

HINDI AND HINDI LITERATURE

Paper 8675/04

Texts

General comments

Performance this year was slightly better than last year, but it was a bit disappointing that not many candidates produced good all-round scripts. In some cases candidates demonstrated high standards in one or two questions, but quite pedestrian in others. There was also evidence of prepared topics, but not prepared questions to specific questions. Since candidates had memorized general introductions to writers they thought it was imperative to produce that even when that was required. Unfortunately vital time is lost this way. The question on 'language' and 'style' as part of a few questions once again proved difficult. Candidates seemed to be out of their depth in commenting on these.

The standard of Hindi, grammar and vocabulary, was better this year. Some candidates did not clearly specify whether they had answered (a) or (b) as for example **Question 1**. A few candidates had answered both (a) and (b) as two questions. Candidates should be reminded that they must answer three questions on three separate books.

Teachers and invigilators should be advised to remind candidates that the question number must appear clearly and unambiguously in the correct place.

Comments on specific questions

The overall performance of the candidates was satisfactory. A good percentage of them demonstrated their understanding of the literary texts. They also appreciated the demands of the questions. However, **Question (1i)** was not answered correctly. Candidates got confused about the 'speaker' and did not seem to know what examples they could give.

A tiny minority failed to grasp the meaning of **Question 1 (K iii)**. Instead of discussing the differences between the 'brotherly love' of Bharat and Lakshman towards Ram, they thought they were expected to write about the two younger brothers' love for their elder brother Ram. However those who did understand the question answered it well. **Question 2 (ki)** the question was generally well tackled. **Question 2 (Kii)**: not many candidates were able to or thought appropriate to comment on the language and style of extracts from the poem. **Question 2 (kh)** most candidates who tried to comment on the quote from Keshavdas ji failed to understand the meaning behind the metaphors. Some candidates were not able to provide the context, the meaning and usage of individual words and phrases in **Question 3 (k)** without repeating themselves. **Question 3 (kh)** was a good example of candidates reproducing 'learnt materials' based on rote learning. On the whole **Question 4(i)** was tackled well, but once again in **4 (kii)** most candidates simply hedged around the question. **Question 4(kh)** was only answered fully by a few candidates.

Final comments

Once again it was a pleasure marking the scripts: the candidates' overall performance is a reflection of their teachers' commitment and dedication. However the following advice might be useful:

1. Candidates should be given practice in answering examination questions.
2. It appears that the interpretation of a poem in terms of its 'language and style' is not discussed in any great detail. The result is that, apart from a few candidates, no one is able to answer this part of the question satisfactorily.
3. Teachers are advised to explain the cultural importance of politeness expressions in Hindi to the candidates. Most candidates use expressions when talking about 'authors' 'Gods' etc., in the singular whereas in each case it should be plural e.g. in roman transliteration:
 - (a) suurdaas kahtaa hai. (it should be 'suurdaas kahte hain).
 - (b) Kafan kahaanii kaa lekhak premchand hai. (it should be 'kafan kahaanii ke lekhak premchand hain).