MAJLIS PEPERIKSAAN MALAYSIA

SASBADI

Laporan Peperiksaan STPM 2018

MUET (800)

Laporan Peperiksaan STPM 2018

MUET (800)

SASBADI SDN. BHD. (139288-X)
(Anak syarikat milik penuh Sasbadi Holdings Berhad (1022660-T))
PETALING JAYA

MAJLIS PEPERIKSAAN MALAYSIA

Diterbitkan oleh

Sasbadi Sdn. Bhd. (139288-X),
(Anak syarikat milik penuh Sasbadi Holdings Berhad (1022660-T))
Lot 12, Jalan Teknologi 3/4, Taman Sains Selangor 1,
Kota Damansara, 47810 Petaling Jaya,
Selangor Darul Ehsan.
Tel: +603-6145 1188
Faks: +603-6145 1199
Laman web: www.sasbadisb.com
e-mel: enquiry@sasbadi.com

Majlis Peperiksaan Malaysia,
Persiaran 1, Bandar Baru Selayang,
68100 Batu Caves,
Selangor Darul Ehsan.

Hak cipta terpelihara. Tidak dibenarkan memetik atau mencetak kembali mana-mana bahagian isi buku ini dalam bentuk apa jua dan dengan cara apa pun, baik secara elektronik, fotokopi, mekanik, rakaman, atau yang lain-lain sebagainya sebelum mendapat izin bertulis daripada Penerbit.

© Majlis Peperiksaan Malaysia, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia

ISBN 978-983-77-1313-0

CONTENTS

March 2018 MUET (800) ..... *1 – 8*

July 2018 MUET (800) ..... *9 – 16*

November 2018 MUET (800) ..... *17 – 24*

MUET SESSION 1/2018

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 62 366 candidates took the MUET Session 1 2018.

The performance of the 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	1.50	1.50	0.12	0.12	0.36	0.36	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
5	10.01	11.51	3.44	3.56	9.13	9.49	1.19	1.20	2.66	2.67
4	24.35	35.86	24.23	27.79	27.33	36.82	17.83	19.03	26.75	29.42
3	21.01	56.87	53.89	81.68	33.89	70.71	59.65	76.68	45.77	75.19
2	27.94	84.81	16.55	98.23	23.53	94.24	19.13	97.81	22.32	97.51
1	15.19	100.00	1.77	100.00	5.76	100.00	2.19	100.00	2.49	100.00

CANDIDATES' RESPONSES

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 about writing a book. 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 text on music and its effects on Alzheimer's patients and children. The items are of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates are required to assess every option before choosing the best answer.

PART III

The task demands the ability to follow a mixture of texts. The first text is about keeping a scrapbook. The second text is on boomerang children, and the last text is on spiciness of chillies. The items consist 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 were some examples of the candidates' incorrect attempts:

Question 1
- without an article – *write book*
- ungrammatical – *write own books*
- problem with plural form – *write childrens books*

Question 2
- singular noun – *book is interesting*
- distortion in meaning – *characters are alive*
- subject-verb agreement (SVA) problem – *series are interesting*

Question 3
- without an article – *reading books*

Question 4
- wrong spelling – *expend background knowledge*
- missing object to a transitive verb – *expose to a different writing styles*

Question 5
- spelling – *brainstroming*
- unparallel structures – *brainstorming and make notes*

Question 6
- spelling – *the writting timetable*
- random answer – *the flow of chapter*
- ungrammatical – *make a timetable*

PART II

Answers were mostly correct and the candidates attempted to answer all the questions. The multiple-choice questions seemed manageable for the candidates as most of them could answer all the questions correctly. For Question 9 and Question 10, candidates were 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 was required, poor comprehension of the short text, poor paraphrasing, grammatical and spelling errors. This section proved to be the most challenging 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
- exceeded word limit – *ticket, postcard to be decorated with colour and sticker*
- spelling – *poscards*
- non-specific answer – *things you have collected*

Question 16
- ungrammatical – *birth of their first child*
- wrong information – *children's births*
- mixed up information – *child's first birthday*

Question 17
- not a comparative – *feel close to their children*
- ungrammatical – *feeling closer to their children*
- singular instead of plural – *feel closer to their child*

Question 18
- over generalising – *do their own chores*
- ungrammatical – *do their own washing, ironing*
- the word 'own' is omitted – *do their washing*

Question 19
- distortion in meaning – *exposure of water*
- random incorrect answer – *the number of seeds;*
- distortion in meaning – *exposes to water*

Question 20
- random – *reduce more sick*

PAPER 800/2 *(Speaking)*

General Comments

The questions were pitched appropriately for the level of the candidates, and the topics were reasonable, debatable and had a balance of fact-based and opinion-based discussions. The questions and options were accessible and manageable to the majority of the candidates.

Specific Comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:
- Fully utilised the time given to them in both tasks.
- More proficient candidates were able to develop the points well, providing an in-depth discussion that was sustained and displayed maturity of thought.
- They were able to make connections between the task and their personal experiences, as well as current issues and general knowledge.
- Ability to use complex structures accurately, as well as high command of vocabulary.
- Not only conveyed their own views but also justified, convinced and persuaded.
- Showed a high level of confidence and fluency in their presentation and discussion.
- Candidate could understand what was being said and could give impromptu responses to viewpoints raised.

The less proficient candidates' weaknesses are summarised as follows:

- Prone to writing out full sentences for Task A, and were generally unable to sustain communication.
- More capable limited users tried to restate the main ideas, or to list some new ones, but were normally unable to develop the points well.
- Unable to string together a group of words to create simple accurate sentences.
- Unsuccessful groping for words, hesitation, and lack of confidence.
- Many grammatical errors in their language use also hampered intelligibility.

PAPER 800/3 *(Reading)*

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 *(Writing)*

General Comments

The tasks given are challenging and appropriate for pre-university level. They meet the test specifications and measure the language ability of university students as candidates are assessed on their mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical devices, but also of conceptual and judgmental elements for writing. The ability to analyse and synthesise information (for Question 1), and the ability to discuss, explain and justify viewpoints as well as to link ideas to the topic convincingly (for Question 2) are skills at post-intermediate to advanced level of writing. The topic given was familiar to the candidates and it demanded the knowledge of the topic, maturity of thought, analytical-reasoning thinking, ability to present their stand and thoughtful planning.

Specific Comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse the number of visitors in three zoos from 2011 to 2015 in Figure 1 and then link to the promotional activities carried out by the zoos in 2015 given in Table 1 and write a report of not more than 200 words.

Candidates need to analyse, synthesise and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. Candidates must provide accurate data from Figure 1 and link this information to Table 1, and determine the relationship between the number of zoo visitors and promotional activities carried out by the respective zoos in 2015. Accuracy of information, conciseness and correctness of language and logical connection between given information are the requirements.

Question 2

The task requires candidates to discuss whether unemployment among graduates today is mainly because of their attitude. For this question, candidates are given the liberty to agree, disagree or partially agree with the statement and substantiate their viewpoints with explanations and suitable examples. Candidates must present their viewpoints in at least 350 words.

Question 2 is open for discussion and arguments and is rather simple if candidates are able to focus on the keywords of the statement and question given. Candidates should be able to engage in an interesting discussion considering the subject matter. It is something that everyone has an opinion to offer. The task requires the candidates to write an essay on the following statement 'unemployment among graduates today is caused by their own attitude'. For this question, candidates are given the liberty to agree, disagree or partially agree with the statement and substantiate their viewpoints with explanations and suitable examples. In disagreeing, they are allowed to offer other factors that may result in graduates being unemployed so long as a link is made between the factors and unemployment.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse and interpret visuals of the number of visitors to three zoos from 2011 to 2015 and the promotional activities carried out by the zoos in 2015. Candidates are to write the report between 150 and 200 words. In response to the task, candidates are required to analyse and synthesise the data correctly, present an introduction and overview, highlight the key features given and to link the information effectively.

Candidates are expected to observe the 200-word limit. Therefore, they need to be able to highlight salient information, particularly all the significant key features pertaining to the year 2015. Candidates need to be mindful of the word choice and tone so as to portray academic report writing and to avoid any assumptions or distortions.

The candidates were required to perform the following abilities:

- To analyse Figure 1: the number of visitors to three zoos (Animal Town, Nature's Pets and Four Legged Farm) from 2011 to 2015, and Table 1: the number and types of promotional activities carried out by the zoos in 2015. The candidates were expected to use trend words such as 'increased', 'decreased', 'remained unchanged', 'the lowest', 'the highest', 'the largest' and 'the same'.
- To synthesise/ link the number of visitors to three zoos (Animal Town, Nature's Pets and Four Legged Farm) in 2015 with the number or types of promotional activities carried out by the zoos in 2015. The candidates were expected to show a logical cause-effect relationship between the information (only in 2015); hence, the use of linkers such as 'probably due to', 'because of', 'with', 'despite' and 'although' are required.
- To organise the required information (all key features) into a coherent report.
- To present the information concisely in 150-200 words with correct subject reference, accurate data support and clear reference of years.

Question 2

The task required the candidates to write an essay on the following statement 'unemployment among graduates today is caused by their own attitude'. Candidates needed to respond by stating their stand and justifying with relevant points. Candidates needed to elaborate their points with relevant examples. The task and topic were familiar to the candidates. The question was also straightforward and easy to relate.

The nature of the question clearly requires candidates to have a stand and to be able to defend that stand throughout the essay. The topic, which is on unemployment among graduates, is a very common topic and many candidates were able to relate to it. If candidates failed to give a good response, this is most probably due to their poor language proficiency and not so much on their ability to provide relevant points. On the whole, Question 2 is also considered as thought provoking. Thus, mature and proficient candidates should be able to present their viewpoints reasonably well.

Whichever opinion or stand the candidates take, they are expected to justify their viewpoints by giving logical reasons, explanations and examples. In terms of development of ideas, the elaborations should not only be convincing and clearly linked to the topic, but they should also support the stand. Furthermore, the voice should be assertive, yet persuasive enough to engage and compel the reader to be in agreement with the writer. The use of language should be consistently accurate and appropriate to the task, content and intention. Moreover, clarity as well as cogency of expression and vocabulary should be used appropriately to express the subtleties of meaning. Ideally, three well-developed points should be given in support of the stand, and the essay should be written in not fewer than 350 words.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

STRENGTHS

- Candidates attempted to respond to the task.
- Candidates were aware of the task as many were able to provide elements required such as a title, introduction and analysis, which ranged from weak, inaccurate to clear ones.
- Many candidates were able to identify and analyse a few key features in Figure 1 and attempt was made to link information from Figure 1 to the activities given in Table 1.
- Candidates generally made an attempt to adhere to the number of words permitted and many of the answers also showed some evidences of planning. For example, paragraphs and the use of discourse markers.

- The following table provides the strengths of the candidates' answers:

Title	Most candidates provided a title although it may not have captured the information given in both the visuals.
Introduction	Many candidates provided a complete introduction of the visuals although this introduction was often lifted from the titles given for both the visuals in the question paper.
Overview	Many candidates were able to provide a complete or at least attempted to provide an overview. Sometimes, the overview appeared in the conclusion.
Analysis and synthesis	1. Candidates were aware that they needed to analyse data given in both the visuals. 2. There was a clear attempt to link the visuals. 3. Simple analysis prevailed in most answers. 4. Syntheses were attempted as the visuals given for this session were easy to comprehend. 5. Many candidates were aware that the activities in 2015 influenced the number of visitors to the 3 zoos. The confusion was when the link to the correct year was made. Many stated from 2011 to 2015 instead of just looking at only 2015.
Conclusion	There was an attempt to provide a conclusion. At times, the overview was found in the conclusion.
Planning	There was evidence of planning in candidates' answers. Paragraphs were used and structure was seen.
Language	Many candidates were able to present their analysis using modest language. Single word errors (SWEs) were found in many scripts. Subject-verb agreement (SVA), prepositional errors, wrong word form were noted. The use of discourse markers (first, next, similarly) were noted too.

WEAKNESSES

- Wrong subject reference was a notable error in many scripts for this session. Instead of referring to the number of visitors, many candidates wrote 'Animal town decreased to …' or 'Four Legged Farm remained constant…'
- Data was sometimes missing in candidates' answers.
- Inaccurate analysis for Four Legged Farm – instead of the number remaining constant from 2014 to 2015, many candidates wrote 'the number remained constant from 2011 to 2015'.
- Many assumptions were noted such as 'the most popular activity' and 'the most effective strategy'.
- Provided irrelevancies – writing a long introduction, and talking about the effectiveness of the activities in general.
- Repeated sentence structure.
- No overview or wrong overview (year missing or linked from 2011 to 2015).
- Described information from Figure 1 and Table 1 with no attempt to analyse.
- Distortions – candidates used wrong trend words such as 'rating' and 'visitors rose'.
- Repetition of analysis.
- Candidates did not link Figure 1 and Table 1 for 2015. They analysed Figure 1 in isolation.

Question 2

STRENGTHS

- Candidates understood the requirement of the question and were able to provide some relevant points.
- Most candidates were able to provide relevant points and there were attempts to elaborate the points with simple examples.
- Conventions of writing were seen in many scripts. Even the weaker students were able to present some relevant information required although they grappled poorly with the language.
- Most candidates also adhered to the technique of writing like providing an introduction and conclusion.

WEAKNESSES

- Although the topic was familiar to the candidates (unemployment among graduates), they were not able to provide good answers. Many candidates were unable to clearly show how attitude or other factors led to the unemployment among the graduates. Many merely listed the reasons and did not provide details.
- Discussion generally was superficial and lacked depth. Points given were very predictable. Very few were able to provide mature ideas.
- The tone at times was inappropriate as some candidates ended on an advising note.
- In terms of language use, only simple sentence structures and high frequency words were used by most of the candidates. There were some scripts in which language was incomprehensible. Generally, it was noticed that many candidates made serious language errors such as using wrong choice of words and committing spelling errors, SVA errors and pronoun errors.
- There were candidates who did not give an introduction to their essays. Many started off by stating their stand and moved on immediately to elaborating their points. Even if introduction did exist, it was abrupt and too short. Even conclusions were short and abrupt.
- Other areas of weaknesses:
  a. Focused more on advising parents, graduates, employers and the government on how to provide jobs for the graduates.
  b. There were gaps in the discussion. The examiners had to read between the lines to understand what the candidates were trying to say.
  c. Candidates did not state their stand clearly.
  d. Choice of vocabulary was mainly simple.
  e. Spelling errors were noted.
  f. Unable to distinguish the different forms of word such as ‘success’, ‘successfully’, ‘graduate’, ‘graduated’, and ‘graduates’.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 53 579 candidates took the MUET Session 2 2018.

The performance of the 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	1.27	1.27	0.17	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	7.62	8.90	3.72	3.90	3.23	3.29	0.98	0.99	1.57	1.57
4	18.90	27.80	20.40	24.30	15.43	18.72	12.40	13.40	15.09	16.66
3	19.65	47.45	46.51	70.81	35.81	54.53	57.41	70.80	44.92	61.58
2	31.81	79.26	24.76	95.57	35.94	90.48	26.24	97.04	33.87	95.45
1	20.74	100.00	4.43	100.00	9.52	100.00	2.96	100.00	4.55	100.00

CANDIDATES' RESPONSES

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 text messaging, a common habit among teenagers. 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 between the host of a radio talk show and a computer scientist. The items were of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates were required to assess every option before choosing the best answer.

PART III

The task demands the ability to follow a mixture of texts; a documentary, a brochure, and a short article. The documentary is regarding an exchange student programme. The brochure is on whale watching spots, and the article is on water. The items consist of short-answer questions whereby the candidates were required to answer within a five-word limit for each question.

Specific Comments

PART I

Answers ranged from all correct answers to 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
- exceeded word limit – *fast, convenient and affordable*
- wrong spelling – *affortable/confinient*

Question 2
- wrong spelling – *restoren/libery*
- guessing – *in the school*
- more than one answer – *home, library, street*

Question 3
- only one answer instead of two – *time/attention*

Question 4
- use of noun instead of an adjective – *dependant on parents*
- wrong preposition – *too dependent to parents*

Question 5
- wrong verb form – *loss focus*
- an adjective instead of a verb – *loose focus*
- assumption – *lose focus on study*
- subject-verb agreement (SVA) problem – *It make them lose focus*

Question 6
- totally unrelated response – *stamp*
- ungrammatical – *no enough sleep*

PART II

As the questions were of multiple choices, the candidates were required to assess every option before choosing the best answer. The multiple-choice questions seemed to be manageable for the candidates as most of them could answer all the questions correctly.

PART III

As the questions were open-ended and answers were limited to a maximum of five words, many candidates made structural and grammatical errors in their answers, and thus, they did not get marks for the errors. Many candidates were not able to paraphrase or summarise to provide correct answers. This section proves to be the most challenging 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 choice and wrong spelling – *travel cause and personel expanses*
- mishearing – *personal expensive*

Question 16
- repeated word given in the stem – *scholarships*
- wrong word – *installments, hostel*
- *Bahasa Melayu* spelling – *insurans*

Question 17
- Wrong passive form – *are guarantee to see whales*
- ungrammatical – *can see whales more close*
- spelling error– *gerenti to see whales*

Question 18
- wrong word – *go there to breathe/bridge*
- distortion of information – *are there to breed*

Question 19
- assumptions – *water shortage/water rushing/no water/lack of water*
- spelling by sound – *water resyening/rashioning*

Question 20
- use of singular noun instead of plural – *through many country*
- wrong preposition – *to/over many countries*
- naming the countries – *China, Iraq, Mexico*

PAPER 800/2 *(Speaking)*

General Comments

The questions were pitched appropriately for the level of the candidates, and the topics were reasonable, debatable and had a balance of fact-based and opinion-based discussions. The questions and options were accessible and manageable to the majority of the candidates.

Specific Comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:
- Able to use the time given to them for both Tasks A and B.
- The proficient candidates were able to develop the points well, providing an in-depth discussion that was sustained and displayed maturity of thought.
- They were able to make connections between the task and their personal experience, as well as current issues and general knowledge.
- Displayed the ability 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.
- Showed a high level of confidence and fluency in their presentation and discussion.
- Task B was usually highly interactive as the candidate could understand what was being said and could give impromptu responses to viewpoints raised.

The less proficient candidates' weaknesses are summarised as follows:

- Prone to writing out full sentences and thus unable to sustain communication once they had read aloud their last written sentence.
- Lack of general knowledge in some of the candidates.
- Displayed their comparative lack of proficiency through their lexical choices and simpler, less complex language structures.
- Displayed their discomfort and lack of confidence in using the language by showing markers such as jerky speech with false starts, and reliance on a limited numbers of phrases.
- Candidates were not able to utilise turn-taking and conversation strategy.

PAPER 800/3 *(Reading)*

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 *(Writing)*

General Comments

Overall, both questions are challenging and appropriate in assessing the prospective pre-university candidates' knowledge and language ability. Question 1 complies to the MUET syllabus specifications as it tests the candidates' ability to give a title, an introduction, overview, analyses, syntheses, and a conclusion. The task is comprehensible and provides sufficient key features for candidates to write a report. Question 2 pertains to a subject matter that the candidates are familiar with and relate to. The requirement of the task is clear. However, it is very challenging, as it demands high critical thinking skills from candidates. It tests the candidates' ability to make a stand, write an effective thesis statement, present viewpoints and provide justifications for the stand taken.

Specific Comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse the number of guests in homestays (2016) in Figure 1 and link to the satisfaction ratings received from guests (2016) given in Table 1 and write a report of not more than 200 words.

The question was in the form of a line graph and a table. The graph (Figure 1) depicts the number of guests in homestays (2016). The table (Table 1) contains four categories related to the homestays for guests to rate their satisfaction based on their stay. The task requires candidates to analyse, synthesise and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. It also demands the candidates' ability to provide accurate data from Figure 1 and link this information to Table 1, hence determining the relationship between the number of guests staying in the homestays and the satisfaction ratings these homestays received in 2016.

Question 2

The question requires candidates to discuss whether sports unite people. For this question, candidates are given the liberty to agree, disagree or partially agree with the statement and substantiate their viewpoints with explanations and suitable examples. Candidates should be able to respond correctly using at least 350 words.

Question 2 is open for discussion and arguments and is rather simple if candidates are able to focus on the keywords of the statement and question given. Candidates should be able to engage in an interesting discussion considering the subject matter. The task and topic are familiar to the candidates. The question is also straightforward and easy to relate to. The nature of question clearly requires candidates to have a stand and to be able to defend that stand throughout the essay.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse and interpret visuals of the number of guests in three homestays in 2016 and the satisfaction ratings received from the guests in 2016. In response to the task, candidates are required to be able to analyse and synthesise the data correctly, present an introduction and overview, highlight the key features given and to link the information effectively.

Candidates are expected to be able to analyse and synthesise the required information in the non-linear texts related to the number of guests to three homestays for three months; January, June and December 2016 and the satisfaction ratings received from the guests in 2016. They need to know the format of a report and able to write concisely and accurately within 150 and 200 words.

They also need to convey the overview or overall trend of Figure 1 – the line graph, followed by the analysis of the correct key features, data, trend words and the time frame. With the analysis of both Figure 1 and Table 1, candidates have to link them appropriately and be able to synthesise. Logical connection of the data and usage of appropriate linkers are expected. In doing so, candidates must display the accurate use of language; meaning must come across clearly with the use of variety and appropriate sentence structures plus vocabulary. Irrelevant and inaccurate key features, data, time frame and trend are not accepted as well as assumptions or new unrelated information outside of the presented task.

Question 2

The task requires candidates to present a response on the statement (sports unite people) and whether it unites them or otherwise. They also must be able to write in about 350 words. Moreover, they need to respond by stating a stand and providing thesis statement. They are supposed to state their opinion and elaborate on the topic sentences and must be able to develop ideas effectively.

The candidates were required to perform the following abilities:

- to address and express opinion on the above statement which was a contemporary topic. The candidates were expected to state their opinion as to whether they agreed, disagreed or partially agreed that sports unite people.
- to support their stand by giving an in-depth elaboration and mature treatment to the task. The candidates were required to justify and illustrate any one the following opinions in a convincing way, with appropriate reasons and examples:
  a. Sports – unite – people
  b. Sports – do not unite – people
  c. Sports – unite – people, but may also – cause disunity – to people

Whichever opinion or stand the candidates take, they are expected to justify their viewpoints by giving logical reasons, explanations and examples. In terms of the development of ideas, the elaborations should not only be convincing and clearly linked to the topic, but they should also support the stand. Furthermore, the voice should be assertive, yet persuasive enough to engage and compel the reader to be in agreement with the writer. The use of language should be consistently accurate and appropriate to the task, content and intention. Moreover, clarity as well as cogency of expression and vocabulary should be used appropriately to express the subtleties of meaning. Ideally, three well-developed points should be given in support of the stand, and the essay should be written in not fewer than 350 words.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Question 1

STRENGTHS

- Candidates attempted to respond to the task.
- Candidates were aware of the task as many were able to provide elements required such as a title, introduction and analysis, which ranged from weak, inaccurate to clear ones.
- Many candidates were able to identify and analyse a few key features in Figure 1 and attempt was made to link information from Figure 1 to the satisfaction ratings given in Table 1.
- Candidates generally made an attempt to adhere to the number of words permitted and many of the answers also showed some evidence of planning. For example, paragraphs and the use of discourse markers.
- The following table provides the strengths of the candidates' answers:

Title	Most candidates provided a title although it may not have captured the information given in both the visuals.
Introduction	Many candidates provided a complete introduction of the visuals although this introduction was often lifted from the titles given for both the visuals in the question paper.
Overview	Many candidates were able to provide a complete or at least attempted to provide an overview.

Analysis and synthesis	1. Candidates were aware that they needed to analyse data given in both the visuals. 2. There was a clear attempt to link the visuals. 3. Simple analysis prevailed in most answers. 4. Syntheses were attempted as the visuals given for this session were easy to comprehend. 5. Many candidates were aware that the number of guests in the homestays was influenced by the ratings of satisfaction.
Conclusion	There was an attempt to provide a conclusion. At times, the overview was found in the conclusion.
Planning	There was evidence of planning in candidates' answers. Paragraphs were used and structure was seen.
Language	Many candidates were able to present their analysis using modest language. Single word errors (SWEs) were found in many scripts. Subject-verb agreement (SVA), prepositional errors, wrong word forms were noted. The use of discourse markers (first, next, similarly) was noted too.

WEAKNESSES

- Wrong subject reference was a notable error in many scripts for this session. Instead of referring to 'the number of guests decreased', many candidates wrote 'Melor Homestay decreased'.
- Data was sometimes missing in candidates' answers.
- Many assumptions were noted such as 'facilities were good' or 'most popular homestay'.
- Provided irrelevancies – writing long introduction, and talking about the effectiveness of the aspects.
- Repeated sentence structure.
- No overview or wrong overview (number of guests influencing the ratings).
- Described information from Figure 1 and Table 1 with no attempt to analyse.
- Distortions – candidates used wrong trend words such as 'ranking' and 'highest guest'.
- Repetition of analysis.
- Candidates did not link Figure 1 and Table 1. They analysed Figure 1 in isolation.
- Wrong time frame – 'number of guests increased throughout the year' or 'January until December'.
- Did not mention years in the report.
- Inaccuracies – 'Yasmin fluctuated from January (75) to 80 in June, then drop in December (75)'.

Question 2

STRENGTHS

It is evident that most candidates were aware of the issue of sports uniting people. Some even defined 'sports' and 'unite' and provided the following elements in their answers:

- Provided examples of sports and named some prominent sports personalities and athletes.
- Made a clear stand on the issue (to agree, disagree or partially agree).
- Wrote an argumentative or discussive essay justifying how and why sports unite or do not unite people.
- Presented three points (or at least two) and developed them with reasonable depth.
- Explained or justified their viewpoints with appropriate examples.
- Treated the subject with a certain level of maturity.
- Organised their ideas in paragraphs, showing evidence of planning and knowledge of the conventions of academic writing.

- Used a variety of sentence structures.
- Used varied and appropriate vocabulary.
- Made comparisons of the different types of international sport events.
- Provided reasons how and why sports succeeded or failed in uniting people.
- Related interesting examples to support arguments.

WEAKNESSES

- Many candidates failed to clarify how sports lead to unity among people. Generally, the answers for the question were shallow. The candidates had understood the question well based on their stand. However, the planning of the essay was weak as certain paragraphs had a repetition of the same points, vocabulary and sentence structures were limited.
- The answers reflected general weaknesses in the maturity of the candidates and their writing as most of the answers lacked depth in their understanding of the topic. Some did not give the idea of 'unity' but gave the ideas of 'benefits' or 'advantages and disadvantages'. Points were not well-developed and examples were immature and simple.
- Some candidates had a clear stand but the answer provided did not reflect the stand. Some gave wrong ideas even though they had stated an agreement to the topic.
- Candidates failed to explain the impact of unity in sports on people. Too many reasons were stated but with very few explanations. Some of the points were just stated without any explanation or elaboration with examples. There was uneven paragraph development as some were well written while others were mere repetitions.
- Candidates also wrote very poor sentence structures and they were unable to construct a simple sentence without any grammatical mistakes. Word order was influenced by mother tongue/native speakers' language. Some just gave strings of English words without any meaning.

MUET SESSION 3/2018

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

A total of 68 094 candidates took the MUET Session 3 2018.

The performance of the 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	7.27	7.27	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	16.89	24.16	4.09	4.22	3.54	3.60	0.74	0.75	2.03	2.03
4	20.57	44.72	28.97	33.19	20.79	24.39	12.72	13.47	23.51	25.54
3	14.28	59.01	49.96	83.15	41.87	66.26	63.18	76.65	47.13	72.67
2	19.52	78.53	14.95	98.10	28.09	94.35	21.82	98.47	24.38	97.05
1	21.47	100.00	1.90	100.00	5.65	100.00	1.53	100.00	2.95	100.00

CANDIDATES' RESPONSES

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 dust mites and their effects on human beings. 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 dialogue between two friends Ronnie and Maya on buying a computer. The items were of multiple-choice questions whereby candidates were required 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 piece of advice, and a talk. The conversation is regarding the benefits of the KL-Singapore rail service to families. Next, is a piece of advice on how to write an application letter. Finally, the talk is about handwriting and personality. The items consist 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 correct answers to 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.

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

Question 1
- singular noun/adjective – *allergy/allergic*
- wrong spelling – *ashma/athma/asma*

Question 2
- wrong synonym – *warm and wet/hot and humid*
- names of countries – *Singapore and Malaysia*

Question 3
- wrong part of speech – *death skin*
- extra word, ungrammatical – *dead skin dropped/dead skin dropout*

Question 4
- wrong spelling – *runy*
- wrong adjective – *running nose*

Question 5
- wrong adjective – *watering eyes*

Question 6
- spelling by sound – *coffing/ cofing/ caughing*
- wrong word – *coffin*

PART II

As the questions are of multiple choices, the candidates are required to assess every option before choosing the best answer. The multiple-choice questions seemed to be manageable for the candidates as most of them could answer all the questions correctly.

PART III

As the questions are open-ended and answers are limited to a maximum of five words, some candidates made structural and grammatical errors in their answers, and thus, they did not get marks for the errors. Some candidates were not able to paraphrase or summarise to provide correct answers. This section proves to be the most challenging 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
- not in the text – *traffic, meals and rail stops*
- not in the text – *traffic jams, rest stops and meals*

Question 16
- wrong tense – *spent quality time together*
- random wrong answer – *more love another*

Question 17
- wrong spelling – *expected sallary*

Question 18
- ungrammatical – *secure you to interview*
- unclear pronoun reference – *catch their attention*

Question 19
- not an adjective – *personalities type*
- word is not found in text – *personality type and physical condition*

Question 20
- subject-verb agreement (SVA) problem; singular noun instead of plural – *writes in large letter*

PAPER 800/2 *(Speaking)*

General Comments

The questions were pitched appropriately for the level of the candidates, and the topics were reasonable, debatable and had a balance of fact-based and opinion-based discussions. The questions and options were accessible and manageable to the majority of the candidates.

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:
- Lacked ability to connect the responses to the required task.
- Lacked command of basic structures.
- Many global errors, i.e sentence structures/grammar.
- Lacked general/prior knowledge of current issues. Hence, their presentation was monotonous and lacked maturity of thought.
- Lacked confidence and participation especially in Task B. So repetition of the same ideas/points in Task B was common. As a result, they were not able to respond directly to the viewpoints raised by other group members. Some could not even respond well to the ongoing discussion and were merely stating memorised phrases.
- Candidates were also reported to repeat their ideas, especially when they lacked the proficiency to elaborate.

PAPER 800/3 *(Reading)*

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 *(Writing)*

General Comments

Questions are challenging and appropriate for pre-university level. They meet the test specifications and measure the language ability of university students as candidates were assessed on their mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical devices, but also of conceptual and judgmental elements for writing. The ability to analyse and synthesise information (for Question 1), and the ability to discuss, explain and justify viewpoints as well as to link ideas to the topic convincingly (for Question 2) are skills at post-intermediate to advanced level of writing. As such, the paper is appropriate for the level expected of the candidates. The topic given was familiar to the candidates and it demanded the knowledge of the topic, maturity of thought, analytical-reasoning thinking, ability to present a stand and thoughtful planning.

Specific Comments

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse the number of dengue cases in Figure 1 and link them to the dengue prevention activities carried out in the respective years given in Table 1 and write a report of not more than 200 words.

The task requires candidates to analyse, synthesise and organise required information from given non-linear texts into a coherent report. It demands the ability of candidates to analyse the number of dengue cases in Figure 1 and link them to the dengue prevention activities carried out in the respective

years given in Table 1 and write a report of not more than 200 words. It also demands the candidates' ability to provide accurate data from Figure 1 and link this information to Table 1, hence determining the relationship between the number of dengue cases in the three residential areas and the dengue prevention activities in 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Question 2

The question requires candidates to discuss whether failure makes one a better person. For this question, candidates are given the liberty to agree, disagree or partially agree with the statement and substantiate their viewpoints with explanations and suitable examples. Candidates should write in at least 350 words.

Question 2 is open for discussion and arguments and is rather simple if candidates are able to focus on the keywords of the statement and question given. Candidates should be able to engage in an interesting discussion considering the subject matter. It is something that everyone has an opinion to offer about. The task and topic are familiar to the candidates. The statement given was 'Failure makes one a better person'. The nature of the question clearly requires candidates to have a stand and to be able to defend that stand throughout the essay. The topic is a very common one and candidates should be able to relate to it.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Question 1

The task requires candidates to analyse and interpret visuals of the number of dengue cases in three residential areas from 2012 to 2016 and the dengue prevention activities carried out in 2012, 2014 and 2016. Candidates are to write the report in 150 to 200 words. In response to the task, candidates are required to analyse and synthesise the data correctly, present an introduction and overview, highlight the key features given and to link the information effectively.

Candidates are expected to observe the 200-word limit. Therefore, they need to be able to highlight salient information, particularly all the significant key features pertaining to the years 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Candidates need to be mindful of the word choice and tone so as to portray academic report writing and to avoid any assumptions or distortions.

Two visuals are presented: a line graph on the number of dengue cases in three areas from 2012 to 2016, and a table depicting the dengue prevention activities carried out in 2012, 2014 and 2016.

The candidates are required to perform the following abilities:

- to analyse Figure 1: the number of dengue cases in three residential areas from 2012 to 2016, and Table 1: the dengue prevention activities carried out in 2012, 2014 and 2016.
- to synthesise/ link the number with the number of dengue cases in three residential areas in 2012, 2014 and 2016, to the types of prevention activities carried out in these years respectively. The candidates were expected to show a logical cause-effect relationship between the information in Figure 1 and Table 1; hence, the use of linkers such as 'probably due to', 'because of', 'with', 'despite' and 'although' are required.
- to organise the required information (all key features) into a coherent report.
- to present the information concisely in 150-200 words with correct subject reference, accurate data support and clear reference of years.

The candidates are expected to write the number of dengue cases in Taman Mawar, Taman Lily and Taman Lavender from 2012 to 2016, the number of promotional activities and/or the types of promotional activities in 2012, 2014 and 2016, and highlighting happenings of 2012, 2014 and 2016 in both Figure 1 and Table 1.

Giving any new or extra information other than the one found in the given stimuli is considered as making assumptions or distortions and irrelevancies.

Question 2

The task requires the candidates to write an essay on the following statement 'Failure makes one a better person'. Candidates need to respond by stating their stand and justifying with relevant points. Candidates need to elaborate their points with relevant examples.

The nature of the question clearly requires candidates to have a stand and to be able to defend that stand throughout the essay. The topic, which is on unemployment among graduates, is a very common topic and many candidates were able to relate to it. If candidates failed to give a good response, this was most probably due to their poor language proficiency and not so much on their ability to provide relevant points. On the whole, Question 2 is also considered as thought provoking. It is felt that any mature and proficient candidates should be able to present their viewpoints reasonably well.

Whichever opinion or stand the candidates take, they are expected to justify their viewpoints by giving logical reasons, explanations and examples. In terms of development of ideas, the elaborations should not only be convincing and clearly linked to the topic, but they should also support the stand. Furthermore, the voice should be assertive, yet persuasive enough to engage and compel the reader to be in agreement with the writer. The use of language should be consistently accurate and appropriate to the task, content and intention. Moreover, clarity as well as cogency of expression and vocabulary should be used appropriately to express the subtleties of meaning. Ideally, three well-developed points should be given in support of the stand, and the essay should be written in not fewer than 350 words.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

STRENGTHS

- Candidates attempted to respond to the task.
- Candidates were aware of the task as many were able to provide elements required such as a title, introduction and analysis, which ranged from weak and inaccurate to clear ones.
- Many candidates were able to identify and analyse a few key features in Figure 1 and attempt was made to link information from Figure 1 to the activities given in Table 1.
- Candidates generally made an attempt to adhere to the number of words permitted and many of the answers also showed some evidence of planning. For example, paragraphs and the use of discourse markers. There was structure even in weak scripts.
- The following table provides strengths of the candidates' answers:

Title	Most candidates provided a title although it may not have captured the information given in both the visuals.
Introduction	Many candidates provided a complete introduction of the visuals although this introduction was often lifted from the titles given for both the visuals in the question paper.
Overview	There was attempt to provide an overview.

Analysis and synthesis	1. Candidates were aware that they needed to analyse data given in both the visuals. 2. There was a clear attempt to link the visuals. 3. Simple analysis prevailed in most answers. 4. Synthesis was attempted but many candidates created inaccuracies due to illogical linking or wrote wrong years.
Conclusion	There was an attempt to provide a conclusion. At times, the overview was found in the conclusion.
Planning	There was evidence of planning in candidates' answers. Paragraphs were used and structure was seen.
Language	Many candidates were able to present their analysis using modest language. Single word errors (SWEs) were found in many scripts. Subject-verb agreement (SVA), prepositional errors, wrong word forms were noted. The use of discourse markers (first, next, similarly) was noted too.

WEAKNESSES
- Candidates exceeded number of words allowed (more than 200 words).
- Missing time frame/years in the title, introduction and overview.
- Inaccurate overview as they used the time frame '2012–2016'.
- Overview was missing in many scripts.
- Overview was misinterpreted as analysis (highest and lowest number).
- The words 'Generally' and 'Year' were missing in the overview, thus creating inaccuracy.
  E.g. '*The number of dengue cases in three residential areas was influenced by prevention activities.*'
- Assumptions were made when candidates failed to report all four or three activities or when they described these activities as effective or bad.
- Wrong use of trend words – e.g 'Taman Mawar shows fluctuated from 2012 to 2015 and went down to 6 in 2016'.
- Candidates did not link information, i.e. separate analysis of Figure 1 and Table 1.
- Narrative or descriptive essay on dengue and how to prevent it.
- Wrong subject reference – e.g. 'Taman Lily was highest at 35'.
- Candidates created distortions when the word 'number' was absent in their analysis – e.g. 'Taman Mawar had highest cases in 2014'.

Question 2

STRENGTHS
- Candidates understood the requirement of the question and were able to provide some relevant points. Most candidates were able to provide relevant points and there were attempts to elaborate the points with simple and relevant examples like Thomas Edison, Dato' Lee Chong Wei and Jack Ma.
- The writing convention was evident in many scripts; introduction, stand, thesis statement, topic sentence and conclusion.
- Even the weaker candidates were able to present some relevant information required although they grappled with language. The use of language was average.
- Most arguments were consistent with the stand chosen.
- Used appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures.
- Many had single word errors in most of their sentences but these did not hinder meaning.

WEAKNESSES:

- Although the topic was familiar to the candidates, they were not able to provide good answers. Many candidates were unable to clearly show how failure makes one a better person.
- Discussions generally were superficial and lacked depth. Points given were very predictable such as 'learning from mistakes, become more hard working and do not give up'. Very few were able to provide matured ideas. Candidates also cited similar examples – Thomas Edison–light bulb, Steve Jobs, Jack Ma founder of Ali Baba Group, and Albert Einstein.
- The tone at times was inappropriate as some candidates ended on an advising note.
- In terms of language use, only simple sentence structures and high frequency words were used by most of the candidates. There were some scripts where language was incomprehensible. Generally, it was noticed that many candidates made serious language errors such as using wrong choice of words and committing spelling errors, SVA errors and pronoun errors.
- There were candidates who did not give an introduction to their essays. Many started off by stating their stand and moved on immediately to elaborating their points. Even if introduction did exist, it was abrupt and too short. Even conclusions were short and abrupt.

Laporan Peperiksaan STPM 2018

LAPORAN PEPERIKSAAN STPM 2018 MUET (800)

SASBADI SDN. BHD. (139288-X)
(Anak syarikat milik penuh Sasbadi Holdings Berhad (1022660-T))
Lot 12, Jalan Teknologi 3/4, Taman Sains Selangor 1,
Kota Damansara, 47810 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan.
Tel: +603-6145 1188 Faks: +603-6145 1199
Laman web: www.sasbadisb.com e-mel: enquiry@sasbadi.com

MAJLIS PEPERIKSAAN MALAYSIA
Persiaran 1, Bandar Baru Selayang,
68100 Batu Caves, Selangor Darul Ehsan.
Tel: +603-6126 1600 Faks: +603-6136 1488
e-mel: ppa@mpm.edu.my

ISBN 978-983-77-1313-0