CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned**.

UNIVERSITY *of* CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

MARATHI AND MARATHI LANGUAGE

GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

> **Papers 8688/02 and 9688/02**
>
> **Reading and Writing**

General comments

Candidates' performances were good, however, it was observed that candidates did not answer in detail. The language part was poor. Comprehension of the prose passage was satisfactory but the expression part was not up to the mark.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates' responses were not satisfactory. They gave incorrect equivalent meanings of the words. However, use of these words in sentences was done correctly.

Question 2

Candidates' responses were poor. They could not choose the exact word from the passage for a given phrase in the question.

Question 3

Candidates performed well. However, candidates did not write answers in their own words and sentences. This is not appropriate, candidates should comprehend the passage and then answer the questions in their own words.

Question 4

Candidates performed well. However, expression was not satisfactory. Candidates preferred to give answers that were too short. They also preferred not to write answers in their own words. They generally copied from the prose passage. Comprehension was good, but candidates lacked confidence in expressing their answers in their own words.

Question 5

(i)   Candidates were expected to base their answers on the two prose passages. Candidates performed well, but their answers did not cover all the points. Candidates did not explain in detail and also did not keep to the optimum word limit of 140 words. Answers were very short and this resulted in a poor score.

(ii)   Candidates made an effort to give some information about their country on the topic asked for, but this information was speculative rather than based on facts. Candidates' knowledge of the contemporary aspects of their country needs updating.

<div style="border:1px solid black;">

Papers 8688/03 and 9688/03
Essay

</div>

General comments

The candidates' performances were good and apt. Their answers were within the word limit as indicated in the rubric. Those who were strong in content, but poor in the language aspect, scored less as the language part carries more marks than the content. Hence, those who were good at language, but poor in content, scored better since the language aspect has more weight in marking.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates' performances were really good. They dealt with all the possible aspects of the topic.

Question 2

Candidates were expected to narrate the significant importance and need of tourism as a hobby and how it helps in enriching the historical, cultural and social knowledge of the place and country of visit. Instead, candidates narrated the importance of tourism as an industry.

Question 3

Candidates do not have a clear concept of mother tongue. Candidates claimed Creole as their mother tongue instead of Marathi. The concept was not clear, hence the essay was not in tune with the topic.

Question 4

Satisfactory.

<div style="border:1px solid black;">

Paper 9688/04
Texts

</div>

General comments

Candidates had studied the text material in detail and answers were apt, covering all the points from the text. Candidates understood the question and fared well in answering it. Content was good. However, expression and language needs improvement.

Comments on specific questions

Question 2

(b) Candidates had a tendency to narrate the gist of the poem. Candidates were expected to explain and discuss the social and cultural aspects of the society and give opinions on the contemporary human behaviour and beliefs. Instead, candidates narrated how Saint Tukaram prayed to the God Vitthal.

Question 3

(a) Satisfactory, good narration.

(b) Candidates did not discuss the substance and central ideal of both the poems. They discussed only one poem. Comparative discussion was absent. There was a lack of detailed discussion on both poems. Text content was poor.

Question 4

(a) Good answers, covering all the points.

(b) Candidates were expected to discuss the special features of the poems and evaluate the poet as a poet of nature. Candidates hardly did this. They tried to discuss only one poem and overlooked the other poem.

Question 5

(a) All candidates performed well. However, in sketching a character, candidates merely gave the events. How the events reflect the nature of the character was not discussed in the answers.

(b) Satisfactory. Some points were left out, for example in the first act, how all the characters were introduced, conflict in the play, the theme of the play, etc.

> **Paper 9688/05**
> **Prose**

General comments

The ability of candidates to translate the prose passage into the target language was poor. Comprehension of the prose was good, but translation was poor.

Comments on specific questions

Target language translation needs improvement in the following areas:

- Use of words.
- Grammatically wrong structures.
- Placement of subject, object and verb in target language is incorrect.
- Verb forms are incorrect. Not according to tense of the sentences.
- In translating, candidates keep the same order of subject, object and verb in target languages.