

MUET SESSION 1 2022

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

For Session 1 2022, 29 585 candidates sat the test.

The percentages 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 are as follows:

Band	CEFR Level	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
		%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
5+	C1+	0.52	0.52	0.25	0.25	1.71	1.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.0	C1	9.32	9.84	2.88	3.14	17.65	19.36	0.05	0.05	0.30	0.30
4.5	B2	25.81	35.65	8.53	11.67	31.13	50.50	0.87	0.92	5.93	6.23
4.0		36.88	72.53	23.07	34.74	33.89	84.38	4.59	5.50	38.98	45.21
3.5	B1	19.80	92.33	37.45	72.19	11.44	95.83	15.54	21.05	40.97	86.18
3.0		6.70	99.03	20.74	92.93	3.18	99.01	45.68	66.73	11.58	97.76
2.5	A2	0.90	99.94	5.36	98.28	0.93	99.94	28.39	95.12	2.15	99.90
2.0		0.06	100.00	1.68	99.96	0.06	100.00	4.74	99.86	0.10	100.00
1.0		0.00	100.00	0.04	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.14	100.00	0.00	100.00

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

Answer Key

Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key
1	A	11	A	21	B
2	C	12	C	22	C
3	C	13	B	23	B
4	B	14	C	24	A
5	A	15	E	25	B
6	A	16	C	26	B
7	B	17	B	27	C
8	B	18	A	28	B
9	B	19	B	29	A
10	C	20	A	30	A

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)

General Comments

On the whole, it was seen that the majority of the candidates were acclimatised with the new format. Furthermore, the quality of the candidates' performance was more or less consistent with the previous MUET session, which was dependent largely on their mastery of the language. The questions were relevant to the scope of the candidates' daily life, and/or general knowledge around the area. Aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) standards, the topics ranged from Level A2 to B1 for Part 1 and Level B1 to B2 for Part 2. The general consensus was that the difficulty of the papers was uniform across the board. Moreover, the test did the job of discriminating the proficiency of the candidates, especially with regard to the difference in requirement of task between Part 1 and Part 2.

Specific Comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Developed the points well, providing an in-depth discussion that was sustained and displayed maturity of thought
- Made connections between the task and their personal experiences, as well as current issues and general knowledge (for candidates who were better read)
- Used the preparation time to write notes in point form rather than creating full sentences, and used the presentation time to elaborate on the notes
- Displayed the ability to use complex structures accurately, as well as a high command of vocabulary, not only to convey their own views but to justify, convince, and persuade
- Showed a high level of confidence and fluency in their presentation and discussion
- Connected their points to the points raised by their peers in a way that made the discussion logical and cohesive
- Showed good interaction skills and intelligible utterances such as responding to viewpoints raised, initiating new topics for discussion, drawing conclusions from differing perspectives, and negotiating to arrive at a consensus

The less proficient candidates had the following weaknesses:

- Prone to writing out full sentences for Parts 1 and 2.
- Unable to continue their presentations after reading aloud. More capable limited users may try to restate the main ideas, or list some new ones, but they would typically be unable to develop their points in a comprehensive or an informative way.
- Lacked vocabulary and complexity in language structures. Many of these candidates were unable to string together a group of words to create simple accurate sentences.
- Unsuccessfully groping for words and lack of confidence while delivering speech
- Could not respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates and the group discussion was marked by mere taking of turns (as opposed to turn-taking).
- The presentations of these less proficient candidates were also often not connected properly to the presentations made by other candidates, or even to the development of the task. This was usually because these less proficient candidates were more concerned with transmitting their points, rather than developing their points with the other points as raised by their peers.

The most common recurring problem that many candidates faced, regardless of their linguistic ability, was the lack of ability to connect their responses to the required task. Candidates were also reported to repeat their ideas, especially when they lacked the proficiency to elaborate. There was also the issue of the lack of general knowledge in some of the candidates, and this could also be seen in some of the candidates who were more proficient. It can be surmised that the less read or informed candidates are on current issues, the less the quality of their task fulfilment. Nevertheless, this

problem is a strategic one, and can be remedied with better understanding of question requirements, and logical, organised thinking.

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General Comments

The kind and standard of writing expected in the performance of the two tasks are of form six and pre-university levels 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 understand and apply information (for Task 1), and the ability to discuss, explain, and justify viewpoints as well as to link ideas to the topic convincingly (for Task 2), skills that are commonly observed at post-intermediate to advanced levels of writing. As such, the paper is appropriate for the level expected of the candidates.

Specific Comments

Task 1

The task requires candidates to respond to a letter between friends, Sabrina (sender) and Zack (recipient) pertaining to a programme on reducing the use of plastic bags. Candidates are required to read the letter as well as the corresponding notes for each paragraph carefully and have to write a response appropriately. The letter should be at least 100 words in length and written concisely and clearly with appropriate register. In order to tackle the task effectively, candidates are required to identify the correct subject to write on and identify which information in the letter to respond to, use all the prompts given, write adequate response to each note, and use language appropriate to the context of a letter.

Task 2

The task requires candidates to write a discursive or an argumentative essay of at least 250 words in agreement, disagreement, or partial agreement with the statement which reads modernisation has robbed us of our peace of mind in about 50 minutes. The key words (subject) must not be changed and a formal genre is expected. A stand must be demonstrated and it should be discussed, sustained, and justified with suitable examples to show why the claim is reasonable and logical. Arguments must be relevant and accurate, and may show the advantages and disadvantages but the proposed side must be more convincing than the other side.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Task 1

The task requires candidates to reply to a letter sent by Sabrina to Zack inviting him to a programme to reduce the use of plastic bags organised by her neighbourhood. The task requires candidates to provide accurate and relevant information on the four notes given in a letter. A letter format is sought and the maximum word count is at least 100 words. The letter has to be concise, yet compact and accurate. An opening remark followed by the body paragraph and an appropriate closure are expected. Candidates need to use appropriate linkers and apt vocabulary. The expected voice is one of clarity and consistent yet friendly. Irrelevancies and inaccuracies of information are not tolerated. Information outside the question is not required. When a candidate fails to respond to the notes given, it is considered that the candidate has failed to fulfil the task in a satisfactory manner.

Candidates are expected to reply to an informal letter to a friend by responding to the four notes for each paragraph. They are also expected to provide an address, date, salutation, opening and closing statements, and a sign off in their responses. The reply should include the following nine parts:

- (a) Opening remark/ salutation/ name of receiver.
- (b) Informing about the programme to reduce the use of plastic bags.
- (c) Mentioning when the programme will be held.
- (d) Enquiring about the activities or express hope that the activities will be fun/ beneficial.
- (e) Expressing regret for not being able to attend the programme by giving reasons.
- (f) Agreeing and describing why the use of plastic bags is bad for the environment.
- (g) Apologising to Sabrina once again for not being able to attend the programme.
- (h) Stating if family and friends will be able to join in the programme.
- (i) Closing remark/ signing off with the correct name (Zack).

Candidates are required to provide relevant elaborations for the sub-notes. Apt vocabulary and a range of simple to complex structures are required for a script to be placed in a high band. Candidates are expected to give logical connections to their responses by making use of appropriate linkers. Candidates are also expected to use the correct register in replying to the letter. Irrelevancies and inaccuracies should not be present in the response to the letter.

The correct subject which is participating in a programme on reducing the use of plastic bags is required for the correct part of reference. A response that does not clearly and correctly state the subject is deemed vague, indicating that the candidate has failed to understand the message in the letter. Any ensuring responses will be considered irrelevant to the task. Or, a response that lacks link between the information in the notes and expansion indicates that the candidate has not fully understood the task. Candidates are also expected to use the phrases or words provided in the notes or some other words which carry the same ideas/contexts to the notes.

Task 2

The task requires the candidates to write a discursive or an argumentative essay in which the function of the language used is to explain or justify a particular stand held in relation to the statement given. Candidates have to discuss whether "Modernisation has robbed us of our peace of mind or otherwise". The candidates are expected to state their opinion as to whether they agree, disagree or partially agree to the statement given. Viewpoints are presented as well as justified in relation to the context given. The discussion must be mature, in-depth and supported with relevant examples in order to convince the reader. Candidates need to be clear on the requirement of the task. A minimum of three points with relevant examples are expected to support the stand held and the response must be at least 250 words long.

Details should be given and examples must be relevant to the discussion. The discussion can carry points such as the need to upgrade gadgets can be stressful, obsession with social media and gadgets can lead to mental health issues, and modernisation makes people work harder and thus leaving little time for relaxation.

On the other hand, if the candidates disagree to the statement given, they need to provide reasons why modernisation has not robbed us of our peace of mind. Points to support this stand can be modern inventions make life easier, social media can bring joy, and modern security systems can provide safety.

If the candidates choose the partial stand, they must provide points for and against the statement given.

Mechanics of writing are to be observed and effective use of language is a demand of the task too. Candidates are expected to:

1. Define the key words in the given statement (preferably).
2. Make a clear stand on the issue (to agree, disagree or agree to a certain extent)
3. Write a clear thesis statement to indicate the direction taken.
4. Write an argumentative or discursive essay on why and how modernisation has robbed us of our peace of mind, if the candidate agrees with the statement. In disagreeing, the candidate has to prove otherwise.
5. Provide three points (or at least two) and develop them with reasonable depth.
6. Explain or justify viewpoints with appropriate examples.
7. Treat the subject with a certain level of maturity: No unsubstantiated claims or sweeping statements should be made.
8. Organise ideas in paragraphs, showing evidence of planning and knowledge of the conventions of academic writing.

In terms of language, candidates are expected to:

1. Use a variety of sentence structures.
2. Use varied and appropriate vocabulary.
3. Use the appropriate cohesive devices or connectors to link sentences.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Task 1

Majority of candidates responded to the letter using appropriate writing structure and letter style. Conventions of letter writing i.e. title, greeting as an opening remark, and a closing for the letter could be seen in candidates' responses. The candidates also responded to all the notes given in the stimulus. Most candidates were able to write a clear opening remark.

Generally, answers were in the modest range. The candidates did not fare well in Task 1 due to misinterpretation of the task leading to either irrelevant or inaccurate responses. There were multiple attempts from candidates to write a short and concise reply by mainly not mentioning things that were already written in the letter. This resulted in marks not being awarded to the candidates due to the lack of reference in the responses.

Candidates' responses were short and simple due to the number of words shown in the instruction which might have placed a psychological effect on them to keep their responses within 100 words. However, there were some who have understood the task and provided sufficient development to each of the notes given.

On average, most candidates managed to give elaboration on each task/ note given. However, the elaborations differed in quality. Some candidates were able to develop ideas sufficiently, but some merely responded to the prompt in one sentence.

STRENGTHS

Generally, candidates were aware of the requirement of the task. This was evident in the responses. Even the weaker candidates provided their responses in a letter format and tried to respond to the simpler parts of the notes in a limited manner. Most candidates provided a response that was more than 100 words in length. As the subject matter of the letter

was on a 'reducing the use of plastic bags', many candidates had an idea of the kind of responses that they had to provide, especially for Note 3. It was also noted that candidates were able to handle Notes 1 and 2, better than 3 and 4.

Although some candidates gave irrelevant information for Note 3, the essence of the response was captured in the examples given. For instance, many talked about landfills, marine lives, and flood occurrences.

The use of language ranged from fair to weak. Choice of vocabulary was generally high frequency words with simple structures. Many responses had single word errors.

Planning was also noted in most of the responses. Paragraphs were used to separate the discussion of the four notes given for Task 1. Candidates also adhered to the letter writing format, in which most candidates followed the format which they noted in the question paper.

Most candidates were able to respond to the task. Some analysis and interpretation were present even in the weaker responses. Candidates generally were able to interpret the letter and the four notes given. Most of the candidates provided a salutation and an opening remark and they responded to some of the notes given. Some key features were analysed. It is worth noting that some candidates were able to use appropriate style and correct register.

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weaknesses, many candidates did not mention the name of programme throughout their responses. For example, they referred to the programme as:

- (a) *Great that you are organising the programme.*
- (b) *I am happy that your neighbourhood is organising the programme.*
- (c) *Sorry that I cannot attend the programme.*

The absence of the "point of reference to the programme" impacted the quality of response given by the candidates. Clarity and accuracy, therefore, were lacking in many of the candidates' responses although good language ability was noted among them. Some candidates also signed off with a different name and not "Zack".

In terms of language fluency, many candidates had only a fair command of the language. Simple structures and words were used throughout the response. Single word errors were noted frequently in their scripts. There were also very weak candidates who could only string words randomly in sentences, creating distortions and incomprehensible content.

Task 2

Generally, many candidates partially agreed to the statement that modernisation has robbed us of our peace of mind, believing that it seemed to be the best option to go for. Sadly, due to the misinterpretation of the demand of the question, many agreed to the topic given, yet they only provided the examples of benefits of modernisation. There were many candidates too that had written about the benefits of modernisation to different group of users. As such, the type of responses given were of limited relevance. For those who disagreed to the topic given, they managed to discuss accordingly by explaining the examples of how modernisation has robbed us of our peace of mind as it was rather a head-on approach. As such, they were able to incorporate both the 'why' and 'how' in their responses. Candidates were not allowed to change the subject or the object, therefore, it was highly unlikely for them to go off on a tangent related to this requirement. However, it would be possible, if the candidate failed to touch base. Candidates' responses mostly varied from very modest to low satisfactory. Almost all candidates had clearly stated their stand in the introductory paragraph and reiterated the stand in the concluding paragraph. However, most of the candidates responded insufficiently or modestly to this task primarily because they were not able to elaborate and substantiate the ideas due to insufficient content knowledge and weak language proficiency.

Arguments to support their stand were general, tainted with grammatical errors and meaning was often distorted. Their arguments were often shallow and unconvincing. The vocabulary and the sentence structures were also of limited

variety and not very precise. As such, sentences were often distorted, with some almost incomprehensible and therefore, making reading difficult because meaning did not come through. This may be because of their limited vocabulary and content knowledge on current issues. Their arguments and elaborations were, therefore, often insufficient, superficial, loose, repetitive, vague, lacked depth and maturity. There were also candidates who obviously failed to plan their responses as their responses lacked coherence and were discussed haphazardly. Though most of them were able to give at least three points, candidates had difficulty in presenting their viewpoints. Their arguments were shallow, unorganised, immature, lacked focus and direction as well as conviction. Examples given were general, unconvincing, irrelevant, and sometimes inaccurate. There were no justifications given and as such there were plenty sweeping statements.

Candidates generally showed a fair planning in their responses. Most gave an introduction, three points and a conclusion. Conventions of writing were seen in most scripts including the weaker ones. Candidates made a stand and gave thesis statement. Points were developed with details and examples, although most of the discussion were modest in nature.

Most of the candidates had difficulty presenting their viewpoints, and the ideas presented lacked maturity and planning. Majority of them only focused and dealt with one part of the argument. Often, there were simplistic ideas, superficial discussions or repetitive statements or phrases and general examples. The ideas were not developed, and the link was not made clear. Therefore, the discussion lacked depth and was not interesting at all. The average and weak candidates found it very challenging to discuss the issue effectively, as many of them lacked language proficiency, sufficient examples, and justifications necessarily to do so.

The language proficiency of most candidates was modest, and they often struggled to structure their sentences effectively. This led to problems with word order, which distorted the intended meaning of their statements. A few had first language interference as literal translation from the mother tongue to English could be seen. There was also a lack of concrete logical details in the discussion. Discussion of ideas were superficial, at time lacking in focus due to scarcity of knowledge. There was no variety of sentences due to candidates' limited vocabulary. As for the weaker students, their poor mastery of the language hampered their efforts to formulate and justify their ideas. Glaring errors such as direct translation, faulty pronoun reference and major errors in structures caused meaning to be blurred. The weaker candidates also gave very general and shallow statements without specific or real-life examples.

STRENGTHS

Most candidates were able to use the correct writing convention. Most introductory paragraphs showed clear stands. Many also tried to provide thesis statements although they were fragmented and vague. Most candidates were able to provide at least three points and some details. Many of these paragraphs started with a clear topic sentence. In the concluding paragraphs, many candidates reiterated their stand, summarised their main points and gave suggestions or advice to the reader. Most candidates were able to provide between two and three points with simple elaborations. Examples were relevant, perhaps due to the current in nature of the topic. Social media, modern inventions, smartphones and pollutions were the common points and examples given by the candidates.

In general, the candidates' responses demonstrated the following:

1. Most candidates were able to produce a response that adhered to the format of extended writing – with lead in, clear stand, and an attempt to write a concise thesis statement. Most of the candidates were also able to provide a modest closure for their responses.
2. Planning and organisation were evident in most responses. Points were separated by paragraphs and there was a clear evident that candidates tried developing their points although they may be brief and sometimes irrelevant information was given. For example, *focusing more on the advantages of a modern gadget or providing suggestions.*
3. Examples given were mainly simple yet relevant. Most candidates talked about *modern gadgets like smartphones which eases communication, home appliances which aid housewives, modern technology at workplace, internet*

for online learning and making additional money via online business. Candidates could generally relate to the topic as it is current, and they are living in a modern world.

4. Candidates ended their responses by reiterating their stand and restating the points explored in the response. It was noted that conclusion was not given much attention as compared to the other parts of the response.
5. The attempt to express opinions was noted although many struggled in the process of doing so due to language inability and lack of general knowledge.
6. Candidates also adhered to the number of words needed for the task. Many wrote beyond 250 words, and this indicates the attempt taken by the candidates to respond to Task 2.

Most candidates provided three main points although the quality varied from limited to satisfactory. Some candidates were able to address the task satisfactorily – citing examples from personal experience and through their observation of how modernisation has or has not robbed us of our peace of mind.

Responses that agree to the statement commonly focused on:

1. The stress and anxiety over the negative impact of social media that causes us to lose our peace of mind such as coping with online bullying, negative comments, keeping up with online appearance that is far from reality;
2. The stress of losing jobs due to advancement of technology that takes over manual labour;
3. The pollutions caused by the development and constructions of modern and high-tech buildings and facilities that have caused people to feel disturbed and to fear for their health;
4. The stress and anxiety about the need to be ever-ready and to respond instantly on social media;
5. The stress and constant need to compete and put in extra effort for a more secure, and sophisticated lifestyles in order to keep up with modern and updated lifestyles.

WEAKNESSES

The weaker candidates had misinterpreted the statement given for the task. Majority of the candidates misconstrued the statement from “modernisation has or has not robbed us of our peace of mind” to “advantages and disadvantages of modernisation”. Some candidates also focused on the importance of modernisation in our society. Some even elaborated on how the society has placed importance on social media, modern inventions and smartphones as a major part of life focusing on people’s behavior and attitude. Most of these responses focused on merely giving the advantages of “modernisation” without any link to “our peace of mind”. A great number of responses went off on a tangent. They revolved around the benefit or harm of modernisation. Some common responses were on:

1. The advantages of having mobile phones – makes communication and doing business transactions easier; improving relationships between people regardless of distances; allowing online learning during this pandemic season;
2. The advantages of modern and high-tech household items or equipment that assist us in doing house chores;
3. The destruction of habitats for animals due to the development and constructions of buildings;
4. The development of modern fashion that is different from the “old fashion”;
5. Comparison of the modernisation with traditional lifestyle;
6. Descriptions of the evolution of culture such as in fashion and music to illustrate modernisation.

The following are the weaknesses noted in the candidates’ responses:

1. Many candidates wrote responses that went off on a tangent. Many of the responses revolved around describing the benefits and harm of modernisation or advantage and disadvantage of technology. This is probably due to their lack of understanding of what “robbing peace of mind” means. Another possible fact is that candidates, while responding, may have overlooked the need to relate their responses to the idea of “robbing or not robbing” one’s peace of mind. Some weak candidates did not understand the task and ended up writing a response which talked about the modern and traditional way of living.

2. Responses were generally brief and lacked depth. Points were developed modestly with little explanation and examples. This made the writing fuzzy, and the examiners had to do a lot of inferences.
3. There were gaps in the discussion as candidates may choose to bring in a new point in the discussion but left it unexplained. This clearly indicates that the candidates did not plan their work; they simply wrote whatever came to their minds at that moment in time.
4. Paragraphs were not concluded. The discussions of the points were left abruptly. The consequence of this is that the link to the phrase "robbing peace of mind" was not seen at the end of the discussion although the attempt to do so was noted in the writing.
5. Points were predictable and lacked maturity. Most candidates gave points such as "scammers, fake news, pollution, lose of jobs, modern appliances at home, and internet makes studying easy".
6. Many candidates demonstrated poor command of the language. The errors extended beyond single-word mistakes to include multiple-word errors, which adversely affected overall readability. Examiners had to re-read sentences and paragraphs in order to understand candidates' thoughts.
7. Some of the responses that went off on a tangent touched on topics such as the importance of writing for school bulletins, the importance of the internet, the importance of monitoring children's technology use and suggestions on how to use "modernisation" to benefit mankind.

MUET SESSION 2 2022

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

For Session 2 2022, 46 680 candidates sat the test.

The percentages 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 are as follows:

Band	CEFR Level	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
		%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
5+	C1+	2.32	2.32	0.32	0.32	0.88	0.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.0	C1	17.59	19.91	2.56	2.89	11.05	11.93	0.10	0.10	0.55	0.55
4.5	B2	31.28	51.19	6.83	9.72	20.94	32.87	0.72	0.82	6.66	7.21
4.0		31.10	82.29	19.50	29.22	36.03	68.91	4.11	4.93	34.24	41.45
3.5	B1	13.57	95.86	37.15	66.36	21.44	90.35	17.51	22.43	40.48	81.93
3.0		3.63	99.49	23.60	89.97	7.14	97.48	42.40	64.83	14.78	96.71
2.5	A2	0.46	99.95	7.46	97.42	2.38	99.86	26.15	90.98	3.12	99.83
2.0		0.05	100.00	2.49	99.92	0.13	100.00	8.89	99.87	0.17	100.00
1.0		0.00	100.00	0.08	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.13	100.00	0.00	100.00

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

Answer Key

Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key
1	C	11	C	21	A
2	B	12	A	22	A
3	A	13	B	23	B
4	B	14	C	24	A
5	A	15	E	25	C
6	B	16	A	26	A
7	B	17	C	27	B
8	B	18	A	28	C
9	A	19	B	29	C
10	A	20	B	30	A

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)

General Comments

The questions were designed to be direct and worded simply and concisely to facilitate comprehension. They were pitched at the targeted Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) levels according to Parts 1 and 2, and thus, candidates at the intended level should be able to access the words. The questions were relevant to the scope of the candidates' daily life, and/or general knowledge around the area. Aligned with the CEFR standards, the topics were pitched at Level A2 to B1 for Part 1 and Level B1 to B2 for Part 2. The general consensus was that the difficulty of the papers was uniform across the board. Moreover, the test did the job of discriminating the proficiency of the candidates, especially with regard to the difference in requirement of task between Part 1 and Part 2.

Specific Comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Developed the points well, provided an in-depth discussion that was sustained and displayed maturity of thought.
- Demonstrated connections between the task and their personal experiences, as well as current issues and general knowledge (for candidates who were better read).
- Showed a high level of confidence and fluency in their presentation and discussion.
- Connected their points to the points raised by their peers in a way that made the discussion logical and cohesive.
- Used the preparation time to write notes in point form rather than creating full sentences, and used the presentation time to elaborate on the notes.
- Displayed the ability to use complex structures accurately, as well as a high command of vocabulary, not only to convey their own views but also to justify, convince, and persuade.
- Showed good interaction skills and intelligible utterances such as responding to viewpoints raised, initiating new topics for discussion, drawing conclusions from differing perspectives, and negotiating to arrive at a consensus.

The less proficient candidates had the following weaknesses:

- Prone to writing out full sentences for Parts 1 and 2.
- Lacked vocabulary and complexity in language structures. Many of these candidates were unable to string together a group of words to create simple accurate sentences.
- Unsuccessfully groping for words and lack of confidence while delivering speech.
- Unable to continue their presentations after reading aloud their last written sentence. More capable limited users may try to restate the main ideas, or list some new ones, but they would typically be unable to develop their points in a comprehensive or an informative way.
- Could not respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates and the group discussion was marked by mere taking of turns (as opposed to turn-taking).
- The presentations of these less proficient candidates were also often not connected properly to the presentations made by other candidates, or even to the development of the task. This was usually because these less proficient candidates were more concerned with transmitting their points, rather than developing their points with the other points as raised by their peers.

The most common recurring problem that many candidates faced, regardless of their linguistic ability, was the lack of ability to connect their responses to the required task. Candidates were also reported to repeat their ideas, especially when they lacked the proficiency to elaborate. There was also the issue of the lack of general knowledge in some of the candidates, and this could also be seen in some of the candidates who were more proficient. It can be surmised that the less read or informed candidates are on current issues, the less the quality of their task fulfilment. Nevertheless, this

problem is a strategic one, and can be remedied with better understanding of question requirements, and logical, organised thinking.

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General Comments

Overall, both tasks are appropriate and pitched at the intended CEFR levels, namely, Task 1 is at Level A2 to B1 and Task 2 at Level B2 to C1. Task 1 and Task 2 comply with the MUET writing test specifications as both tasks intend to assess candidates' ability to communicate in writing in the context of higher education, in a less formal to a more formal writing genres respectively. For Task 1, candidates are expected to respond accordingly to a given email based on guided notes. Task 2 is based on a subject matter familiar to the candidates, enabling them to relate. The requirement of Task 2 is clear but very challenging as it demands high critical thinking skills. It tests candidates' ability to make a stand, write an effective thesis statement, present relevant viewpoints, and provide justifications for the stand taken.

Specific comments

Task 1

In task 1, the candidates are expected to write a reply to Linda's email, provide information about an online business talk and seek suggestions for products to be sold online in the near future. Candidates are required to read the email as well as the corresponding notes given for each paragraph carefully and respond to the notes with the appropriate forms. The context, task, and lexical items are familiar to the majority, if not all test-takers. The language used in the email and notes is appropriate and familiar to candidates of varying language proficiency as the language is pitched at Levels A2 to B1. The four notes given are also simple and clear. Sentences written in the email are simple and short. So, reading the email should not have given any problems to the candidates. All in all, the task mostly contained high frequency words and candidates should be able to comprehend the task. Language and terms used are generally apt for email writing. Hence, all candidates irrespective of language ability, would have understood the email and the notes given for the task. The rubric clearly outlined the requirements of the task. The use of language in the instruction and question is suitable with the level and nature of the test. Only familiar words are used in the email given to the candidates. For example, "business talk, online business, product to sell online, join me, and setting up".

Task 2

The task requires candidates to present a response to the statement “The lack of appreciation for our culture has caused Malaysians to lose their true identity” in not less than 250 words. Candidates are required to make a stand and provide two well-developed points or three developed ideas to support the stand made with convincing argument or discussion with relevant examples. The statement employed straightforward and direct language. The context given for the task is simple as well. Words like “culture, appreciation and identity” are also found in Bahasa Melayu. Hence, understanding the requirement of the task should not be too difficult for most candidates. On word level, misinterpretation should not happen as the language used is clear-cut. At sentence level, low proficiency candidates will find this task to be a real challenge as the keywords “lack of appreciation”, “culture”, and “to lose true identity” may hinder their understanding of the task. However, the real challenge may lie on the test takers’ knowledge on this topic rather than the terms and language used in the task. The instructions for the tasks are very direct and absolute. Candidates should be able to understand the requirement of the task. Although the topic is relevant and appropriate for all levels and backgrounds of the target groups, it requires candidates’ critical thinking and maturity to discuss the question effectively and convincingly.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Task 1

The candidates are expected to write a reply to Linda’s email, provide information about an online business talk and seek suggestions for products to be sold online in the near future. They are required to read the email as well as the corresponding notes given for each paragraph carefully and to respond to the email with the appropriate forms. Candidates are also required to organise their writing coherently and cohesively with clear reference to “the respondent is doing great!”, “apologise for missing the online business talk”, “agree to a statement made by the speaker; online business is more popular than the traditional way of doing business”, “suggest two products to be sold online to Linda” and “tell Linda that the respondent will not be able to join her in setting up an online business in the future and give a reason for” as mentioned in the email. The reply should be at least 100 words in length and written concisely and clearly with appropriate register (i.e. semi-formal).

Task 2

Task 2 is open for discussion and arguments, and is rather simple if candidates are able to focus on the keywords of the statement given. The ability to fully understand the task as a whole is certainly important in order to respond to this task. 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 question taps candidates, higher order thinking ability to critically give an opinion on the statement “The lack of appreciation for our culture has caused Malaysians to lose their true identity”. To respond to this task, test takers have to identify what represents culture. They need to identify correct cultural elements to discuss, give reasons, and provide evidence to show that a lack of appreciation is observed through convincing examples and discussion, and to link the discussion to the loss of true identity.

Candidates who disagree with the statement are expected to provide real-life and convincing examples of how Malaysians preserve and appreciate their culture in order to prove that a lack of appreciation for culture does not occur and, thus, a loss of true identity does not occur. The nature of the task clearly requires candidates to have a stance and to be able to defend that stance throughout the response. The challenges to the candidates are to stay consistent to a stance, discuss all keywords given in the statement, justify viewpoints with relevant examples, and focus the discussion on the correct subject. In conclusion, these are challenging feats for the candidates. Accurate use of language with a combination of simple to complex structures are demanded to achieve a high band for this task. Mechanics of writing is to be observed and effective use of language is a demand of the task too.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Task 1

The task requires candidates to reply to an email using the four notes provided. Generally, candidates had a fair understanding of the task and all candidates attempted Task 1. Many replied to the email using all the notes given although the quality of the responses mainly ranged from MUET Band 2.5 to 3.5. Many candidates were not able to provide good elaborations of the notes. Thus, responses were rather shallow and lacked details. It was also observed that Notes 2 and 3 were challenging to many candidates. There were also candidates who provided wrong names for the sender and receiver. Planning, especially paragraphing, was seen in most responses. The notes given guided the candidates to plan and present their responses in an orderly manner. Email format sometimes were not present and some candidates responded using a letter format.

In terms of presentation, majority of candidates responded to the email using appropriate writing structure and email format. Conventions of email writing, i.e. title, greeting as an opening remark, and a closing remark for the email can be seen in candidates' responses. The candidates also responded to all the notes given in the stimulus. Most candidates were able to write a clear opening remark. Generally, responses were in the modest range. The candidates did not fare well in Task 1 due to misinterpretation of the task, leading to either irrelevant or inaccurate responses. There were multiple attempts from candidates to write a short and concise reply by mainly not mentioning things that were already written in the email. This resulted in marks not being awarded to the candidates due to the lack of reference in the responses.

Candidates' responses were short and simple as due to the number of words shown in the instruction might have placed a psychological effect on them to keep their answers within 100 words. However, there were some who have understood the task and provided sufficient development to each of the notes given.

On average, most candidates managed to give elaboration on each task/note given. However, the responses differed in quality. Some candidates were able to develop ideas sufficiently, but some merely responded to the prompt in one sentence.

STRENGTHS

Generally, candidates were aware of the requirement of the task. This was evident in the responses. Even the weaker candidates provided their responses in an email format and tried to respond to the simpler parts of the notes in a limited manner. Most candidates provided responses that were longer than 100 words. As the subject-matter of the email was on "online business", many candidates had an idea of the kind of responses that they had to provide.

The use of language ranged from fair to weak. Choice of vocabulary generally was of high frequency words with simple structures. Many responses had single word errors. Planning was also noted in most of the responses. Paragraphs were used to separate the discussion of the four notes given for Task 1. Candidates also adhered to the email writing format, in which most candidates followed the format which they noted in the rubric.

Most candidates were able to respond to the task. Some analyses and interpretations were present even in the weaker responses. Candidates generally were able to interpret the email and the four notes given. Most of the candidates provided a salutation and an opening remark, and responded to some of the notes given. Some key features were analysed. It is worth noting that some candidates were able to use appropriate style and the right register.

It has been observed that candidates who were aware of the conventions of letter writing have been able to fulfil the requirements of the task. They were able to:

1. Understand the task.
2. Write a correct opening and an appropriate closure.

3. Use all the notes given correctly.
4. Answer and show planning, good organisation, and appropriate paragraphing.
5. Identify the keywords and items to respond to in the email, and responded to the most parts of the task accurately.
6. Present all the parts and sub parts.
7. Use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures, and a variety of linkers.
8. Use appropriate register.
9. Employ sound grammar, at least among a portion of the candidates.
10. Relate to the topic on doing online business.
11. Address all of the items in the task.
12. Write coherent responses whereby transition markers were sparingly, not mechanically used and points were presented in the same order as the notes.
13. Write cohesive sentences with appropriate cohesive devices.

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weaknesses, candidates who did not address the task appropriately and adequately had the following issues:

1. Did not develop the notes. They merely responded to the notes, often, giving information out of context or with no specific subject reference.
2. Gave limited and modest responses for the task. This is because most of them only addressed most parts with the main parts missing or just the simplest parts in a simple manner.
3. Paragraphing was also sometimes lacking where candidates wrote their email in one paragraph only.
4. The convention or format of email writing was not adhered to. Frequently, the format, though not mandatory, was missing, incomplete or inaccurate.
5. There were also vague salutations or none at all, minimal responses and without any proper closure or sign-off.
6. Ended the email without a signature block (here, a name).
7. Used inappropriate tone.
8. Did not address all the given notes.

Many candidates also did not observe the following:

Online Business

Most candidates forgot to put in this term that seemed to be the main element of the stimulus, thus the idea of online business did not come through especially for Note 3.

Point of reference

Most candidates responded directly without giving the point of reference to the task which made them did not fulfill the requirement of the task.

Inaccurate time frame or inaccurate reason

Candidates needed to decline the offer to set up an online business after completing their studies. However, many candidates failed to observe this, thus rendering their reasons for declining inaccurate or illogical such as “having a lot of homework to do”, “do not have enough time due to classes”, and “work commitment”.

Task 2

The nature of the task clearly requires candidates to have a stance and to be able to defend that stance throughout the response. The challenges to the candidates were to stay consistent to a stance, discuss all keywords given in the statement, justify viewpoints with relevant and apt examples, and focus the discussion on the correct subject. In short, these were challenging feats for the candidates.

The task was very challenging for most candidates as they needed to fully understand and analyse the multiple keywords posed in rubric (culture, lack of appreciation and Malaysians' true identity) when presenting their opinions through their content points. A great number of candidates were misled by the situation provided in the rubric, depicting Malaysia's Independence Day as example. As a result, candidates were trapped into discussing the history of the country, national warriors of Malaysia, racial disharmony, and the Independence Day. Perhaps the context provided for the task should be more direct and in line with the task in the future. Quite a number of candidates failed to identify cultural elements to discuss. Many candidates identified multiracial society, the Independence Day, and patriotism as culture. Many candidates also failed to discuss all keywords, resulting in only half of the statement were discussed.

The issue to be discussed in Task 2 was common to all candidates but seen as very challenging for the low proficiency candidates. It may appear rather manageable for high proficiency candidates, but that depended on how they were able to deliberate or develop their ideas in order to merit a high band. The task was really demanding as the candidates had to address the key terms while at the same time highlighting the "why" and "how" the lack of appreciation for our culture has caused Malaysians to lose their true identity. Despite being able to comprehend the question, many of the candidates did not have the maturity to explain well because many of them frequently failed to establish a clear link between the two main key elements in the task given. As such, most candidates were unable to address the task effectively and discuss the topic maturely. In other words, most candidates were merely telling and describing "culture and lack of appreciation" but not showing "whether it has caused Malaysians to lose their true identity or vice versa". The points discussed were most of the time immature and minimally explained. Many got carried away and as such they failed to respond accurately. It was necessary for the candidates to have a high level of critical thinking skills to present convincing responses. The high proficiency candidates could write about almost anything from various perspectives, therefore, permitting them to think, explore and express their views based on their respective backgrounds. Overall, most of the candidates were able to present their viewpoints along with some modestly developed elaborations. Even though the stand was usually clearly stated, the thesis statement was almost always not present. Almost all candidates had clearly stated the stand in the introductory paragraph and reiterated the stand in the concluding paragraph.

Majority of the candidates gave a minimum of three main points but the arguments were often insufficient, lacking depth, immature, superficial as well as poorly linked, and there was little conviction in the writing. Most of the candidates responded insufficiently or modestly to this task primarily because they were not able to elaborate and substantiate their ideas due to insufficient content knowledge and weak language proficiency. Arguments to support their stands were general, tainted with grammatical errors, and meaning was often distorted. Their arguments were often shallow and not convincing.

The vocabulary and the sentence structures were also of limited variety and not very precise. As such, sentences were often distorted, with some almost incomprehensible, therefore, making reading difficult because meaning did not come through. This may be because of their lack of vocabulary and content knowledge on current issues. Their arguments and elaborations were therefore often insufficient, superficial, loose, repetitive, vague, lacks depth and maturity. There were also candidates who obviously failed to plan their responses as they were lacked in terms of coherence and discussed haphazardly. Though most of them were able to give at least three points, candidates had difficulty in presenting their viewpoints. Their arguments were shallow, unorganised, immature, lacked focus and direction, as well as conviction. Examples given were general, not convincing, irrelevant, and sometimes inaccurate. There were no justifications given and as such there were aplenty sweeping statements.

STRENGTHS

In terms of strengths, proficient users responded to the task with the correct conventions of academic writing. They were able to:

1. Take their stand and were consistent throughout their responses.
2. Provide thesis statement and topic sentences representing the main ideas.
3. Give a well-organised, informative, and comprehensible writing.
4. Substantiate their points primarily with factual evidence, demonstrating a clear maturity of thought.

5. Display good ability in managing simple sentence structures and display good control of complex structures
6. Show evidence of planning and organisation – reflected in the use of paragraphs to organise answers
7. Convey and develop three points
8. Use relevant ideas, explanations, and examples to develop main ideas
9. Include keywords from the given statement in the response
10. Use relevant real-life examples
11. Include relevant and current issue to support their discussions
12. Use good cohesive devices such as:
 - a. On the flipside - ergo
 - b. At the forefront of the issues - support my stance
 - c. In light of this - as an exemplification
 - d. Another point to ponder - apart from that
13. Use lexicons ranged from everyday to basic vocabularies in Task 2. Although it was a rare occurrence, some of the candidates were able to use the vocabulary appropriately in explaining why and how lack of appreciation for the culture has caused Malaysians to lose their true identity. The words chosen were quite apt:
 - a. “delicacies”, “emulating”, “social cohesion”, “heterogeneous”, “daunting”, “cultural mirroring” and “blood and tears”
 - b. old school
 - c. cosplayed
 - d. mocked
 - e. invariably
 - f. tranquilise
 - g. lame
 - h. awe
 - i. myriads of
 - j. emulated

It was noted that candidates were aware of the task and the kind of response to be given. Most candidates were able to provide between two and three points with simple elaborations. Examples given were predictable such as “being influenced by the western culture”, “parents are guiding their children”, “lack of knowledge” and et. cetera.

Candidates with higher level of proficiency were able to expand and provide additional elaborations of their ideas. They were also able to organise their responses well and use effective cohesive devices. Candidates could clearly compare and contrast the elements of local and foreign culture to highlight why and how lack of appreciation for culture can lead to loss of true identity.

Examples:

- a. *Food is also a very important part of our culture because its recipes are passed down from generations to generations. Malaysians often do not see the uniqueness of their own cultural food because they think*

that it is not as fancy as the western steak served in five-star hotel. But little do they know that their own cultural foods hold more meaning than the others. For example, during the dragon Boat Festival by the Chinese, all family members should come together to learn how to make the dumplings which are said to bring luck to you after eating it. Sadly, most Malaysians find it a waste of time. Eventually, the recipe for the dumplings would go extinct and the future generations would not be able to know the true meaning behind those dumplings anymore hence, losing their own identity.

- b. *Nowadays, Malaysians especially teenagers they love to follow trend on TikTok especially video from other country like from America and Korea. They love to follow the fashion of their idol and they think our traditional cloth like Baju Kurung and Kebaya is old-fashioned. They also love to eat fast food, Kimbap and not eat like Nasi Lemak or Nasi Kerabu because they want to be like American or Korean. So, this make the teenagers lose their true identity because they love other cultures than Malaysia culture.*

Most candidates were able to at least give reasons for lack of appreciation for culture, though not linked to loss of true identity.

- a. *Secondly, people think that traditional is very complicated. All traditional things and foods all made by people hands and some simple machine at the past century. So, produce a traditional foods or things is quite waste time to do it. For example, bamboo rice. People need to cut bamboo and stay in front of the fire very long time to roasted it. Therefore, people think traditional is very waste time and also tired because all they need to do by themselves.*

Some candidates gave good and relevant day-to-day examples.

- a. *In Malaysia, that known about traditional food such as Nasi Lemak, Nasi Dagang and others. For today's trend, the young are more likely to support the food of other countries. For example, Sushi that is from Japan.*

Most candidates displayed mechanics of writing. Paragraphs were used effectively and developed in a consistent manner. For examples, paragraphs began with a topic sentence, followed with elaborations, example, and a simple conclusion. Even, the weaker responses had some elements of planning.

Language ability was mainly fair. Errors, though frequent, they did not hamper reading or the meaning of the content. Some apt vocabularies were used by many candidates and this may due to the familiarity of the topic itself. Candidates might have discussed the topic in class or read about it. So, a familiar topic certainly helped many candidates to attempt the task.

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weakness, many candidates misinterpreted the statement given for the task and adequately had the following issues:

1. There were a great number of responses went off on a tangent, which revolved around celebrating Independence Day. There were other illogical or distorted angles taken by the candidates. For example,
 - a. describing the different cultures in Malaysia
 - b. discussing how to avoid the loss of appreciation for Malaysia Day
 - c. talking about unity among races in Malaysia
 - d. suggesting ways to promote love for our culture
2. Unclear introductions, missing and unclear stand, as well as missing and unclear thesis statements were noted in many responses. For example,

In the eyes of the world, Malaysia is one of the countries with a multiracial population that is famous for being harmonious. The result of assimilation of culture dated back to our ancestors' days, has gone a long way. This is something Malaysians should uphold.

3. Many responses also had scanty or shallow discussion. For example,

In my opinion, it is true that many of us Malaysians have lost our true identity because of the lack of appreciation for culture. This happens because people nowadays use gadgets and become addicted to social media and will follow the trend like TikTok videos. This can cause people to forget about our culture.

4. Responses had no clear link between the lack of appreciation for Malaysian culture and losing Malaysian identity. For example,

Besides that, because of the other country life style. People always want to follow other country style, that is nice to follow and good to follow. Some of us Malaysians want to follow the trend and don't want to miss out so they can look cool and always updated about trending style.

5. Many candidates only provided suggestions to prevent the lack of appreciation for culture in their responses. For example,

In my opinion, ways to prevent this major issue are for the Malaysian directors publish historical movies. Other than that, teachers and parents' roles also very important to prevent teenagers from the lack of appreciation. They have to bring the kids to museums, watch historical movies and if they refuse to do so, just indirectly bribe them with gifts. It is also very affective if the parents bribe filtering the internet access in order not to show the teens unwanted contents.

6. Candidates did not link the point to the loss of true identity:

- a. *parents nowadays are busy with work and they don't have time to teach their children to appreciate Malaysian culture like eating traditional food and did not expose their children with our traditional clothes. This situation shows lack appreciation of culture among Malaysians.*
- b. *people of Malaysia like the youth love to follow western culture and they follow their fashion and not like our traditional cloth because it's old fashion style like the Baju Kurung or Kebaya Nyonya.*

7. Candidates also focused more on general impact of the lack of appreciation for culture. For example,

Secondly, as time goes by, the culture in Malaysia would be forgotten by the younger generations. This is because, they did not get teach about our cultures that are full of and rich of ethnic. For example, there's no more celebration at school about our culture.

8. Many candidates agreed with the statement, but were unable to justify how and why lack of appreciation for culture leads to the loss of true identity. Candidates did not understand the meaning of culture. For example,

- a. *Furthermore, we have beautiful Malaysian. Because in Malaysia we have KLCC and we have KL Tower. Many people outside Malaysia come to Malaysia want see "Sejarah of Malaysia". We have a museum and a lot of things in Malaysia.*
- b. *Malaysians did not respect when they sing "Negaraku" and when the song is playing, many of them did not stand up.*
- c. *Malaysians lose their true identity because nowadays they are selfish and love to stay at home.*
- d. *Students in Malaysia don't like to learn history subject because they feel bored learn the subject.*

9. Candidates used vague language that hindered meaning, thus creating serious distortions in the writing. For example,

That why not even educate in education's subject but students need to learn about culture for example in school, as teacher they need to teach about culture and introduce students the effect when people not appreciate culture in Malaysia.

10. Candidates with poor language proficiency resorted to the use of L1 vocabulary. For example,

lagu negaraku, cultures Barat, drink arak, Barat vibe, Barat language, Amerika Syarikat, media sosial, Cina, Melayu, India etc.

In short, shallow, immature and in-depth discussions with missing examples were also found throughout the responses. Discussions lacked focus. Gaps were also seen in many responses, leaving the reader to infer meanings or message of the discussion on their own. Many candidates began the task abruptly and stated their stand straight away without a proper introduction while many also ended their discussions with a one liner or an abrupt conclusion.

MUET SESSION 3 2022

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

For Session 3 2022, 65 886 candidates sat the test.

The percentages 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 are as follows:

Band	CEFR Level	800/1		800/2		800/3		800/4		800	
		%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage	%	Cumulative Percentage
5+	C1+	7.35	7.35	0.26	0.26	1.61	1.61	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
5.0	C1	26.78	34.13	2.48	2.74	14.00	15.61	0.14	0.14	0.97	0.97
4.5	B2	30.39	64.52	7.51	10.25	25.24	40.85	1.18	1.32	10.32	11.29
4.0		25.09	89.61	22.51	32.76	36.06	76.91	6.81	8.13	41.95	53.24
3.5	B1	8.52	98.13	38.00	70.77	16.94	93.85	21.26	29.38	35.43	88.67
3.0		1.71	99.83	21.61	92.38	4.99	98.84	45.56	74.95	9.63	98.30
2.5	A2	0.16	99.99	5.74	98.11	1.11	99.95	21.27	96.22	1.61	99.91
2.0		0.01	100.00	1.83	99.94	0.05	100.00	3.68	99.89	0.09	100.00
1.0		0.00	100.00	0.06	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.11	100.00	0.00	100.00

PAPER 800/1 (LISTENING)

Answer Key

Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key
1	A	11	C	21	B
2	A	12	C	22	B
3	A	13	C	23	C
4	B	14	C	24	C
5	B	15	E	25	B
6	B	16	D	26	C
7	C	17	B	27	C
8	B	18	C	28	A
9	A	19	A	29	A
10	A	20	B	30	C

PAPER 800/2 (SPEAKING)

General Comments

The questions were relevant to the scope of the candidates' daily life, and/or general knowledge around the area. Aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) standards, these topics were pitched at Level A2 to B1 for Part 1 and Level B1 to B2 for Part 2. The general consensus was that the difficulty of the papers was uniform across the board. Moreover, the test did the job of discriminating the proficiency of the candidates, especially with regard to the difference in requirement of task between Part 1 and Part 2.

Specific Comments

Proficient candidates demonstrated the following abilities:

- Developed the points well, providing an in-depth discussion that was sustained and displayed maturity of thought
- Made connections between the task and their personal experiences, as well as current issues and general knowledge (for candidates who were better read)
- Displayed the ability to use complex structures accurately, as well as a high command of vocabulary, not only to convey their own views but also to justify, convince, and persuade
- Showed a high level of confidence and fluency in their presentation and discussion
- Connected their points to the points raised by their peers in a way that made the discussion logical and cohesive
- Used the preparation time to write notes in point form rather than creating full sentences, and used the presentation time to elaborate on the notes
- Showed good interaction skills and intelligible utterances such as responding to viewpoints raised, initiating new topics for discussion, drawing conclusions from differing perspectives, negotiating to arrive at a consensus.

The less proficient candidates had the following weaknesses:

- Prone to writing out full sentences for Parts 1 and 2
- Unsuccessfully groping for words and lack of confidence while delivering speech
- Could not respond immediately to the viewpoints raised by other candidates and the group discussion was marked by mere taking of turns (as opposed to turn-taking)
- Unable to continue their presentations after reading aloud their last written sentence, more capable limited users may try to restate the main ideas, or to list some new ones, but they would typically be unable to develop their points in a comprehensive or an informative way
- Lacked vocabulary and complexity in language structures. Many of these candidates were unable to string together a group of words to create simple accurate sentences
- The presentations of these less proficient candidates were also often not connected properly to the presentations made by other candidates, or even to the development of the task. This was usually because these less proficient candidates were more concerned with transmitting their points, rather than developing their points with the other points as raised by their peers.

The most common recurring problem that many candidates faced, regardless of their linguistic ability, was the lack of ability to connect their responses to the required task. Candidates were also reported to repeat their ideas, especially when they lacked the proficiency to elaborate. There was also the issue of the lack of general knowledge in some of the candidates, and this could also be seen in some of the candidates who were more proficient. It can be surmised that the less read or informed candidates are on current issues, the less the quality of their task fulfilment. Nevertheless, this problem is a strategic one, and can be remedied with better understanding of question requirements, and logical, organised thinking.

PAPER 800/3 (READING)

Answer Key

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

PAPER 800/4 (WRITING)

General Comments

Both tasks are appropriate and pitched at the intended CEFR level, namely, Task 1 is at Level A2 to B1 and Task 2 at Level B2 to C1. For Task 1, candidates are expected to respond accordingly to a given letter based on guided notes. Task 2 is on a subject matter that the candidates are familiar with, thus, able to relate to. The requirement of Task 2 is clear but very challenging as it demands high critical thinking skills from candidates. It tests their ability to make a stand, write an effective thesis statement, present relevant viewpoints, and provide justifications for the stand taken. Task 1 and Task 2 comply with the MUET Writing test specification where they intend to assess candidates' ability to communicate in writing in the context of higher education, in a less formal and a more formal writing genre respectively.

Specific comments

Task 1

Task 1 is deemed appropriate in terms of its level of difficulty and a subject matter which is familiar to candidates (class farewell party). The task requires a reply to an email which responds to news about Johan's grandmother who was admitted to a hospital, informs the receiver, Johan, about attendance to the party, describing food and interesting activities carried out at the farewell party, and declining Johan's request to meet next week. The task is clearly pitched at a lower level of language proficiency, rather straight forward and familiar to all candidates, thus allowing them to attempt the task. This is evident in the choice of vocabulary which are pitched at Levels A2 and B1, simple sentence structures with prompts, which are direct in nature.

The terms used are easy to comprehend and the rubric clearly outlines the task requirements. The use of language in the instruction and question is suitable with the level and nature of the test. Only familiar words are used in the email given to the candidates. For example, "farewell, party, ill, journey, interesting activities and meet up". The four notes given are also simple and clear. Sentences written in the email are simple and short. So, reading the email should not have caused any problems for the candidates.

All in all, the task mostly contains high frequency words and candidates should be able to comprehend the task. Language and terms used are generally apt for email writing. Hence, all candidates irrespective of language ability, would have understood the email and the notes given in the task.

Task 2

Task 2 is written using simple language and direct in nature. The context given for Task 2 is simple as well. Words like “young adults, lack and survival skills” are high frequency words. Hence, understanding the requirements of the task should not be too difficult for most candidates. On word level, misinterpretation should not happen as the language used was clear-cut. At sentence level, low proficiency candidates will find this task to be a real challenge as the key words “lack of survival skills” may hinder their understanding of the task.

On the whole, Task 2 is considered demanding, thought provoking and challenging. Any mature and proficient candidates should be able to present their viewpoints reasonably well. The nature of the task clearly requires candidates to have a stance and to be able to defend that stance throughout their responses. The challenges to the candidates were to stay consistent to a stance, discuss all keywords given in the statement, justify viewpoints with relevant and apt examples and focus the discussion on the correct subject. In conclusion, these are challenging feats for the candidates. The task is very challenging for most candidates as they need to fully understand and analyse the multiple keywords posed in the statement when presenting their opinions through their content points.

EXPECTED ANSWERS

Task 1

Task 1 is candidate-friendly in the sense that the information given is clear and the notes provided in the email are simple and straightforward. The candidates are expected to write a reply to Johan’s email in which information relating to a class farewell party. The candidates are required to read the email as well as the corresponding notes given for each paragraph carefully and respond with the appropriate forms. They are required to organise their writing coherently and cohesively with clear reference to, “apologise for missing the class farewell party”, “the respondent enjoyed the party”, “the respondent expressing his condolences about the sender’s grandmother and the long journey his family had to endure”, “explain the party attendees, food, and interesting activities at the farewell party” and “tell Johan that the respondent will not be able to meet up with him next week and give a reason for this” as mentioned in the email. The email should be at least 100 words in length and written concisely and clearly with appropriate register (i.e., semi-formal).

The response requires candidates to:

1. Identify the correct sender and recipient of the email
2. Use the correct salutation and opening
3. Respond to johan’s apology for missing the party and enquiry
4. Respond to johan’s news about his grandmother and his journey to visit the grandmother
5. Respond to johan’s enquiries about the party attendees, food and activities during the party
6. Respond to johan’s request for a meet up
7. Use the correct closing statement and sign off

In order to fulfil the requirement of the task effectively, candidates are required to address all the four prompts, provide accurate information, and provide adequate responses to the task. This task is reasonably challenging as the candidates need some basic knowledge about class parties and travelling to their hometown in order to respond to Note 2 and Note 3 effectively. Apart from that, another difficulty lies in the ability of the test takers to identify pertinent information they need to respond to from the stimulus.

Task 2

Task 2 is open for discussion and arguments and is rather simple if candidates are able to focus on the keywords of the statement given. The ability to fully understand the task as a whole is certainly important in order to respond to this task. 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 question taps candidates' higher order thinking ability to critically give an opinion on the statement "young adults today lack survival skills". To respond to this task, it is important for candidates to identify what represents survival skills. Unfortunately, this proves to be difficult for many candidates. This task is exceptionally challenging as candidates are required to:

1. Identify correct survival skills to discuss
2. Give reasons and provide evidence to show lack of survival skills is observed via convincing examples and discussion
3. Link the discussion to the subject – young adults

Candidates who disagree with the statement are required to prove that "young adults today do not lack survival skills" by giving real life and convincing examples. The nature of the task clearly requires candidates to have a stance and to be able to defend that stance throughout their responses. The challenges to the candidates are to stay consistent to a stance, discuss all keywords given in the statement, justify viewpoints with relevant and apt examples, and focus the discussion on the correct subject. In conclusion, these are challenging feats for the candidates. The task is very challenging for most candidates as they needed to fully understand and analyse the multiple keywords posed in the statement when presenting their opinions through their content points.

All in all, for this task, candidates are required to:

1. Identify the keywords and understand the keyword of young adults, lack, survival skills
2. Give some kind of lead-in to the topic in the introduction
3. Choose a stand and stay consistent to it
4. Write a clear thesis statement
5. Provide a clear topic sentence
6. Give reasons and provide evidence or support to show lacking or not lacking
7. Identify current and relevant survival skills for young adults today
8. Provide three points
9. Tie up all the points

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN CANDIDATES' ANSWERS

Task 1

Generally, candidates had a fair understanding of the task and all candidates attempted Task 1. Many replied to the email using all the notes given although the quality of the responses mainly ranged from MUET Bands 2.5 to 3.5. Many candidates were not able to provide good elaborations for the notes. Thus, responses were rather shallow and lacked details. It was also observed that Notes 2 and 3 were challenging to many candidates. There were also candidates who provided wrong names for the sender and receiver. Planning, especially paragraphing, was seen in most responses. The notes given guided the candidates to plan and present their responses in an orderly manner. Email format sometimes was not present, and some candidates responded using a letter format.

In terms of presentation, a large number of candidates responded to the email using appropriate writing structure and email format. Conventions of email writing, i.e. title, greeting as an opening remark, and a close for the email could be seen in candidates' responses. The candidates also responded to all the notes given in the stimulus. Most candidates were able to write a clear opening remark. Generally, answers were in the modest range. The candidates did not fare well in Task 1 due to misinterpretation of the task, leading to either irrelevant or inaccurate responses. There were multiple

attempts by the candidates to write a short and concise reply mainly not mentioning things that are already written in the email. This resulted in marks not being awarded to the candidates due to the lack of reference in the responses.

Candidates' responses were short and simple due to the number of words shown in the instruction might have placed a psychological effect on them to keep their responses within 100 words. However, there were some who understood the task and provided sufficient development to each of the note given.

On average, most candidates managed to give elaboration on each task/ note given. However, the responses differ in quality. Some candidates were able to develop ideas sufficiently, but some merely responded to the prompt in one sentence.

STRENGTHS

In terms of strengths, all candidates including the weaker ones attempted Task 1. Candidates who were aware of the conventions of email writing were able to fulfil the requirements of the task. They were able to:

1. Understand the task
2. Write a correct opening and an appropriate closure
3. Use all the notes given correctly
4. Respond and show planning, good organisation, and appropriate paragraphing
5. Identify the keywords and items to respond to in the email and responded to the most parts of the task accurately
6. Present all the parts and sub parts
7. Use appropriate vocabulary, correct sentence structures, and a variety of linkers
8. Use appropriate register
9. Use good grammar (for some candidates)
10. Relate to the topic on class parties and travelling to their hometown
11. Address all of the requirements of the task
12. Write coherent responses whereby transition markers were sparingly, not mechanically used, and points were presented in the same order as the notes
13. Write cohesive sentences with appropriate cohesive devices

Planning was also noted in most responses. Paragraphs were used to separate the discussion of the four notes given for Task 1. Candidates also adhered to the email writing format, in which most candidates followed the format which they noted in the stimulus.

On average, most candidates were able to respond to the task effectively. Candidates generally were able to interpret the email and the four notes given. Most of the candidates provided a salutation, an opening remark, and they also responded to some of the notes given. Some key features were analysed. It is worth noting that some candidates were also able to use appropriate style and the right register. However, the responses differed in quality. Some candidates were able to develop ideas sufficiently, but some merely responded to the prompt in one sentence.

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weaknesses, candidates who did not address the task appropriately and adequately had the following issues:

1. Most limited and low English proficiency candidates did not develop the notes. They merely responded to the notes, often, giving information out of context or with no specific subject reference
2. Gave limited and modest responses for the task. This was because most of them only addressed most parts with the main parts missing or just the simplest parts in a simple manner. Paragraphing was also sometimes lacking as they only presented their responses in a single paragraph
3. The convention or format of email writing was not adhered to. Frequently, the format, though not mandatory, was missing, incomplete or inaccurate.

4. There were also vague salutations or none at all, minimal responses, and without any proper closure or sign-off.
5. Ending the email without a signature block (here, a name)
6. Using inappropriate tone
7. Not addressing all the given notes.

Many candidates did not observe the following:

Class farewell party

Most candidates forgot to put in this term which seemed to be the main element of the task thus the idea of class farewell party did not come through especially for Note 3.

Point of reference

Most candidates responded directly without giving the point of reference to the task which made them did not fulfill the requirement of the task.

Inaccurate time frame or inaccurate reason

The candidates are required to decline the request to meet up with Johan “next week”. However, many candidates failed to observe this thus, rendering their reasons for declining inaccurate or illogical such as “having lot of homework to do”, “do not have enough time due to classes”, “work commitment”.

Omission of the word ‘farewell’ when responding to Note 3

Due to this, many responses in Note 3 were vague as the idea of a class farewell party was not seen in the responses.

Task 2

Generally, in Task 2, the task fulfilment ranged from simple to adequate. Candidates were able to present a response using the correct writing convention (introduction, content, and conclusion) and provided thesis statements and topic sentences. Stand was made and most of the responses were consistent. The responses came in varying length and degree of success. The majority of candidates provided three points and were able to focus their discussion on one particular idea in each paragraph.

Despite being able to comprehend the question, many of the candidates did not have the maturity to explain equally well because many frequently failed to establish a clear link between the two main key elements in the task given. As such, most candidates were unable to address the task effectively and discuss the topic maturely. In other words, most candidates were merely telling and describing survival skills but not showing “whether young adults lack survival skills or vice versa”. The points discussed were most of the time immature and minimally explained. Many got carried away and as such they failed to respond accurately and did justice to the task. It was necessary for the candidates to have a high level of critical thinking skills to present convincing responses. The high proficiency candidates could write about almost anything from various perspectives and therefore, permitting them to think, explore, and express their views based on their respective backgrounds. Overall, most of the candidates were able to present their viewpoints with some elaborations modestly. Even though the stand was usually clearly stated, the thesis statement was almost always not present. Almost all candidates had clearly stated the stand in the introductory paragraph and reiterated the stand in the concluding paragraph.

The majority of the candidates gave a minimum of three main points but the arguments were often insufficient, lacking depth, immature, superficial as well as poorly linked, and there was little conviction in the writing. Most of the candidates responded insufficiently or modestly to this task primarily because they were not able to elaborate and substantiate the

ideas due to insufficient content knowledge and weak language proficiency. Arguments to support their stand were general, tainted with grammatical errors and meaning was often distorted. Their arguments were often shallow and not convincing.

The vocabulary and the sentence structures were also of limited variety and not very precise. As such, sentences were often distorted, with some almost incomprehensible and therefore, making reading difficult because meaning did not come through. This may be because of their lack of vocabulary and content knowledge on current issues. There were also candidates who obviously failed to plan their answers as their responses lacked coherence and were discussed haphazardly. Examples given were general, not convincing, irrelevant, and sometimes inaccurate. There were no justifications given and as such there were plenty of sweeping statements.

Candidates generally showed fair planning of their responses. Most gave an introduction, three points, and a conclusion. Conventions of writing were seen in most scripts including the weaker ones. Candidates made a stand and gave thesis statement. Points were developed with details and examples, although most of the discussion was modest in nature.

Most of the candidates had difficulty in presenting their viewpoints and ideas presented lacked maturity and planning. The majority of them only focused and dealt with one part of the argument. Often, there were simplistic ideas, superficial discussion or repetitive statement/ phrases, and general examples. The ideas were not developed, and the link was not made clear. Therefore, the discussion lacked depth and was not interesting at all. It was very challenging for the average and weak candidates because many of the candidates did not have the language proficiency, examples, and justifications to effectively discuss the issue.

STRENGTHS

In terms of strengths, candidates were able to respond to the task with the correct conventions of academic writing. Good and proficient users were able to respond to the task using the conventions of academic writing as follows:

1. Took a stand and was consistent throughout the response
2. Provided thesis statement and topic sentences representing the main ideas
3. Gave a well-organised, informative and comprehensible response
4. Substantiated their points mainly through facts-evidence
5. Displayed good ability in managing simple sentence structures and good control of complex structures
6. Showed evidence of planning and organisation – reflected in the use of paragraphs to organise responses
7. Conveyed and developed three points
8. Used relevant ideas, explanations, and examples to develop main ideas
9. Included keywords from the given statement in the response
10. Used relevant real-life examples
11. Included relevant and current issues to support their discussions
12. Used good cohesive devices
13. Used appropriate vocabulary in explaining why and how young adults lack survival skills. The words chosen were quite apt

Most candidates were able to provide between two and three points with simple elaborations. Examples given were predictable such as being influenced by “modern lifestyle”, “parents are guiding / not guiding their children”, “lack of knowledge” and et. cetera.

Candidates with a higher level of proficiency were able to expand their ideas and provide additional elaborations to the point made. They were also able to organise their responses well and use effective cohesive devices. Candidates could clearly compare and contrast the elements of traditional and modern lifestyles to highlight why and how young adults today lack survival skills.

Candidates were also able to:

1. Write their stand clearly e.g. *I agree that young adults today lack survival skills due to several reasons.*
2. Write clear thesis statement e.g. *this essay will discuss the reasons why young adults lack survival skills namely young adults cannot leave their families, are busy with their own work and are pampered by their parents.*
3. Elaborate on their points and give examples to support their statements e.g. *Young adults today lack survival skills due to laziness. This is because they are lazy to learn new skills because they could not see the importance of the skills. For example, they prefer to play games and sleep most of the time instead of learning survival skills.*
4. Think of points to agree e.g.
 - Over dependence on gadgets
 - Over-protective parents
 - Young adults lack socialising skills.
 - Parents provide all the comfort that they need
 - I strongly agree young adults lack survival skills due to several factors namely today's lifestyle, being pampered by their parents and technology.
 - young adults lead a comfortable life using technology. They have everything at their fingertips.
5. Think of points to disagree e.g.
 - Young adults earn four to five figure salary by doing part time jobs to support themselves and their studies.
 - Young adults are good in saving.
 - Young adults are good in time management.
 - Young adults are very adaptable. They are able to manage own life if the need arises – find own rental home/room and pay bills.
 - Young adults are able to live on their own.
 - Young adults are independent
 - Jobs are also convenient. They can work from home and earn money.
 - They can cook anything with modern technology
 - Young adults have entrepreneurial skills which help them survive financial crises.

Most candidates observed mechanics of writing. Paragraphs were used effectively and developed in a consistent manner. For example, paragraphs began with a topic sentence, followed with elaborations, example, and a simple conclusion. Even the weaker responses had some elements of planning.

Language ability was mainly fair. Errors though frequent, they did not hamper reading or the meaning of the content. Some apt vocabularies were used by many candidates, and this may be due to the familiarity of the topic itself.

Candidates may have discussed the topic in class or read about it. So, a familiar topic certainly helped many candidates to attempt the task.

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weaknesses candidates who did not address the task appropriately and adequately had the following issues:

1. Not able to aptly identify survival skills. They mistook survival skills as using the internet and social media, and doing power point presentation.
2. Encountered difficulties to establish and show evidence of lacking/not lacking survival skills. Even if they were able to link, the weaker candidates provided shallow arguments and made sweeping statements.
3. Failed to identify the actual task and proceeded to discuss the information in the instructions rather than the statement provided. For instance, they provided reasons why young adults are pampered and overprotected. As such, there was no discussion on lacking survival skills was made.
4. Touched on topics that went off on a tangent:

Describing survival skills

Describing the effects and importance of survival skills

Discussing the challenges young adults must face about important skills

Discussing the roles of parents, schools, and the government in developing survival skills among young adults

5. Gave irrelevant introduction e.g. *Since 2020 we had the pandemic. Everybody suffers as a result of Covid-19. Even the young adults suffer. They don't go to school. Everybody stays at home. That is why I agree young adults lack survival skills.*
6. Gave a modest lead-in in the introduction.
7. Lacked clear thesis statement or had no thesis statements e.g. *there are many reasons why I say this/ I agree to the statement due to the following reasons like technology existence, parenting skill and most importantly lack of faith in self*
8. Shifted stand, for example, some candidates chose partial stand, but the points given totally agree with the statement.
9. Wrote a stand ineffectively e.g. *I agree with the statement that young adults lack survival skills but I also disagree because sometimes young adults have survival skills and they are not pampered.*
10. Lacked interpretation of survival skills such as *hunting, fishing, and starting a fire.*
11. Showed limited ability in managing simple sentence structures causing the sentences to be fragmented and incomplete. There were quite a number of candidates who were not able to compose correct simple sentence structures as they tended to miss out on the correct subject of the sentence, the correct verb or the correct object. Candidates showed lower ability in composing correct sentences, making reading very difficult and meaning very confusing e.g.
 - *young adults must to know and learned about surroundings that their against*
 - *secondly, stress too much among young adults will be lead them to suicide*
 - *them lost of control to protect themselves and impact to their health mentality*

Distorted sentences

I know keyword of injured, which green light was for small pain, yellow mike for injured such dizzy and stomach pain, red mike if there was hazard of animals such as lion in the jungle

12. Produced a two-paragraph introduction in their responses. Some introductions contained information that was irrelevant or too general.
13. Wrote a very brief introduction and conclusion and some even started their responses with a stand or stated the stand at the concluding paragraph. In terms of cohesive devices, candidates were able to use some variety of cohesive devices appropriately.

In short, often shallow, immature, and in-depth discussions with missing examples were found throughout the responses. Discussions lacked focus. Gaps were also seen in many responses, leaving examples to infer meanings or message of the discussion on their own. Many candidates began the task abruptly and stated their stand straight away without a proper introduction while many also ended their discussions with a one liner or an abrupt conclusion.