

# CONTENTS

---

FOREWORD .....	1
HINDI.....	2
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level .....	2
Paper 8687/02 Reading and Writing .....	2
Paper 8687/03 Essay .....	3

## 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.**

# HINDI

---

## GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

Paper 8687/02  
Reading and Writing

### General comments

Candidates appeared to be fairly well prepared for the examination. However, a very few candidates failed to heed the rubric, which resulted in some cases not answering the questions fully. Nevertheless the overall performance of candidates was of a good standard.

The two parts of this Paper were successful in differentiating across the ability-range with a number of outstanding candidates. At the other end of the ability range, candidates often lost marks because they failed to distinguish between the apparent and hidden meaning in the stimulus material. Candidates would have found it beneficial to spend more time reading through the material.

For both sections, a common error was that candidates sometimes showed the tendency to write out chunks of the source.

Although the overall understanding was commendable, the response to the last question of the second section was rather disappointing. A number of candidates misinterpreted the task.

To perform better or excellently, candidates must have a reasonable range of vocabulary and a good command of orthography. Candidates should be exposed to the comparative nature of ideas hence emphasis should be put on the message behind the passage and how to use extracts to illustrate and compare the points they wish to make.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Section 1**

##### **Question 1**

This question was tackled extremely well. The understanding of the vocabulary was well handled. Generally answers were informative, relevant and well organised.

##### **Question 2**

Here the subsections **(a)**, **(c)** and **(e)** elicited the poorest responses. Candidates struggled to explain the meaning of required words and expressions in their sentences.

##### **Question 3**

Candidates often appeared to be knowledgeable. A minority of candidates produced outstanding answers to this Question, especially subsections **(a)**, **(d)**, and **(e)**. However candidates showed insufficient understanding of subsection **(b)** and **(c)**. Candidates should be encouraged to re-read the passage as a whole to argue the point effectively.

## **Section 2**

### **Question 4**

Most of the answers were lifted from the text and failed to give reasons and examples.

### **Question 5**

A very few candidates tackled this question successfully. This question often suffered from imbalance. Many candidates wrote at length on one passage and ignored the other substantially. Although in some cases an attempt was made to give a descriptive account or a summary of the passage, the comparison was not explicit enough to attain a satisfactory score.

**Paper 8687/03**

**Essay**

### **General comments**

Candidates' work demonstrates a wide range of ability with a few scoring marks in the upper range of 30 to 35 marks. At the very bottom end of the scale a few candidates scored between 10 to 13 marks. The majority of the candidates were in the middle bracket of achievement. Some candidates underperformed mainly owing to dialect interference and lack of syntactical skills coupled with a narrow range of vocabulary deployed.

The two most frequently occurring blemishes noted were

- lack of use of the polite forms of expression and
- lack of gender recognition and its misapplication in the essays

### **Comments on specific topics**

The popular chosen topics were **2, 3 and 4**. The A graded essays were well planned with a sustained theme. There was ample material which was fully relevant. The candidates demonstrated good linguistic ability using a varied and appropriate vocabulary, good sentence structure and linking devices.

The majority of the essays fall within a range where there is sufficient, reasonably relevant, material but the content was uninspired and flat or too long, rambling and repetitive. The vocabulary used was narrow and the sentence structure is irregular.

The essays at the bottom end of achievement were disconnected reflecting confused or distorted views with poor sentence structure, poor sequencing and littered with grammatical errors, including serious misspelling of every day vocabulary.