

MALAY (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0546/02
Reading and Directed Writing

Key messages

Candidates need to ensure that they:

- read the questions and rubrics very carefully
- allow themselves time at the end to check their work and correct any mistakes.

General comments

Section 1 of the paper is designed to give less able candidates the chance to gain marks and give them confidence before they attempt the more difficult and demanding questions in **Sections 2** and **3**.

Candidates are commended for their attempts to answer all of the paper, with only a few leaving blanks.

The least able candidates found **Questions 19i** and **19ii, 20, 27, 28** and **31** to be the most challenging.

In **Question 16**, the strongest candidates covered all three content points in no more than 40 words. Some other very well-written answers could not score highly as they were too long.

In terms of the quality of language used, there was an increase in candidates answering in Indonesian Malay. While some basic words in Indonesian Malay are accepted, a whole sentence or a whole essay in the language is not acceptable.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1

Questions 1-5

The vast majority of candidates achieved full marks for this exercise. Where candidates dropped a mark it was usually on **Question 3** where weather vocabulary such as *salji*, *angin*, *kilat* and *hujan* seemed unfamiliar to some.

Exercise 2

Questions 6-10

Almost all scored full marks. A small number struggled with **Question 7**.

Exercise 3

Questions 11-15

Most candidates scored full marks. A few faltered on **Question 14**.

Exercise 4

Question 16

Candidates were required to describe their new school: **(1)** the school grounds, **(2)** what they like about facilities offered and **(3)** their new friends. Candidates were given pictures to guide them; including the school yard, a swimming pool, and a group of young people. Many candidates coped well with this task. Those who used the pictures as a guide to their content often gained full marks. On the other hand, those who chose to include a lengthy salutation, to elaborate on each point or write about unrelated matters could not score highly. Candidates are reminded that the word limit is 40, and no content after 40 words can be marked.

In terms of language, this was mostly good. Some had problems with the word 'mengenai' (about) which was misinterpreted as 'mengenali' (to know).

Section 2

Exercise 1

Questions 17-24

Although many scored full marks in this exercise, some found **Questions 17ii, 19ii, 20, 23 and 24** challenging. Candidates were required to read very carefully, particularly in **Questions 17 and 19**. Most candidates answered **Question 18** correctly as '*teenagers under the age of 18,*' however some less able candidates answered '*parents*'.

With **Questions 19i and ii**, several candidates wrote both answers on the first answer line. This is acceptable, and can receive both marks, but only if the second answer line is left blank. When candidates wrote a third, irrelevant piece of information on the answer line for **19(ii)**, this invalidated one of the two answers given on the answer line for **19(i)**.

Many answered **Question 20** correctly giving the answer as '*sukarelawan*'. However a handful wrongly answered '*Datuk Hassan Abdullah*'. It is possible that they did not understand the word *membimbing* (to guide).

The majority gave the correct answer to **Question 21**.

Most answered **Question 22** correctly, giving the answer as either "*semua dijemput hadir*", '*ibu bapa remaja*' or '*Datuk Hassan Abdullah*'

Exercise 2

Question 25

Candidates were required to write a letter to the manager of a campsite asking about the location of the campsite, the facilities provided and rental for a night (in the future).

Many managed to write an effective email to the manager of the campsite, asking the right questions and even adding their own information with extra questions related to the bullet points, which gained them extra content marks. Candidates must cover the given bullet points, but can add as much detail about them as they wish within the 80-100 words. Examples of relevant extra content are: how they knew about the campsite; when they planned to go; with whom; for how many nights. Others enquired about extra facilities and why they were interested in those facilities.

Unfortunately, a few candidates misunderstood the task and wrote as if they had already been to the campsite. Instead of asking questions to the manager, they wrote a review of their trip. This meant that their content mark was very low, or zero. Careful reading of the task is very important before starting to write a response.

As in **Question 16**, there is a word limit for this task. Candidates need to complete the task in 80-100 words. Credit cannot be given for any material that goes beyond 100 words.

Section 3

Exercise 1

Questions 26-32

A good majority of the candidates got full marks. Some found **Questions 26** and **30** difficult, or omitted the justification for **Question 27**. Candidates need to remember that they need to provide a justification when the answer is false.

In **Question 30**, some candidates gave an incorrect answer. Instead of '*dalam perjalanan pulang ke rumah* – (on the way back to the house) – the answer given was 'on the way back to the college'.

Exercise 2

Questions 33-40

The final exercise on the question paper is designed to be the most challenging. Many candidates coped very well, and the only questions that they seemed to find difficult were **Questions 37** and **38**. They did not notice the difference between these two questions: **Question 37** asks how many days, while **Question 38** asks when successful applicants were required to work.

A small number of candidates answered **Question 34** incorrectly, giving the names of the hotels instead of listing the jobs offered.

MALAY (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0546/03

Speaking

Key messages

- Examiners must familiarise themselves fully with the contents of the Teachers' Notes booklet.
- Examiners must follow the script of the Role Play tasks as set out in the Teachers' Notes booklet.
- If a candidate misses out an element of a Role Play, the examiner should prompt them to try to elicit the complete task.
- Examiners should make a clear distinction between Section 2 and Section 3.
- Keeping a close eye on the time elapsed is crucial so that candidates all have the same experience.
- Examiners should vary the topics covered and should not ask all candidates the same series of questions.
- Candidates should be asked both expected and unexpected questions.
- To achieve the highest possible mark candidates do not have to be of native speaker standard.

General comments

This Speaking Test was common to all candidates, whether Core or Extended, and, as in previous years, a wide range of performance was heard by the Moderators. The majority of candidates displayed excellent levels of competence and their range of communication skills was extremely good. They had been appropriately prepared for the test and were familiar with its requirements.

Administration

An increase in the number of clerical errors has been noticed by the Moderator. The following administrative problems were encountered:

- Errors in addition of marks: Centres are reminded that they must ensure that the addition of each candidate's marks is checked before transfer to the MS1 Mark Sheet.
- Centres are reminded of the need to include the name of the conducting Examiner(s) in the space allowed for this purpose on the Working Mark Sheet (Oral Examination Summary Mark Sheet).
- Incorrect candidate numbers: it is crucial that names and numbers on all documentation are correct.
- Use of more than one Examiner per Centre: where large Centres wish to use more than one Examiner, permission to do so must be requested from Cambridge well before **each** Oral examination session. Where permission is granted, Internal Moderation procedures will need to be put in place in the Centre to ensure that candidates follow a single rank order. Such Centres will then submit a recorded sample of 6 candidates, across the range, in the usual way, but ensuring that the work of all Examiners is covered.
- Missing MS1 Mark Sheets: the Moderator copy of the completed MS1 Mark Sheet must be included with the materials for moderation.
- Missing examination details and labels on cassettes/CDs: Some Centres did not put any details or labels on cassettes/CDs making it very difficult for the Moderator to identify the recordings. This is especially difficult in Centres with a large number of candidates.
- A number of Centres still sent all their recordings without carrying out any sample selection. As a result, the moderation process took longer than usual. In addition, some Centres did not spread the sample selection evenly, often omitting the weakest candidate's recording. Some only submitted recordings from one Examiner and failed to include recordings of the other Examiner(s) as part of the sample selection.
- A few samples arrived much later than the specified deadline.

Quality of recording

The vast majority of Centres had taken great care to ensure the audibility of their samples. However, work received from a very small number was inaudible/muffled in places. This was sometimes the result of poor positioning of the microphone/tape recorder. Centres are reminded of the need to check all equipment prior to the test in the room in which the examination will take place. There were also some background noises

which affected the audibility of the recordings. Examiners should also remember to announce the number of each candidate on the recording – the candidate him/herself should not do this. Once the recording of each candidate should be continuous, for example, the recording must not be paused during an individual candidate's examination. Some centres, unfortunately, did not spot check recordings before submitting them to Cambridge, as some elements of the examination were not available for moderation as the recordings were unavailable, incomplete or stopped abruptly.

Timings

Timings were usually good (15 minutes per candidate), but in some Centres candidates were not examined for the correct amount of time. Some tests were very short and did not comply with the requirements of the examination. Some were too long and became quite tedious for candidates. Please remember to ensure that all candidates receive equal treatment and that the timings specified in the Teachers' Notes Booklet are kept to.

Preparation of candidates

Most Centres had prepared their candidates in an appropriate way and there was evidence of spontaneous, natural conversation in the two Conversations section. In the large majority of Centres, Examiners managed to engage their candidates in a lively, spontaneous and engaging way, following up leads wherever possible. Such Examiners used a variety of questions with different candidates and pitched the level of questioning according to the ability of the candidate being tested. There were, however, a small number of Centres in which candidates were over-prepared and only focused on the same topic, for example, "My Self", "My Family" and "My School". Centres are reminded that under no circumstances must candidates know in advance the questions they are to be asked in the examination. It is also important that Examiners vary questions between candidates. If candidates are over-prepared, it becomes difficult for the Moderators to hear evidence of the ability to cope with unexpected questions in a variety of timeframes and candidates are denied access to the top bands of the mark scheme.

In the Role Plays section, Examiners must keep to the prompts given, and not create their own tasks. If the prompts are changed or missed out, candidates are disadvantaged because they prepare themselves for the Role Plays according to the cards, but then cannot get full marks as they struggle to follow the Examiners' own, newly created, tasks.

Application of the mark scheme

The mark scheme was generally well applied in Centres and marking was often close to the agreed standard.

MALAY (FOREIGN LANGUAGE)

Paper 0546/04
Continuous Writing

Key messages

Candidates need to ensure that they:

- read the questions two or three times carefully before attempting to answer
- adhere to the word limit specified
- allow themselves time at the end to check their work and correct any mistakes.

General comments

In general, the candidates did well in their chosen topics.

In **Section 1**, most candidates chose the informal email to a friend and responded well. Among the candidates who chose the more formal letter task, some found it difficult to cover the bullet points.

The most successful candidates are not necessarily those with the best command of Malay. Those who do best are those who demonstrate their command of Malay within the allowed word count. No matter how good the content of an answer, if it extends beyond the allowed word limit, it cannot be rewarded. For letters and emails, addresses are not counted in the 130-140 words. Candidates are advised to just go straight into the subject matter and deal with the points to be included in the letter or the email. An elaborately written letter or email that does not address the points given cannot gain many marks.

In a formal letter, many candidates adhered to the rule of using formal language, especially in addressing the recipient (*anda/encik*) and addressing oneself (*saya*). A few used the informal form of *you – kamu/awak*, which is deemed impolite when addressing people who are older or in a senior position. In an email to a friend, candidates can use the informal form of address.

In **Question 2**, where candidates were required to continue the story, there is no need for candidates to repeat or paraphrase the given beginning. This is not only a waste of time but also a waste of a valuable number of words which cannot be included in the word count. No matter how good the story is, the counting of words stops at 140.

In this examination, the language used must be Malaysian Malay rather than Indonesian Malay. There are some words that are acceptable but some words convey a totally different meaning and cannot be accepted.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) This was not as popular as the other question in this section. Most wrote in the format of a formal letter as taught in schools and this is most commendable. However for this task, because of the limited number of words allowed in the response (130-140 words), it is advisable to tell the candidates to go straight into a brief salutation, and then proceed to cover the bullet points, without writing a lengthy formal introduction to their letter.

Many wrote about why they were interested in history, giving reasons such as their interest about things in the past that had helped to shape the present and the future, about prominent figures and their contribution to the country.

As for what they have done to promote their interest in this field, some wrote about their activities in school, their visits to historical sites and reading and researching subjects relating to history.

Many candidates found the next point more challenging: how to use the information from the interview to help realise their ambition.

Most candidates asked for the opportunity to do part time work at the museum, ending their letter expressing their appreciation and hopes that they would be able to get the interview and the part time job.

Question 1

- (b) The majority of the candidates chose this question: perhaps they could relate to being in such a situation. Although this was supposed to be an email, many candidates treated this as a letter, including the usual salutations and asking after the well-being of the friend as well as informing the friend of his/her good health. This was not an advisable use of the 130-140 word limit. The most successful responses made a very limited greeting and then started straight away to cover the bullet points.

The most common reason given for the absence from School was dengue fever. Some went into great detail about how they got the illness and what they had to go through. Other causes of absence ranged from a broken leg as a result of an accident, 'high' fever or a life threatening disease. A handful did not mention anything except for 'recovering from an illness' – which was of course already in the rubric.

Candidates also wrote elaborately on what they did or did not do at home, ranging from reading to just watching TV and playing computer games. They expressed that they felt bored and could not wait to go back to school as they had missed their friends.

Many expressed concern over an impending important exam, saying how ill-prepared they were as they had missed their lessons. They asked for the friend's help, either to bring back homework or class notes. Some mistook this bullet point, thinking that they needed to ask for help in telling their teacher the reason for their absence.

The last bullet point was often misunderstood. Perhaps candidates did not understand the phrase '*membalas budi baiknya*' - to repay the kindness. The strongest candidates promised to repay the kindness with a holiday abroad, a treat at the cinema, a favourite book and a treat at their favourite restaurant. Those who did not understand just repeated the word '*membalas budi baiknya*' – to repay his/her kindness.

The question very clearly states that the candidate had missed class for a month – all in the past tense. However, a handful of candidates used the future tense when describing what they were going to do at home during the one month away from School.

Another point worth raising is the use of '*kami*' and '*kita*', candidates need to be sure of the difference between these two words. Similarly the use of the words *minta/suruh/tanya* – *minta* is to ask for something, *suruh* is to ask someone to do something and *tanya* is to ask a question.

Question 2

Most candidates handled this question very well, using their language creatively and letting their imagination run. It could be a straightforward story of either not finding anything after a lot of effort spent dragging up the box/chest from the bottom of the river to the river bank, or a more elaborate and involved storyline with a description of the box; displaying their knowledge of history or art.

Most candidates described a feeling of anxiety, fear and even excitement at the prospect of finding out what was in the chest/box.

Although candidates realised that they could not afford to write a lengthy essay, many repeated themselves in describing the attempts to drag the chest/box up and/or the attempts to open the box.

Stories included surprises such as chest/box not containing treasures or money, or in some cases a more macabre discovery was made. Those taking the latter approach described reporting their find to the police and being rewarded for their efforts. Those who found some artifacts of value sent them to the museum,

while a handful kept the money or treasure for their own use. Some candidates described finding a bottle.

They are some very good responses which were well structured and where candidates used the classifiers and affixes.

Among the weaker responses were those where candidates had not read the question properly, and did not continue the story from the beginning provided. A small minority used a lot of words to describe the weather, and what they were doing by the river before they started to talk about the box/chest. This meant that their content marks were lower, as they could not develop and conclude the story within 140 words.

There were some candidates who did not fully understand the question, misunderstanding two important words/phrases: *membawa naik* and *peti*. They thought that *membawa naik* (to bring up) was just to 'go up' or 'to ride' the box/chest.

This could sometimes be acceptable according to context they gave, and those who 'rode' the box/chest then embarked on an adventure, after which they felt tired and went home to relate the story to their parents.

'*Peti*' posed another problem – some took it to mean pet – one that they took home to look after.

Some wrote about swimming and finding the chest/box but did not elaborate more on their discovery.

A handful of candidates addressed the task of finding the trunk but changed the story plot into a mishap that happened after finding the trunk (involved in an accident, drowning in water/quicksand, a robbery at home as the trunk was brought home, putting the trunk on display at home and wiping it daily).