. This connection is the essence of the task. Alternatively those candidates who were focusing on a scene as opposed to individual speeches were liable to write effective responses if they pinpointed those parts of the text which demanded to be addressed by the

actor (s). The precise use of critical terminology is important to Criterion A though there is an overlap here with Criterion C. In general candidates were more adept at literary criticism than they were at performance analysis and certainly more able to go into the critical specifics of a passage with more confidence than in describing the specifics of a physical action.

Criterion B:

Candidates still describe acting in general terms and too often they appear to work from the assumption that acting involves movement of arms or changing expressions of the face. Acting demands that the whole body comes into play and speaking demands that the full range of the voice is available. Whether through cultural conditioning, self-consciousness, or naivety, assumptions are made about acting and speaking that diminish the range of reference drastically.

Candidates should be more aware of themselves as actors and should not be reluctant to examine the motors for expression that move them physically. Those candidates who found the precise terminology to be specific about this scored highly.

Many candidates see the action that follows the analysis in generic or general terms and so their descriptions of this are evasive and limited. There is an exaggerated respect displayed. The analysis of performance should aim to capture the visceral nature of the theatre. When dealing with plays like Othello the candidate is looking to register traumatic shifts in identity, sexual threat and uncertainty, open violence, intense repression. To find a language for this through the physical action is what is most thrilling about this exercise. To find words to describe that action so as to convey its intensity is what makes this criterion such a challenging one to address.

Criterion C:

The responses were usually well written though as mentioned above specific issues require attention. The structure of the work could be simply enhanced by candidates being more careful in their introduction to it. Tell the examiner what you are doing: what character are you working on and what speech or speeches are you playing out?

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There is a growing tendency to impose an external interpretation on the play or rather to see it through the filter of a theory. Once a candidate begins to extrapolate character from the text so that he/she typifies forces or elements beyond the text there is a danger that the theory takes over the interpretation so that what is being acted out is not a passage from a play but a theory about what that passage may be taken to mean. In the same way practitioner theory can be an unnecessary element in the acting out of a character in a play. The Stanislavski system is really not important to the way a student encounters a play text. All the task asks is that the student studies the play subjects it to literary analysis and chooses a passage to direct or a speech or speeches to act out, examining the relationship between the two. There is no need to introduce any practitioner theory into this relationship

It is appropriate to trace a character's development through an extended section of a play by focusing on a succession of shorter speeches or alternatively to look at an extended speech. It is often the case that in looking at the character under focus another character or characters requires commentary, again that is fine but be sure to maintain the primary focus on your character.

If you have selected a scene to focus on try and ensure that your intentions as an actor are clear to the examiner. It is difficult to assess work that is simply randomly focused on an action to no underlying purpose.

Always ensure that you *locate* the examiner in your stage space. Movement matters and of course proxemics need to be carefully traced but there are always parameters in staging and you as an actor need to be aware of what kinds of limitations your staging space imposes.

Never forget that this is being done to establish and convey meaning for an audience so be continually aware *of your position in relation to them*.

Keep reference to technical or design aspects to a practical minimum. This is about your encounter with the language of the text and what you make of it as a performer.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-13	14-16	17-20

General comments

General comments: The performance of candidates in this paper is beginning to be compromised by the pitfalls attending an assessment task, the response to which is governed by general questions which can be shaped quite easily to prepared responses. The fact that the assessment task allows the candidates to use their texts in the exam and the undoubted fact that some teachers are explicitly teaching to the task has created a situation where candidates seem to be unconsciously replicating responses. This issue becomes more apparent in the work of centres who repeat the same text from year to year with the unfortunate consequence that their candidates use the same descriptors to introduce it, write similar analyses of character and plot and respond in very similar ways to the questions on the exam paper because the same passages are drawn on for staging purposes. It is a great pity to see how teaching can sometimes (unknowingly) actually diminish the imagination of the student and compromise the work they produce. What is even more disappointing is that this recourse is often identified in the work of talented candidates who presumably would not discover exactly the same insights as their colleagues if they were encouraged to move outside the same handful of passages.

The observations above might be taken as standing caveats for what follows: before proceeding, the examining team would urge teachers to be adventurous enough not to repeat the same text year by year, and would further urge teachers to encourage their students to vary their choices of passage and to explore the literature with intellectual curiosity and open minded approaches. The spirit of the learner profile and the recommendations for academic honesty expect nothing less. That written, it should be stressed that examiners mark on merit and have certainly not transferred their concerns about these tendencies into their assessment of the responses.

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

Some thought needs to go into the selection of texts since some texts might be more limited for potential adaptation than others. Collections of short stories are not novels and so works like Joyce's "Dubliners" should not be used. Novellas like: Kafka's "Metamorphosis" should not be used.

The assessment exercise is not to "transform" the text but to "adapt" the text to another genre (Drama) by staging it. The transformation exercise is confined to the performance exercise assessed by the teacher and moderated by the examiner (internal coursework).

Candidates sometimes found it difficult to "practically" adapt the passage to the stage. "Special effects" of a cinematic nature are usually not convincing on stage and rarely communicate much about the text. Candidates should look for simple practical solutions to staging problems and they should be very wary of proposing any technical effect they cannot visualize. This is particularly true of lighting. If somebody could tell me what "grey lighting" actually looks like this examiner may have a better chance of crediting such a proposal.

The structuring of the response continues to challenge some candidates. If candidates follow the principle that the process of literary analysis must be connected to the staging so that the one follows the other then much of the structural issue would be resolved. The candidate is practically implementing what the analysis has established about the text, analysis is therefore selective. The candidate is concerned to analyse what is to be staged so that the staging represents the comprehensive meaning of the passage as far as possible.

Candidates need to make more of their opening paragraph which can locate them in relation to the question, the passage they select to address it and the stage space they intend to use to do so.

Candidates are not obliged to adapt the work of theatre practitioners to the staging exercise. Some of the weakest responses were aiming to replicate staging ideas from Brecht or Artaud generally at the expense of the individual and creative ideas of the candidate. This is a mistake. This exercise should be completed by the candidate; the mediation between text and performance is legitimized and validated by the imaginative and reflective work of the candidate not by mandated elements of epic theatre or the theatre of cruelty.

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

The examination team have been impressed by the detailed knowledge some candidates clearly had of the text selected. This was often reflected by very comprehensive accounts of the passage and its context.

The use of the terminology of literary criticism and performance was often used to a sophisticated level. If the candidate managed to do this and avoid the temptation to light fires on stage, cut down trees, use live rabbits or try and bring life size models of whales into the action then they generally did well.

There is a growing tendency to employ technical elements in staging the text and when this is done carefully and precisely it is a strength resulting in some very well argued responses. Much literature is highly atmospheric and questions can focus on mood or setting. There is a terminology associated with sound and lighting and indeed all production effects which the candidates should make it their business to be familiar with so that “dim lighting” or “dark lighting” or even “bright lighting” can be replaced by more appropriate descriptive terminology.

The best work was thought provoking and original and this invariably involved a candidate’s relationship to the text, its careful interrogation which resulted in some imaginative and creative staging plans.

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

This was a popular question since it lends itself to the “selected passage” treatment. It also gave candidates a lot of flexibility which many took great advantage of to make the very most of the passage. The importance of context to the question was missed by many candidates who decided to disregard the word “pivotal” to their cost. Claims needed to be made for the passage in relation to the novel as a whole and these claims were not always made. In treatments of “The Great Gatsby”, a perennial favourite, some candidates were clearly influenced by the latest film production and their work was far from original. It might be an idea to stay away from novels that have recently been subject to beguiling cinematic adaptations.

The introduction to the word “mood” into a question on this paper is an open invitation for candidates to find ever more elaborate ways of confusing the examiner with complicated lighting and sound effects. Just keep it simple, know what you are trying to convey and make sure you have the terminology and the precision in your plans to convey it sensibly is this examiner’s advice. The specific injunction to look for suspense made this question a slightly more specialized one than the first. It was the second favourite and was often done quite well with candidates being able to place a structure around the process by which an author creates suspense, increases it to a pitch with a resulting climactic or anti-climactic resolution. Some candidates were skilful in measuring their response to this proportionate approach.

The last question on fantasy or dream was an invitation to imagine which the majority declined. This was definitely the question fewest attempted but for those intrepid pioneers who did there

were some rich pickings. As is often the case the least popular question drew some very interesting responses. Work by Rushdie and Marquez with their magic realist tendencies elicited some brave and electrifying responses from candidates. Again some responses were compromised by exaggerated attempts to stage the unstageable.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Aim for practical and simple solutions to staging challenges.
- Prepare for this exercise not by selecting likely passages and adopting formulaic responses but by entering into the imaginative life of the novel and exploring it on your own terms. The standardized response is the least interesting, especially if it is shared by half of your class.
- Analyse to stage.
- Use your first paragraph wisely.
- Be precise in how you direct the technical aspects of your staging.
- Do not use practitioner work. There is no need to and it will only complicate your work. No reason why you should not be aware of different practitioner led solutions to communication or staging but do not impose a “style” to a staging that is not engendered by your own responses.
- Stay away from cinematic adaptations.
- Study the whole text as a *novel* before you begin to consider how you might adapt it to the stage.
- Really aim to use the precise terminology that is particular to the genre you are addressing.
- Value your own ideas.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-2	3-5	6-9	10-12	13-16	17-19	20-25

General comments

This year’s candidature appears to have been much more clearly informed of the demands of the criteria, attending, in many cases, to all of them with equal emphasis. Practically all submissions addressed some aspect of the question and many of them gave sufficient attention to both poets under consideration. Often candidates revealed that not only had they studied the poetry carefully, but also conveyed some zest for the experience. The range of poets studied was similar to previous years, and perhaps some schools might want to vary their choices so as to explore whether they might improve their performance with a different selection.

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

The congruence between knowledge of the poets studied and the inclination or ability of the candidates to engage in close analysis was limited in some cases. Again this year, paraphrase and explication were substituted for needed close analysis. One recurrent weakness was a failure to respond to the actual question selected, with students bringing prior or practice responses to bear on a different examination question, not a successful strategy. Biographical materials sometimes occupied inordinate space in the essays.

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

Candidates knew their poems, and knew them well, in many cases. The teaching in this part of the course seems quite successful and candidates appreciative and knowledgeable. They were able to see where concerns and styles were different or similar. Choices of poets were varied but frequent selections were Duffy, Heaney, Larkin, and Wordsworth along with Oliver, Plath, and Bukowski.

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

Question 1 was fairly often chosen, and candidates were put to the test to see if they could connect the poems they had studied with some effect. Often the perception of something 'happening' as a result of the poems was one of potential effect rather than actuality, as candidates explored the address of class or race or injustice. This was certainly an acceptable course of action, and worked well with Heaney or Duffy or Whitman.

Question 2 left quite a lot of latitude for choosing a direction for response and candidates tended to be less successful in delivering a compelling argument than with some other questions. Here an answer really required attention to some particular word choices and candidates—and there were a fair number—who knew their poems very well, with lines from poems often memorized, were able to succeed with this question. Some candidates wrote successfully about semantic fields, which gave their response more coherence and depth.

Stanzas, in Question 3, attracted some candidates, although often the response was descriptive instead of showing the effect of choices the poets made about stanzaic patterns.

Questions 4 and 5 were the most popular choices. 'Emotion' clearly attracted many candidates. However, as is often the case with candidates reading questions in an examination situation, more than a few candidates failed to note the qualifier 'intense' and provided a wide-ranging survey of the presence of emotion in selected poems.

In responding to the idea that poems can deliver a poet's realization, (Question 5) candidates were well able, in many cases to show not only the presence of such a feature, but how the poem was constructed to convey that. Assistant examiners found this question elicited the most successful set of responses.

Although Question 6 did not attract a large number of candidates, there were some very good answers which either addressed an actual journey as in poems by Duffy or a personal journey of intellectual or emotional development.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates need to avoid assertive conjectures about what might be happening or what might be intended. Ambiguity is one of the rich features of poetic speech; instruction and practice about appreciating its role would help raise the level of discussion about its presence in poetry.
- Many candidates brought to the examination a rich portfolio of information and material for analysis of style. What they needed to do, however, was to be more selective, choosing material that was particularly relevant to the question. Many wrote essays that contained a good deal of information that was not truly connected to the terms of the question, clouding their line of argument.
- A weakness that needs to be discussed with candidates is too narrow an address of meaning in the whole poem, basing answers on one or two lines rather than a wider angle.
- Candidates would be advantaged by being able to identify and discuss the particular forms in which their poets have written: sonnets, odes, ballads and the like.
- If experience shows that a candidate's handwriting is extremely difficult to decipher, it might be best to ask for an exception allowing word processing. On the other hand, candidates using word processing need advice about organizing a pointed answer, not simply delivering every detail that comes to mind.
- Some better patterns of organization than one poet-one poem, then a second poet and poem, would enhance the coherence of the responses. But candidates will need some substantial practice with more sophisticated organizational patterns to be able to do that well in the examination.
- Overall the biggest need is to be sure that candidates understand that paraphrasing ('here the poet is saying...') and re-description of content have only limited value in an exercise like Paper 2. Clearly, some work needs to be done with distinguishing the various critical operations involved in these responses.