

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02
Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

The overall standard achieved this year was high, as in previous years, and most candidates successfully obtained high scores. The majority of the candidates seemed to have a clear understanding of the requirements of each exercise. There were only a small number who appeared unclear on some parts of the exercises, such as **Section 1**, Exercise 4. This was also true of **Section 3**, Exercise 1, **Questions 26 – 31**, where, apparently, some candidates did not pay attention to the instructions given.

As in previous years there were always some who tended to lift the entire section of a passage as an answer, including irrelevant elements. This raised the question of whether they had understood the text and/or the question. In some cases correct answers were given in response to the wrong question.

Candidates must remember to write their answers clearly enough to enable Examiner to understand them. There were many candidates with very small and cramped handwriting which was very difficult to read, or big and clear handwriting which consequently ran out of space.

Some candidates wrote the answers to comprehension questions in long format while short format would be acceptable. This would prevent candidates having to squeeze the answer into the space provided and make marking of their work easier.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Question 1 – 5

The full mark was widely achieved by candidates on this set of multiple choice questions, where they had to choose one right answer from four options. Only a few failed to achieve full marks, mainly due to failing to answer option A instead of C for **Question 4**, possibly due to misinterpretation of the picture.

Exercise 2 Questions 6 – 10

Candidates had to match a subject to a teacher who was described. Almost all of the candidates gained full marks. The most common error appeared to be on **Questions 6** and **10** due to lack of attention to detail.

Exercise 3 Question 11 – 15

Most candidates performed well and gained full marks on these TRUE - FALSE choice questions, where they had to choose whether the statement was true or false according to the text. A small number of candidates found **Question 15** challenging.

Exercise 4 Question 16

On this postcard writing exercise candidates were asked to write a message to a friend based on the pictures shown. Most candidates found no problem on this exercise and attained the maximum marks. However, as in the previous year there were candidates who did not pay full attention to the pictures shown and consequently gave wrong/unrelated information, so that no marks were awarded.

There were also a few candidates who seemed unclear about what they should do. As well as writing the message in the postcard/space provided they also answered the questions by the pictures.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Question 17 – 24

The exercise was a reading comprehension and the majority of candidates did very well and scored highly: around 75% achieved full marks. Approximately 25% of candidates failed to answer **Question 19** correctly, and this seems to be due to the fact that they did not read the passage and question carefully.

Exercise 2 Question 25

Candidates were required to write between 80-100 words about their favourite activities at the weekend. The maximum mark of fifteen was obtained from ten marks awarded for communication by covering the points stated in the rubric, and five marks for accuracy which were based on ticks given for correct usage (verbs and the affixes, adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, idioms, etc.) which were then converted to a mark out of five.

The majority of candidates gained full marks. However, there were some who disobeyed the word limit, by writing either too little or too much, and some who did not give enough information to cover all points required, thus failing to achieve full marks. Most candidates wrote within the word limit and scored highly.

Section 3

Exercise 1 Question 26 – 31

On this section candidates were asked to decide whether the statements based on a passage about 'Dewi's Dream' were true or false. They had to provide a correction if they thought the statement given was wrong. Correction was only required on the false statements. There were candidates who also gave explanations on the true statements, which was not required, thus wasting time which could have been spent on other answers.

A large number of candidates achieved full marks, and the majority of candidates obtained high scores.

Exercise 2 Question 32 – 37

This reading comprehension exercise was based on an experience of a housewife with a sick husband. Unfortunately 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 due to lack of attention to detail (e.g. on **Question 32** where many candidates answered that the husband had a liver disease rather than that the disease would have been worse if he had not been not hospitalized). On **Question 34** stating that the operation was expensive had to be connected to the fact that the family did not have enough money.

The questions required careful reading and the candidates should always re-read the questions and their answers to ensure to obtain the correct answers. Some candidates had a tendency to lift whole sentences from the text without carefully selecting the relevant elements and, as commented above, this tended to make it difficult to establish whether the question and/or the passage were understood correctly.



FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03
Speaking

General comments

The overall standard was very high, and there were only a very small number of candidates who fell in the weak category. The majority of the examination Centres are based in Indonesia and most candidates seemed to have native or near-native speaker ability: therefore they were likely to do well. Although that was the case, there were some elements which prevented them from obtaining full marks due to the use of slang, dialects and also colloquial language, especially in the Topic and General Conversations, which should be conducted in formal language.

All Centres deserve credit for their hard work and their success in conducting this oral examination. We appreciate the work involved in labelling and packaging cassettes. However, it is worth reminding all Examiners that it is essential to spend time reading and to follow the Teachers' Notes thoroughly, in order to ensure the examination process and administration are carried out in accordance with the instructions.

As in the previous year, there were some concerns regarding the exam administration. Moderation can be difficult if, for example, cassettes are not labelled, Role play numbers are not stated at the beginning, or names of candidates are not in the same order as on the MS1. This is even more of a problem when there is no Working Mark Sheet and/or MS1 to work from. Some Centres did not send their Working Mark Sheet and others did not send the copy of the MS1. Centres also need to double-check their addition to avoid arithmetical errors. Those which send recordings on a CD Rom should rename the files with the candidate number or name.

Overall, both parties, Examiners and candidates acted realistically on Role plays and worked hard on discussion and conversations. It was interesting as well as informative and enjoyable to listen to.

Comments on specific questions

Test 1: Role plays

General

The majority of candidates scored highly on this section. It is worth remembering with all the Role plays that if candidates fail to give the information asked for by the Examiner which is not required by the Role play, marks should not be deducted. Providing all the specified tasks are completed then full marks should be given.

Utterances do not have to follow the exact order shown on the card, however, it is easier to allocate marks if the given prompts are followed. This also helps the Examiner to avoid missing or forgetting to complete each task.

There is no requirement to add more tasks or embellish the Role play as this will create confusion for the candidates and could also result in their not completing the specified tasks. Clear points of communication - following the prompts given - are what are needed.

A. Role plays 1, 2 and 3: Candidate goes to a tourist information office.

Candidates needed to enquire about a hotel at a tourist information office, state the total number of rooms required then choose whether they would prefer one with a restaurant or without, in the centre of town or by the beach. Finally they had to ask a question about the hotel (e.g. car park? price?).

Most candidates did this very well. Candidates failed to score full marks usually due to missing task/s caused by the Examiner's failure to give the correct cues, or to not following the prompts given. Some Examiners added more tasks or created their own prompts and missed the given prompt/s. Others gave the information before being asked by the candidates, which prevented the candidates from completing the task.

A. Role plays 4, 5 and 6: Candidate eats at a restaurant.

Most candidates were able to score high marks on this eating-out theme. Again, candidates failed to score full marks often due to uncompleted tasks, mostly caused by faults on the Examiner's part. Examiners need to note that they have to follow the prompts given. Failure to provide correct cues or give the appropriate prompts could result in candidates missing the task/s required and losing marks as a result. Therefore Examiners should follow the prompts given and rephrase the question in order for candidate/s to complete the tasks and obtain full marks.

Some candidates forgot to ask about the bill and so failed to gain full marks.

A. Role plays 7, 8 and 9: Candidate buys bread and birthday cake for a friend at the bakery.

Most candidates scored highly and, as in other Role plays, some candidates failed to obtain the full marks available because of the Examiner's failure to follow the prompt given, or the provision by the Examiner of information which should have been supplied by the candidate. Some candidates failed to differentiate between bread and cake and this also resulted in failure to complete the task and gain the full marks.

B. Role plays 1, 4 and 7: Candidate answers a series of questions from an Indonesian host parent where he/she is staying.

The B Role plays are intended to present a slightly more challenging and involving task. On this particular occasion the candidate needed to ask permission to go out with his/her friend. The parent needed to know where and when and who with. The candidate was required to give an explanation how he/she would get back home since the parent would not be able to pick him/ her up, and what he/she would do if there was a problem.

In general, the candidates found no problem in visualising the situation and played their role well. They could ask the right questions and give clear explanations. Candidates failed to gain the full marks due again to the Examiner failing to give the correct prompt, or because they missed the prompt/s given. Some Examiners also gave the information which should have been asked for by candidate, and this also prevented candidates from completing their tasks and obtaining the marks available.

B. Role plays 2, 5 and 8: Candidate phones a tour bus company concerning an item which has been left on the bus from Bali.

Again, the situation here involved a problem where candidates needed to explain a problem and give the information required by the bus company. They also had to describe the item and explain why that item needed to be found. Both candidates and Examiners played their roles in a very realistic way.

The majority of candidates scored high marks and the few who failed to score high marks were candidates who failed to mention that they had to find the item. A few 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. Rephrasing or repeating of questions by Examiners would help in this area.

B. Role plays 3, 6 and 9: Candidate phones a hotel to apply a temporary job.

The task here was that candidates needed to apply for a job which had been advertised. Candidates had to explain where they saw the advert and request information about when the job would start and for how long. They also had to ask for information related to the job (e.g. accommodation? hours? wage?) and explain their experience of working at a hotel. Provided candidates kept to the outline of the script and provided the details required, this caused no problems.



Many candidates failed to score full marks as they did not cover all points of communication required. The task which most candidates missed out was where candidates had to ask about when the job starts and for how long. It seems that some candidates did not notice that they were not only required to answer questions but also had to ask questions at the same time. Examiners need to 'jog' a candidate's memory or to 'nudge' them by asking i.e.: "Ada lain/Apa lagi yang akan Anda tanyakan?" when a candidate/s misses a task/s or part of task, to enable them to complete all points required.

Test 2: Topic (prepared) Discussion

As in previous years, the topics chosen were very broad and interesting to listen to; nevertheless 'My ambitions' and 'My hobbies' were most popular, alongside 'My Country' and other topics which sometimes were very ambitious. It was very clear that most candidates had a personal interest in the topic chosen and had really prepared for it.

Most candidates performed well and gained high scores, though there were a few Centres which did not include the 1-2 minutes topic presentation but went straight to discussion instead. Timing also should be kept as required in the instructions. Although this year time keeping was better than previous years, and most Centres kept the time well, there were some schools which continued to ignore the correct timing. Again it is worth reminding Examiners that they should always carefully read and follow the Teachers' Notes.

There were Centres where candidates chose more challenging topics (e.g. environmental issues, moral issues, etc.). This of course would lead to more challenging questions, but it can sometimes disadvantage candidates, especially those whose knowledge of the issues/topics is limited even if their language skills are adequate. Examiners should not encourage candidates to choose over-ambitious topics to avoid the possibility that they may disadvantage themselves.

There was also a great deal of Jakartan slang and borrowed English used. Centres are advised to encourage candidates to use formal Indonesian language as much as possible, and Examiners are recommended to lead the way.

Test 3: General (unprepared) Conversation

In general most Centres conducted this section of the oral examination well and as in the previous year most candidates scored highly. Conversations were varied and the typical themes were around candidates' studies, hobbies, plans for the future, family life and their general interests. Some Examiners used some of the information given in the topic to lead into the general conversation. This is acceptable provided these had not already been dealt with in the earlier discussion. As in the Topic Discussion, problems occurred when Examiners asked over-challenging questions which were beyond the candidates' knowledge or experience, although within their language skills.

The allocation of time of 5 minutes was usually well-managed in nearly all Centres. Unfortunately, there were some Examiners who conducted this session as in the Topic (prepared) Discussion, where candidates have to prepare and present a presentation. Once more, Examiners should read the Teachers' Notes and follow the instructions as required.



FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04
Continuous Writing

General comments

This year, as last year, the majority of candidates performed well. Their work was often interesting to read, demonstrating quite complex linguistic ability at this level. Only a very few candidates performed unsatisfactorily. These candidates generally had problems with basic spelling, grammar and vocabulary.

Some still use *Jakartan slang* and/or informal language (i.e. candidates wrote the way they spoke the language), which is unfortunately not acceptable for the exam.

Most candidates managed to write within the specified word limit. A few either did not meet the minimum 130 words or went way over the limit of 140. However, most of those who did not meet the minimum word count managed to provide the necessary answers and obtained sufficient marks. Unfortunately most of those who went over the limit would often lose some marks as correct answers were provided beyond the 140 word limit.

As last year, lots of crossings out and hardly legible, tiny or untidy handwriting are commonplace and can lead to a loss of marks.

General mistakes:

- the mix of informal '**aku**' (= I / me) with formal '**saya**' and informal '**kamu**' (= you) with formal '**Anda**' in the same piece of writing.
- Misspelling of '**Anda**' which was often incorrectly spelled as '**anda**' without a capital letter.
- the use of informal words like: **lagi**, **biar** instead of formal: **sedang**, **supaya/agar** (= in the middle of doing/ '-ing form', so that)
- the use of slang
e.g.: **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)
udah for **sudah** (= already)
sama for **dengan** (= with)
- the use of the informal suffix 'in' instead of formal 'kan'
e.g.: **dikerjain** for **dikerjakan** (= to be done)
- the missing of '**h**' at the end of words, hence: **susa**, **suda**, **masi**
instead of: **susah**, **sudah**, **masih** (= difficult, already, still)
- 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.: **di**berikan (= to be given - connected) as opposed to **di** rumah (= at home – separated)
- prepositions should be separated from the next words
e.g.: **ke sini** (to here)
di sana (over there)

- the writing of possessive pronouns should be connected
e.g.: **negaraku** (= my country) NOT negara **ku**
pekerjaan rumahnya (= his/her homework) NOT **pekerjaan rumah nya**
- the words that should be or should not be written separately
e.g.: **kacamata** (= glasses – 1 word) NOT **kaca mata**
olahraga (= sports) NOT **olah raga**

ibu kota (= capital city – 2 words) NOT **ibukota**
orang tua (= parents – 2 words) NOT **orangtua**

beri tahu (= to inform – 2 words), hence: **memberi tahu** (2 words)
but '**memberitahukan**' or '**memberitahukannya**' (both written as 1 word)
- more spelling problems
e.g.: **negeri** (= country) NOT **negri**
rapor (= School report) NOT **rapot/raport**
 rapi (= tidy) NOT **rapih**
sembahyang (= to pray) NOT **sembayang**
museum NOT **musjum**
mal NOT **mall**
aktivitas (= activity) NOT **aktifitas**
etc.
- incorporating borrowed words with Indonesian inappropriately
e.g.: **to print** --> '**memprint**' should be '**mencetak**'
traditional --> '**makanan tradisional**' (= traditional food) should be '**makanan tradisional**'

Comments on specific questions

None of the questions was particularly easy or difficult for the majority of candidates. However, **Question 1 (b)** and **2** seemed to pose some minor problems.

Question 1

Candidates had a choice of answering **1 (a)** or **1 (b)**. Most of them chose **Question 1 (a)** which is an informal letter to a friend.

(a) *A letter to persuade a friend to come to the writer's country (informal).*

Most candidates seemed to know how to set out a letter and to use appropriate opening and closing phrases. Candidates who chose to do this question generally answered it well. They provided relevant answers to all the questions and therefore a lot of them gained full marks for **Communication**. These candidates generally also used the appropriate register used in writing a letter to a friend (*informal*). The ability to use the appropriate register also affected how marks for **General Impression** were given.

For those who did not gain full marks, the common error made was in answering point (i) of this question, i.e. *Which tourist objects/attractions can be seen/visited and why they are interesting*. Whilst most of them mentioned and/or described the local tourist attractions, some candidates failed to explain why they were interesting.

The word '**bawa**' (= to take/bring) in point (iii), i.e. *What your friend has to take/bring (?) and why*, was sometimes misunderstood. Some took it as '*what to take with them on their holiday abroad*' but some thought it was '*what to bring back with them as souvenirs for their family and friends*'. Some chose the second one and offered the same answer as to point (ii), i.e. *What things and souvenirs can be bought*.

There was a lot of similarity in the choice of places of interest (in Indonesia): **Bali** and **Yogyakarta** are the two clear favourites. This was to be expected considering the background and culture of most candidates.

With regard to the language skills, quite a few made the following mistakes:
Inappropriate use of '**Anda**' in an informal letter to a friend.

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

Inaccurate usage of the Indonesian plural form when preceded by numerical adjectives, phrases such as '**banyak**' (= many) or '**beberapa**' (= some), e.g.: '**patung-patung**' (= statues) or '**banyak patung**' (= many statues) and '**barang-barang**' (= things) or '**beberapa barang**' (= some things) are correct, whereas '**banyak patung-patung**' or '**beberapa barang-barang**' are incorrect.

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

(b) *An application letter for a job as a home help and a gardener (formal).*

Very few candidates chose this topic. Some were unsure whether to use formal language or not throughout. Only one or two of those who did this question gained full marks for **Communication**. The common weaknesses in candidates' answers were generally failure to provide a relevant answer for point (iii), i.e. *Why they can be trusted/relied upon*, and/or an answer for point (ii), i.e. *What skills and experience they have*, of this question. Most of them for example, provided a description of their skills but not their experience.

Question 2

An explanation/description of what would happen next and what one would do when they found out that their important homework was not in their bag on the day they had to hand it in.

Very few candidates misunderstood the rubric or the question completely. However, more than 5% (more than 30 out of at least 500 scripts) thought they had to write a letter of apology to their teacher. A lot of these letters made excuses or explained why they did not have their homework with them that day, i.e. what happened the day/night before, but failed to explain what happened that day after they found out that they did not have their important work. In most cases they eventually answered the questions, though occasionally candidates used up their word limit and therefore did not get full marks for **Communication**, but they still gained marks from **Language** and **General Impression**.

Also, whilst most candidates explained '*what happens next*', quite a lot of them did not explain '*what they will do next*' and failed to gain the full 5 marks. Therefore, quite a few of them gained only 4 marks rather than the full 5 marks for **Communication**.

Common language mistakes include:

Incorrect use of preposition '**ke**' instead of '**kepada**' when followed by a person, e.g.: '**ke** ibu guru' instead of the correct '**kepada** ibu guru (= to the <female> teacher)'

Misspelling of words ending in '**-kan**' when used with suffix '**-nya**', e.g.: '**memberikanya**' instead of the correct '**memberikannya**'.

Inappropriate use of third person pronoun '**dia**' when referring to a person who is older or is respected, e.g.: when referring to a teacher '**beliau**' should have been used to indicate respect instead of '**dia**'. Though this may not affect marks given for **Language**, it could affect marks given for **General Impression**.