

HINDI LANGUAGE

Paper 8687/02
Reading and Writing

General Comments

Most candidates were able to attempt all five questions reasonably well. Candidates appeared to be well prepared for the examination and did not appear to have found one part more difficult than other. There was a number of outstanding candidates; however, at the other end of the ability range, candidates often lost marks on the grammatical aspects of the language, especially in correct agreement of adjectives, use of complex structures and irregular verbs, orthography and difficulty with irregular verbs.

Some examples of general difficulties follow.

There were some examples of deviation from standard Hindi language, e.g.

मंदरा	for	मंडरा
दर	for	डर
पकर	for	पकड़
खतड़नाक	for	खतरनाक

Choice of inappropriate words and phrases, e.g.

खनावट	for	निर्माण
मिलावट	for	मिश्रण

Spelling mistakes, e.g.

निदोर्श	for	निर्दोष
कौचित	for	क्रोधित
बूडे	for	बुरे
खरतनाक	for	खतरनाक



Incorrect formation of plurals, e.g.

हथियारें
हजारें
लोगें
जीवाणुशं
चोरों पसीने पसीने हो गए ।

Gender related mistakes, e.g.

पैंकडों लोगों की जानों चले गए थे ।
हथियारें उत्पन्न हुई ।

Use of incorrect pronouns, e.g.

ताकि उन देशों भी आतंकवाद के खिलाफ कदम न उठाए ।
कीटणु न केवल उत्पन्न किए बल्कि इनके बढ़ावा के बाद इन्हें
जैविक बम में अग्रसर किया ।

Candidates should also be reminded that **Questions 3** and **4** assess comprehension of the passage (15 marks) with 5 marks overall for language. Candidates must demonstrate to the Examiner that they understand the information from the passage, which they are attempting to convey. This means that candidates should avoid copying chunks of information from the passage and should therefore ensure that they write in their own words as far as possible.

To perform well at this level, candidates must have a reasonable understanding of the vocabulary used in context, not just the meaning in the dictionary.

Comments on specific Questions

Part 1

Question 1

Candidates attempted this question successfully. Less able candidates had difficulties with 1(c), 1(d) and 1(e). Many candidates took the word सीमित to be समीप or संक्रमित; असाधारण as अवांछित or सुगम; पेचीदा as लागत or विशिष्ट or पीड़ित or दुष्प्रभाव.

Question 2

Most candidates attempted this question satisfactorily and secured full marks. **Question 2(d)** elicited the poorest response, with a number of candidates struggling to explain the meaning. They mistook the word प्रतीत as प्रतीक or प्रती.

लाल गुलाब प्रेम का प्रतीत होता है ।
मां - बाप भगवान का प्रतीत है ।
प्रेम के प्रतीत उमा का प्यार बढ़ता गया ।
मैंने राजेश के हथियार के प्रतीत अपना गुस्सा जाहिर किया ।



Some candidates took 2(a) and 2(c) in their literal meanings and not as an idiomatic usage e.g.

जहरीली दवा खाने से योगेश के हाथ-पाँव फूल गए।
दिन भर काम करने के बाद राज पसीने-पसीने हो
रहा था।

Question 3

Candidates seemed to find the comprehension topic user friendly and the source material modern and easy to follow. Generally their answers were informative, relevant, and well organised, but were sometimes lacking in detail. For example in **Question 3(a)** many candidates just wrote anthrax (जैविक कीटाणु) is dangerous, but did not mention the process involved in the making of anthrax, which was required for the full answer. Similarly in **Question 3(e)** they needed to include all the elements to score full marks.

Question 4

It was important for candidates to read the comprehension passage carefully and to respond to the questions in their own words. The second part of **Question 4(a)** proved difficult for less able candidates.

Question 5

This section demands candidates' understanding of the texts, picking out the main points and then giving their own views. Response to the text was variable.

- (a) Quite a few candidates tackled this question successfully. Most candidates managed to compare both passages commendably and responded well to the issue raised. The best candidates were able to compare the points made and to give examples in support of the point.
- (b) Able candidates successfully showed their ability to suggest a range of ideas and a capacity to express a personal point of view; less able candidates responded to the ideas raised in the text rather sketchily.



HINDI LANGUAGE

Paper 8687/03

Essay

General Comments

Candidates' work demonstrated a wide range of ability. Quite a few scored in the upper range of 29 to 35 marks. At the bottom end of the scale a few candidates could only manage a score of between 11 to 14 marks. The majority of the candidates scored in the middle range of achievement between 15 and 28 marks. One candidate scored 0 marks as he wrote his entire essay in English, and not in Hindi.

As has been the case in previous years, some candidates under-performed due to dialect interference, lack of structure, coupled with either an inappropriate or a narrow range of vocabulary deployed. But it was encouraging to note that the overall standard of achievement this year again has been higher than in previous years. There is a noticeable change in the standard of performance of all of the candidates in all areas of essay writing-language, layout, content and development. It is clear that the teachers and the majority of the candidates have worked hard and have been focused.

The most frequently occurring errors noted this year were:

1. The lack of gender and number recognition and their misapplication in the essays.
2. Confusion when using tenses.
3. The lack of use of the polite forms of expression, which are an integral part of the grammar of Hindi.

More Specific Comments

The popular essays were in response to **Questions 3 and 5**. These essays dealing with pollution and fast foods respectively were particularly well handled by the majority of the candidates who had chosen them. However candidates who wrote in response to **Question 1**, which focused on social and political responsibilities, dealt with the topic rather negatively.

The best essays were well planned with a sustained theme, well illustrated, coherently argued and structured: it was a pleasure to read them. These high scoring candidates demonstrated a good grasp of linguistic competence, a command of wide ranging vocabulary and an ability to handle complex sentence patterns. The majority of the essays were, however, within a range where there was sufficient reasonably relevant material, but uninspired or flat content or were too long, rambling and repetitive. The vocabulary used was narrow and the sentence structure irregular.

The essays at the bottom end of performance were disconnected, reflecting confused or distorted views with poor sentence structure, poor sequencing and full of grammatical errors including serious misspelling of everyday words.

