UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS **GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level**

www.papacambridge.com MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

8687 HINDI LANGUAGE

8687/03

Paper 3 (Essay), maximum raw mark 40

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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

		m
Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabu
	GCE AS LEVEL – October/November 2011	8687

er

Page 2		Mark Scheme: Teachers' Version		Syllabu	a er		
		GCE AS LEVEL – October	/Novem	ber 2011	8687	Pac.	
	La	nguage (out of 24)		Conte	ent (out of 16)	ambr	
21–24	Very Good Confident use of complex sentence patterns; generally accurate; extensive vocabulary; good sense of idiom.		Content (out of 16) 14–16 Very Good Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated; coherently argued and structured.				
16–20	spite of c	y sound grasp of grammar in juite a few lapses; reads oly; some attempt at varied iry.	11–13	11–13 Good Sound knowledge and generally relevant; some ability to develop argument and draw conclusions.			
10–15	laboured	e icy to be simple, clumsy or ; some degree of accuracy; riate use of idiom.	7–10	Adequate Some knowledge, but not always relevant; a more limited capacity to argue.			
5–9	sentence	ntly simple or pedestrian patterns with persistent errors; ocabulary.	3–6	Poor Some attempt at argument, tends to be sketchy or unspecific; little attempt to structure an argument; major misunderstanding of question.			
1–4	little evid	or simplest sentence patterns; ence of grammatical ss; very limited vocabulary.	1–2	Very Poor Vague and general; ideas presented at random.			