



# Cambridge IGCSE™

---

FIRST LANGUAGE ARABIC

0508/02

Paper 2 Writing

May/June 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

---

**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 May/June 2022 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 **8** 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.

**1 General Marking Notes****1.1 Annotations in RM Assessor**

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
✓	Good content point.
?	Unclear meaning or illegible
^	Omission
	Highlight
<b>CON</b>	Contradiction
<b>DET</b>	Relevant detail
<b>DEV</b>	Development
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation
<b>IL</b>	Inaccurate language
<b>IR</b>	Irrelevant
<b>L</b>	Good language
<b>SEEN</b>	Use on all blank pages to show you have checked them for content.
<b>X</b>	Incorrect point

**2 General Marking Instructions**

Candidates will be awarded two marks for each of the two compositions they write:

- the first mark is out of 12 for Style and Accuracy: see Table A;
- the second mark is out of 13 for Content and Structure: see Table B1, B2 or B3 (depending on the type of composition: Argumentative or Discursive, Descriptive or Narrative).

**Irrelevant answers**

The following guidance is intended to clarify how to mark answers if they bear no relevance to the question(s) asked. Please contact your Principal Examiner (or Product Manager for Single Examiners) if you are in any way unsure how to mark a response.

- First check if any of the response has some connection with another question on the paper.
- Look for any parts of the response that could be a plausible response to the question set, and reward the language there. It is likely that the resulting mark will be very low.
- Use the vertical wavy line + IR annotation in the margin to indicate irrelevant material and do not award Language marks for these parts of the answer.

- **Content:** zero is a valid mark if the answer bears no relation at all to any of the questions asked on the paper.  
'Rarely relevant' is in the zero descriptor. For a mark of 1–2 they have to have a few discernible points. If their points do not address the question in any way then they cannot be considered to be discernible points.
- **Language:** apply an approach of only rewarding language within parts of the answer that are in response to the question set.
- If there are really no parts of the answer that could be considered to be an attempt to respond to the question, then zero would be the mark.
- 1–2 marks: 'vocabulary is limited' – if there is very little to mark that is relevant to the question, this will suit.
- 3–4 marks: 'vocabulary communicates simple facts/details accurately'. May be appropriate if there is more relevant material than would justify a 1–2 mark.

<b>TABLE A – STYLE AND ACCURACY</b>		
Band 1	11–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent; variety of well-made sentences, including sophisticated complex sentences where appropriate, used to achieve particular effects.</li> <li>Wide, consistently effective range of vocabulary with appropriately used ambitious words.</li> <li>Assured use of grammar and punctuation, spelling accurate.</li> </ul>
Band 2	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly fluent; sentences correctly constructed, including a variety of complex sentences.</li> <li>Vocabulary often effective, sometimes complex, mostly varied.</li> <li>Grammatically correct; punctuation mostly correct between and within sentences; very occasional spelling mistakes.</li> </ul>
Band 3	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occasional fluency; sentences of some variety and complexity, correctly constructed.</li> <li>Appropriate and accurate vocabulary with occasional examples of choice made to communicate precise meaning or to give interest.</li> <li>Simple grammatical terms correct; sentence separation mostly correct but other forms of punctuation sometimes inconsistently used; occasional spelling mistakes – but no error of any sort impedes communication.</li> </ul>
Band 4	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sentences tend to be simple and patterns repetitive. Where more complicated structures are attempted there is lack of clarity and inaccuracy.</li> <li>Vocabulary communicates general meaning accurately.</li> <li>Some errors of punctuation including sentence separation; several spelling and grammatical errors, rarely serious.</li> </ul>
Band 5	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may be the occasional grammatically complex sentence but mostly these are simple and repetitively joined by ‘and’, ‘but’ and ‘so’, with other conjunctions being used ineffectively, if at all.</li> <li>Vocabulary communicates simple details/facts accurately.</li> <li>Many errors of punctuation, grammar and spelling, but the overall meaning is never in doubt.</li> </ul>
Band 6	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sentences are simple and sometimes faulty and/or rambling sentences obscure meaning.</li> <li>Vocabulary is limited and may be inaccurate.</li> <li>Errors of punctuation, grammar and spelling may be serious enough to impede meaning.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meaning of the writing is often lost because of poor control of language; errors of punctuation, grammar and spelling too intrusive to award a mark in Band 6.</li> </ul>

<b>TABLE B1 – ARGUMENTATIVE/DISCURSIVE TASKS</b>		
Band 1	11–13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a consistent quality of well developed, logical stages in an overall, at times complex argument.</li> <li>Each stage is linked to and follows the preceding one. Sentences within paragraphs are soundly sequenced.</li> </ul>
Band 2	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each stage of the argument is defined and developed, although the quality of the explanation may not be consistent.</li> <li>The stages follow in a generally cohesive progression. Paragraphs are mostly well sequenced, although some may finish less strongly than they begin.</li> </ul>
Band 3	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a series of relevant points and a clear attempt is made to develop some of them. These points are relevant, straightforward and logical/coherent.</li> <li>Repetition is avoided, but the order of the stages in the overall argument can be changed without adverse effect. The sequence of the sentences within paragraphs is satisfactory, although opportunities to link ideas may not be taken.</li> </ul>
Band 4	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mainly relevant points are made and they are developed partially with some effectiveness.</li> <li>The overall argument shows signs of structure but may be sounder at the beginning than at the end. There may be some repetition. It is normally possible to follow sequences of ideas, but there may be intrusive ideas or misleading sentences.</li> </ul>
Band 5	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A few relevant points are made and although they are expanded into paragraphs, development is very simple and not always logical.</li> <li>Overall structure lacks a sense of sequencing. Paragraphs used only for obvious divisions. It is sometimes possible to follow sequencing of sentences within paragraphs.</li> </ul>
Band 6	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A few points are discernible but any attempt to develop them is very limited.</li> <li>Overall argument only progresses here and there and the sequence of sentences is poor.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely relevant, little material, and presented in a disorderly structure.</li> <li>Not sufficient to be placed in Band 6.</li> </ul>

<b>TABLE B2 – DESCRIPTIVE TASKS</b>		
Band 1	11–13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many well defined, well developed ideas and images, describing complex atmospheres with a range of details.</li> <li>• Overall structure is provided through devices such as the movements of the writer, the creation of a short time span, or the creation of atmosphere or tension. Focus is description (not storytelling). Repetition is avoided and the sequence of sentences makes the picture clear to the reader.</li> </ul>
Band 2	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a good selection of interesting ideas and images, with a range of details.</li> <li>• These are formed into an overall picture of some clarity, largely consistent. There may be occasional repetition and opportunities for development or the provision of detail may be missed. Sentences are often well sequenced and the description is often effective.</li> </ul>
Band 3	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a selection of effective ideas and images that are relevant to the topic and which satisfactorily address the task. An attempt is made to create atmosphere and to provide some details.</li> <li>• The description provides a series of points rather than a sense of their being combined to make an overall picture, but some of the ideas are developed successfully, albeit straightforwardly. Some sentences are well sequenced.</li> </ul>
Band 4	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some relevant and effective ideas are provided and occasionally developed a little, perhaps as a narrative. There is some feeling of atmosphere, but most of the writing is about events or description of objects or people.</li> <li>• There is some overall structure, but the writing may lack direction and intent. There may be interruptions in the sequence of sentences and/or some lack of clarity.</li> </ul>
Band 5	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content is relevant but lacking in scope or variety. Opportunities to provide development and detail are frequently missed.</li> <li>• Overall structure, though readily discernible, lacks form and dimension.</li> <li>• The reliance on identifying events, objects and/or people sometimes leads to a sequence of sentences without progression.</li> </ul>
Band 6	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some relevant facts are identified, but the overall picture is unclear and lacks development.</li> <li>• There are examples of sequenced sentences, but there is also repetition and muddled ordering.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely relevant, little material and presented in a disorderly structure. Not sufficient to be placed in Band 6.</li> </ul>

<b>TABLE B3 – NARRATIVE TASKS</b>		
Band 1	11–13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrative is complex and sophisticated and may contain devices such as sub-texts, flashbacks and time lapses. Cogent details are provided where necessary or appropriate.</li> <li>The different sections of the story are carefully balanced and the climax carefully managed. Sentence sequences are sometimes arranged to produce effects such as the building up of tension or providing a sudden turn of events.</li> </ul>
Band 2	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The writing develops some features that are of interest to a reader, although not consistently so. Expect the use of detail and some build-up of character or setting.</li> <li>The writing is orderly and the beginning and ending (where required) are satisfactorily managed. The reader is aware of the climax even if it is not managed completely effectively. The sequencing of sentences provides clarity and engages the reader in events or atmosphere.</li> </ul>
Band 3	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A straightforward story (or part of story) with satisfactory identification of features such as character and setting.</li> <li>While opportunities for appropriate development of ideas are sometimes missed, the overall structure is competent, and features of a developed narrative are evident. Sentences are usually sequenced to narrate events.</li> </ul>
Band 4	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A relevant response to the topic, but largely a series of events with occasional details of character and setting.</li> <li>The overall structure is sound although there are examples where a particular section is too long or too short. A climax is identified but is not effectively described or led up to. Sentence sequences narrate events and occasionally contain intrusive facts or misleading ideas.</li> </ul>
Band 5	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A simple narrative with a beginning, middle and end (where appropriate). It may consist of simple, everyday happenings or unlikely, un-engaging events.</li> <li>Unequal or inappropriate importance is given to the sections of the story. Dialogue that has no function may be used or over-used. There is no real climax. Sentence sequences are used only to link simple series of events.</li> </ul>
Band 6	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stories are very simple and narrate events indiscriminately. Endings are simple and lack effect.</li> <li>The shape of the narrative is unclear; some of the content has no relevance to the plot. Sequences of sentences are sometimes poor, leading to a lack of clarity.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely relevant, little material, and presented in a disorderly structure.</li> <li>Not sufficient to be placed in Band 6.</li> </ul>