

# MALAY

---

<p><b>Paper 0546/03</b> <b>Speaking</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- The teacher/examiner should familiarize themselves fully with the contents of the teachers' notes booklet.
- The teacher/examiner should announce the transition between each part of the test.
- The teacher/examiner should remember that to achieve the highest possible mark candidates do not have to be of native speaker standard

### **In the Role play section:**

- The teacher/examiner should stick to the role play tasks as set out in the teachers' notes and should not omit, create or replace any task.
- The teacher/examiner should start the conversation in each role play.
- The teacher/examiner should give an appropriate prompt if an element of a role play task is omitted or response is ambiguous.
- The teacher/examiner should not offer vocabulary items or options, unless these appear in the teachers' notes – please let candidates work for their marks.

### **In the Topic presentation/conversation section:**

- The teacher/examiner should interrupt the candidate if the candidate's topic presentation lasts for more than two minutes.
- The teacher/examiner should encourage their candidates to choose their own topic for the topic presentation/conversation section. They should avoid 'My self' or 'My life'.
- The teacher/examiner should consistently ask questions to elicit past and future meaning.

### **In the General conversation section:**

- The teacher/examiner should vary the topics covered and should not ask all candidates the same series of questions.
- The teacher/examiner should not ask questions which test candidates' general knowledge or questions which are too demanding.
- The teacher/examiner should be patient, give more time to weaker candidates to think and should not use English to help the candidates.
- The teacher/examiner should cover about three topics in each candidate's general conversation and should not cover areas already covered in the topic conversation.
- The teacher/examiner should consistently ask questions to elicit past and future meaning

## General comments

As in previous years, a range of performance was heard by the Moderator. 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. The examining was sympathetic and the Examiner put candidates at their ease.

## **Administration**

Regrettably, administrative errors have been noticed by the Moderator.

- Errors in addition of marks: Centres are reminded that they must ensure that the addition of each candidate's marks in the WMS is checked before transfer to the MS1 Mark Sheet. The interactive form available from the Samples database will automatically calculate the total marks.
- Incorrect candidate numbers: it is crucial that names and numbers on all documentation are correct.

- Some Centres with more than two examiners did not carry out any Internal Moderation and this increased the duration of the external moderation process. Some Centres that carried out Internal Moderation changed marks even when these were **within  $\pm 2$  or 3** marks of each other and some of these were changed in isolation. There were some Centres that had more than one examiner, even though the Centres had not contacted Cambridge in advance for permission.
- Missing examination details and labels on CDs: Some Centres did not put any details or labels on CDs, making it very difficult for the Moderators to navigate the recordings. Also, some Centres did not put any examination details in the recordings; for example, just writing 'Track 1' to represent a sample candidate instead of the full examination details such as candidate name and number.
- A number of Centres did not spread the sample selection evenly, meaning that a recording was unavailable for the weaker candidates. Some only submitted recordings of one examiner instead of including recordings of the other examiner(s) as part of the sample selection.
- A handful of Centres sent material for a different language. Centres are reminded to check contents carefully when they send materials to Cambridge.

### Examining technique

- For the Conversations section, Examiners must not take up time giving their own opinions during the Topic Conversation and General Conversation. The examination is an opportunity for candidates to show what they can do, and the Examiner's role is to facilitate a discussion.
- In the General Conversation, a full five minutes need to be allocated to each candidate for a genuine conversation. Some Examiners awarded full marks to candidates who were allowed to deliver a pre-prepared monologue, or where the conversation lasted less than 3 minutes.
- Examiners should not ask about topics that are above the expected linguistic or maturity level of the candidates, for example politics and current affairs.
- As candidates can only be awarded a mark above 6 for Language if they demonstrate past, present and future meaning, Examiners need to ask questions to elicit this. Examiners need to be creative and agile. Regrettably, even very good Examiners can be inconsistent in this area. When Centres use Examiners who are not familiar with the examination format, they must be thoroughly briefed and know what to do so that they conduct the examination properly.

### Quality of recording

The vast majority of Centres took care to ensure the audibility of their samples, but work received from a very small number was inaudible/muffled in places. This was sometimes the result of poor positioning of the microphone. 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 negatively affected the moderation process. Examiners should also remember to announce the name and number of each candidate on the recording – the candidate him/herself should not do this. Once started, the recording of each candidate should be continuous: the recording must not be paused/stopped during an individual candidate's examination. Some Centres, unfortunately, did not spot check their recordings before submitting them to Cambridge, as some elements of the examination were missing.

### Timings

Timings were usually good (15 minutes per candidate). 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 fair treatment in terms of timing.

### Preparation of candidates

Most Centres prepared their candidates in an appropriate way and there was evidence of spontaneous, natural conversation in the two Conversations section. There were, however, a small number of Centres in which candidates were over-prepared and only focused on the same topic, for example, 'My Family' and 'My School'. Centres are reminded that candidates must not know in advance the questions they are to be asked in the examination. Examiners must also 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 tenses and candidates are denied access to the top bands of the mark scheme. It was pleasing, however, to note that, in the large majority of Centres, Examiners did manage 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.

In the Role Play section, Examiners must keep to the prompts and not create their own tasks. This is to avoid confusing candidates, who will have prepared themselves for the Role Plays according to the prompts on their card.

### **Application of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme was generally well applied by Examiners and marking was often close to the agreed standard. One of the main reasons Moderators had to reduce marks was because Examiners had awarded high Language marks to candidates who did not demonstrate their ability to communicate past, present and future meaning. Indeed, many Examiners did not ask questions to elicit past/future tenses and so limited the potential of their candidates to receive high marks.

# MALAY

---

<p><b>Paper 0546/22</b> <b>Reading</b></p>
--

## Key messages

- To succeed in Section 1, candidates should build up a good base of vocabulary, including common verbs.
- Being familiar with affixes will help candidates to choose the correct word in the “fill in the gap” questions.
- In comprehension exercises, brief answers are required. Longer answers may include incorrect details which invalidate an otherwise correct answer.

## General comments

Generally, the performance of the candidates was very good.

With comprehension questions, candidates should read the text several times before attempting to answer the questions. They should read the questions to see what specific information is required, and not just copy out chunks from the text.

While simple spelling errors are tolerated, if the wrong spelling creates a new meaning, the word cannot be accepted. The same applies for incorrect prefixes and suffixes: if ambiguity of meaning results, then the communication is not successful and cannot be rewarded.

The language used should be standard Malaysian Malay. Where candidates wrote using Indonesian Malay, marks could not always be awarded because some spellings in Indonesian Malay bring about another meaning.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1**

#### **Exercise 1 Questions 1–5**

The majority of candidates got these questions right. Those who did not, got **Question 3** wrong. These candidates did not know the word ‘arnab’ (rabbit) and chose the picture of a cat instead.

#### **Exercise 2 Questions 6–10**

Almost all candidates scored full marks.

#### **Exercise 3 Questions 11–15**

Most candidates scored full marks.

### **Section 2**

#### **Questions 16–20**

Candidates had to fill in the blanks with the correct answer, taken from a list of words provided. Most answered all the questions correctly.

### Questions 21–28

In this section, the most challenging question was **Question 22** : ‘How do people communicate with each other?’

Many candidates answered incorrectly with ‘they play games’, taken from the second paragraph.

### Section 3

#### Question 29–33

Based on the text given, candidates first decide whether the given statements are True or False. If the statements are false, candidates have to give a correct statement, based on the information in the text.

The most challenging question was **Question 33**.

‘At the end of his experience, Arif still felt scared and worried’. Candidates needed to find out how he felt at the end of his experience. Most were able to correctly identify that the statement was false, but found it harder to correct the statement to ‘At the end of the experience, he felt his knowledge about his own country has increased/it has also increased his self confidence’.

When writing the justification sentences, candidates should not use the first person ‘saya’ (copied from the text), as this invalidates their answers.

#### Exercise 2 Questions 34–39

Most candidates did well in this exercise. Some candidates need to remember not to use the first person ‘saya’ (copied from the text), as this invalidates their answers.

# MALAY

---

<p><b>Paper 0546/23</b> <b>Reading</b></p>
--

## Key messages

- To succeed in Section 1, candidates should build up a good base of vocabulary, including common verbs.
- Being familiar with affixes will help candidates to choose the correct word in the “fill in the gap” questions.
- In comprehension exercises, brief answers are required. Longer answers may include incorrect details which invalidate an otherwise correct answer.

## General comments

Generally, the performance of the candidates was very good.

With comprehension questions, candidates should read the text several times before attempting to answer the questions. They should read the questions to see what specific information is required, and not just copy out chunks from the text.

While simple spelling errors are tolerated, if the wrong spelling creates a new meaning, the word cannot be accepted. The same applies for incorrect prefixes and suffixes: if ambiguity of meaning results, then the communication is not successful and cannot be rewarded.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1**

#### **Exercise 1 Questions 1–5**

The majority of candidates got these questions right.

#### **Exercise 2 Questions 6–10**

Almost all candidates scored full marks.

#### **Exercise 3 Questions 11–15**

Most candidates scored full marks. However, among those who did not, **Questions 12** and **13** proved the most challenging.

For **Question 12**, the answer should be C ‘tidak teruk’ (not serious). However, many chose B ‘merbahaya’ (dangerous). There was nothing in the text to show that Johan had a dangerous condition or illness.

For **Question 13**, the answer should be A ‘dia tidak ada selera’ (he lost his appetite). However, many candidates chose C ‘dia demam’ (he has a fever) which was incorrect.

## Section 2

### Questions 16–20

Candidates had to fill in the blanks with the correct answer, taken from a list of words provided. Most answered all the questions correctly. **Question 18** was challenging for some candidates, who wrongly chose the word 'makmal' (lab). The correct answer was 'kemudahan' (facilities).

### Question 21–28

In this section, the most challenging question was **Question 22**: 'What types of writing are required for this competition?'

Some thought that this required them to list the themes and answered incorrectly 'perayaan/kasih sayang keluarga' (festivals/loving relationship in the family).

In **Question 24**, only one answer was needed, but the majority of candidates gave two answers taken from the text. This question could be answered with a simple one word answer 'gambar' (picture) or 'lukisan' (drawing). Candidates who gave two answers were not penalised, unless they gave a long answer including invalid information.

In **Question 25**, weaker candidates copied out a chunk of text from the passage, without demonstrating their understanding.

Some candidates need to remember not to use the first person 'saya' (copied from the text), as this invalidates their answers.

## Section 3

### Question 29–33

Based on the text given, candidates first decide whether the given statements are True or False. If the statements are false, candidates have to give a correct statement, based on the information in the text.

### Question 29

Most candidates answered this question correctly. However, the few who got it wrong gave the answer as "two weeks".

### Question 30

For this trip, the writer and his friend got some help from their friends. The statement is false. For the justification sentence, some candidates copied the whole sentence from the text. This could not be accepted as it put the Examiner in the position of having to choose the right answer.

### Exercise 2 Questions 34–38

Many candidates answered correctly.

In **Question 37**, there were several options for the correct answer. Weaker responses were incomplete and did not fully answer the question.

Some candidates need to remember not to use the first person 'saya' (copied from the text), as this invalidates their answers.

# MALAY

---

**Paper 0546/42**  
**Writing**

## **Key messages**

- Marks are awarded for both communication and language.
- Candidates should use a wide variety of vocabulary items, different affixes and appropriate register to receive high marks.

## **General comments**

Overall, the candidates' performance in the paper was good.

The most successful candidates demonstrated a secure command of the language, with generous use of compound and complex sentences, excellent use of vocabulary and minor or negligible grammatical errors. They also used idiomatic expressions appropriate to the context and demonstrated great creativity in expressing their ideas and thoughts. In conclusion, it was truly a joy reading their essays.

Average and slightly above average students demonstrated a good grasp of grammar and wrote reasonably good sentences; a mixture of many simple with few compound sentences, only occasionally complex. Complex sentences were usually limited to use of conjunctions such as 'although', 'because' and 'when'. Compound sentences were mainly joined by coordinating conjunctions such as 'but', 'because' and 'and'. There were also good attempts by candidates to use idiomatic expressions.

Weaker candidates struggled with the language at times, but many were able to answer satisfactorily using simple words and structures. Even where they could not understand the whole question, they tried answering some points in the questions to the best of their ability, enabling them to score some marks.

It is important to note that the handwriting of some candidates was of concern; too small or barely legible. Future candidates should be made aware of the importance of presentable handwriting.

In general, basic skills must be continually reinforced: building more vocabulary, continuing to improve grammar and placing more focus on sentence structure.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section 1***

#### **Question 1**

The majority of the candidates were able to obtain full marks for this question. Many tried their best, making good use of all possible vocabulary that they knew to answer the question. There were some spelling errors. These were acceptable as they looked the same or sounded the same as the correct spelling. Care needs to be taken not to use words or phrases that are not familiar in the Malay language, e.g. *kebun haiwan*, *sepeda*.

#### **Question 2**

Candidates were generally able to fulfil all the communication requirements for this question. Good candidates knew that they should write their answer with straightforward vocabulary and structure in order to get full marks for Language. These candidates understood well the requirement for the Language by

producing simple sentences and affixes. Many were able to score 4–5. Only a few scored below 4 for Language.

## **Section 2**

**Questions 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c)** were equally popular.

Many of the stronger candidates exceeded the word limit, but the ideas were well organised with a proper flow. They also used different words and phrases when describing the same thing in order to inject variety into their writing. It is not an advisable strategy to write more than the suggested word limit though, as this increases the risk of inaccurate language detracting from the overall quality of the response.

### **3(a)**

Most candidates who answered this question did well. They had the necessary vocabulary to comprehend the tasks and were able to respond appropriately. A few candidates were also able to write appropriate opening and closing sentences. This shows the candidates' knowledge of letter writing. Most candidates managed to obtain full marks for Communication. Good candidates were able to use affixes and classifiers correctly. Stronger candidates knew how to select the specific time phrases to indicate future or past meaning for this question, e.g. *telah, mahu, hendak, akan*.

### **3(b)**

The tasks in this question were clear cut and easy to understand. All candidates provided appropriate responses. The only thing that separated the strong from the weak candidates was the marks for Accuracy of Grammar and Structure. The strongest candidates were able to express their ideas with a wide variety of sentence structures and vocabulary. Stronger candidates knew how to select the specific time phrases to indicate future or past meaning for this question, e.g. *telah, mahu, hendak, akan*.

### **3(c)**

Candidates who answered this section were independent writers and developed the story well, using their imagination. Some candidates copied out the question in the body of their essay, instead of using it as the starting point from which to continue. Future candidates would be well advised to read the instruction carefully. In terms of language, many candidates managed to apply a wide range of vocabulary aptly and the stories were written sufficiently to sound like a narrative.

# MALAY

---

**Paper 0546/43**  
**Writing**

## **Key messages**

- Marks are awarded for both communication and language.
- Candidates should use a wide variety of vocabulary items, different affixes and appropriate register to receive high marks.

## **General comments**

Overall, the candidates' performance in the paper was good.

The most successful candidates demonstrated a secure command of the language, with generous use of compound and complex sentences, excellent use of vocabulary and minor or negligible grammatical errors. They also used idiomatic expressions appropriate to the context and demonstrated great creativity in expressing their ideas and thoughts. In conclusion, it was truly a joy reading their essays.

Average and slightly above average students demonstrated a good grasp of grammar and wrote reasonably good sentences; a mixture of many simple with few compound sentences, only occasionally complex. Complex sentences were usually limited to use of conjunctions such as 'although', 'because' and 'when'. Compound sentences were mainly joined by coordinating conjunctions such as 'but', 'because' and 'and'. There were also good attempts by candidates to use idiomatic expressions.

Weaker candidates struggled with the language at times, but many were able to answer satisfactorily using simple words and structures. Even where they could not understand the whole question, they tried answering some points in the questions to the best of their ability, enabling them to score some marks.

It is important to note that the handwriting of some candidates was of concern; too small or barely legible. Future candidates should be made aware of the importance of presentable handwriting.

In general, basic skills must be continually reinforced: building more vocabulary, continuing to improve grammar and placing more focus on sentence structure.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section 1***

#### **Question 1**

The majority of the candidates were able to obtain full marks for this question. Many tried their best, making good use of all possible vocabulary that they knew to answer the question. However, some candidates tended to repeat the same words. For example, some would write '*Kedai kasut*' and '*Kedai bunga*' as two separate answers, but only one mark could be awarded. There were some spelling errors. These were acceptable as they looked the same or sounded the same as the correct spelling.

## Question 2

Candidates were asked to write about a movie that he/she had watched. Candidates needed to include the name of the film, say who they saw it with, say why they chose that film, state what was interesting about the film and say what film they will see next. Most candidates followed the rubrics carefully, enabling them to score full marks for both the communication and language aspect. They were successful in using extra relevant information to support any of the 5 communication points.

A small number of candidates were confused between point 3 (why they chose that film) and point 4 (what was interesting about the film). The word *menarik* was used frequently in their response. This prevented candidates from attaining further marks for that point, as they showed less variation in their choice of adjectives and descriptive sentences. For point 5, most candidates responded as required by stating either the type or name of the film they will see next. A small number of candidates overlooked this point and stated when they would next watch a film, which was not a successful response to that point.

If writing a list of things in order to secure more marks for communication points, candidates should remember the guidance in the marking scheme which states that lists of 1–3 items = 1 mark, lists of 4 items = 2 marks.

Good candidates knew to write the answer with straightforward vocabulary and enough elaboration in order to get 5 marks for Language. This means that candidates understood well the requirement for the Language by producing simple sentences and affixes. Many were able to score 4–5 and only a few scored below 4 for Language.

## Section 2

### Question 3

Questions 3(a) and 3(b) were equally popular. Fewer candidates chose Question 3(c).

Many of the stronger candidates exceeded the word limit, but the ideas were well organised with a proper flow. They also used different words and phrases when describing the same thing in order to inject variety into their writing. It is not an advisable strategy to write more than the suggested word limit though, as this increases the risk of inaccurate language detracting from the overall quality of the response.

#### 3(a)

Most candidates who answered this question did well. They had the necessary vocabulary to comprehend the questions asked and were able to respond appropriately. It was impressive to see how vocabulary was aptly used to express ideas in writing. Some strong candidates even used the correct register for family members in a letter, e.g. *nenda* and *cucunda*. They were also able to write appropriate opening and closing sentences. This shows the candidates' knowledge of letter writing. Good candidates were able to use affixes and classifiers correctly. Many candidates knew how to select the specific time phrases to indicate future or past meaning for this question, e.g. *telah*, *mahu*, *hendak*, *akan*.

#### 3(b)

Candidates who attempted this question answered well, in general. Some candidates did not succeed with the first content point (the location of the restaurant), because they just said that it was located *di bandar saya* (in my town), which was derived from the rubrics. A simple mention of the name of the road (*kedai itu terletak di Jalan Kuching*) was suffice to obtain one mark. The same applied to the second content point, where some candidates did not mention where they heard about the restaurant. Possible answers included *kawan saya memberitahu saya tentang restoran ini* (my friend told me about the restaurant) and *saya terbaca iklan tentang restoran ini* (I saw an advertisement of the restaurant). For the third content point, some candidates mentioned what kind of food and drink the restaurant sold instead of what food or drink they tried there.

Overall, the aspect that separated the strong from the weak candidates was the marks for Accuracy of Grammar and Structure. The strongest candidates were able to express their ideas with a wide variety of sentence structures and vocabulary. Stronger candidates knew how to select the specific time phrases to indicate future or past meaning for this question, e.g. *telah*, *mahu*, *hendak*, *akan*.

**3(c)**

The question required candidates to narrate an incident that happened at a *pasar malam*. Some candidates copied out the question in the body of their essay, instead of using it as the starting point from which to continue. Future candidates would be well advised to read the instruction carefully.

Candidates who answered this section were independent writers and had developed the story well up to their imagination. It was unfortunate that some good candidates overlooked some tasks in the writing process, although they were confident writers. There were a few instances where candidates were confused about the requirements for task 1 and task 2: the man's reaction when the police got near him, and what happened between the man and the police. Elaboration on these two content points had to be stated clearly to be awarded full marks for communication. In terms of language, many candidates managed to apply a wide range of vocabulary aptly and the stories were written sufficiently to sound like a narrative.