

March 2016 MUET (800)

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 58,093 candidates took the March 2016 MUET.

The performance of candidates for each paper, 800/1 Listening, 800/2 Speaking, 800/3 Reading 800/4 Writing and the subject, 800 MUET, according to bands is as follows:

Band	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
6	10.69	10.69	0.15	0.15	0.48	0.48	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.05
5	26.94	37.63	2.80	2.95	6.25	6.73	2.55	2.57	4.48	4.53
4	25.91	63.54	23.50	26.45	20.32	27.05	22.51	25.08	27.74	32.27
3	13.11	76.65	50.11	76.56	33.23	60.28	55.38	80.46	43.17	75.44
2	14.15	90.80	20.61	97.17	30.52	90.80	18.30	98.76	22.35	97.79
1	9.20	100.00	2.83	100.00	9.20	100.00	1.24	100.00	2.21	100.00

RESPONSES OF CANDIDATES

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

General comments

PART I

The task demands the ability to discern and reconstruct required information from a given text to note form. The listening text is a talk on the *development of cheerleading*. The items ranged from short-answer questions, to table-completion and multiple-choice questions.

PART II

The task demands the ability to listen to an interview with a corporate trainer on *intercultural training*. The items were of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates are needed to assess every option before choosing the best answer.

PART III

The task demands the ability to follow a mixture of texts; a conversation, a discussion and a news item. The conversation is on *heart disease and diabetes among the younger generation*. The discussion is on *global recession* and the news item is about the *effects of holidays*. The items consisted of short-answer questions whereby the candidates are required to answer within a five-word limit for each question.

Specific comments

PART I

Answers ranged from all correct answers to all incorrect attempts. The inaccurate attempts could either be due to writing more words than is required, inability to rephrase correctly, spelling errors leading to a change in meaning, partially correct information, missing required information and wrong information. There were candidates who made no attempts to answer some of the questions.

The following are some examples of the candidates' incorrect attempts:

Question 1

- wrong spelling – *incourage football teams*
- wrong word leading to distortion – *encourage soccer teams*

Question 2

- wrong answer – *cheerleading squads*
- wrong answer – *less than 100,000*

Question 3

- wrong word choice – *in American in 1877*
- wrong spelling – *in Amarica*
- missing preposition (in) – *America in 1877*

Question 4

- wrong answer – *their own sound and cheers*
- wrong answer – *their own song and dance*

Question 5

- wrong answer – *microphones were used*
- subject-verb agreement – *megaphone were used*

Question 6

- wrong spelling – *gimnastik*
- exceed word limit – *gymnastics and dances that are performed*

PART II

Answers ranged from a few correct answers to all incorrect attempts. The objective questions seemed to be the easiest for the candidates as most of them could get at least four out of six correct. For Question 9 and Question 10, candidates are required to write the letter of the answer.

PART III

Answers ranged from a few correct answers to all inaccurate attempts. The inaccurate attempts were mainly writing more words than is required, poor comprehension of the short text, poor paraphrasing, grammatical and spelling errors. This section proves to be the most difficult for most candidates as only a handful of them managed to answer all the questions correctly.

The following are some examples of the candidates' inaccurate attempts:

Question 15

- wrong word form – *heart disease and obesity*
- wrong answer – *hard disease and diabetes*

Question 16

- wrong answer – *oil and sugar*
- wrong word – *too oil and too sweets*

Question 17

- wrong spelling – *restucting their organisations*
- wrong word – *structuring their organisations*

Question 18

- wrong spelling – *tayar manufacturing industry*
- wrong answer – *risk their jobs*
- the word 'tyre' is omitted – *manufacturing industry*

Question 19

- wrong answer – *they go on a holiday*
- wrong answer – *they relax during the holiday*

Question 20

- wrong pronoun – *its happiness after the holiday*
- wrong spelling – *happinest after the holiday*

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)**General comments**

The questions in all the booklets tested the skills stipulated in the test specifications which cover accuracy in using the language, speaking with confidence, using varied vocabulary and expressions as well as presenting relevant ideas and adequate content while displaying maturity throughout the discussion.

Specific comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Made use of the preparation time to make short notes of main points which they would then elaborate
- Able to fully utilise the two-minute presentation time given to provide in-depth and mature treatment of the topic
- Points raised were well organised and elaborated
- Able to link current issues and personal experiences to the topic being discussed
- Fluent and confident and were able to use words and phrases and idioms effectively to convey their ideas
- Able to use a wide repertoire of vocabulary and language structures to perform a wide range of language functions ranging from describing and explaining, to justifying, convincing and persuading

The less proficient candidates' weaknesses are summarised as follows:

- Spent the preparation time writing out whole sentences
- Hesitant in speech with frequent pauses
- Lacked vocabulary to express opinion thus avoiding elaboration of ideas
- Grammatical errors were evident
- Lacked general knowledge and were not well-informed of current issues
- Unable to respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates (Task B)

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer keys

Question number	Key	Question number	Key	Question number	Key
1	A	16	A	31	D
2	B	17	B	32	A
3	C	18	A	33	D
4	C	19	B	34	C
5	B	20	B	35	D
6	C	21	B	36	C
7	C	22	C	37	D
8	A	23	B	38	A
9	A	24	B	39	D
10	C	25	B	40	D
11	B	26	A	41	A
12	A	27	A	42	C
13	C	28	A	43	C
14	A	29	C	44	A
15	C	30	C	45	A

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General comments

Both questions met the test specifications and measured the language ability of both pre-university and prospective university students. The questions demand knowledge of topic, maturity of thought, analytical-critical thinking, organisational skills and the ability to express opinion.

Question 1

The task demands the ability to analyse, synthesize and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. The task also demands the candidates' ability to provide meticulously accurate data and the connection of the gathered data with the other visual given in the task. The instruction provided was clear whereby candidates were to 'link the information given in the visuals' as they needed to compose a report on *the number of heart attack cases among men and women from 2011 – 2015 and the number of activities carried out by both genders during the same period*. Accuracy of information, conciseness and correctness of language and logical connection between given information are the requirements.

Question 2

The task demands the ability to address and express an opinion on an issue of common knowledge to most candidates. Depth and maturity of thought is required of the candidates to present a discussion on competition is healthy. If the candidates understood very clearly the needs of the question itself, then they should produce an argumentative and not just a descriptive piece of writing. Candidates must indicate in the discussion whether they agree or disagree to the statement. At the same time, they can also provide partial stands as long as relevant and consistent viewpoints are clearly presented.

Specific comments

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

STRENGTHS:

- Able to present the overview
- Made comparison and linked the information in both figures
- Analysed and synthesized data and presented key features
- Wrote within the word limit
- Used appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connection

WEAKNESSES:

- Unable to present the correct overview and conclusion
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information (do not provide data/trend word)
- Lack synthesis as candidates analysed both figures separately
- Included irrelevancies and assumptions
- Unable to link the information in the visuals given
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing

Question 2

STRENGTHS:

- Correct format and convention
- Presented a clear stand
- Presented clear and relevant ideas
- Provided relevant examples whereby the ideas were developed satisfactorily
- Used appropriate vocabulary and varied sentence structures

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked planning and organisation
- Unable to present opinion and simplistic response of ideas
- Elaborated the ideas immaturely
- Lacked relevant explanations and concrete examples
- Used simple vocabulary and repetitive sentence structures
- Made simple grammatical errors
- Misunderstood the task (tend to write on the benefits of having competition to make us healthy)

Specific comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to write about the number of heart attack cases among men and women in 2011 – 2015 and to link the information to the number of activities performed by them. Candidates are to write their report in 150 to 200 words. The overview is ‘Generally, the number of activities performed by men and women influenced the number of heart attack cases among them.’ In conveying the required information, candidates are required to integrate and interpret the data correctly, present an overview, highlight the key features in relation to the overview and to link the key features to information contained in the tables.

Question 2

The task requires candidates to present a discussion on whether competition is healthy, in not fewer than 350 words. Candidates are required to have an opinion and to discuss whether the candidates agree, disagree or convey a mixed stand whether competition is healthy. Candidates have to state what their opinions are, explain why they have that opinion and show that they have examined and evaluated other possibilities in this regard. Candidates are to give a strong commitment to the view held, providing at least three relevant points as well as justify and substantiate it with elaboration and examples.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires the candidates to analyse, synthesize, and organise information from the visuals into a coherent piece of writing within 200 words. Accuracy and conciseness of information as well as correctness of language of reporting and logical connection of information between the visuals are the requirements of the task.

An overview should be conveyed, followed by key features in support of the overview, analysis and synthesis of key features, as well as conclusion in the report. The candidates are expected to give a complete introduction of the two visuals displayed followed by a clear, appropriate overview that shows the *link between the number of heart attack cases among men and women, and the activities performed by them in the five years (2011 – 2015)*.

When presenting the report, the candidates are to be selective and analytical so as to highlight and compare all the significant features in the visuals (e.g. comparing the number of heart attack cases between men and women in the five years). Apart from that, candidates must show how the number of heart attack cases among men and women corresponds with the activities performed by them. This entails skills that include identifying relevant information as well as analysing and synthesizing information.

In terms of language, the candidates are to observe of the mechanics of report writing and to write the report in a formal tone using accurate and appropriate language, as well as precise and apt words. The report must not only be clear, concise, coherent and cohesive, but it must also be written within the specified number of words.

Question 2

A discursive or argumentative essay is expected in which the function of the language used here is to explain or justify a particular opinion held in relation to the context given. Candidates have to state what that opinion is and to support it with appropriate reasons and examples. They need to be clear on the opinion held and be consistent throughout the essay.

Candidates have to be clear on the requirements of the task. Candidates may hold the opinion that competition is healthy or unhealthy, or partially agree with the statement. In considering whether competition is healthy, candidates may express opinions such as *it can drive or motivate one to work hard; it enables one to set a goal to reach the target; it fosters relationship with other competitors; it can improve the standard of the competition*, etc. among others as relevant points.

Alternatively, candidates may disagree by giving points such as *it can bring out the worst in people such as have wrong desires (fame, money, status); one can go beyond his limit that may endanger health (taking drugs, steroids); one can have negative attitudes, behaviours, thinking (dishonest, cunning, violent, corrupted etc); one may lose self-confidence; one may have low self-esteem*, etc. Strong justification must be made supported by evidence, and argued in a persuasive voice. A minimum of three points, in support of the opinion, is expected, and to be written in **not fewer than 350 words**.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

There were fewer above average than below-average performers and their voices faintly consistent. Many could not analyse information contained in the table correctly, much worse, could not present an overview of information presented in the two visuals. Examples of distortions/inaccuracies/assumptions in answers:

- **Wrong spelling**

Heart attact case is 600 men higest on 2014.

- **Distortion**

Women were only 80 heart attack cases in 2015.

- **Irrelevancy**

Heart attack is a common disease among men and women nowadays.

- **Assumption**

As men suffered less heart attacks than women, men are healthier than women.

- **Vagueness**

The highest number of heart attack cases was among men in 2014

- **Description**

English at workplace has low rating.

- **Inaccuracy**

The number of heart attack cases among men increased from 320 cases in 2011 to 350 cases in 2012.

Many candidates were still not aware of the requirements of the task especially on the stipulated number of words, and the fact that they have to base their response entirely on the information provided in the stimuli for Question 1. Quite a number of candidates wrote more than the 200 word count, thus the analyses and syntheses as well as the conclusion that were written beyond the word count were not taken into consideration. Other than that, some had given their own opinions as well as assumptions on why the number of heart attack cases was higher among men than among women as well as gave suggestions on ways to prevent heart attack, which are irrelevant for the task.

STRENGTHS:

- Provided an introduction though incomplete (*omission of Figure 1*)
- Attempted to provide an overview
- Analysed data and presented key features
- Presented overall trend
- Used comparative and superlative forms of adjectives (e.g. more than, less than, the most, the least, highest, lowest)
- Used language of comparison (e.g only, except for)
- Used conjunctions or transition markers in sentences to link information (e.g when, although, as, because, due to, however)

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked the ability to fully understand the requirements of the task
- Wrote beyond word count
- Wrote irrelevant introduction
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information
- Wrote assumptions instead of analysis
- Unable to link the information in the table
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing

Question 2

On average, the task was modestly attempted. Candidates understood the demand of the question and were able to relate to the topic, i.e. to address the issue and to give an opinion on the statement. Many of the candidates were in agreement with the statement provided in the question. However, many were not able to state and present their opinion satisfactorily in explaining why and how competition is healthy or unhealthy. There were hardly any concrete examples or convincing explanations to justify their viewpoints. Furthermore, many of the candidates failed to develop their points adequately.

Most of the candidates' ideas lacked maturity. In some essays, the main idea was weak or vague, as it was not stated clearly in the supporting paragraphs.

Example:

'Competition is healthy because it gives a lot of benefits. The competitors can enjoy the game with other players and stay healthy, so competition is healthy...'

In the poor answers, ideas were shallow and immaturely developed, and there was a tendency to use vague-sounding words. Language also ranged from modest to poor control. Structures and vocabulary lacked variety, basic grammatical errors of subject-verb agreement, wrong vocabulary, run-on sentences, wrong prepositions, omission of articles, wrong use of articles, missing words, and wrong spellings.

Only a small percentage of the candidates could fulfill the requirements of the task competently by presenting a good discursive or argumentative essay with logical, convincing explanations and concrete examples. Many had given an introduction and an opinion or stand in the first paragraph of their essay, presented some points in the supporting paragraphs and ended the say with a conclusion. Although a number of the candidates had poor or modest control of the language they labored stoically to fill up one to two pages of writing in hope to get some marks for their effort.

July 2016 MUET (800)

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 63,825 candidates took the July 2016 MUET.

The performance of candidates for each paper, 800/1 Listening, 800/2 Speaking, 800/3 Reading 800/4 Writing and the subject, 800 MUET, according to bands is as follows:

Band	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
6	3.88	3.88	0.15	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
5	18.42	22.30	3.11	3.26	3.84	3.93	1.19	1.20	2.04	2.05
4	28.85	48.15	19.86	23.12	18.21	22.14	14.09	15.29	20.53	22.58
3	16.39	64.54	44.72	67.84	34.33	56.47	51.03	66.32	41.84	64.42
2	19.95	84.49	26.28	94.12	33.33	89.80	28.82	95.14	30.34	94.76
1	15.51	100.00	5.88	100.00	10.20	100.00	4.86	100.00	5.24	100.00

RESPONSES OF CANDIDATES

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

General comments

PART I

The task demands the ability to discern and reconstruct required information from a given text to note form. The listening text is a *talk on an invitation to join the Sunshine Summer Camp*. The items ranged from short-answer questions, to table-completion and multiple-choice questions.

PART II

The task demands the ability to listen to a *discussion between Amir, Alia and Molly on their class project*. The items were of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates are needed to assess every option before choosing the best answer.

PART III

The task demands the ability to follow a mixture of texts; a piece of advice and two news items. The advice is on *the dangers of falling asleep on trains with earphones plugged in*. Next, is a news item reporting on a *missing Automated Telling Machine (ATM) in a supermarket* as well as a news item reporting on an accident involving a lorry that was transporting heavy machinery. The items consisted of short-answer questions whereby the candidates are required to answer within a five-word limit for each question.

Specific comments

PART I

Answers ranged from all correct answers to all incorrect attempts. The inaccurate attempts could either be due to writing more words than is required, inability to rephrase correctly, spelling errors leading to a change in meaning, partially correct information, missing required information and wrong information. There were candidates who made no attempts to answer some of the questions.

The following are some examples of the candidates' incorrect attempts:

Question 1

- wrong use of article – *a interesting activities*
- wrong spelling – *intersting activities*

Question 2

- wrong answer – *enhance youths*

Question 3

- wrong word choice – *enjoy 20% discount (seen as redundancy when referred to the stem)*
- wrong spelling – *20% discount*

Question 4

- distortion in meaning – *improve self-confidences*
- wrong word form – *improve self-confident*

Question 5 and Question 6 (inter-tangible answers)

- wrong prepositions – *cooperate in one another; to interact one and other*
- verb is omitted – *chance to interact*

PART II

Many of the candidates were confused with Question 11 and Question 13. Thus, it was noticed that although many candidates were able to answer the rest of the questions correctly in this section, they were not able to give the right answers for these two questions.

PART III

Answers ranged from a few correct answers to all inaccurate attempts. The inaccurate attempts were mainly writing more words than is required, poor comprehension of the short text, poor paraphrasing, grammatical and spelling errors. This section is relatively the most challenging part in the listening test. Questions 17,19 and 20 were challenging questions, as many candidates were not able to give the correct answers.

The following are some examples of the candidates' inaccurate attempts:

Question 15

- wrong word form – *closing their eyes*

Question 16

- wrong spelling – *annoucement from the driver*
- wrong word form – *announcement make from driver*

Question 17

- wrong answer – *worker from the bank*

Question 18

- distortion in meaning – *CCTV at the side*
- wrong answer – *recording*

Question 19

- subject-verb agreement – *driver lose control*

Question 20

- wrong spelling – *trefik jem*
- distortion in meaning – *traffic jammed*

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)

General comments

The questions in all the booklets tested the skills stipulated in the test specifications which cover accuracy in using the language, speaking with confidence, using varied vocabulary and expressions as well as presenting relevant ideas and adequate content while displaying maturity throughout the discussion.

Specific comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Made use of the preparation time to make short notes of main points which they would then elaborate
- Able to fully utilise the two-minute presentation time given to provide in-depth and mature treatment of the topic
- Points raised were well organised and elaborated
- Able to link current issues and personal experiences to the topic being discussed
- Fluent and confident and were able to use words and phrases and idioms effectively to convey their ideas
- Able to use complex structures accurately, as well as a high command of vocabulary, to not only convey their own views but to justify, convince and persuade

The less proficient candidates' weaknesses are summarised as follows:

- Spent the preparation time writing out whole sentences
- Showed clear 'discomfort' in using English
- Hesitant in speech with frequent pauses

- Lacked vocabulary to express opinion thus avoiding elaboration of ideas
- Grammatical errors were evident
- Lacked general knowledge and were not well-informed of current issues
- Unable to respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates (Task B)

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer keys

Question number	Key	Question number	Key	Question number	Key
1	B	16	C	31	D
2	A	17	A	32	A
3	C	18	C	33	B
4	B	19	C	34	C
5	B	20	B	35	D
6	B	21	B	36	A
7	A	22	A	37	A
8	A	23	B	38	C
9	A	24	C	39	A
10	A	25	C	40	C
11	B	26	C	41	D
12	B	27	A	42	A
13	A	28	B	43	A
14	C	29	A	44	C
15	C	30	B	45	B

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General comments

Both questions met the test specifications and measured the language ability of both pre-university and prospective university students. The questions demand knowledge of topic, maturity of thought, analytical-critical thinking, organisational skills and the ability to express opinion.

Question 1

The task demands the ability to analyse, synthesize and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. The candidates must be able to interpret the information given in the visuals by analysing the *number of investors and types of investments (1970 – 2010)* and *reasons for investing in*

1970 and 2010. The task also demands the candidates' ability to provide meticulously accurate data and the connection of the gathered data with the other visual given in the task. Accuracy of information, conciseness and correctness of language and logical connection between given information are the requirements.

Question 2

The task demands the ability to address and express an opinion on an issue of common knowledge to most candidates. Depth and maturity of thought is required of the candidates to present a discussion whether *the traditional male role has changed with modernisation*. If the candidates understood very clearly the needs of the question itself, then they should produce an argumentative and not just a descriptive piece of writing. Candidates must indicate in the discussion whether they agree or disagree to the statement. At the same time, they can also provide partial stands as long as relevant and consistent viewpoints are clearly presented.

Specific comments

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

STRENGTHS:

- Able to present the overview
- Made comparison and linked the information in both figures
- Analysed and synthesized data and presented key features
- Wrote within the word limit
- Used appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connection

WEAKNESSES:

- Unable to present the correct overview and conclusion
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information (do not provide data/trend word)
- Lack synthesis as candidates analysed both figures separately
- Included irrelevancies and assumptions
- Unable to link the information in the visuals given
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing

Question 2

STRENGTHS:

- Correct format and convention
- Presented a clear stand
- Presented clear and relevant ideas
- Provided relevant examples whereby the ideas were developed satisfactorily
- Used appropriate vocabulary and varied sentence structures

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked planning and organisation
- Unable to present opinion and simplistic response of ideas
- Elaborated the ideas immaturely

- Lacked relevant explanations and concrete examples
- Used simple vocabulary and repetitive sentence structures
- Made simple grammatical errors
- Misunderstood the task (candidates interpreted 'traditional male role' as clothes, food, festivals)

Specific comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse the *number of investors and types of investments (1970 – 2010)* and *reasons for investing in 1970 and 2010*. Candidates are to write their report in 150 to 200 words. The overview is 'Overall, the number of reasons for investing influenced the number of investors and types of investments in 1970 and 2010.' In conveying the required information, candidates are required to integrate and interpret the data correctly, present an overview, highlight the key features in relation to the overview and to link the key features to information contained in the visuals.

Question 2

The task requires candidates to present a discussion on whether *the traditional male role has changed with modernisation*, in not fewer than 350 words. Candidates are required to have an opinion and to discuss whether the candidates agree, disagree or convey a mixed stand whether *the traditional male role has changed with modernisation*. Candidates have to state what their opinions are, explain why they have that opinion and show that they have examined and evaluated other possibilities in this regard. Candidates are to give a strong commitment to the view held, providing at least three relevant points as well as justify and substantiate it with elaboration and examples.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires the candidates to analyse, synthesise, and organise information from the visuals into a coherent piece of writing within 200 words. Accuracy and conciseness of information as well as correctness of language of reporting and logical connection of information between the visuals are the requirements of the task.

There should be an introduction, an overview, analysis and synthesis of key features, as well as a conclusion in the report. The candidates are expected to give a complete introduction of the two visuals displayed followed by a clear, appropriate overview that includes the information in both visuals together with the years.

When presenting the report, the candidates are to be selective and analytical so as to highlight and compare all the significant features in the visuals (e.g. comparing the number of investors in the three types of investments from 1970 to 2010 for Figure 1 comparing the number of type of reasons in 1970 with those in 2010 in Table 1. Apart from that, candidates may explain how the number of investors in 2010 corresponds with the reasons for investing in that year. This entails skills that include identifying relevant information as well as analyzing and synthesizing information.

In terms of language, the candidates are to observe of the mechanics of report writing and to write the report in a formal tone using accurate and appropriate language, as well as precise and apt words. The report must not only be clear, concise, coherent and cohesive, but it must also be written within the specified number of words.

Question 2

The task requires the candidates to give an opinion or make a stand based on the statement given. Logic, depth and maturity of thought on whether the traditional male role has changed with modernisation are sought. A discursive or argumentative voice is expected in the writing.

The candidates have to state what that opinion is and to support it with appropriate reasons and examples. They need to be clear on the opinion held and be consistent throughout the essay. In answering the question, three angles of discussion may be adopted. Candidates may hold the opinion that the traditional male role has changed with modernisation, the traditional male role has remained unchanged with modernisation, or partially agree with the statement. In considering whether the traditional male role has changed with modernisation, candidates may express opinions such as *males nowadays are no longer the sole provider for the family; males nowadays have become caretakers of the home and family (house-husband); males nowadays have taken up jobs which are formerly regarded as women's job*, etc. among others as relevant points.

Alternatively, candidates may disagree by giving points such as the *males nowadays are still the provider for the family (breadwinner of the family); males are still the protector of the family (shows strength, courage and toughness); males are the leaders of their family; males restricts/suppresses emotions*, etc.

Whichever opinion or stand the candidates take, they are expected to justify their viewpoints by giving logical reasons, explanations and examples. The elaborations should be convincing and clearly linked to the topic. In addition, the voice should be assertive, yet persuasive enough to engage and compel the reader to be in agreement with the writer. A minimum of three points, in support of the opinion, is expected, and to be written in **not fewer than 350 words**.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

There were fewer above average than below-average performers and their voices faintly consistent. Many could not analyse information contained in the table correctly, much worse, could not present an overview of information presented in the two visuals. Examples of distortions/inaccuracies/assumptions in answers:

- **Wrong use of words / spelling**

Bank deposits is 600,000 and most highest for year 1970.

- **Merely describing information**

In 1970, there were 80,000 investors in shares and 40,000 investors in properties.

- **Irrelevancy**

Bank deposits had the highest number of investors at 600,000 in 1970 because many investors wanted to get married so they had to save money for their wedding.

- **Distortion**

In 1990, the number of investors in bank deposits and shares were the same at 380,000.

Many candidates were still not aware of the requirements of the task especially on the stipulated number of words, and the fact that they have to base their response entirely on the information provided in the stimuli for Question 1. Quite a number of candidates wrote more than the 200 word count, thus the analyses and syntheses as well as the conclusion that were written beyond the word count were not taken into consideration. Other than that, some had given their own opinions as well as assumptions on why the number of investors had chosen the reasons listed in Table 1. Many candidates had also suggested on how investments can improve the economy of a country or on ways to invest which are irrelevant to the task.

STRENGTHS:

- Provided an introduction though incomplete (*omission of Figure 1*)
- Attempted to provide an overview
- Analysed data and presented key features
- Presented overall trend
- Used comparative and superlative forms of adjectives (e.g. more than, less than, the most, the least, highest, lowest)
- Used language of comparison (e.g only, except for)
- Used conjunctions or transition markers in sentences to link information (e.g when, although, as, because, due to, however)

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked the ability to fully understand the requirements of the task
- Wrote beyond word count
- Wrote irrelevant introduction (wrote the rubrics or general statements about investments)
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information
- Wrote assumptions instead of analysis
- Unable to link the information in the table
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing
- Poor language control

Question 2

Many of the candidates were in agreement with the statement provided in the question. However, many were not able to state and present their opinion satisfactorily in explaining why and how the traditional male role has changed with modernisation. There were hardly any concrete examples or convincing explanations to justify their viewpoints. Furthermore, many of the candidates failed to develop their points adequately.

Most of the candidates' ideas lacked maturity. In some essays, the main idea was weak or vague, as it was not stated clearly in the supporting paragraphs.

Example:

'The traditional male role has changed with modernisation. Nowadays many females are smarter than males, so many males cannot go to university. The males cannot find good jobs, so they have low income. Now many females don't respect the males. So, the traditional male role has changed with modernisation...'

Majority of the candidates recognised that the traditional male role is an important aspect in life and supposed to be somehow changed or not changed with modernisation. Candidates addressed the task from various perspectives, such as:

- What does it mean by 'traditional male role'?
- What does it mean by 'modernisation'?
- What are the examples of 'traditional male role'?
- How traditional male role has changed or not changed with modernisation
- Compared male and female roles in discussion in relation to modernisation
- Showed elements of modernisation – past versus present

In the poor answers, ideas were shallow and immaturely developed, and there was a tendency to use vague-sounding words. Language also ranged from modest to poor control. Structures and vocabulary lacked variety, basic grammatical errors of subject-verb agreement, wrong vocabulary, run-on sentences, wrong prepositions, omission of articles, wrong use of articles, missing words, and wrong spellings.

Only a small percentage of the candidates could fulfill the requirements of the task competently by presenting a good discursive or argumentative essay with logical, convincing explanations and concrete examples. Most of the essays had form and structure. Many had given an introduction and an opinion or stand in the first paragraph of their essay, presented some points in the supporting paragraphs and ended the say with a conclusion. Although a number of the candidates had poor or modest control of the language they labored stoically to fill up one to two pages of writing in hope to get some marks for their effort.

November 2016 MUET (800)

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 43,282 candidates took the November 2016 MUET.

The performance of candidates for each paper, 800/1 Listening, 800/2 Speaking, 800/3 Reading 800/4 Writing and the subject, 800 MUET, according to bands is as follows:

Band	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
6	13.68	13.68	0.18	0.18	0.41	0.41	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
5	26.75	40.43	4.33	4.51	9.58	9.99	1.26	1.28	5.28	5.31
4	22.93	63.36	24.99	29.50	26.48	36.47	18.68	19.96	32.90	38.21
3	11.97	75.33	45.16	74.66	32.37	68.84	57.67	77.63	37.79	76.00
2	13.80	89.13	21.22	95.88	25.19	94.03	20.12	97.75	21.38	97.38
1	10.87	100.00	4.12	100.00	5.97	100.00	2.25	100.00	2.62	100.00

RESPONSES OF CANDIDATES

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

General comments

PART I

The task demands the ability to discern and reconstruct required information from a given text to note form. The listening text is an *interview with the chief of security from a hotel who is giving advice on how to maintain safety when staying at a hotel*. The items ranged from short-answer questions, to table-completion and multiple-choice questions.

PART II

The task demands the ability to listen to a *radio interview with the owner of a popular restaurant, Mr Jacobs*. The items were of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates are needed to assess every option before choosing the best answer.

PART III

The task demands the ability to follow a mixture of texts; two short talks and an announcement. The talk is on the *possibility of children being addicted to sugar and the advice to their parents*. Next, is an *announcement about a blood donation week happening in general hospitals in the country* as well as another *talk advising people to do what they love so that they will be able to give their best in life*. The items consisted of short-answer questions whereby the candidates are required to answer within a five-word limit for each question.

Specific comments

PART I

Answers ranged from all correct answers to all incorrect attempts. The inaccurate attempts could either be due to writing more words than is required, inability to rephrase correctly, spelling errors leading to a change in meaning, partially correct information, missing required information and wrong information. There were candidates who made no attempts to answer some of the questions.

The following are some examples of the candidates' incorrect attempts:

Question 1

- distortion in meaning – *chief of securities*
- wrong spelling – *cheif of security*

Question 2

- exceeds word limit – *hotel premises, guests and staff*

Question 3

- wrong answer – *CCTV monitors*
- wrong word form – *functions room*

Question 4, 5 and 6 (inter-tangible answers)

- wrong spelling – *Lock the suitecase*
- exceeds word limit – *Ensure that you lock the suitcase*
- incomplete answer – *Close the door*
- wrong word form – *Keep the key card savely*
- wrong answer – *Keep the key card carefully*

PART II

Answers ranged from all correct answers to all incorrect attempts. The objective questions seemed to be the easiest for the candidates as most of them were able to answer at least four out of six answers correctly.

PART III

Answers ranged from all correct answers to all inaccurate attempts. The inaccurate attempts were mainly writing more words than is required, poor comprehension of the short text, poor paraphrasing, grammatical and spelling errors. This section is relatively the most challenging part in the listening test for the candidates as only a handful of them managed to answer all the questions correctly.

The following are some examples of the candidates' inaccurate attempts:

Question 15

- wrong answer and wrong spelling – *sugar addition*

Question 16

- wrong pronoun – *watch our children's diet*
- wrong usage of phrasal verb – *watch over their children's diet*

Question 17

- wrong word form – *blood donations week*

Question 18

- wrong preposition – *a little time of*
- exceeds word limit – *a little time off to donate blood*

Question 19

- wrong answer (distortion in meaning) – *were passionately in love*

Question 20

- wrong answer (meaning is vague) – *do something well*
- exceeds word limit – *have no regrets in the future*

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)**General comments**

The questions in all the booklets tested the skills stipulated in the test specifications which cover accuracy in using the language, speaking with confidence, using varied vocabulary and expressions as well as presenting relevant ideas and adequate content while displaying maturity throughout the discussion.

Specific comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Made use of the preparation time to make short notes of main points which they would then elaborate
- Able to fully utilise the two-minute presentation time given to provide in-depth and mature treatment of the topic
- Points raised were well organised and elaborated
- Able to link current issues and personal experiences to the topic being discussed
- Fluent and confident and were able to use words and phrases and idioms effectively to convey their ideas
- Able to use complex structures accurately, as well as a high command of vocabulary, to not only convey their own views but to justify, convince and persuade

The less proficient candidates' weaknesses are summarised as follows:

- Spent the preparation time writing out whole sentences
- Showed clear 'discomfort' in using English
- Hesitant in speech with frequent pauses
- Lacked vocabulary to express opinion thus avoiding elaboration of ideas

- Grammatical errors were evident
- Lacked general knowledge and were not well-informed of current issues
- Unable to respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates (Task B)

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer keys

Question number	Key	Question number	Key	Question number	Key
1	A	16	B	31	C
2	A	17	B	32	B
3	C	18	C	33	A
4	A	19	A	34	D
5	B	20	B	35	B
6	C	21	B	36	D
7	C	22	B	37	A
8	A	23	C	38	A
9	B	24	C	39	A
10	A	25	A	40	B
11	B	26	C	41	C
12	A	27	A	42	C
13	B	28	B	43	B
14	C	29	A	44	B
15	C	30	C	45	A

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General comments

Both questions met the test specifications and measured the language ability of both pre-university and prospective university students. The questions demand knowledge of topic, maturity of thought, analytical-critical thinking, organisational skills and the ability to express opinion.

Question 1

The task demands the ability to analyse, synthesize and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. The candidates must be able to interpret the information given in the visuals by analysing the *market share of four hypermarkets in Malaysia (2008 – 2014)* and *profile of four hypermarkets in Malaysia in 2008 and 2014*. The task also demands the candidates' ability to provide

meticulously accurate data and the connection of the gathered data with the other visual given in the task. Accuracy of information, conciseness and correctness of language and logical connection between given information are the requirements.

Question 2

The task demands the ability to address and express an opinion on an issue of common knowledge to most candidates. Depth and maturity of thought is required of the candidates to present a discussion whether *the Internet is often blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth*. In this question, candidates need to comprehend the key words in the rubrics namely 'the Internet', 'lack of creativity' and 'critical thinking'. Candidates must indicate in the discussion whether they agree or disagree to the statement. At the same time, they can also provide partial stands as long as relevant and consistent viewpoints are clearly presented.

Specific comments

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

STRENGTHS:

- Able to provide a title and an introduction
- Able to present the overview
- Made comparison and linked the information in both figures
- Analysed and synthesized data and presented key features
- Wrote within the word limit
- Used appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connection

WEAKNESSES:

- Unable to present the correct overview and conclusion
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information (do not provide data/trend word)
- Lack synthesis as candidates analysed both figures separately
- Included irrelevancies and assumptions
- Unable to link the information in the visuals given
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing

Question 2

STRENGTHS:

- Correct format and convention
- Presented a clear stand
- Presented clear and relevant ideas
- Provided relevant examples whereby the ideas were developed satisfactorily
- Used appropriate vocabulary and varied sentence structures

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked planning and organisation
- Unable to present opinion and simplistic response of ideas
- Elaborated the ideas immaturely
- Lacked relevant explanations and concrete examples
- Used simple vocabulary and repetitive sentence structures
- Made simple grammatical errors
- Wrote off-tangent essays focusing on the good or harm of the Internet in general

Specific comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse the *market share of four hypermarkets in Malaysia (2008 – 2014) and profile of four hypermarkets in Malaysia in 2008 and 2014*. Candidates are to write their report in 150 to 200 words. The overview is '*Generally, the four hypermarkets' profiles influenced their market share in 2008 and 2014*'. In conveying the required information, candidates are required to integrate and interpret the data correctly, present an overview, highlight the key features in relation to the overview and to link the key features to information contained in the visuals.

Question 2

The task requires candidates to present a discussion on whether *the Internet is often blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth*, in not fewer than 350 words. Candidates are required to have an opinion and to discuss whether the candidates agree, disagree or convey a mixed stand whether *the Internet is often blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth*. Candidates have to state what their opinions are, explain why they have that opinion and show that they have examined and evaluated other possibilities in this regard. Candidates are to give a strong commitment to the view held, providing at least three relevant points as well as justify and substantiate it with elaboration and examples.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires the candidates to analyse, synthesize, and organise information from the visuals into a coherent piece of writing within 200 words. Accuracy and conciseness of information as well as correctness of language of reporting and logical connection of information between the visuals are the requirements of the task.

There should be an introduction, an overview, analysis and synthesis of key features, as well as a conclusion in the report. The candidates are expected to give a complete introduction of the two visuals displayed followed by a clear, appropriate overview that includes the information in both visuals together with the years.

When presenting the report, the candidates are to be selective and analytical so as to highlight and compare all the significant features in the visuals. This entails skills that include identifying relevant information as well as analyzing and synthesizing information.

In short, candidates are expected to:

- Write a complete introduction
- Write an overview showing the *correlation between the percentage of market share of the hypermarkets and their profiles in 2008 and 2014*
- Analyse and synthesize all key features
- Write only the information that is presented in the visuals, and not to include any assumptions or speculations
- Write in not fewer than 150 words but not more than 200 words

In terms of language, the candidates are to observe of the mechanics of report writing and to write the report in a formal tone using accurate and appropriate language, as well as precise and apt words. The report must not only be clear, concise, coherent and cohesive, but it must also be written within the specified number of words.

Question 2

The task requires the candidates to give an opinion or make a stand based on the statement given. Logic, depth and maturity of thought on whether *the Internet is to be blamed or is not to be blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth* are sought. A discursive or argumentative voice is expected in the writing.

The candidates have to state what that opinion is and to support it with appropriate reasons and examples. They need to be clear on the opinion held and be consistent throughout the essay. In answering the question, three angles of discussion may be adopted. Candidates may hold the opinion that the Internet is to be blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth, or disagree with the statement, or partially agree with it. In considering whether the Internet is to be blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking in today's youth, candidates may express opinions such as *the Internet causes the youth to steal or copy ideas (no originality); the youth may become dependent on the Internet for ideas, answers and solutions; the youth may become lazy to think and create ideas*, etc. among others as relevant points.

Alternatively, candidates may disagree by giving points such as *the Internet enables the youth to get information and gain knowledge to enhance creativity and critical thinking; the youth may use the Internet as an outlet for research, an opportunity to delve deeper into topics for further information to expand creativity and develop critical thinking; the youth are able to meet people on the Internet with the same interests to share ideas, collaborate and get feedback*, etc.

Whichever opinion or stand the candidates take, they are expected to justify their viewpoints by giving logical reasons, explanations and examples. The elaborations should be convincing and clearly linked to the topic. In addition, the voice should be assertive, yet persuasive enough to engage and compel the reader to be in agreement with the writer. A minimum of three points, in support of the opinion, is expected, and to be written in **not fewer than 350 words**.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

There were fewer above average than below-average performers and their voices faintly consistent. Many could not analyse information contained in the table correctly, much worse, could not present an overview of information presented in the two visuals. Examples of distortions/inaccuracies/assumptions in answers:

- **Merely describing information**

In 2008, Super Hypermarket had 6 stores and 150 workers, but in 2014 it had only 5 stores and 140 workers.

- **Irrelevancy**

With 40% of the market share, Prosper Hypermarket was the most popular hypermarket in 2014 probably it was the biggest hypermarket in Malaysia.

- **Distortion**

Prosper Hypermarket increased from 31% in 2008 to 40% in 2014.

- **Inaccuracy**

Market share of Premium dropped from 23% in 2008 to 17% in 2014.

Many candidates were still not aware of the requirements of the task especially on the stipulated number of words, and the fact that they have to base their response entirely on the information provided in the stimuli for Question 1. Quite a number of candidates wrote more than the 200 word count, thus the analyses and syntheses as well as the conclusion that were written beyond the word count were not taken into consideration. Other than that, some had given their own opinions as well as assumptions on how the economy or a marketing strategy had affected the percentage of market share of a particular hypermarket. Many candidates had also explained why the hypermarket had to reduce its number of stores and sack its workers, which are irrelevant to the task.

STRENGTHS:

- Provided an introduction though incomplete (*omission of Figure 1*)
- Attempted to provide an overview
- Analysed data and presented key features
- Presented overall trend
- Used comparative and superlative forms of adjectives (e.g. more than, less than, the most, the least, highest, lowest)
- Used language of comparison (e.g. only, except for)
- Used 'trend' words (e.g. increased, decreased, rose, dropped)
- Used conjunctions or transition markers in sentences to link information (e.g. when, although, as, because, due to, however)

WEAKNESSES:

- Lacked the ability to fully understand the requirements of the task
- Wrote beyond word count
- Wrote irrelevant introduction (wrote the rubrics or general statements about investments)
- Presented inaccurate, irrelevant and limited information
- Wrote assumptions instead of analysis

- Unable to link the information in the table
- Unable to use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures and logical connections
- Lacked the mechanics and rigours of report writing
- Poor language control

Question 2

Most of the candidates were in disagreement with the statement provided in the question. However, not much had been elaborated to explain why and how the Internet is not to be blamed for the lack of creativity and critical thinking among today's youth. There were hardly any concrete examples or convincing explanations to justify their viewpoints. Furthermore, many of the candidates failed to develop their points adequately.

Most of the candidates' ideas lacked maturity. In some essays, the main idea was weak or vague, as it was not stated clearly in the supporting paragraphs. The supporting points were also weak and simplistic. Many a time, they were not clearly linked to 'creativity and critical thinking'.

Example:

'The youths nowadays can communicate with their friends and family members through the social media. They can keep in touch with them by sending messages through WhatsApp and Facebook. There are many applications and gadgets in the Facebook, so they can post creative pictures on the wall and think critically about they read. Through the social media, they can also make new friends. As the youths can communicate with others through the Internet, they can be creative and think critically.'

Other than that, some of the ideas were disorganised. There were overlapping and repetition of points in the supporting paragraphs. At times, the ideas presented were inconsistent with the stand or were contradictory to it. The opinion or stand given may be in agreement with the statement in the question but the ideas were divided. Thus, the writing lacked clarity, focus and coherence.

In the poor answers, ideas were shallow and immaturely developed, and there was a tendency to use vague-sounding words. Language also ranged from modest to poor control. Structures and vocabulary lacked variety, basic grammatical errors of subject-verb agreement, wrong vocabulary, run-on sentences, wrong prepositions, omission of articles, wrong use of articles, missing words, and wrong spellings.

Only a small percentage of the candidates could fulfill the requirements of the task competently by giving logical, convincing explanations and concrete examples as well as linking their viewpoints to 'creativity and critical thinking'. Most of the essays had form and structure. Many candidates had given an introduction and an opinion or stand in the first paragraph of their essay, had presented some points in the supporting paragraphs and ended the say with a conclusion. Although a number of the candidates had poor or modest control of the language, they labored stoically to fill up one to two pages of writing in hope to get some marks for their effort.