



Cambridge International AS Level

ARABIC LANGUAGE

8680/31

Paper 3 Essay

October/November 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **3** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Essays which address the broad topic area but relate to the exact essay title/question **only in places** will be awarded content marks in the 'poor' band, with access to the full range of marks for language.

Essays which address the broad topic area but **do not** relate in any way to the exact essay title/question will be awarded 0 marks for content and 0 marks for language.

Language (24 marks)	Content (16 marks)
21–24 Very good Confident use of complex sentence patterns, generally accurate, extensive vocabulary, good sense of idiom.	14–16 Very good Detailed, clearly relevant and well illustrated; coherently argued and structured.
16–20 Good Generally sound grasp of grammar in spite of quite a few lapses; reads reasonably; some attempt at varied vocabulary.	11–13 Good Sound knowledge and generally relevant; some ability to develop argument and draw conclusions.
10–15 Adequate A tendency to be simple, clumsy or laboured; some degree of accuracy; inappropriate use of idiom.	7–10 Adequate Some knowledge, but not always relevant; a more limited capacity to argue.
5–9 Poor Consistently simple or pedestrian sentence patterns with persistent errors; limited vocabulary.	3–6 Poor Some attempt at argument, tends to be sketchy or unspecific; little attempt to structure an argument; major misunderstanding of question.
0–4 Very poor Only the simplest sentence patterns, little evidence of grammatical awareness, very limited vocabulary.	0–2 Very poor Vague and general, ideas presented at random.