



Cambridge International AS & A Level

TAMIL

9689/42

Paper 4 Texts

May/June 2026

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 75

Published

This mark scheme contains the instructions and marking guidance that our examiners used to mark candidate responses for this component.

Before they start marking, examiners complete a standardisation process. They review a range of candidate responses and discuss the mark scheme in detail to agree which answers can and cannot be accepted. Examiners award marks where it is clear that candidate responses have met the requirements of the mark scheme. These requirements may vary between different components or different versions of the same component, depending on the exact requirements of the question and the candidate responses seen during the standardisation process.

Sometimes, our mark schemes may allow marks to be awarded to responses which contain elements that are factually incorrect or for content not covered by the syllabus. We do this in response to the demands of a specific question to support candidates and make sure that our assessments are fair. However, these allowances should not be used as a guide for teaching and learning.

We cannot discuss the mark scheme with schools, and we recommend that schools read the mark scheme together with the assessment material and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

This document consists of **6** printed pages.

General marking principles

All examiners must apply these marking principles when marking candidate responses.

1	Examiners must award marks for each response in line with: - the specific content defined in the mark scheme - the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions - the standard of response required as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
2	Examiners must award whole marks (not half marks, or other fractions).
3	Examiners must award marks positively . This means that: - marks are not deducted for errors or omissions - marks are awarded for correct/valid answers as defined in the mark scheme and also for other valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme referring to your team leader as appropriate - the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are judged only when the mark scheme indicates that these features are specifically assessed in the question. However, the meaning of all responses must be unambiguous.
4	Examiners must consistently apply the requirements of the mark scheme and any rules for what to do when candidates have not followed instructions correctly.
5	Examiners must use the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme, unless limited by the quality of the candidate responses seen.
6	Examiners must award marks according to the mark scheme and must not award marks with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Credit for good language or content point
	Incorrect
	Omission
	Repetition
	Irrelevant
	Development, expansion of a point
	Relevant detail
	Evaluation
	Relevant example used
	Meaning unclear or illegible
	To indicate that page has been seen and any creditworthy material has been awarded
Highlighter	Highlight
On-page comment	Wrong question number given by candidate
Off-page comment	Used to make a holistic comment about the script

General Marking Instructions	
Questions 1/2/3/4/5/6	Check the script to see which question the candidate has answered and then select the correct row in the mark input box (<i>e.g. if the candidate has answered question 3(a), select 3(a) in the mark input panel</i>). Note: If a candidate has written down the wrong question number, e.g. they have clearly answered question 2(b), but have written question 1(a) on the script, place a '?' next to the question number. You must enter the mark against the question number that the candidate actually answered. Marks Select 1(a) or 1(b) or 2(a) or 2(b) or 3(a) or 3(b) or 4(a) or 4(b) or 5(a) or 5(b) or 6(a) or 6(b), according to which question the candidate has answered. Enter a mark out of 25 in the mark input box for the question that the candidate has answered. After you have entered your marks for the question(s) that the candidate has answered, CLICK ON COMPLETE so that 'NR' can be populated automatically for the questions that the candidate has not answered.
	Relevance Only material relevant to the question should be awarded marks. If the candidate has written an essay which is a genuine attempt to answer the question, but has strayed from the focus of the essay title, it will not normally score full marks. If the candidate has presented an essay which is clearly completely irrelevant and does not attempt to answer the question, it should score 0.
Rubric infringements: Candidates are told to answer one question from section A, one question from section B and one other. Each question that the candidate answers must be on a different set text. Sometimes a candidate will misread the rubric and will answer more than three questions, fewer than three questions, or more than one question on the same set text. Please mark all of the responses on each script. RM Assessor will automatically calculate the best mark that the candidate can achieve, within the acceptable rubric rules.	
Crossing out: (a) If a candidate changes his/her mind over an answer and crosses out an attempt, award a mark if the final attempt is correct. (b) If a candidate crosses out an answer <u>to a whole question</u> but makes no second attempt at it, mark the crossed-out work. (Please note that a 'second attempt' could just be a single word.)	

Candidates must write their answers in the target language. Examiners will look for a candidate's ability to communicate effectively and will ignore those linguistic errors which do not impede communication.

Passage-based questions

Examiners should consider the extent to which candidates have been able to identify the significant issues raised in the passage and, where appropriate, have applied these to the text as a whole. The passage is a stimulus passage, to be used as a springboard to give candidates a starting point for their answer. Examiners should allow candidates to use the passage as they choose, and ask themselves how successfully the candidates have manipulated their material and to what extent they have shown depth of awareness and knowledge of the workings of the text under discussion. This is not an exercise in literary criticism: Examiners should reward candidates whose answers show good understanding of how a text works and how an author has conveyed the key issues.

Essay questions

A prime consideration is that candidates show detailed knowledge and understanding of the text.

Extracts from Examiners' Notes

This paper is intended to test candidates' knowledge of a text and their ability to use this knowledge to answer questions in a clear and focused manner. A sophisticated literary approach is not expected (though at the highest levels it is sometimes seen), but great value is placed on evidence of a first-hand response and of a thoughtful, personal evaluation of what candidates have read. Candidates may have been encouraged to depend closely on prepared notes and quotations: quotation for its own sake is not useful, though it will not be undervalued if used appropriately to illustrate a point in the answer.

Candidates do not tend to show **all** the qualities or faults described in any one mark-band. Examiners attempt to weigh all these up at every borderline, in order to see whether the work can be considered for the category above. At the lower levels, the answer may mention a few 'facts' but these may be so poorly understood, badly organised and irrelevant that it falls into category 10–11; or there may be just enough sense of understanding and focus for the Examiner to consider the 12–13 band. Again, at a higher level, an answer may be clear, solid and conscientious (perhaps 18–19), without showing quite the control and attention to perceptively chosen detail which would justify 20 or more.

Examiners take a positive and flexible approach and, even when there are obvious flaws in an answer, reward evidence of knowledge and especially any signs of understanding and careful organisation.

Candidates are expected to write 500–600 words for each of their answers. Candidates who write more than 600 words cannot be placed higher than the 16–17 category in the Mark Scheme.

Marks	Description
22+	Exceptional work. Excellent ability to organise material, thorough knowledge, considerable sensitivity to language and to author's intentions, understanding of some literary techniques. Really articulate and intelligent answers should be considered in this band even if there are still flaws and omissions.
20–21	Very good. Close attention to detail of passages, controlled structure, perceptive use of illustration, good insight when discussing characters. Ability to look beyond the immediate material and to show some understanding of author's intentions and of underlying themes.
18–19	Thoroughly solid and relevant work. Candidate does not simply reproduce information: can discuss and evaluate material and come to clear conclusion. Good focus on passages. Some limitations of insight but coherent, detailed approach and aptly chosen illustrations.
16–17	Painstaking. Sound knowledge of texts; mainly relevant. Some attempt to analyse and compare, some sense of understanding. Possibly not in full control of material; solid but indiscriminate. Many very conscientious candidates fall into this category: they tend to write far too much as they are reluctant to leave out anything they have learnt. Focused, coherent essays which lack really solid detail but convey a good understanding of the text should also be considered for this band.
14–15	Fair relevance and knowledge. Better organised than work in the 12–13 band: the candidate probably understands the demands of the question without being able to develop a very thorough response. Still a fairly simple, black and white approach. Some narrative and 'learnt' material but better control and focus than work in the 12–13 band. Many candidates probably fall into this category.
12–13	Sound, if simple and superficial, knowledge of plot and characters. Makes assertions without being able to illustrate or develop points. Probably still too dependent on narrative and memorised oddments but there may be a visible attempt to relate these to the question. Can extract one or two relevant points from a set passage.
10–11	Some very basic material but not much sense of understanding or ability to answer question. The candidate rarely reads the set passage but uses it as a springboard for storytelling and memorised bits and pieces about characters. Very general, unspecific approach. Random, bitty structure. Signs of organisation and relevance should be looked for in case the answer can be considered for a mark in the 12–13 band.
6–9	Marginally more knowledge here than in the 0–5 band. The candidate may have read the text but is probably unable to see beyond the barest bones of the plot or half-remembered notes. Insubstantial; very little relevance. The candidate may have problems with the language and will be unable to express ideas comprehensibly.
0–5	No discernible material. Often very inadequate language. Marks in this section are awarded almost on the basis of quantity: up to 3 for a sentence or two showing a glimpse of knowledge, 4 or 5 where there is also a hint of relevance to the question. It is possible for a candidate to write a whole page demonstrating no knowledge at all (have they read the book?), or only misunderstood background facts or very vague general remarks unrelated to either text or question.