

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

8672 PORTUGUESE LITERATURE

8672/04

Paper 4 (Texts), maximum raw mark 75

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2010 | 8672 | 04 |

Candidates are expected to write 500–600 words for each of their answers. Candidates who write more than 600 words cannot be placed higher than the 16–17 category in the mark scheme.

| Marks | Description |
|--------------|--|
| 22+ | Exceptional work. Excellent ability to organise material, thorough knowledge, considerable sensitivity to language and to author's intentions, understanding of some literary techniques. Really articulate and intelligent answers should be considered in this band even if there are still flaws and omissions. |
| 20–21 | Very good. Close attention to detail of passages, controlled structure, perceptive use of illustration, good insight when discussing characters. Ability to look beyond the immediate material and to show some understanding of author's intentions and of underlying themes. |
| 18–19 | Thoroughly solid and relevant work. Candidate does not simply reproduce information: can discuss and evaluate material and come to clear conclusion. Good focus on passages. Some limitations of insight but coherent, detailed approach and aptly chosen illustrations. |
| 16–17 | Painstaking. Sound knowledge of texts; mainly relevant. Some attempt to analyse and compare, some sense of understanding. Possibly not in full control of material; solid but indiscriminate. Many very conscientious candidates fall into this category: they tend to write far too much as they are reluctant to leave out anything they have learnt. Focused, coherent essays which lack really solid detail but convey a good understanding of the text should also be considered for this band. |
| 14–15 | Fair relevance and knowledge. Better organised than work in the 12–13 band: the candidate probably understands the demands of the question without being able to develop a very thorough response. Still a fairly simple, black and white approach. Some narrative and 'learnt' material but better control and focus than work in the 12–13 band. Many candidates probably fall into this category. |
| 12–13 | Sound, if simple and superficial, knowledge of plot and characters. Makes assertions without being able to illustrate or develop points. Probably still too dependent on narrative and memorised oddments but there may be a visible attempt to relate these to the question. Can extract one or two relevant points from a set passage. |
| 10–11 | Some very basic material but not much sense of understanding or ability to answer question. The candidate rarely reads the set passage but uses it as a springboard for storytelling and memorised bits and pieces about characters. Very general, unspecific approach. Random, bitty structure. Signs of organisation and relevance should be looked for in case the answer can be considered for a mark in the 12–13 band. |
| 6–9 | Marginally more knowledge here than in the 0–5 band. The candidate may have read the text but is probably unable to see beyond the barest bones of the plot or half-remembered notes. Insubstantial; very little relevance. The candidate may have problems with the language and will be unable to express ideas comprehensibly. |
| 0–5 | No discernible material. Often very inadequate language. Marks in this section are awarded almost on the basis of quantity: up to 3 for a sentence or two showing a glimpse of knowledge, 4 or 5 where there is also a hint of relevance to the question. It is possible for a candidate to write a whole page demonstrating no knowledge at all (have they read the book?), or only misunderstood background facts or very vague general remarks unrelated to either text or question. |