

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02

Reading and Directed Writing

General Comments

As in previous years, the overall standard of achievement this year was very high and most of the candidates obtained high scores.

The majority of candidates appeared familiar with the format, had a clear understanding of the questions, and were able to demonstrate a high level of linguistic accuracy for this level. There were only a small number of candidates who appeared unfamiliar with the demands of the exercises, especially on **Section 1, Exercise 4**, where they were required to write an email based on the pictures provided. Likewise, on **Section 3, Exercise 1, Questions 24 – 29** some candidates corrected all the sentences, rather than the ones that they thought were wrong. It is recommended that candidates are given the chance to become familiar with the form of the test, so that they understand the instructions and avoid spending time on unnecessary tasks.

As in the previous year there were many candidates who simply lifted a section from the passage which they hoped was related to the question. This produced answers which were not always correct. The questions on reading comprehension require a careful reading, then the selection of appropriate content. It is advisable always to re-read questions and answers to ensure that they are correct. Where candidates lift from the text without carefully selecting the relevant elements it can be difficult to establish whether the question and/or the passage has been understood correctly.

As in previous years there were also many candidates with very small and cramped handwriting which was very difficult to read. On the other hand, there were candidates with very large and clear handwriting who ran out of space and continued the answers on the side or bottom of page or on an extra sheet. Candidates should strive to write their answers clearly, so as to enable the examiner to understand the answers.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Exercise 1 Question 1- 5

On this section candidates had to choose one right answer from four options. Most coped well and gained full marks on this multiple choice task.

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

Generally candidates understood the matching task required on this section and gained full marks.

Exercise 3 Question 11 - 15

Most candidates performed well on these *true/false* questions. There was only a handful of candidates who did not manage to gain full marks, and the majority gained high scores.



Exercise 4 Question 16

On this exercise candidates were required to write an email to their uncle on the subject of what they did to earn some extra pocket money. The content of the email was to be based on the pictures shown. A maximum mark of 5 was available; 2 marks for accuracy and 3 for communication. Most candidates found no problem in addressing the requirements of the rubric appropriately, and gained the full marks for both language accuracy and communication. However there were candidates who did not answer the question fully and missed out a part or some parts of the answers to the questions: for example, on **(b)** some did not provide information about how long they worked, while some others did not say how much they earned.

There were also candidates who did not give their full attention to the pictures shown or misinterpreted the questions, which both resulted in incorrect answers and prevented the award of full marks.

As in previous years, there were also a few candidates who seemed unclear about what they should do. As well as writing the message in the email box/space provided they also answered the questions at the side of the pictures, which was not necessary. A few candidates wrote more than the total word limit allowed and some lost marks as the correct answers were in the section beyond the word limit.

Section 2

Exercise 1 Question 17 - 22

The majority of candidates did very well in this Reading Comprehension Exercise. Most candidates scored highly and some gained full marks. However, there were some candidates who misunderstood **Question 18**, or perhaps read it without care, and answered with a period of time instead of the specific month.

Exercise 2 Question 23

Candidates were required to write 80-100 words about their school experience. A maximum mark of fifteen was available; ten marks awarded for communication by covering the points stated in the rubric and five marks for accuracy which based on the ticks given for the correct usage (verbs and 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, which affected their mark, especially on communication. There were also some who did not cover all the points required and therefore did not gain the full marks available: for example, on **Question C** some candidates did not elaborate their answer but simply gave a list of facilities without offering their opinion of the facilities. Most candidates wrote within the word limit and scored highly.

Section 3

Exercise 1 Question 24 - 29

On this section candidates were first asked to decide whether the statements based on the passage were true or false. They had to provide a correction if they thought the statement given was wrong. Correction was only required on a false statement.

On the whole, candidates did well, a large number obtaining high scores (8 marks and above) and only very few below 6 marks. The most problematic question was **Question 24**. Most candidates correctly labelled it 'false', but then offered an incomplete or ambiguous correction.

As in previous years, there were candidates who also gave explanations about the true statements, which was not necessary. Although it did not affect the mark, it will have affected their timing in completing the whole examination. Again, it is important for candidates to read the instructions carefully to avoid misunderstanding and unnecessary tasks.

Some candidates only answered the *true/false* section without correcting the *false* statement. This meant that they could only achieve a maximum of 6 marks. It is advisable for candidates to practice on previous examination papers to help them to understand the instructions and to familiarise themselves with the examination format in advance.

Exercise 2 Question 30 - 36

The exercise was a reading comprehension based on a story. Candidates generally did well and many scored highly. Where candidates did not gain maximum marks, this was often due to lack of attention to detail: for example, on **Question 36** many candidates interpreted the question generally rather than specifically based on the reading passage.



FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03
Speaking

General Comments

The overall standard was very high in this session, and there was only a very small number of candidates who obtained lower marks. As in the previous year, the majority of the examination Centres are based in Indonesia and most candidates seemed to have native or semi-native speaker ability, and therefore they were likely to do well. Despite this, there were some elements which prevented them from obtaining full marks due to the use of slang, dialects and also colloquial language, especially on the Topic and General Conversations, which should be carried out in formal language.

All Centres deserve credit for all their hard work and their success in conducting this oral examination. In general, Centres carried out the test well. All the effort involved in labelling and packaging cassettes/CDs is highly appreciated. However, in order to ensure the examination process and administration are carried out in accordance with the instructions, it is worth reminding all Examiners that it is essential to follow the instructions and requirements which are provided in the Teachers' Notes. Examiners need to read and follow the instructions given about all aspects, in order to be able to carry out the examination process well (e.g. on Role Plays, there should be no questions omitted, tasks should not be invented, the correct cues must be given, etc. On the Topic Discussion as well as General Conversation Examiners should ask plenty of questions to cover all the areas required, rather giving their own explanations or opinions). Examiners need to remember that the examination is aimed at measuring the candidates' linguistic abilities, and so the Examiner should talk less than the candidates. The candidates need to be active and should be given the maximum opportunity to speak and to express their linguistic ability.

Examiners also need to take care to complete the administrative arrangements in accordance with the guidelines specified in the Teachers' Notes. As in the previous year, there were some concerns regarding exam administration. Moderation can be difficult if, for example, there are any arithmetical errors (incorrect addition of marks), cassettes/CDs are not labelled, if each file is not labelled and introduced with the candidate's name and number, Role play numbers are not stated at the beginning of the recording, if candidate's names are not in order or are not in the same order as in the MS1, and especially if there is no Working Mark Sheet and/or MS1 to work from. Although most Centres completed all the requirements, there were a few Centres which did not send their Working Mark Sheet or filled it in incorrectly, and others did not send the copy of the MS1. Centres also need to double check the addition to avoid arithmetical error.

Overall, both Examiners and candidates executed the Role Plays realistically and worked hard on the discussions 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. Most candidates performed very well and seemed to enjoy taking part in the Role Plays. As in previous years, there were some Examiners who added more tasks to the ones provided by CIE in the Role Plays. This practice often disadvantages the candidates, as it confuses them and leads them to miss or not complete the specified tasks, resulting in lost marks. The Examiners need to remember to give full marks only if candidates do not complete the tasks specified by CIE. If all the specified tasks are completed then full marks should be given even when the candidates did not manage to complete the Examiner's added tasks. On the other hand, the full marks should not be given when candidates did not complete the tasks set by CIE even if they successfully completed the additional tasks invented by the Examiner.

It is important not to add more tasks or embellish the Role play as this will create confusion for the candidates and could also result in not completing the specified tasks. Clear points of communication – closely following the prompts given – are what is needed.

A. Role plays 1, 2 and 3: Candidate telephones a hotel to book a room

Most candidates did very well. As in the previous year, some candidates did not manage to score full marks due to missed/incomplete tasks, mostly caused by the Examiner's not giving the correct cues or not following the prompts given. Some Examiners added more tasks or created their own prompts and missed out the given prompts. Others gave the information before being asked by the candidate, which prevented the candidate from completing the task.

A. Role plays 4, 5 and 6: Candidate at a railway station to buy a ticket to Surabaya.

Most candidates scored highly. Again, candidates did not gain the full marks often due to incomplete tasks, caused mostly by incomplete prompts given by the Examiners. Examiners need to note that failure to provide correct cues or give the appropriate prompts could result in loss of marks. Therefore Examiners should follow the prompts given and 'nudge' candidates or rephrase the questions in order for candidates to complete the tasks and obtain full marks. For example, some candidates forgot to ask the arrival time of the train: in this situation the Examiner should prompt the candidate about whether she/he requires other information in order to give him/her the chance to obtain the marks available.

A. Role plays 7, 8 and 9: Candidate goes to a food store to buy food and drink for picnic.

In general, the candidates found no problem in visualising the situation and performed well in their role. Most candidates gained full marks; however, there were a few who missed the first task where they should have stated what they would like to do, which was buying some food and drinks for picnic. They skipped to the second task by asking the kind of juices available.

Similar to Role play A and the previous year, some candidates were unsuccessful in gaining full marks due again to the Examiner's not giving the correct prompts or missing the prompts given. Examiners should study the situation and the roles carefully to ensure there will not be any role-swapping or giving of information before it is asked for by candidates. Such situations can disadvantage candidates and prevent them from completing their tasks.

B. Role plays 1, 4 and 7: Candidate wants to go to the cinema with a friend but he/she is late. Candidate phones his/her friend.

The B role plays are intended to be a slightly more challenging and involve problem solving. Most candidates gained full marks, and candidates as well as the Examiners took their role seriously and realistically. However, as on the A Role PLays, some Examiners missed giving the prompts specified or did not let the candidates complete the tasks, or and created and added their own tasks, as well as talking more than they should. Occasionally, Examiners gave incorrect cues which prevented candidates from completing the tasks, e.g. instead of just saying "Baiklah, akan saya tunggu" ("Alright, I will wait for you"), the Examiners asking "Di mana kita akan bertemu?" ("Where are we going to meet up?"). This last should have been the question asked by the candidates: however, when it was completed by the Examiner, candidates lost their opportunity to ask the question and be awarded marks.

B. Role plays 2, 5 and 8: Candidate experiences a broken tooth, phones a dental clinic requested to visit the clinic immediately to see a dentist.

The majority of candidates as well as the Examiners performed well here. Both parties played their roles in a very realistic way that was entertaining and enjoyable to listen to.

The majority of candidates scored high marks and the few who did not manage to score highly are candidates who either omitted to complete the task three, where they were required to state their name and date of birth or omitted the whole task number four all together. Both of these were often due to incomplete or careless examining.

B. Role plays 3, 6 and 9: Candidate plans to give a surprise birthday party to his/her younger sibling. Candidate phones a friend.

Most candidates and Examiners kept to the outline of the script and performed as required. Candidates provided the information required and this caused no problems for most. However, there were a few Examiners who were carried away in the Role play, and as a result did not lead candidates to cover all the tasks.

Test 2: Topic (prepared) Discussion

As in previous years, the topics chosen were very broad and interesting to listen to. 'My ambitions' and 'Hobbies' were the most popular, as well as 'My Country' and other topics which sometimes were very ambitious and challenging. It was very clear that most candidates had a personal interest in the topic chosen and had really prepared for it. There were, however, a few candidates who sounded unprepared and others who were not given enough opportunity to express their linguistic abilities because the Examiners talked more than the candidates.

Overall, most candidates performed well and gained high scores. The majority of the Examiners were well prepared and conducted this section very well. Although there were a few Centres which did not include the 1-2 minutes topic presentation but went straight to discussion instead, and other Centres combined the two conversations together (topic discussion and general conversation), in general the conduct - including time-keeping - of most Centres was better than the previous year. Again, it is worth reminding Examiners they should always carefully read and follow the 'Teachers' Notes'.

As mentioned above, the choice of topics was varied and rather broader than in previous years. There were Centres where candidates seemed to choose more challenging topics (e.g. environmental issues, moral issues, etc.). This leads to more challenging questions, and it can disadvantage candidates, especially those whose knowledge of the issues/topics is limited even if their language skills are adequate. Examiners should beware of encouraging candidates to choose such topics. As mentioned in the Teachers' Notes, it is the candidates linguistic abilities/skills which are to be measured and not the candidates knowledge or other skills. Therefore, the marks should be based on the candidate's performance of their language and not the knowledge of the subject chosen.

There was also a great deal of Jakartan slang as well as the colloquial Indonesian and or English used. Examiners are advised to encourage candidates by example to use formal Indonesian language.

Test 3: General (unprepared) Conversation

In general most Examiners conducted this section very well, and as in the previous year most candidates scored highly. Topic conversations were varied and the typical areas covered were around the candidate's family life, studies, hobbies, plans for the future, and their general interests. Some Examiners used some of the information given in the topic to lead in to the general conversation. This is acceptable, provided these have 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 candidate's knowledge rather than measuring their language skills. This should not affect the candidate's marks and/or performance: however, if the questions were too challenging and candidates were not able to answer or to give the correct answer/s, this can affect the candidates' confidence and then their performance and marks obtained.

The allocation of time of five minutes was usually well managed by nearly all Examiners. However, there were some Examiners who did not fully utilise the time. Some Examiners used only one or two minutes of the time provided and did not ask more than two or three questions, or did not cover the three areas required. A small number of Examiners conducted this session as in the Topic (prepared) Discussion, where candidates have to present a presentation, which is not what is required in Test 3. Although most of the Examiners followed and completed the requirements, there were some who remain unfamiliar with the instructions and all are encouraged to read the Teachers' Notes and to familiarise themselves with the requirements, so as to assist candidates to demonstrate their full ability.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04
Continuous Writing

General comments

This year most candidates performed very well again, demonstrating their linguistic ability at this level. Very few of them showed a lower ability. These are the ones who in general have problems with basic spelling, grammar and vocabulary.

Quite a few candidates still used *Jakartan slang* and/or informal language (i.e. spoken language), which is unfortunately for them not acceptable for the exam (see examples below).

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 words limit.

There are still lots of examples of crossing out and hardly legible, tiny or untidy handwriting which can lead to a loss of marks for them.

General mistakes:

- The use of hyphens is quite important in Bahasa Indonesia therefore cannot be ignored:
 - Plural form: teman-teman, rumah-rumah, pohon-pohon etc.
 - Repeated form: **baik-baik**, **berjalan-jalan** etc.
 - To connect syllables or parts of a word that are separated **at the end of a line**:
..... **memberitahu-**
kan dokter hewan ...

..... kamu **baik-**
baik saja.

..... dokter hewan telah **di-**
beritahukan ... ('di-' with hyphen – prefix for passive voice)

As opposed to:
..... terletak **di**
seberang taman ... ('di' without hyphen - preposition)
- 'Ke' followed by numbers (to form ordinal numbers): **ulang tahun ke-16** etc.
- The mix of informal 'aku' (= I / me) with formal 'saya' and informal 'kamu' (= you) with formal 'Anda' in the same piece of writing.

e.g.: **Saya** juga ingin berwisata ke Bali sebagai hadiah dari orang tua **ku** (**aku**).
(I would also like to go on holiday in Bali as a birthday present from my parents.)

Apa kabar **Anda**? Saya harap **kamu** baik-baik saja.
(How are you? I hope you are well.)

- The use of first person plural (= we/us/our): **kita** (we/us/our, including the person we're talking to) as opposed to **kami** (we/us/our, excluding the person we're talking to).

- The use of slang:

bikin for **membuat** (= to make)

buat for **untuk** (= for)

kasih for **beri/memberi** (= to give)

e.g.: Saya akan **kasih** obat **buat bikin** anjing itu sembuh.

It should be:

Saya akan **memberi** obat **untuk membuat** anjing itu sembuh.

(I will give some medicine to make the dog better.)

biar for **supaya/agar**

e.g.: Anjing itu kuberi makan **biar** sehat.

It should be:

Anjing itu kuberi makan **supaya/agar** sehat.

(The dog was given food (by me) so that it will be healthy.)

pas for **ketika/waktu** (= when)

lagi/baru for **sedang** (= '-ing form', in the middle of doing something)

e.g.: **Pas** saya **lagi/baru** berjalan di taman ...

It should be:

Ketika/waktu saya **sedang** berjalan di taman ...

(While/when I was walking in the park ...)

ketemu for **bertemu/menemukan** (to see/meet or to find)

e.g.: Saya pasti akan **ketemu** anjing itu setiap bulan.

It should be:

Saya pasti akan **bertemu** anjing itu setiap bulan.

udah for **sudah** (= already)

e.g.: Saya **udah** tanya orang tua saya ...

It should be:

Saya **sudah** tanya orang tua saya ...

(I have already asked my parents ...)

aja for **saja** (= only/just)

e.g.: Jadi anjing itu saya bawa pulang **aja**.

It should be:

Jadi anjing itu saya bawa pulang **saja**.

(So I just took the dog home.)

sama for **dengan** (= with)

kapan for **waktu/ketika** (= when/while)

e.g.: **Kapan** saya berjalan di taman **sama** teman saya ...

It should be:

Waktu/ketika saya berjalan di taman **dengan** teman saya ...

(When/while I was walking in the park with my friend ...)

- The use of the suffix 'in' instead of 'kan'

e.g.: Aku minta **dibeliin** 'handphone' baru saja.

It should be:

Aku minta **dibelikan** 'handphone' baru saja.

- 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.: **diberikan** (= to be given - connected) as opposed to **di sekolah** (= at School - separated)

- Prepositions should be separated from the next words

e.g.: **ke sana** (to (go) there)

di sana (over there)

- The writing of possessive pronouns should be connected

e.g.: **ulang tahunku** (= my birthday) NOT **ulang tahun ku**

suratmu (= your letter) NOT **surat mu**

- The use of classifier **'se-'** (=a/an): **seekor** (for animals); **seorang** (for people); **sebuah** (for things) etc.
e.g.: **sebuah penjaga taman** should be **seorang penjaga taman** (= a park attendant)
sebuah anjing should be **seekor anjing** (= a dog)
- The words that should be or should not be written separately
e.g.: **apalagi** (= moreover – 1 word) NOT **apa lagi**
daripada (= than – 1 word) NOT **dari pada**
olahraga (= sport – 1 word) NOT **olah raga**

ulang tahun (= birthday – 2 words) NOT **ulangtahun**
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)
- The writing of ordinal numbers
e.g.: **'ke 15'** should be **'ke-15'** (= the 15th)
'ke enam belas' should be **'keenam belas'** (= the sixteenth)
- The use of abbreviations is not acceptable (Is this as a result of familiarity with text message language?)
e.g.: **'yg'** should be **'yang'** (= which)
'makanan2' should be **'makanan-makanan'** (= food pl) or **'guru2'** should be **'guru-guru'** (= teachers)
- The confusion between parts of speech
e.g.: Saya **hobi menyanyi**. (the use of a NOUN as a VERB)
It should be:
Hobi saya menyanyi. (= My hobby is singing.)

Saya harus **fokus** dalam kelas. (the use of a VERB as an ADJECTIVE)
It should be:
Saya harus **memfokuskan** diri dalam kelas. (= I have to focus myself in class.)
- More spelling problems
e.g.: **restoran** (= restaurant) NOT **restauran(t)**
film (film) NOT **filem**
pikir (= to think) NOT **fikir**
mal NOT **mall**
aktivitas (= activity) NOT **aktifitas**
izin (= permission) NOT **ijin**
etc.
- Incorporating borrowed words with Indonesian inappropriately
e.g.: **to print** → **'memprint'** should be **'mencetak'**
interior designer → **'interior desainer'** should be **'desainer interior'**
police station → **'stasiun polisi'** should be **'kantor polisi'**
etc.

Comments on specific questions

As was found last year, the questions were simultaneously accessible and suitably demanding, and none of them presented excessive difficulty for the candidates.

Question 1

Candidates had a choice of answering **1 (a)** or **1 (b)**. More of them chose **Question 1 (a)**, which was an informal letter to a friend. Fewer chose **Question 1 (b)**, which was a more formal report.

(a) *A letter to tell a friend about the writer's coming birthday (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 for writing a letter to a friend (informal). The ability to use the appropriate register also affects how marks for **General Impression** are given.

A few misunderstood the rubric and simply wrote a letter to a friend asking for his/her help or ideas for the birthday party.

For those who did not gain full marks, the most common error made was in answering the second point of this question (preparations for the birthday). Whilst most of them mentioned what they wanted to do for their birthday and who they were going to celebrate their birthday with, a few candidates failed to explain what actual preparations they were making for the celebration.

With regard to the **Language** skills, quite a few of them 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.
- Misspelling of '**Anda**' which was often incorrectly spelled as '**anda**' without a capital letter.
- Inaccurate use of Indonesian plural form when preceded by numerical adjectives such as '**banyak**' (= many), '**beberapa**' (= some) or '**kedua**' (both).
e.g.: '**teman-teman**' (= friends) or '**banyak teman**' (= many friends) or '**beberapa teman**' (= some friends) or '**kedua teman**' but NOT: '**banyak teman-teman**', '**beberapa teman-teman**' or '**kedua teman-teman**'.
- '**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, ...).

(b) *A report about what the writer wants to do when he/she finishes School (formal).*

Some candidates chose this topic. As a report, this writing is supposed to be more formal than a letter to a friend. However, some did not seem too sure about what language they were supposed to use, and employed quite informal language.

For the second point of the question (Why you chose that career), many answered: "Because I have always liked doing it since I was small." It makes sense if they chose to be a singer or a musician as their career for example (i.e. they have always liked singing or playing an instrument), but if they wanted to be a doctor or an architect, that answer seemed sometimes a little weak.

A few also misunderstood the second point of the question and spent most of their word allowance to explain why a certain career is or will become very important.

The third point of the question (What you have to do in order to pursue your career goals) was also rather problematic in the sense that quite a few of the candidates simply wrote a rather generic, undeveloped answer such as, "I will work hard." or "I will study hard.", hence also gaining fewer marks in **General Impression**.



Question 2

An explanation/description of what the writer would do if he/she found an injured dog in a park.

Very few candidates misunderstood the rubric or the question completely. A few avoided answering what 'he/she himself/herself' would do, instead 'delegating' somebody else to do it for them.

Common language mistakes included:

- Incorrect use of preposition '**ke**' instead of '**kepada**' when followed by a person as in '*... bertanya ke orang tua*' instead of the correct '*... bertanya kepada orang tua* (= asking **to** the parents)'.
ke
- Misspelling of words ending in '**-kan**' when used with suffix '**-nya**', e.g. '**memberikanya**' should be '**memberikannya**'
memberikanya
'**menamakanya**' should be '**menamakannya**'
menamakanya

