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## Overview

Chief Assessors’ reports give an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

## School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

All folios submitted for moderation met the requirements of the subject outline. Folios that ranged from three to five tasks — including at least one of each of Oral Interaction, Text Production, and Text Analysis — provided opportunities for students to produce work focusing on a variety of concepts and topics, and to respond to and be assessed by the full scope of the assessment design criteria.

It was pleasing to see that some teachers made very specific and explicit reference to the assessment design criteria when developing their task sheets for students, and when posing questions in the Text Analysis task(s). This provided every opportunity for students to respond according to the performance standards. It is important to note that while texts used in external assessments are pitched at an appropriate level for most Stage 2 students to analyse and comprehend, the respective questions provided are limited and may not fully meet the requirements of the folio if unchanged. Teachers are advised to adapt and develop their own questions that relate to the specific features of the Interpretation and Reflection assessment design criterion if selecting these texts for use in the folio.

In general, Text Production tasks covered a range of text types and ideas. The word count and criteria for these tasks varied from 250 to 400 words. This allowed students to express their ideas in depth and breadth, according to the requirements of the individual task.

Oral Interactions were generally well done and were well prepared. In order for students to achieve at the highest level, interactions must include a good amount of spontaneity rather than a rehearsed list of questions and answers or a presentation. The best interactions were those with a natural flow, with evident enthusiasm and interest in the topic, and which covered a range of topics and ideas in depth and breadth. Some interactions were solely between students, allowing them to demonstrate their ability to formulate questions and maintain and forge discussions on unfamiliar topics.

If students are presenting information prior to interacting with an audience, they must ensure that the total length of the task is within 5 and 7 minutes. If the presentation aspect is 5 minutes in length, 2 minutes leaves little time to adequately demonstrate interaction at an A level. Moderators do not listen to interactions beyond the time limit.

When submitting materials for moderation, it is requested that everything is clearly labelled and that an individual audio file is submitted for each student.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Three assessment tasks make up the in-depth study: an oral presentation, a written response in Indonesian, and a reflective response in English. As stated in the subject outline, each task must differ in context purpose and audience. It is pleasing to note that the majority of in-depth studies adhered to these requirements.

It can be difficult for moderators to confirm achievements when some aspects of the task design are unclear. Teachers should promote the difference of context, purpose and audience of the three tasks by incorporating this information in the individual task sheets.

The purpose of the in-depth study is to select and research concepts or topics in depth. The ‘umbrella’ topic of the in-depth study should remain the same throughout and this should relate to ‘The Indonesian-speaking Community’ or ‘The Changing World’. As in the past, environmental topics were popular. However, students and teachers are increasing their creativity and confidence in broadening their scope in selecting research topics and themes.

**Oral Presentation**

It is important to note that the requirements of this task are not the same as the oral interaction in Assessment Type 1: Folio. Students need only to present information for this task within the confines of a context, purpose, and audience; they do not need to respond to interaction-style questions.

On occasion, the content and ideas of the oral presentation were similar to that of the written response in Indonesian. Teachers are asked to make a clear distinction between the two tasks to allow students to achieve at the highest level.

Most tasks stayed within the time limit of 3 to 5 minutes.

**Written Response in Indonesian**

Written responses were generally very well done. The tasks conformed to the appropriate word length and students managed to compose pieces that demonstrated their in-depth understanding of their topic.

Students’ ability to express their ideas and opinions in Indonesian was impressive. They often used a range of linguistic structures and features accurately to achieve interest, cohesion, and flow in the piece. Where the audience was specified, students responded in a culturally and socially appropriate manner, for example, *beliau* when addressing the President.

**Reflective Response in English**

Moderators noted a vast improvement in student achievement for the reflective response in English. With continued efforts and focus on ensuring that students critically analyse and reflect on values, beliefs, practices, and ideas — both on the way this is presented in texts and how it affects them personally — it is possible to see greater improvement and achievement in this area.

## General

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. Teachers’ assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. Teacher grades/marks should be evident on all student school assessment work.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Oral Examination

Section 1: Conversation

Overall, students coped well with the discussion and were able to respond to most questions in some capacity. The majority of students performed highly, with many achieving results in the A band.

Ideas

Students were able to cover a range of topics, such as their plans for the future, local area, school, and family. The students who elaborated on topics were more successful. Only one student brought a photo to discuss for this section. This enhanced the conversation as it provided a springboard for discussion. Photos used in this way are a good way of engaging the audience; however, limiting the number of photographs to one or two is advisable. Students need to be ready to discuss the ideas they bring up. For example, if they mention an experience, they need to be prepared to be able to elaborate on that experience (what, where, when, how, who with), as these are questions they can naturally be expected to be asked. Stronger responses gave life to a topic, with the student sharing what they thought about it and how it impacted on them or what they gained from an experience. The school topic responses generally lacked detail. Many students struggled to reflect on their school or elaborate on their answers and instead listed some prepared responses. There were, however, some detailed responses and students who managed to give an elaborate picture of their school life.

Expression

The stronger responses contained a range of language to enhance expression, for example,*pada pihak lain*, *maksud saya*, *bukan main*, and *melainkan juga*. Weaker responses displayed mistakes with word order, confusion of verbs and nouns, or incomplete sentences, for example, *saya olahraga*, *paling suka saya pelajaran* *Bahasa Indonesia*.

Most students who began sentences with a noun experienced difficulty because of the need for the passive voice. Common errors were ‘*orang yang saya bekerja dengan*…’, ‘*topik-topik yang saya belajar*…’, ‘*apa yang saya memikir paling sulit*…’ or ‘*sumber yang saya menggunakan adalah*…’. This of course did not impede meaning but highlighted the need to practise this grammar function when speaking. However, there were some students who showed the ability to use the passive voice in conversation.

Students who were well prepared and able to respond to questions that were not taken from exemplar questions were most successful. Their answers were very natural, and backed up with justification, clarification, and elaboration. Strong responders could adjust their response based on the stimulus from the examiner.

Some students struggled to understand questions that may have been worded differently to the way they had experienced in class. Most were able to ask for clarification using strategies in Bahasa Indonesia, which was positive. It is advisable to expose students to a range of questioning on the same topics, so that they can be prepared for a range of examiners. Students need to be aware that different examiners may begin differently. They might, for example, let the student know that the interview will be recorded. It would be useful to be prepared for this so as not to be surprised.

Most students understood questions immediately but some required a second question to expand on responses or prompting from the examiner. Some misinterpreted questions or words used in questions, for example, *belajar* instead of *bekerja*. The obvious remedy for this is practise, using a variety of questions in class.

There was a varied display of strategies to enhance conversation, including *seperti saya katakan tadi*, *sebagai contoh*, *maksud saya*, *dapat dikatakan bahwa*, *tidak dapat disangkal bahwa*,and *hanya karena*. However, some relied on ‘*maaf*’ in all of its uses rather than using other phrases for clarification, or perhaps the use of ‘*maksud saya*’ to self-correct or clarify.

It was positive to see students acknowledge the question, then answer or elaborate. For example,in answering a question that begins, ‘*Apakah Anda mau*…’ they might answer, ‘*Ya, mau…apa yang mau saya lakukan…*’ or in responding to a clarifiying question they might use ‘*Betul Bu, Pak,* …’.

Pronunciation was generally good. Some areas for improvement include rehearsed incorrect pronunciation of certain words, for example, *kesukaran* instead of *kesukaan*, ‘*key*’ instead of ‘*ke*’, over-stressing the ‘e’ in *karena*, and adding ‘er’ to words, such as *sayer* (*saya*) and *bekerjer* (*bekerja*). Students generally spoke clearly and planned their answers thoughtfully. Background speakers occasionally used colloquial language but it was good to see self-correction, showing awareness. Many students struggled to produce the trill of the ‘r’ required in Indonesian, as is generally common.

Section 2: Discussion

Students performed well in this section and the variety of topics chosen was interesting, showing thought and consideration. Again, the majority of students achieved highly in this section. The most successful responses were obviously well prepared, backed by a variety of sources of information including Indonesian sources, and were regarding topics of real interest to the student.

Ideas

The discussion section requires students to not only share what they have discovered about their chosen topic, but also to reflect on the journey of the learning and share how the learning has impacted them. By doing this, students can be very successful at the performance standards of creating impact and interest and engaging the audience, while ‘reflecting on how cultures, values, beliefs, practices, and ideas are represented or expressed in texts’, and ‘recognising and explaining connections between their own values, beliefs, practices and ideas’. This was demonstrated effectively by students who had linked their topic with something they were passionate about, interested in, or that was related to something else they had learned and wanted to pursue in more depth. When asked why they chose this topic, these students gave elaborate detail and justification.

There were a range of topics chosen, for example, smoking, drugs, ‘*jilbab*’ fashion, surfing, water pollution, street children, bullying, the impact of tourism on Balinese culture, and endangered animals. Most students were able to convey the point they wanted to make about their topic and could discuss the process of their research, citing resources used and explaining why or how they came to be studying this topic. Some, however, were limited in their ability to expand on ideas and give examples, which gave a less successful response.

The In-depth Study form that is used by students to outline the main points they wanted to cover was generally a very useful resource for examiners and certainly allowed the student to share as much as possible of their research. It is very important for this outline to be well-considered so that students are able to talk about the points they have mentioned and recognise in Bahasa Indonesia the key words they have written in English on the sheet, for example, *manfaat* (benefits) or *kebudayaan* (culture). It is recommended that students not put ‘sources I used’ as one of the points. This is does not allow for as much discussion as other ideas. Examiners may also ask if there is anything else they might like to add, and students need to be prepared for this, whether or not they have something to add.

Expression

Some students didn’t pick up on the word ‘*penelitian*’ for ‘research’ when asked about their research topic. Some used the word incorrectly or used incorrect word order: ‘*saya penelitian tentang*’ where the intention may have been ‘*saya meneliti’* or *‘penelitian saya*’. Another word that many students did not recognise was ‘*dampak*’. It is important to expose the students to common words which might be used in an inquiry about their topic, such as *dampak*, *manfaat*, *guna*, *bermanfaat*, *berguna*, *keadaan*, and *kesulitan*.

Expression was generally clear and very effective. Some students confused nouns with verbs, for example, *pelajaran/belajar***,** *bekerja/belajar*, ‘*kuatir tentang berbahaya*’. Mistakes were common when students were using the passive voice, for example, ‘*Pariwisata dihancurkan lingkungan*’, ‘*Pemerintah harus ditutupi kebun binatang*’, and ‘*anak dibeli rokok*’. Other areas of error were confusion with *tidak/belum*, *waktu/kalau*, and *kalau/apakah*. Some students use ‘*kamu*’ like they do in English, for example, ‘*Kalau kamu mengunjungi Bali*…’ (‘If you go to Bali…’). It is necessary to advise students to explore other ways of saying this while explaining that the way we express something in English may not be transferrable to Indonesian, as well as the possibility that an expression like this may be confused for inappropriately addressing the examiner. Stronger students were able to self-correct when they realised they had made an error.

Interpretation and Reflection

Stronger responses discussed topics in confident depth and well prepared students were able to cope with questions which differed from those in the exemplars. These students could handle ‘follow-on’ questions, and discuss resources used and evaluate their usefulness rather than simply stating they used ‘the Internet’. It was evident that some students only used English resources, which restricts the possibility of learning relevant language for their topic. Those who used Indonesian sources like newspaper articles and interviews clearly benefited from this.

Some were able to make connections between texts and share how they were able to extract useful information. Many students were able to identify what they found interesting or had learned from a topic, and stronger students were able to state the challenges they had faced and how they overcame those. A clear lack of preparation did hinder some students, as they had little to draw on and discuss.

Students conveyed interest but more depth in reflection could be explored. What surprised them? What worried them? What interested them? How did it surprise them? What do they know now, that they didn’t know before? Did this topic allow them a fresh view of something they had already learned?

Few students used photos or realia for this section, yet these were used effectively and in an engaging manner.

It can be said that genuine interest, ranging from curiosity to excitement, was conveyed by all of the students about their topics, which was great.

Written Examination

In 2014, 58 students across South Australia and the Northern Territory sat the Indonesian (continuers) examination. Overall, the standard of work produced was solid and teachers are to be congratulated for their endeavours to prepare these students throughout the year and for the examination. This year saw an increased understanding of the requirements by the students, and a clear attempt to meet the performance standards. The quality of student work across all sections was sound.

Achievement in the written examination showed that students were generally prepared and had reached a competent level of Bahasa Indonesia which could be used to demonstrate their understanding of each section.

This year in general Section 1 (Listening), Section 2 (Reading and Responding A), and Section 4 (Writing) were handled well.

Section 3 (Reading and Responding B) proved to be the most challenging for a number of students.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

Overall, the content of the listening texts was accessible to most students, and they were able to identify key features of each text. Some students struggled when more specific detail or supporting evidence from the texts was required. It is important for students to justify their answers where required. To prepare for this part of the examination, students need exposure to a range of voices speaking in Bahasa Indonesia, and practise extracting information from a range of audio texts.

Question 1

Students were generally successful in identifying a variety of strategies used to attract the listener. Most were able to identify what characteristics were needed from entrants to the competition.

Question 2

This was a question requiring answers about strategy and tone. Most students handled both of these requirements well, explaining a variety of strategies used by the boy to get *bakso*. Many students noted repeated word use by the boy (‘*Bu, bu, bu*…’) as a reason/strategy to get his mother onside, the fact that he had run out of money, his extreme hunger, his information about *bakso* being nutritious, and his feelings about the *pembantu* not being able to cook *bakso* as well.

Students used an assortment of adjectives to describe the tone of the text, for example, whiney, desperate, and persuasive. This showed there is a good understanding among students and teachers about ‘tone’, or what could be seen as the writer or speaker’s attitude, bias, or personality.

Students were generally able to use key features of the text to justify their understanding of the meaning in texts. Many students were able to identify the register of the text, note that it was an informal conversation, and give some justification as to why they came to this conclusion, such as *aku* rather than *saya*. Beyond this, justifying their answer using evidence from the text was challenging for some. Evidence could have included the context, which was between a mother and son about food and the loving, friendly banter between them.

Question 3

Overall this was very successfully handled, with most students gaining high marks. The question required students to identify six pieces of information about *Bu Lina*, and to describe the relationship between the two speakers. Most students could identify at least four pieces of information in part (a).

In part (b) most students could identify the relationship between the two speakers, note the register of the text being formal, and cite terms of address used and the tone and context (an interview between applicant and future boss) of the text as evidence.

Question 4

This text proved most difficult for students even though it was a shorter text. They had difficulty identifying information in detail, with many general comments being provided in their answers about weather. Many students struggled to identify the time and numbers that were required to answer part (b). Very few were able to give a specific time or number of degrees. Many students were only able to give an overview of the important information the speaker gave about Jakarta. The specifics were quite often missed or incorrect, for example, the description of weather or the time difference.

Question 5

Fewer students gained full marks for this question. Most identified a possible audience for the text but few justified their answer. When the audience suggested was not quite appropriate, an explanation would have supported the answer.

Most could record a few of the reactions of the two presenters to the movie. Most were able to identify the message at the end of the text, which was to support Indonesian films.

Section 2: Reading and Responding Part A

Question 6

Generally this question was handled well, with around 75% of students gaining 4/7 marks or above. The majority of students identified the relationship between the two people in the letter correctly and were able to give supporting evidence from the text.

Part (b), which asked why Tari was proud of her success, proved difficult for quite a number of students who struggled to determine the reasons, which all related to her winning the poetry competition even though she struggled with writing poetry and felt that her language was poor. There were quite a few students who thought that the library was not yet built. Some students answered as if the library was going to be built because the student won the poetry contest. This showed that they were identifying key information, but not identifying tense.

Question 7

The majority of students provided successful responses to this question which was about the possibility of the ‘*Angkringan*’ in Yogyakarta becoming a thing of the past. Most students were able to identify what an ‘*angkringan*’ was based on the context in which it was used, a place to gather socially, eat, and chat. Few students relied on the literal dictionary meaning only.

Most students were successful in answering part (a), identifying the use of rhetorical questions as a technique used by the author to engage the audience. Others cited the sentimental nature of the text, evoking memories in the reader.

Part (b) was more of a challenge, and students needed to compare and contrast the different opinions of the teenagers with those of the older generation. At times responses were very brief (an overview or summary), but did not go into detail where detail was required. It is a useful exercise to look at the marks indicated and then determine how many facts might be needed to gain those marks.

For part (c), over 95% of students successfully suggested an alternative title in Indonesian for the article and were able to explain in English the reason for their answer.

Section 2: Reading and Responding Part B

This text was feedback from a disgruntled customer on a Safari Park Website. It required students to imagine that they had a more positive experience and to write a positive review that addressed those of the disgruntled customer and included their own experience. Understanding of the text in this section was generally good but there was confusion with how to tackle the response. Despite this being the section students found most challenging, 30% achieved in the A band, 29% achieved in the B band, and 37% achieved in the C band.

Ideas

Nearly all students responded in sufficient length with good ideas and expression.

Many students did not seem confident in writing a review of this kind. Students tended to answer Soewarno (the disgruntled customer) or respond directly to him. Some produced emails to Soewarno or a dialogue from the perspective of a worker. Stronger responses drew upon imagined experiences and wove them together to negate Soewarno’s response without making it personal. The confusion in responses indicates that students did not read the question carefully. It is suggested that students make sure they are clear about what is being asked, who their audience is, what their purpose is, and what style they need to write in, before they begin. A mind map or plan before writing is invaluable.

It is important also to expose students to a variety of purposes, audiences, texts, and styles for writing and to provide opportunities to practise. In this case they were writing a review in a public forum in which they could disagree with the disgruntled customer and provide their own experience. Dot points like the original text or continuous prose were both valid methods of responding. Deciding how to respond proved confusing for many students. It is recommended that students are exposed to online reviews while they are learning about text types, to support them to respond to questions like this.

The ideas in responses, the depth and breadth of the content, and elaboration and support of opinions were varied. Weaker responses were limited to negating the points made by Soewarno whereas stronger responses elaborated on ideas by including a more holistic, constructively critical/positive review of the Safari Park. The strongest responses justified statements and opinions.

Expression

Expression was generally good, even when the audience and purpose were not correct.

Some common spelling errors were *taman* being confused with *teman*, *bingatang* (*binatang*), *berkarta* (*berkata*), *karna/karana/kerna* (*karena*), *untunk* (*untuk*), *de* (*di*), *siyang* (*siang*), and *kedang-kedang* (*kadang-kadang*). Word order was an issue also (e.g. *ada tidak*; *makan rumah*). In weaker responses there was incorrect selection of words from the dictionary,for example, *patah* vs *rusak*, and confusion between nouns and verbs. Stronger responses manipulated cohesive devices and varied structures to maintain engagement and interest. Some conjunctions were over-used and therefore lost emphasis and power, for example, ‘*bukan main…*’.

Section 3: Writing in Indonesian

Overall, students coped well with this task. Students were generally careful about making sure their writing was relevant to what the task was asking of them (e.g. the style, purpose, audience, and context), although there was a small number of students whose writing was not consistent with a clear text type.

Question 9 was chosen most frequently, and required students to write an email about a family holiday in Indonesia. Students conveyed a sense of enjoyment writing this response.

Question 10 required students to write the text of a speech persuading the audience of the best place to live in Australia.

Question 11 required students to write an article for the Indonesian community newsletter about the positive impact studying Indonesian has had on the student, as well as why it is important to study Indonesian.

The aversion to questions 10 and 11 may point to a lack of confidence in students with writing these text types. Therefore it is advised that students have opportunities throughout the year to gain confidence through practice in writing a variety of text types.

Students are reminded not to use names, teacher names, or school names in their writing.

Ideas

Strong responses showed depth, relevance, ideas that were well developed, detail, and elaboration. Weaker responses diverted from the topic and did not address the points that needed to be discussed. They also did not take up opportunities to elaborate on points they had made, and instead made simple statements.

Expression

Expression was generally sound and students did well to write correctly in Indonesian most of the time with a good command of grammar. There were some common errors, even in the stronger responses. Some of those noted were:

* noun/verb confusion
* word order issues
* mixing *aku* and *saya* throughout their writing
* confusion with *bersenang-menyenangkan*, *berjalan-perjalanan*
* *menarik-tertarik pada/akan*
* *saya harapan-saya berharap*.

Students are reminded to utilise a range of grammar functions to demonstrate their ability in the language, for example, understanding the specific function of nouns and verbs and their function/meaning in a sentence. There were opportunities for the natural use of the passive voice, which were missed by students, indicating a possible lack of confidence in using this tool.
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