

FIRST LANGUAGE THAI

<p>Paper 0518/02</p> <p>Reading and Directed Writing</p>
--

General comments

This year candidates found **Question 1** quite challenging. However, in the rest of the paper, candidates made confident use of their skills. Strong candidates were good at selecting relevant information and at writing persuasively in their own words. Also, strong candidates were aware of the audience, writing with clear and precise direction.

Areas where candidates could improve their performance included careful reading of the rubric, using time more wisely and dividing it equally for each of the questions, and spelling. Candidates must not copy whole chunks from the texts as they will be penalised not only in terms of content, but also in terms of language. Good handwriting makes it much easier for the Examiner to read the candidates' work.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Summarise the two texts: a. In what ways does Bangkok attract foreigners? b. how has tourism changed Bangkok?

This was the most difficult question for the majority of the candidates. The most important point was for candidates to read the instructions carefully. Many put forward their own opinions, and this was not required. The summary style required information to be drawn from the texts, not from the candidates' own knowledge. Writing a summary has to be precise and clear; many candidates had significant problems with how to extract the information needed for the task. The summary required a degree of structure and organisation e.g. changes happening in Bangkok should be listed together. The register of the piece needed to be considered: a formal style was required throughout.

Question 2

Write a conversation between you and your relatives, who have just come back from abroad after leaving Bangkok for a long time.

Candidates seemed to enjoy this question, and a lot of them made the conversation interesting with relevant information from both texts. Some were a pleasure to read, with convincing characterisation and a natural feel. However, some candidates failed to use the information from the texts, and some did not understand that this needed to be a conversation.

Question 3

Write a letter to a friend about the activities in the eco camp that you have visited.

Candidates again seemed to enjoy this question and performed well. Strong candidates knew how to select information relevant to the task and lend it their own distinctive, persuasive voice. Some of the responses were a joy to read with engaging content. Weak candidates failed to identify relevant information and chose to write their own story instead. Language needed to be appropriate for writing to a friend, but not too informal. Again the essential aspect of this question was for candidates to read the rubric and do what the question asked.

FIRST LANGUAGE THAI

<p>Paper 0518/03 Continuous Writing</p>

General comments

There are 9 questions on this paper and candidates must select one. The most popular questions offered candidates the opportunity to recount their own experiences and the content of these compositions did not pose any difficulties. One area that was more of a problem was sentence structure, as candidates tended to follow English patterns rather than Thai. Sentence separation and spelling are other areas that need to be worked at. Weaker candidates should be praised for doing their best to write a full composition even when their knowledge of Thai was very limited.

Candidates are reminded to ensure that their handwriting is legible at all times.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 2 and 8 were the most popular as they allowed candidates to draw upon their own experiences.

Question 6 asked candidates to make up a short story; sometimes these essays lacked an appropriate ending.

Question 5 was quite demanding and candidates needed to use their time wisely to incorporate the elements required for this composition.

Question 7 was difficult for candidates not used to Thai verse as the vocabulary and images needed to be interpreted.

Questions 1, 3, 4 and 9 were less popular than **2 and 8**. They required candidates to give their opinions on various topics relevant to young people.