

FIRST LANGUAGE THAI

Paper 0518/02
Reading and Directed Writing

Key messages

- This is the last year of this examination format. Teachers are advised to read the syllabus carefully for the June 2018 examination, alongside the specimen assessment materials and other support materials.
- The best candidates understood how to use appropriate register, organisation, grammar and vocabulary.
- Candidates should take time to read all questions carefully to ensure they do not miss marks by omitting part of the task.

General comments

This year's candidates, in general, performed very well. Many responses were interesting to read.

Candidates are reminded to take care with their handwriting, to ensure that it is legible. Examiners try hard to understand all that is written, but marks cannot be awarded if communication is not successfully achieved because of illegible handwriting.

In order to do well, candidates need to answer the questions using their own words, rather than lifting large sections from the original reading text.

Comments on specific questions

Part 1

Question 1

The best candidates well understood the task of how to summarise the two texts according to the questions asked. They were able to use appropriate register and lexis; however, a small number of candidates did not have the skills to select appropriate information, instead adding descriptive details or lifting large sections from the original texts. Such extra information is not required, and cannot receive marks. For this task, candidates need to be precise and give information while comes only from the two texts. This needs to be written as continuous prose, not a list of points or bullet points. They do not need to offer comments or opinions of their own. This year there were some candidates who included their opinions about the cause of waste: some candidates tried to use their own words which gave different meanings from the original words. Some candidates lifted large sections from the original texts without using their own words. In order to do well, candidates need to summarise the text without adding own opinions. When using their own words, candidates need to make sure that the words used have the same meaning in the context.

Question 2

Stronger candidates used appropriate language wisely, engaging the reader's interest and making their article more effective and convincing. In the very best responses, the reader was able to get a real sense of the importance of recycling in the article. In this task, candidates did need to use their own words; it was not enough to copy all the information from the texts.

Strong responses included mention of the causes and impact of waste. They introduced different methods of waste management to their school friends, including what young people can do for the recycling effort and details of the exhibition. There were some candidates who wrote about recycling without using their own words. Some candidates did not include information from Passage 1. Candidates are reminded that they must carefully read the question and instructions before beginning to write their response. The better responses used their own, often emotive language to convince the reader to start to recycle.

Part 2

Question 3

The best responses were written in both emotive and factual language, showing an awareness of how to grab the reader's attention. These responses were very convincing and persuasive. Weaker response tended to lift most information from the text without using their own words, or exaggerated the facts. Some candidates did not read the question carefully. Therefore, they did not mention Mr Seksun and his inspiration in the article. The best responses combined facts and opinions very well. Factual language and emotive language were suitable and blended in nicely including a sense of coherence of paragraphs. They were able to convince the reader to start doing voluntary work.

FIRST LANGUAGE THAI

Paper 0518/03
Continuous Writing

Key messages

- This is the last year of this examination format. Teachers are advised to read the syllabus carefully for the June 2018 examination, alongside the specimen assessment materials and other support materials.
- Performance was generally better than last year. Candidates demonstrated a good variety of sentence structures, and a more sophisticated use of vocabulary to communicate their intended meaning.
- Most candidates also adhered to the suggested word limit.

General comments

Candidates who used a varied and sophisticated vocabulary that properly conveyed their meaning were able to score high marks. Strong responses contained correct and appropriate comparative words as well as complex and varied types of sentence structures, resulting in interesting and engaging writing. A much welcomed improvement in spelling and punctuation was observed.

Good planning to match the story with the topic was important, and stronger responses came from those candidates who had allowed sufficient time to structure their answers, compared to those who relied on formulaic pre-learned phrases, inserted without any due reflection of whether they were relevant to the topic or not.

As in previous years, relevance is still an issue for some candidates. Although most were able to write a relevant story, some parts were either irrelevant or inconsistent, reducing the impact of the work. Weaker candidates produced stock answers which were not specifically written to meet the requirements of the question.

Candidates must use accurate spelling, appropriate tenses and relevant vocabulary.

Comment on specific questions

The most popular questions were **Questions 4, 6, and 8**. **Question 4** was particularly popular because this topic required candidates to provide their opinion on mobile phones and their role as a tool controlling people's lives, which seems to be something closely related to young people's life experience. **Topic 8** was also popular as it asked candidates to examine whether they agreed or not with the proposition that there are no secrets left in the world. Some very credible answers were put forward and the best marks were awarded to those who presented coherent and indeed, in some cases, well-argued critiques, with relevant examples.

Question 3 required candidates to develop a story from a photograph of children helping a dog out of the water. Some scripts showed advanced language skills as well as good imagination, with effective use of emotional vocabulary that spoke to the depths of emotion that can exist between humans and dogs.

Question 1 was the least popular topic, and asked for an analysis and personal reflection on a Thai poem which was in the Lokaniti format. The poem was focused on human values reflected in their good deeds, because when people die the only part of them remaining in the world is the result of either their good deeds or bad deeds. Those who did choose this question were able to secure good marks through a technical evaluation of the piece and, more critically at this level, inclusion of their own perspective.