TAMIL

> **Paper 9689/02**
>
> **Reading and Writing**

General comments

Overall, the performance of the candidates was quite good this year. Many candidates showed a good understanding of the language, although some candidates made grammatical and syntactical errors which occasionally impeded understanding.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

There are five parts to this question, testing the meaning and usage of vocabulary items. The overall performance of the candidates was quite poor, with many struggling to find suitable synonyms in the passage.

Question 2

This question tests the candidates' ability to use the given words in sentences. Most candidates tackled this question very well indeed.

Question 3

This is a set of comprehension questions on an unseen passage, which carries a total of 15 marks for Content and 5 marks for Language. In general, candidates did not perform well, many failing to write their responses in their own words and/or to locate the appropriate answer.

Section B

Question 4

This question is another set of comprehension questions on a different unseen passage, also carrying a total of 15 marks for Content and 5 marks for Language. Again, the overall performance of the candidates was quite poor, with many candidates failing to write their responses in their own words, simply lifting chunks from the text.

Question 5

This question requires candidates to write responses drawing information from both passages and including a personal response. This question carries 20 marks (15 for Content and 5 for Language).

The performance of the candidates in this question was a little disappointing. Candidates did not demonstrate adequate control over grammar and syntax, and showed limited vocabulary.

TAMIL

> **Paper 9689/03**
> **Essay**

General comments

The overall performance of the candidates was good, with only a small number of entrants at both extremes of the mark range. Weaker candidates' responses were characterised by a combination of misunderstanding of the question, especially on **Questions 1**, **4** and **5**, leading to a loss of marks for content, and poorer language skills such as spelling mistakes and poor construction of sentences. There were no apparent issues around the use of time of misinterpretation of the rubric by candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This was the most popular question, and produced a wide range of marks. Spelling errors and poor focus of content were seen in weaker responses. Strong candidates' responses were characterised by well-structured, complex sentences and few spelling and grammatical errors.

Question 2

This question was popular, and whilst some candidates' responses were fairly weak, many candidates achieved reasonable or very good marks.

Question 3

This question was popular, and whilst some candidates' responses were fairly weak, many candidates achieved reasonable or very good marks.

Question 4

This question produced a range of marks. Some candidates tackled it well, and there were also some excellent essays.

Question 5

Again, this question produced a range of marks. Spelling errors and poor focus of content as well as repetition were seen in weaker responses. However, strong candidates produced responses which were characterised by well-structured, complex sentences and only occasional spelling and grammatical errors.

TAMIL

| Paper 9689/04 |
| Texts |

General comments

In general, candidates performed well on this paper. Some candidates would benefit from more practice in summarising ideas. There were no apparent rubric infringements.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

The most popular questions were **Questions 2(a)**, **3(a)** and **3(b)**. Candidates seemed to enjoy **Question 2(a)** and provided suitable answers. There were some good responses to both of the questions set in **Question 3**, with candidates conveying appropriate information.

Section B

Question 4 was the most popular in this section, with candidates generally performing well. Some candidates made errors in grammar and syntax which occasionally impeded understanding.

TAMIL

Paper 9689/05

Prose

This year the overall performance was generally good. The marks ranged between 2 and 40. The majority of candidates gained more than half the marks available while the weaker candidates lost marks through spelling errors, incorrect meaning and sentence construction. There were no apparent problems for candidates in the use of time or interpretation of the rubric.

The sentences that caused particular problems for some candidates were: "Others would define sport in purely physical terms, by how fit the different parts of the body are." and "This argument is based on the thinking and philosophy of the ancient Greeks and Romans and has influenced the way sport and physical education have developed in schools."

Even some of the stronger candidates found parts of the translation challenging. For example, in the fourth sentence some candidates broke the sentence into two separate ones and thereby produced a largely correct translation, but they seemed unable to manage to translate it as on whole sentence. Weaker candidates, however, failed to produce a correct translation here at all.