

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02

Reading and Directed Writing

## General comments

The overall standard is very high as in previous years. Most of the candidates worked well and scored highly. However, there was still a tendency by some to copy out whole sections of the text as an answer which of course sometimes will include irrelevant elements. As a result it was sometimes unclear whether they had understood the text and/or the question, and therefore marks could not be awarded.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section 1**

#### **Exercise 1 Question 1- 5**

The majority of candidates found no problem on these multiple choice questions, where they had to choose one right answer from four options. Most of them gained full marks: however, there were some candidates who failed to achieve full marks due to answering **Question 1** incorrectly, in many cases choosing option D instead of C. In addition, a few had problem with **Question 4**, where they chose option C instead of option A.

#### **Exercise 2 Questions 6-10**

On this part of the exercise candidates had to match a place/city to a person who was described. Almost all of the candidates gained full marks. A few candidates failed to gain full marks through mixing up the answers to **Questions 9** and **10**.

#### **Exercise 3 Question 11-15**

Most candidates performed well and gained full marks on these questions, where they had to choose whether the statement was true or false according to the text.

#### **Exercise 4 Question 16**

Candidates were asked to write a message to a friend, based on the pictures shown. Although most candidates found no problem on this exercise and attained maximum marks, there were some who did not pay full attention to the pictures shown and consequently gave wrong information. It is worth mentioning that all candidates followed the instructions well and wrote within the word limit, in contrast to the previous year.

### **Section 2**

#### **Exercise 1 Question 17-24**

On this reading comprehension exercise most candidates did very well and scored highly. However, there were not many candidates who managed to achieve full marks. Some candidates failed to answer **Question 17** correctly, possibly through not reading the question carefully enough. Instead of giving the information related to the colours and the shapes, they mentioned the smell. There were many candidates who also lost a mark on **Question 20**. Again, this may have been the result of carelessness, in that they missed out the word '*paling*' and only mentioned '*enak*' rather than '*paling enak*'. Some candidates failed on **Question 24** as they only stated '*Buah durian bisa jatuh sendiri kalau sudah matang.*' Or '*Buah durian akan berbahaya kalau jatuh.*' They forget to mention that '*Buah durian akan berbahaya kalau jatuh di kepala orang.*'

**Exercise 2 Question 25**

Candidates had to write 80-100 words about their favourite room in their house. The maximum mark of fifteen was obtained from ten marks awarded for communication by covering the points stated, and five marks for accuracy based on the ticks given for the correct usage (verbs, nouns and pronouns, adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, prefixes and suffixes, idioms, etc.) which were then converted to a mark out of five.

The typical choice of a favorite room was their bedroom or study, where they spend most of their time and where there is a computer which they can use for schoolwork, chatting with their friends or playing games.

Nearly all candidates gained full marks. There were only a few who did not gain full marks, apparently as a result of a lack of attention to detail, or through not giving enough information to cover all points asked for. Most candidates wrote within the word limit and scored highly.

**Section 3****Exercise 1 Question 26-31**

This section contained a combination of multiple-choice and true-false exercises based on reading comprehension. Candidates were asked to give an explanation/correction when they thought that the statement given was wrong. Unfortunately there were some candidates who did not give a correction of the false statements. A number of candidates also lost marks on **Question 28**, but the majority managed to gain a high score on this section, and approximately seventy five percent achieved full marks.

**Exercise 2 Question 32- 37**

This is another reading comprehension exercise. There were not many candidates who achieved full marks on this section, although most of them scored highly. Most candidates who failed to achieve maximum marks in this exercise seem to have lost marks through carelessness, especially on **Question 33**. The questions required careful reading, and the candidates should always re-read each question and their answer before moving on. Some candidates had a tendency just to copy out the text without having carefully selected the relevant aspect required. As a result it was sometimes difficult to establish whether the question and/or passage had been understood. There were also some candidates who did not write enough or did not give the full information required, losing marks as a result.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03

Speaking

## General comments

The overall standard of achievement on this paper was high. The majority of the examination Centres are based in Indonesia and most candidates are native speakers or have native speaker ability. There were also numbers of candidates entered who have an international background, for whom Indonesian is a new and foreign language: most of these also have knowledge of local culture, such as the norms of Indonesian manners, food and drink, arts and crafts, and they also have the potential to score highly.

There were some concerns with exam administration. We appreciate the work involved in labelling and packaging cassettes, for which we thank you. However, it is worth reminding Examiners to read and follow instructions given regarding all aspects of the test, in order to be able to carry out the examination process well (e.g. making sure there are no questions omitted, giving the correct cues, marking correctly, etc.) and also so as to be able to complete the administrative arrangements. Centres with large numbers of candidates should note that they are not required to send a recording of every candidate. Unless there is a large range of marks represented in the test, a sample of six candidates showing a spread across the range (2 good, 2 middling, 2 weak) is usually sufficient. Centres are reminded that moderation can be very difficult if cassettes are not labelled, Role play numbers are not stated at the beginning of each test, and if the names of candidates are not in order or are not in the same order as on the MS1.

## Comments on specific questions

### Test 1: Role plays

#### General

It is worth remembering with all the Role plays that if candidates give in one utterance additional information which will be required later, e.g. both ordering food and drink, stating days and time, etc. this information does not need to be repeated later and full marks should be given. Utterances do not have to follow the exact order shown, (though it is easier to allocate marks if the given format is followed).

There is no requirement to extend the dialogue or embellish to avoid confusion. Clear points of communication - following the prompts - are what is needed.

#### **A Role plays 1, 2 and 3: Candidate goes to a restaurant.**

The candidate needed to order a table, food and drink, and then point out a simple problem: (inside? outside?) and, finally, ask where the toilet is. This was done well by nearly all candidates. Some candidates failed to score full marks, usually due to failing to order different food and drink and ordering the same again for their friend. Some candidates also forgot to ask about the toilet and a reminder to the candidate was necessary, e.g. *'Ada yang lain?'* Or *'Ada yang lain yang bisa saya bantu?'* or *'Ada hal lain yang Anda perlukan/tanyakan?'* etc.

#### **A Role plays 4, 5 and 6: Candidate buys a ticket to Jakarta at the bus station.**

Most candidates were able to score high marks. Candidates often failed to score full marks because of giving a wrong destination, which should have been Jakarta as stated on the card. Candidates also need to note that often they have to provide two pieces of information in one line, e.g. the day and the time they would like to go, whether they have a passport, and their age. Failure to provide the full information asked in the rubric resulted in loss of marks. Again, Examiners should 'nudge' candidate/s or repeat the question in order for candidate/s to gain full marks.

**A Role plays 7, 8 and 9: Candidate buys stamps at the post office.**

Again, a reason why a few candidates failed to score full marks was that they failed to provide the information required. The Examiner is perfectly at liberty to jog a candidate's memory (provided this is done without supplying the words needed), e.g. '*ada lain yang bisa saya bantu?*' or '*Ada yang lain yang ingin Anda tanyakan?*', or simply by repeating the question. It is important to remember that if Examiners supply information which should have been provided by the candidate, they will disadvantage the candidate.

**B Role plays 1, 4 and 7: Candidate answers a series of questions from an Indonesian immigration officer**

The B Role plays are intended to be a slightly more challenging and involving problem. On this particular occasion the officer needs to see the candidate's return ticket which, unfortunately, is in the suitcase. Most candidates managed to visualise the situation and play their role well. They could give a clear explanation and asked the right question. Problems occurred mostly on the part where the candidate had to give information regarding the gifts (s)he had brought for the Indonesian family. Some candidates misunderstood by giving the information about the gift they would take back from Indonesia, instead of about what they had brought. Because of this misunderstanding and giving the wrong information, some candidates failed to gain the full marks. However, Examiners could assist candidates by resetting or rephrasing the question to enable candidate to give the right information and to obtain the full marks.

**B Role plays 2, 5 and 8: Candidate lost his/her younger sibling and approaches a police for help.**

Again, the situation here involves a problem with the need to ask for help to find a younger sibling. Both the candidates and the Examiners played their roles in a very realistic way by acting as a panicky individual versus a sympathetic public figure. The majority of candidates scored high marks and the few who failed to do so were candidates who failed to notice that the information regarding when and where the incident happened was given on the top of the Role play card. Some candidates gave different information from the information stated on the card. Marks were also lost as some failed to cover all the points of communication. Examiners can help candidates by rephrasing or repeating questions when necessary.

**B Role plays 3, 6 and 9: Candidate phones a restaurant regarding his/her lost property (bag).**

The problem here is that the candidate needed to find his/her bag which (s)he had left at the restaurant. The candidate needed to explain when and with whom (s)he had eaten at the restaurant (alone or in a group) and the contents of the bag, and then to enquire about the opening hours of the restaurant. Nearly every candidate entered willingly into the situation. Provided candidates kept to the outline of the script and provided the details asked, this caused no problems, though again marks were lost due to failure to cover all the points of communication. Again Examiners are allowed to jog a candidate's memory to enable him/her to complete all the information required.

**Test 2: Topic (prepared ) Discussion**

Topics chosen were very broad and interesting to listen to. Nevertheless, 'My ambitions' and 'hobbies' were the most popular, followed by 'My Country' and other topics which sometimes were very ambitious. It was very clear that candidates have a personal interest in the topic chosen and have really prepared for it, although there were a few Centres which did not include the 1-2 minute topic presentation but went straight to discussion instead. Again, Examiners should always follow the instructions throughout. Some Centres encouraged candidates to raise their level of language by choosing more challenging topics (e.g. environmental issues, morality in a changing Indonesia). This is fine where able candidates can be stretched but would not be appropriate for all. It could also disadvantage candidates, especially where the candidate's knowledge of the issues/topics is limited even though his/her language skills are high. It was also found that a great deal of Jakartan slang and borrowed English was used. Centres are advised to encourage candidates to use formal Indonesian language as much as possible.

**Test 3: General (unprepared) Conversation**

Examiners generally used items of information given in the topic to lead in to the general conversation. Conversations were fairly varied: typical themes dealt with the candidates' studies, their plans for the future, their family life and – provided these had not been dealt with earlier – their general interests. The allocation of time (with tests 2 and 3 lasting approximately 5 minutes each) was usually well managed by nearly all Centres.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04  
Continuous Writing

## General comments

Most candidates performed very well in the exam. They produced work that was quite interesting to read and most of them showed good mastery of the Indonesian language with a wide range of vocabulary. However, there is still a problem with too much use of *Jakartan slang* and/or informal language. In other words, candidates wrote the way they spoke the language. Better candidates were awarded marks for their ability with the written form of the language. In the case of writing a letter to a friend, the use of informal personal pronouns (like 'aku' and 'kamu') could be acceptable. However, there is a considerable difference between this informal language and the grammar and vocabulary to be used in most written communication.

Very few candidates misunderstood the rubric. However, some did not understand what they were asked to write because of lack of vocabulary. For example: the word 'cita-cita' in Indonesian which means 'aspirations/ideals' – if candidates did not understand what that word meant then they were in danger of writing a general letter on random topics. In such a case, the Examiner could not give marks for *Communication*, but marks were awarded for the correct use of *Language* and *General Impression*.

Some candidates needed to pay closer attention to word limit. Some of the strong candidates were so absorbed in their writing that they wrote over-long responses, in excess of 140 words. In this case, anything written beyond the word limit could not gain marks.

On the other hand some, who were perhaps struggling and did not have a broad vocabulary or confidence with the grammar, did not manage to reach the minimum word count of 130. Answers which did not reach the lower word limit would normally not include sufficient points.

Lots of crossing out and hardly legible, tiny or untidy handwriting are commonplace and can lead to a loss of marks.

In summary, candidates who demonstrated good examination technique by setting out their work neatly, paying attention to word limits and focusing on what the task demanded were at an advantage. Better candidates could use formal and informal language forms at appropriate points.

## **General mistakes:**

- the use of formal '**Anda**' (= you) instead of informal '**kamu**' (= you) in an informal letter to a friend
- the mix of '**aku**' (= I / me informal) and '**saya**' (formal) in the same piece of writing
- the use of informal words like: **terus, lagi, biar**  
instead of formal: **lalu/kemudian, sedang, supaya/agar** (= then, in the middle of doing/ '-ing form', so that)
- the use of slang  
e.g.: **ngga/nggak** for **tidak** (= not)  
**banget** for **sangat/sekali** (= very)  
**bikin** for **membuat** (= to make)  
**balik** for **kembali** (= back)  
**pas** for **ketika/waktu** (= when)  
**ketemu** for **bertemu/menemukan** (to see/meet or to find)  
**uda/udah** for **sudah** (= already)  
also the use of the suffix 'in' instead of 'kan'  
e.g.: **lanjutin** for **melanjutkan**
- the missing of '**h**' at the end of words, hence: **seluru, suda, kasi** instead of: **seluruh, sudah, kasih** (all, already, love)
- the writing of '**di**' as **prefix** (connected to the verb) as opposed to '**di**' as **preposition** (meaning 'in/at/on', separated from the next word - a place)



- e.g.: **diberi** (= to be given - connected) as opposed to **di sungai** (= in the river - separate)
- the writing of possessive pronouns should be connected  
e.g.: **cita-citaku** (= my aspirations) NOT **cita-cita ku rumahnya** (= his/her house) NOT **rumahku**
- the incorrect use of active and passive voice  
e.g.: **menarik** (active) – **ditarik** (passive)  
**mengunjungi** (active) – **dikunjungi** (passive)

### Comments on specific questions

#### Question 1

Candidates had a choice of answering **1 (a)** or **1 (b)**. More or less equal numbers chose either option. Both questions were equally well answered.

#### **(a)** *A letter to a friend about one's aspirations/ambitions*

Most candidates seemed to know how to set out a letter and to use appropriate opening and closing phrases. Here we were looking for informal language, but at times candidates used more formal phrases.

e.g.: "Yang terhormat" (= Dear ...) is fine as a salutation in a formal letter, but this situation required an informal variation, such as: "Temanku yang baik" (= My dear friend, ...) .

As mentioned above, some candidates still mixed the use of formal and informal forms of personal pronouns, e.g.: 'Anda' (= you – formal) instead of 'kamu' (= you – informal).

Generally candidates' aspirations were either to become a doctor or to continue their parents' businesses. This was to be expected considering the background and culture of most candidates.

#### **(b)** *Opinion on whether tourism in one's country is good or bad*

The majority of candidates could lay out their writing in a logical structure using appropriate language to highlight both good and bad points of tourism.

Once again, there was a lot of similarity in the answer to the question of what the tourists found interesting in their country: **Bali** is the clear favourite.

#### Question 2

*An explanation/description of what one would do if they saw a person in the water crying for help*

Although most had probably never experienced it themselves, the majority understood what they were supposed to do and expressed themselves quite well. They were able to set out clearly a sequence of appropriate actions and include aspects such as whether they themselves could swim or not. Because the question gave a specific situation, specific vocabulary was needed.

e.g.: *berenang* (= to swim), *dalam* (= deep), *arus deras/kuat* (= strong current), *kayu* (= wood/stick), *tali* (= rope), *rumah sakit* (= hospital), *polisi* (= the police).