



BOARD OF STUDIES
NEW SOUTH WALES

1999 HSC Malay

Notes from the Examination Centre

© Board of Studies 2000

Published by
Board of Studies NSW
GPO Box 5300
Sydney NSW 2001
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9262 6270

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

April 2000

Schools may reproduce all or part of this document for classroom use only. Anyone wishing to reproduce elements of this document for any other purpose must contact the Copyright Officer, Board of Studies NSW. Ph: (02) 9367 8111; fax: (02) 9279 1482.

ISBN 0 7313 4562 2

200091

Contents

2/3 Unit (Common) (For Background Speakers).....	4
Listening Examination.....	4
Listening Skills	4
Written Examination.....	4
Section I – Reading Skills	4
Section II – Writing Skills	5
Section III – Contemporary Issues	5
3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers)	6
Written Examination.....	6
Section I – Poetry	6
Section II – Novel	6

1999 Higher School Certificate Malay Notes from the Examination Centre

2/3 Unit (Common) (For Background Speakers)

Listening Examination

Listening Skills (20 marks)

In general, candidates performed well in the listening examination. However, most candidates found the questions that referred to the statistics in the text challenging.

Question 8 required candidates to comment on three aspects of style: language, tone and presentation. Many candidates concentrated on presentation alone, and language and tone were often confused with presentation.

The best responses were able to distinguish between the three aspects and to give examples of each.

Written Examination

Section I – Reading Skills (20 Marks)

Question (a) was generally answered well as candidates were able to comment on the effectiveness of the first paragraph.

Candidates lost marks in Questions (b) and (c) because advantages/benefits (*kebaikan-kebaikan*) were confused with uses (*kegunaan-kegunaan*).

In Question (d) many candidates referred to the content of the passage, rather than its style as the question required. The better responses identified the target readership as the educated and more technologically inclined, rather than a particular class of people.

In Question (e) most candidates were able to state the writers' stand on the subject, but only the best responses gave relevant examples from the passage to support their comments on the writer's presentation of the topic.

It was expected that in Questions (a), (d) and (e), candidates provide evidence from the passage to support their answers.

Section II – Writing Skills (20 Marks)

Generally, the appropriate register, as required by the question, was maintained throughout.

Weaker responses focused on communication skills (ie technology) rather than relating communicative skills to language learning and teaching, as was required by the question.

Better responses were those that presented one point of view and supported it. However, it was possible to score high marks by giving the two sides balanced importance, if the argument was supported with appropriate evidence.

Section III – Contemporary Issues (40 Marks)

Question 3 (20 marks)

Part (a)

Better responses included a discussion of **how** the characterisation (not just the characters) was used to present the theme and message.

Weaker responses identified themes and message and used incidents involving the characters, rather than characterisation.

Part (b)

In general, this was not as well handled as 3(a), as many responses did not limit themselves to the stated theme.

As with 3(a), weaker responses used incidents alone to demonstrate how the theme was presented.

Better responses discussed more than one literary technique as used in each story (eg characterisation, style, imagery) and provided relevant examples.

Overall, it was evident that most candidates knew the content of the stories and were able to identify the themes and basic messages but only the best candidates reinforced their responses with the inclusion of pertinent quotes.

Question 4 (20 Marks)

Better responses addressed the key issue of equality. Some responses merely highlighted the low status of women without linking this to development and change.

Most candidates were able to choose appropriate stories but few were also able to identify and incorporate appropriate sources of supplementary material.

3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers)

Written Examination

Section I – Poetry (25 Marks)

This year the poetry question was generally handled well. Question 1 was by far the more popular, with only one candidate attempting Question 2.

Both questions required candidates to compare the nominated poems. Weaker responses were limited to a discussion of each poem separately.

The best responses included supporting evidence from the required poems. The weaker responses discussed the poems in a superficial fashion and referred mainly to content. In these responses there was a lack of individual interpretation and appreciation of the poems.

Section II – Novel (25 marks)

Equal numbers attempted Questions 3 and 4.

Question 3

This was generally better done. All candidates were able to identify some of the symbolism in the novel. Better responses did not limit themselves to simply a discussion of what the different characters represented. They were able to discuss the symbolism of various incidents and relate all their examples to themes and messages. Weaker responses did little more than provide a list of symbols.

Question 4

Candidates generally confined their response to an analysis of the character Pendekar Atan. None of the responses clearly identified where the extract appeared in the story, although all were able to explain whose thoughts were being expressed. The importance of the extract in developing Pendekar Atan's character was generally well explained, but very few candidates were able to link the extract to the development of important themes.