The examination consisted of Paper 1, Paper II and Paper III. This year there was only 1 candidate who sat for this examination. The Grade obtained is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paper 1 (part 1) Listening Comprehension (10 marks)**

The candidate did quite well in this section and managed to answer the questions with some difficulty though.

**Paper 1 (part 2) Conversation (10 marks)**

The candidate was asked to freely select a prepared topic out of the given topics to talk for a few minutes with the examiner. The candidates performed quite well, even though s/he appeared to have learned the chosen topic by heart. The candidate was not at all times fluent and coherent in the chosen conversation topic and at times struggled to find the appropriate vocabulary to maintain the conversation. The examiner had to prompt the candidate to support the flow of the conversation.

**PAPER II**

**Section 1 – Essay (15 marks)**

The candidate seems to have struggled to write and did not obtain full marks. The examiners noted that there were several spelling mistakes and even grammatical errors. The contents and ideas of the essays were not at all times organized, had poor punctuation and at times incoherent development of ideas. Moreover, the idiomatic flow of expression in the essay was lacking. It was also noted that the essay was too short.

**Section 2 – Translation from Arabic into English/Maltese (10 marks)**

The candidate did not obtained full marks in this section. The gist of the translation was barely conveyed by the candidate. The examiners observed that the candidate hardly understood the passage for translation and was unable to translate a complete coherent text. Many important key words, vocabulary or phrases were improvised with other irrelevant words. The candidate made serious syntactic errors to the extent that a sentence barely made sense and thus several marks were lost in this section. Some sentences were also omitted and were not translated. On the whole the candidate produced a very weak translation.

**Section 3 – Translation from English into Arabic (10 marks)**

Once again the candidate did not obtain full marks in this section and the translation produced by the sitting candidate was far from accurate and barely conveyed the gist. The translation lacked the essential vocabulary required and the given text was partially translated. Some spelling mistakes were also noted in the translation.
Section 4 - Text for vocalization (5 marks)

The candidate’s performance in this section was quite satisfactory and his/her grammatical knowledge in vocalization was attained. However the examiners were disappointed to note that there were other grave grammatical mistakes the like of which are not expected at this level.

PAPER III

The overall performance of the candidate in these sections was very unsatisfactory.

Section A - History of the Arabs (12 marks)

Candidates are given a choice of three questions of which they are to choose and write about one of them in English, Maltese or Arabic.

The candidate did not obtain full marks and on the contrary his/her performance in this section was extremely poor. The examiners noted that the candidate did not tackle the examination title set in this section as required. The chosen essay title in this section was mostly out of point, incomplete, too short and even at times incoherent. Many important historical and political aspects were not even discussed in the essay chosen by the candidate. Thus the candidate lost valuable marks.

Section B - Arabic Literary History (12 marks)

In the Literary History section the candidate fared even worse than in Section A. Once again the examiners observed that the essay was mostly out of point, with irrelevant contents and with repetition of the same ideas. It clearly transpired that the candidate hardly tackled or analyzed the required topic in question, whereby many important issues were completely neglected. It appeared that the candidate was not capable to tackle Arabic literature as s/he proved to be incapable of stating the facts and analyzing them within their historical perspective and producing cohesion of ideas. In view of this fact, the candidate did not obtain good marks in this section.

Section C - Literature – Set Book [Translation] (12 marks)

The candidate did not obtain full marks in this part of the examination. This translation is always taken from a set book, thus the examiners expect candidates to perform better since this is a seen or a prepared translation. In spite of this given advantage, the candidate produced a very poor translation with important vocabulary either left out or completely misinterpreted. Many key words or phrases were left out or improvised with other words. The translation barely conveyed the basic gist of its meaning. The examiners noted that the candidate had linguistic difficulties.

Conclusion

The examiners are of the opinion that in general the linguistic competences required for Paper I and Paper II at this level are not satisfactory. They also noted that the major shortcomings were the lack of the right vocabulary that the candidate should have used in the translations or essays together with a poor syntax especially in the translation sections.

With regard to Paper III the level attained was far from satisfactory. The low marks obtained by the candidate in this Paper showed that s/he was not well prepared for the Literature and History sections and that the candidate had problems with relating the learned historical or literary knowledge to the examination questions. The examiners’ impression was that the candidate came with prepared essays and simply wrote down what had been previously learnt while ignoring the essay titles. The examiners’ noted that this keeps recurring every year and thus candidates lose most of the marks from Paper III.
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