

Literature in English

Singapore-Cambridge General Certificate of Education Ordinary Level (2020) (Syllabus 2065)

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
AIMS OF TEACHING SYLLABUS	2
ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES	2
SCHEME OF ASSESSMENT	3
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	4
PRESCRIBED TEXTS	6



AIMS OF TEACHING SYLLABUS

The aims of the syllabus are to:

- Ethical**
- raise awareness of timeless issues concerning society
 - promote the appreciation of multiple perspectives; and
 - build empathy and global awareness.
- Aesthetic**
- inculcate the habit of close reading
 - promote heightened appreciation of nuances of language; and
 - sensitise students to artistic decisions made by writers.
- Intellectual**
- cultivate metacognitive habits of mind as students pay attention to the impact of language on one's thoughts and feelings
 - develop greater acceptance for ambiguity and open-endedness; and
 - equip students with the skills to convince others of their interpretations, based on sound reasoning with evidence.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

Candidates will be assessed on their ability to:

- (i) demonstrate, through close analysis, knowledge of the literary texts studied
- (ii) respond with knowledge and understanding to literary texts from the genres of prose, poetry and drama
- (iii) demonstrate understanding of the ways in which writers' choices of form, structure and language shape meanings
- (iv) communicate a sensitive and informed personal response to what is read; and
- (v) express responses clearly and coherently, using textual evidence where appropriate.

The Assessment Objectives are inter-related. Candidates' responses will be assessed holistically on the attainment of these Assessment Objectives in an integrated and meaningful way.

SCHEME OF ASSESSMENT

Two papers will be set (Papers 2065/01 and 2065/02). Candidates are expected to answer a total of four questions. Total examination time will be 3 hrs 10 minutes. There will be separate sittings for Papers 1 and 2.

Please see table below.

Paper	Duration and Weighting	Details of Paper and Sections
Paper 1: Prose and Unseen Poetry	1 hour 40 minutes [50%]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be two sections in this paper. • Candidates will select <u>one</u> question from each of the two sections. • In total, candidates will answer <u>two</u> questions. • Each question is 25% of the total weighting. <p><u>Section A: Prose [25%]</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each of the six set texts in this section, <u>one</u> passage-based question and <u>two</u> essay questions will be set. • Candidates will answer <u>one</u> question [25%] based on one of the six set texts. • For every year of examination, <u>one or two</u> Singapore texts will be set. <p><u>Section B: Unseen Poetry [25%]</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no set texts in this section. • There will be a choice of <u>two</u> unseen poems with <u>one</u> question set on each poem. • Candidates will answer <u>one</u> of the two questions [25%]. • For every year of examination, <u>one</u> question will be set on a Singapore text.
Paper 2: Drama	1 hour 30 minutes [50%]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will read one text from any of the five set texts. • For each of the five set texts, <u>one</u> passage-based question and <u>two</u> essay questions will be set. • Candidates will answer <u>one</u> compulsory passage-based question and <u>one</u> essay question on the selected text. • Each question is 25% of the total weighting. • For every year of examination, <u>one or two</u> Singapore texts will be set.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Band descriptors for the assessment of O-Level set text questions

	Description
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pays close attention to the terms of the question. Top answers take advantage of the opportunities offered by the question. • Demonstrates sound understanding of the text. Better answers reveal some insights into the text's main concerns and the effects achieved by the author. • Demonstrates a consistent viewpoint, and is substantiated through judicious selection of textual evidence. • Clear, organised and coherent.
18–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally well focused on the terms of the question. • Demonstrates understanding of the text's main concerns and some knowledge of how the author conveys these. • Demonstrates relevant and developed substantiation, with apt selection of textual evidence. • Clear and competent, but laboured arguments may be present. The response may lapse into narrative occasionally.
15–17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to the main thrust of the question. • Demonstrates some understanding of the more obvious concerns of the text but fails to note the wider implications. Attempts to analyse and evaluate can be observed but these are often not successfully done. • Response is substantiated with appropriate selection of textual evidence, though not consistently done. • Generally coherent, with evidence of the development of an argument with tracts of narrative.
12–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally relevant to the question though the link may not always be sustained. • Demonstrates some understanding of the basic concerns of the text but does not show any attempt at interpretation. • Response is in the form of generalisations but selection of textual evidence is generally relevant. • Largely narrative in approach and sketchy in development, but a sense of a very basic argument can be discerned.
9–11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has peripheral bearing on the question. Often includes information from the text without perceiving its significance. • Demonstrates a little understanding of the text and its concerns. • Coherent only in parts. Ideas communicated with some difficulty.
0–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects almost no understanding of the demands of the question. Answers may be extremely brief or are obviously prepared scripts that have little to do with the question. • Some misreading of the text and its concerns. • Almost incoherent and lacks direction or focus. <p>Answers in the lower half of this band (0–4 marks) may reflect no understanding of the text and the question, and may be incoherent, with meaning obscured by poor expression.</p> <p>Short work: Can be presented in various forms, e.g. note form or a series of hurriedly sketched-in paragraphs. It is essential that Examiners mark short work strictly on the basis of what is given. The work should not be marked on the grounds of quality elsewhere in the scripts.</p>

Band descriptors for the assessment of O-Level unseen questions

	Description
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an intelligent grasp of subject matter. Top answers will display freshness of insight. There is good analysis and evaluation of content and presentation, and evidence of the ability to critically appreciate the text. • Pays close attention to the terms of the question. • Sensitive and informed personal response showing close engagement with the text. Ideas are developed effectively and well supported by textual evidence. • Highly coherent argument, with clarity of thought and expression.
18–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a competent grasp of subject matter. There is evidence of analysis and evaluation which is likely to reflect conscientiousness rather than sophistication. • Generally well focused on the terms of the question. • There is a personal response showing evidence of close engagement with the text, though this may not be sustained throughout the answer. Ideas are often supported by relevant substantiation. • Thorough, though rather unsophisticated, argument. Work is coherent and clear, though it may lack polish and subtlety of expression.
15–17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows sound basic understanding of the text and of how to respond to it. There is some evidence of analysis and evaluation. • Addresses the question though it may be brief, mechanical or superficial. • Shows some engagement, and is substantiated with appropriate references to the text. • Demonstrates coherence, and is clear.
12–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some awareness or understanding of the text, largely through paraphrase. There may be some misreading, but not enough to undermine significantly the general ideas put forward. • Does not fully address the demands of the question. • Shows engagement with the text but with inappropriate substantiation. • Fairly coherent. Expression of ideas may be hampered by a lack of clarity or accuracy but the meaning is still conveyed.
9–11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only superficial understanding of the text. • Shows little awareness of the demands of the question. • Shows minimal engagement with the text. • Not very coherent but manages to convey thoughts/comments with some difficulty.
0–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost no understanding of the text and question. • Demonstrates an attempt to communicate understanding of the text. <p>Answers in the lower half of this band (0–4 marks) may reflect no understanding of the text and the question, and may be incoherent, with meaning obscured by poor expression.</p> <p>Short work: Can be presented in various forms, e.g. note form or a series of hurriedly sketched-in paragraphs. It is essential that Examiners mark short work strictly on the basis of what is given. The work should not be marked on the grounds of quality elsewhere in the scripts.</p>

PRESCRIBED TEXTS

Paper 1: Section A Prose

Ray Bradbury: *Fahrenheit 451*
Kiran Desai: *Hullabaloo in the Guava Orchard*
Philip Holden (ed.): *Hook and Eye: Stories from the Margins*
Dalene Matthee: *Fiela's Child*
Ngugi wa Thiong'o: *The River Between*
Elizabeth Wein: *Code Name Verity*

Paper 2: Drama

Lillian Hellman: *The Little Foxes*
Arthur Miller: *A View from the Bridge*
William Shakespeare: *Macbeth*
Haresh Sharma: *Off Centre*
Tennessee Williams: *The Glass Menagerie*

All texts are also set for 2021.

Schools are NOT to select screenplays or abridged versions of the texts for study.