

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME FOR the June 2002 question papers

0488 Literature (Spanish)

0488/1	Paper 1, maximum raw mark 60
0488/3	Paper 3, maximum raw mark 20

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

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 June 2002 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced (A) and Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.

CAMBRIDGE
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

JUNE 2002

INTERNATIONAL GCSE

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0488/1

**Literature (Spanish)
(Open Books)**



Answers will be marked according to the following general criteria.

- 18-20** Detailed, well-written, well-organised answer, completely relevant to question and showing sensitive personal response to book. For passage-based questions, detailed attention to words of passage.
- 15-17** Detailed answer, relevant to question and with personal response; may be a bit cut-and-dried. For passage-based questions, close attention to words but may be a few omissions/superficialities.
- 12-14** Competent answer, relevant but limited; signs of personal response, good knowledge of book. For passage-based questions, some attention to words but some significant omissions and/or misunderstandings.
- 9-11** Answer relevant to question but may show some misunderstanding and/or limitations; effort to communicate personal response and knowledge. Passage-based questions: significant omissions/misunderstandings, but some response comes over.
- 6-8** Attempt to answer question and some knowledge of book; limited, scrappy answer; clumsy expression. Passage-based questions: attempt to respond, but with severe limitations.
- 4-5** Short, scrappy answer; confused; signs that book has been read. Passage-based questions: has read the passage and conveyed one or two basic ideas about it.
- 2-3** Has read book and absorbed some very elementary ideas about it. Passage-based questions: may have glanced at the passage and written a few words.
- 0-1** Nothing to reward. Obvious non-reading of book, or total non-appreciation.

It is very helpful if Examiners comment on the scripts. This does not mean writing long essays, but simply ticking good points, noting a few observations in the margin (eg 'good point', 'irrelevant', 'excessive quotation', etc). A brief comment at the end of an essay (eg 'rambling answer, shows some knowledge but misses point of question') is particularly helpful. If your team leader disagrees with the mark, s/he will find it helpful to have some idea of what was in your mind! Don't forget to write your mark for each essay at the end of that essay, and to transfer all three marks to the front of the script, and total them.

Beware of rubric infringements: usually failure to cover three books, or no starred question (easily missed). An answer that infringes the rubric scores one-fifth of the mark it would otherwise gain. This penalty is applied not to the lowest-scoring answer on the paper, but to the answer that is infringing the rubric.

Eg:

- (1) candidate answers a starred question on Lope de Vega and scores 12; an essay question on Lope de Vega and scores 15; an essay question on Cervantes and scores 12. The Cervantes question must stand, and so must the Lope de Vega starred question, because candidates are required to answer a starred question. Therefore the essay question on Lope de Vega is the one that must be penalised.
- (2) candidate answers two essay questions on Lope de Vega, scoring 13 and 14, and a starred question on Cervantes, scoring 10. The Cervantes answer must stand, because it is the required starred question. But either of the two Lope de Vega questions could be reckoned as the offender, and so it is right here to penalise the lower-scoring of the two essays.

- (3) candidate answers three essay questions, on Lope de Vega, Cervantes and Bécquer, but no starred question. Here you simply penalise the lowest-scoring of the three answers.
- (4) candidate answers three essay questions and covers only two books. In theory, candidate has therefore incurred a double rubric infringement, but normally we would penalise only one answer. This is a rare occurrence; if you come across it, and feel uneasy about how to treat it, please contact the Principal Examiner.
- (5) candidate answers only two questions, on two different books, but not including a starred question. This is not a rubric infringement. We assume that the missing third question would have fulfilled the rubric. Both answers score their full mark.
- (6) candidate answers only two questions, and both are on the same book. This is a rubric infringement, because the missing third answer could not possibly have made the script fulfil the rubric. Penalise the lower-scoring of the two answers.
- (7) candidate answers more than three questions. This is not a rubric infringement, unless the answers do not cover three books and do not include a starred question. Mark all the answers (they will usually be very short!), and take the highest three marks that together obey the rubric (on three different books, including at least one starred question).

It is vital that Examiners notice and penalise rubric infringements. Not to do so unfairly advantages offending candidates and unfairly disadvantages other candidates who have obeyed the rubric. Please mark offending scripts prominently 'RI' for rubric infringement, and show the 'calculation' which has produced the mark you have awarded.

Carpentier

- 1** Carpentier tells us straight out how 'strange' the settlers' behaviour is: basically, they find that to lose everything (in a material sense) means to be free; that total irresponsibility is fun; that the casting off of rigid social convention brings un-dreamed of opportunities. To score 12-14 marks, answers should be able to convey and (to varying extents) illustrate this; weaker answers may merely pick out a few details of the colonists' behaviour. Really good answers will hopefully note the strong underlying irony: the sense that all this scandalous pleasure-seeking is a flight from reality, almost nihilistic and can only end in disaster. Ideally there should also be some reference to the rhetorical structuring of the passage, the well-wrought, incremental descriptions, but only the very best candidates are likely to do this.
- 2** In the past, questions like this have often been badly done, in that episodes are ill-chosen and comments vague; the exceptions have been from well-prepared candidates who have mastered the art of judicious selection and detailed comment. We shall probably have to be generous in our marking and credit anything useful that is said about this essential aspect of Carpentier's narrative technique.
- 3** A more straightforward question which can be answered on a 'narrative' level, so long as sufficient relevant details are adduced. Weakish (9-12/13) answers will probably make some sort of case – for or against – the proposition, but mentioning only a couple of episodes in support; only answers scoring 15 or above are likely to give any sort of global view of the text, and only the very best candidates will actually probe the difficult problem of Carpentier's own sympathies, since it is complicated by his all-pervading irony.

Cervantes

Note that while all set passages from the *Quijote* will be from the prescribed section and candidates are not expected to refer to material outside this section in their answers, they should be given full credit for any relevant observations that draw on the rest of the novel.

- 4 Essentially, the violence is of the Tom-and-Jerry kind which doesn't come across as subjectively painful. Cervantes makes it clear that no steel is involved, only fisticuffs, and that nobody is going to suffer mortal or lasting injury; moreover, with the exception of don Quijote himself, all the characters are conventionally lower-class and can therefore expect to be knocked about as part of everyday life. As for the don, he brings it on himself, and if he is tough enough to attempt rape while already '*molido y quebrantado*', he can certainly stand a few more knocks. Anyway, he deserves it! Also many of the details of the violence are themselves quintessentially comic, as when the *arriero* literally walks all over don Quijote; clearly the author's intention is to make us laugh, not pity him. While the violence is central to the scene, there are innumerable other comic elements as well – the don's flowery speech to the smelly Maritornes (virtuously denying he has any intent against her when he so plainly has), the indignation of the *arriero*, Sancho's ill-judged intervention, all building up to a glorious free-for-all which seems chaotic, but is actually very carefully worked out in the narration. Only the weakest candidates should be incapable of conveying at least some of the above. Candidates who find the violence shocking rather than funny are out of tune with the author's mood, but should be given credit if they can justify their indignation with detail from the text.
- 5 This is a real old chestnut which all candidates should be able to tackle with confidence; by the same token, it may produce pre-digested answers with little support from the text and few signs of personal engagement. The highest credit should, obviously, go to well-balanced answers which do show signs of personal judgement. Answers that consider only one of the two contrasting opinions may be given some credit, but not too much because the synthesis between these two sides of Sancho's character is so essential to the book.
- 6 As always, the first hurdle here is to choose a suitable episode – surely not a difficult task, since almost all the book's highlights depend on precisely this contrast. The set passage is of course one of them: note that it is perfectly permissible for candidates to use a set passage or poem to answer another question on the same book, so long as they don't commit a rubric infringement by answering both. The second hurdle is to explain what the candidate finds funny – always a difficult task at this level. I've deliberately said 'what made you laugh' instead of 'the comic properties of your chosen scene', to try and stimulate a genuine personal response rather than an answer full of technical literary terms which the candidate doesn't really understand.

García Márquez

- 7 The latter half of the novel is often ignored by candidates, and perhaps in class; this is a deliberate attempt to focus candidates' minds on it. The passage is long, so some selection (not too drastic) will be acceptable. Hopefully all but the weakest will appreciate the centrality of the sentence '*Dueña por primera vez de su destino, Ángela descubrió entonces que el amor y el odio eran pasiones recíprocas*'. By a strange irony, Ángela becomes free while virtually imprisoned in her house, discovers independent thought by constantly re-expressing a single obsession, and becomes herself by devoting her entire life to someone she never sees and who never communicates with her. The strangest irony of all is the concluding one – that Ángela has freed herself and her powers of self-expression by writing letters that were never read, but that this doesn't matter because the outcome depended on what she did and thought, not on Bayardo at all ('*era como escribirle a nadie*'). This gives the key to the second part of the question, to why Ángela's obsession may seem so surprising, but isn't really. True, the strong sexual overtones may suggest that she is simply inflamed by obsessive memories of her wedding night followed by months of sexual starvation, and candidates can legitimately insist on this.

- 8 Questions phrased in this way (*¿Qué efecto logra...?*) are seeking a 'literary' rather than descriptive response, but realistically, all but the best candidates are going to reduce this question to *¿Cómo presenta García Márquez al Obispo?*, and we shall certainly have to go up to a mark of 12-14, and maybe to 15-17, on that premise. Weak candidates may give a few details about when and where he appears in the story, and perhaps note some of his oddities such as his passion for cocks' combs. Answers worth 12-14 may get further on to the right lines by noting how his presence is constantly distracting people from the passions flaring in the town. The best answers will probe at least something of the comic and ironic possibilities of this supremely important person who seems of so little importance to the ultimate outcome; this great dignitary of the church who displays so little dignity; this central personage who remains so entirely peripheral; and perhaps even draw some conclusions about the author's presentation of the place of religion in this murderously traditional society. We shall see.
- 9 Although there is an overlap between this question and Question 7, it was felt to be acceptable because candidates can't (without infringing the rubric) answer both. However, please note carefully which question is being answered and mark accordingly: for Question 7 we want the detail, for Question 9 we want the breadth. If you can't tell which question is being answered, then it's a bad answer to either. Having said that, of course the set passage is very important to the answer, and could and should be drawn on. The simplest answers will just assume a happy ending: Bayardo has come back, having at least kept and filed the letters though not read them; he seems disposed to forgive and forget; Ángela has got what she wanted and can settle down to being a model wife like her mother; the supposed offender has been suitably punished and is out of the way. For marks of 14 and above, candidates will have to probe the evidence against such optimism: Ángela's new tendency towards self-assertion, set against the apparently quite unaltered Bayardo with his cryptic self-will, seems to set them both on a collision course which may prove disastrous – or perhaps stimulating and satisfactory to both? Will the 'real' Bayardo (who in any case remains an enigma) really measure up to Ángela's expectations? There is no obvious answer, only a series of interesting possibilities. Any well-supported speculation should be credited.

Puig

- 10 Again, experience suggests that many candidates are likely just to make some suggestions as to why this episode is moving, without trying to explain how that is achieved despite – in fact, by means of – the breathless bareness of the narration. We shall have to award at least 13 on that assumption. Basically, as occurs repeatedly in the novel (so candidates should be well aware of it), what is moving is the way the banal film story that Molina is recalling evokes and then merges with the story of his own life – a story which, because of his imprisonment, is no less fictional than the original story, but much more touching to us because Molina is at the heart of the fiction we are reading. Even weak candidates should be able to indicate **that** this happens, **when** it happens, and (edging up a little) how and why it happens. Answers worth 12+ will be able to trace the build-up of emotion through Molina's memory of the miraculous transformation in the film story, and its culmination in acute and impotent longing for his own beloved. Answers worth 15+ will do progressively more to contrast the banal, soft-edged, conventionally moving details of the film scene – candle-light, violins and harps, etc – with the more down-to-earth, but still pathetically unreal, elements in Molina's own vision.
- 11 Another key aspect of the book which is bound to have cropped up in class discussion because it is so obviously central. Thoughtful candidates are surely likely to see that Puig is continually manipulating our sympathies, swinging us behind one character or the other as their better and worse characteristics are highlighted; some may suggest that he deliberately deters us from being too judgmental. Beyond that, personal reactions will take over, and anything goes so long as it is supported by the text. Of course, candidates may find both characters equally sympathetic or unsympathetic; fine, so long as they explain why.

- 12 There cannot be much doubt as to the main lines of the answer here. Since Valentin is basically quite a simple fellow, and quite unaware of Molina's treachery, his thoughts will be largely of gratitude and regret, however irritating he found Molina at times; he will miss his storytelling and support, and naively hope that the message entrusted to Molina has got through. Really good answers are likely to stand out through the authenticity of the voice, and the amount of dramatic irony that can be conveyed. Sensitive candidates may be able to produce some very moving answers here, as has happened in comparable tasks in previous years.

Castellanos

- 13 This is my favourite example of Castellanos' comic subversion of traditional anti-feminist stories; hopefully candidates will appreciate the sheer impudent fun of it. The traditional Eve is transformed into a modern woman (from this comes a lot of the comedy, of course: '¡Propaganda turística!'... '¡Vitaminas!'), full of robust common sense and shrewdness leaving the much more traditionally presented, and very obtuse, Adam far behind. Less comic and more thought-provoking is the challenge to the 'treason' idea, which Eve spells out: perpetual happiness equals perpetual stagnation; we can only become human by enduring and overcoming suffering. The message is so clear that almost all candidates should be able to convey some appreciation of it; good answers will show a detailed response to the comic and inspirational qualities of Castellanos' writing here.
- 14 On the evidence of the whole play, and making allowance for Lupita's chameleon character, I should be inclined to answer 'no'. Whereas the historical women are shown to be mistresses of their fate, even if that fate is a tragic one (easy to demonstrate from any of the scenes in which they appear), Lupita is frequently battered by the winds of destiny and supremacist masculinity, the eternal victim of the *condición femenina*. On the other hand, some of her avatars, like the Lupita of the wedding-night scene and the interview with the 'autoviuda', show another and much stronger Lupita who has the additional advantage of living in a modern, potentially more liberal (?) society. However, owing to the requirement to compare Lupita with two of the *mujeres históricas*, fairly drastic selection of detail is likely and should be accepted.
- 15 There is really nothing to say about this task that has not been said in the past about many similar ones: sensible choice and detailed comment are the only ways to success. There is plenty to choose from.

Lope de Vega

- 16 This engaging speech may cause trouble because it is so mannered and doesn't advance the story at all – it just rhapsodises. Candidates who don't treat it as what it essentially is – lyric poetry – are likely to waffle and will have to be penalised for doing so. Even those who do realise how lyrical it is may well settle for decoding a few of the images, without responding to their playful charm. To be worth 15+, answers will not only understand, but appreciate the quality of the imagery; only the very top ones are likely to get as far as suggesting that the whole thing is superficial, suggesting a certain early-Romeo-like immaturity in Alonso's feelings (despite the one sinister note).
- 17 This sort of question runs the risk of evoking a pre-digested character sketch, but such answers will be easily detectable and will not score highly – though, naturally, short and superficial character sketches will score lower than more detailed ones. What I hope candidates will realise is that while Alonso has excellent potential from the start, he (again like Romeo) grows in stature as the play progresses, so that the superficial youth of the beginning matures into a man who comes to understand the price that has to be paid for love, for one's own errors, and for heroically accepting one's own destiny when there seems to be a chance of turning aside. Perhaps it may occur to thoughtful candidates that the world's superficial judgement is quite contented by the superficial Alonso of the beginning, so that he merits that reputation from the beginning anyway? A nice twist, but not, I think, a necessary one.

- 18 A nice chance for some gallows humour; good candidates have done a very lively job with such scenes in the past. A good answer, however, will not only be lively but will confirm our impression that Rodrigo, while rather pathetic and flabby, is not wholly wicked but merits some sympathy (he will surely admit that his condemnation is just) and that Fernando, while far from agreeable, is at least a loyal assistant. None of this, of course, will prevent them from blaming each other or lamenting their miserable plight!

Bécquer

- 19 The question is striving to prevent the candidates from wasting their time 'decoding' the 'message', something many always try to do (*aquí el poeta está tratando de decir*), despite the advice contained in the Reports on previous examinations. To score 12 and above, answers must look at the quality of the imagery. Candidates who overcome that first hurdle – most of them, I hope – should then be capable of realising that the images surrounding inspiration are of changeability, uncontrollable power, elusive beauty, things and ideas that are impossible to pin down, whereas those attaching to reason are of order and control; and that (as Bécquer, unnecessarily?, spells out at the end), both elements are necessary to poetry, since inspiration without reason is unproductive – the beauty 'gets away' – whereas reason without inspiration is useless – there is nothing to control. The best answers will convey all the above and add personal appreciation of the quality of the imagery – the more, and the more clearly contrasted, the higher the mark.
- 20 This is, of course, the quintessentially Romantic attitude: I hope it doesn't elicit long and irrelevant disquisitions about Romanticism. Another bedevilment may be the current obsession with the *yo poético*, which candidates are always most careful to dissociate from the poet him/herself – often a useful precaution, but fruitless when dealing with Romantics. (Which is not to say that they don't embellish their 'selves' before serving them up in their poetry.) With such provisos, the choice of suitable poems is wide, and candidates have shown themselves capable of some sound appreciation of Bécquer.
- 21 Little to say here, except that high marks must be reserved for those who answer the exact question asked and don't re-hash an obvious class essay on one of their favourite poems.

Spanish American Modernista Poets

As with previous anthologies, check that candidates have chosen poems that fall within the selection and treat any that don't as rubric infringements.

- 22 Many elements could be adduced: the uninhibitedly grandiose and positive vocabulary; the confident verb forms – present tense, future tense, exuberant imperatives – and the would-be dignifying allusions to classical myth. The poem is intensely rhetorical, a mode that some modern readers may find difficult to appreciate or distasteful. The poem is long and its imagery abundant; I would not insist on a 'full' treatment before awarding high marks, but I should certainly want more than a couple of images selected at random.
- 23 See comments on 21 above.
- 24 See comments on 21 above.