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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.

Fifty-two students sat the Indonesian (continuers) examination in 2015 across South Australia and the Northern Territory. Students performed slightly better in their school assessment compared to their external assessment. Teachers are to be acknowledged for the work they have done throughout the year to provide opportunities for students to perform at their best in all of the assessment components for Indonesian (continuers).

## School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

All folios submitted for moderation met the requirements of the subject outline. Folios ranging from three to five tasks, including at least one of each of the oral interaction, text production, and text analysis, provided opportunities for students to respond to a variety of concepts and topics and to be assessed using the full scope of the performance standards.

Students appeared to meet the requirements of the task and achieve better outcomes when task sheets specified the context, purpose, and audience and were specifically referenced to the specific features of the assessment design criteria by which the task was being assessed.

Of some concern was the number of text analysis tasks using past examination texts and their questions from the reading and responding sections without any additions or changes. It is important to note that while texts used in external assessments are pitched at an appropriate level for Stage 2 students to comprehend and analyse, the respective questions provided are limited and may not fully meet the requirements of the folio if unchanged. Also, the level of analysis possible may also be limited, as the text itself is of appropriate length for examination conditions. It is absolutely critical that teachers use the performance standards when designing text-analysis tasks, specifically when posing questions about a text, to provide opportunity for the students to address the criteria as described by the performance standards in specific features IR1 and IR2 at the A grade band.

Furthermore, texts and questions selected from Reading and Responding, Part B, in past examinations prompt very little analysis and reflection from students. Rather, these tasks align more so with the requirements and standards expected of text-production tasks. Teachers are encouraged to think more critically about tasks for text analysis and the criteria by which they are assessed to ensure that the requirements of the task align with both the purpose and the criteria.

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 variation allowed students to express their ideas in depth and breadth, according to the requirements of the individual task.

Oral interactions were generally well prepared and were well done. In order for students to achieve at the A grade, interactions must include a good amount of spontaneity, rather than a rehearsed list of questions and answers or a long presentation. Where a presentation is included, only the work presented in the 5 to 7 minutes is reviewed. If the presentation aspect is 5 minutes in length, then the remaining 2 minutes leaves little time to adequately demonstrate interaction at an A grade. Moderators will not listen to interactions beyond the time-limit specified in the subject outline.

The most successful interactions had a natural flow, showed evident enthusiasm and interest in the topic, and covered a range of concepts and ideas in depth and breadth. Successful interactions also focused on the students and allowed them to demonstrate what they know and can do, rather than the interlocutor dominating the conversation.

Some interactions were solely between students, allowing them to demonstrate their ability to formulate questions and maintain and forge discussions on unfamiliar topics. However, caution must be taken when doing so because students may not be provided an opportunity to extend themselves if their counterparts have limited ability to engage in the interaction and to formulate questions of a spontaneous nature.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Three assessment tasks make up the in-depth study: an oral presentation in Indonesian, 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 and be supported by evidence of research, interpretation, analysis, and preparation. As also stated in the subject outline, the in-depth study must arise from the themes of the Indonesian-speaking communities or the changing world; thus the in-depth study must have an explicit connection with Indonesia. It is pleasing to note that the majority of in-depth studies adhered to these requirements.

It is easiest for moderators to confirm achievements in the in-depth study when all aspects of the task design are stated clearly on the task sheet(s). 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 about the Indonesian-speaking communities or the changing world. The umbrella topic of the in-depth study should remain the same throughout, with each task providing students with an opportunity to demonstrate their understanding, interpretation, and analysis of the concept, aspect, or subtopic in a different manner. As in the past, environmental topics were popular. However, students and teachers are becoming increasingly creative and confident in broadening their scope in selecting research topics and themes. Topics included, but were not limited to: Indonesia’s annexation of Timor-Leste, uses of *jamu*, the perception of Islam in the media, livestock trade between Indonesia and Australia, performing arts, *kopi luwak* trade, and architecture for geographical and cultural positioning.

*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.

The best responses were when students presented their informative interpretations, analysis, and reflections on their topic in a creative, confident, and engaging manner, demonstrating their own interest and promoting interest from their audience.

Most tasks stayed within the 3–5 minute time-limit.

*Written Response in Indonesian*

Written responses were generally very well done. The tasks conformed to the appropriate word-count 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 their piece. Where the audience was specified, students responded in a culturally and socially appropriate manner.

*Reflective Response in English*

As in the past, moderators noted some outstanding reflective pieces in the body of work presented, as well as work with little or no evidence of reflection. Teachers are encouraged to remind students that the reflective response is just that, reflective, not a recount of the process students undertook to complete the in-depth study.

Students should select an in-depth study topic that allows for reflection on cultures, values, beliefs, practices, and ideas represented in texts, and also personal reflection on their own values, beliefs, practices, and ideas.

The more successful responses included some analysis and evaluation of the texts studied, as well as the impact the texts had on the students’ own learning.

Annotated examples of reflective responses can be found on the Indonesian (continuers) minisite and should be used by teachers and students to ensure that the requirements of this task are fully understood.

**External Assessment**

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Teachers are encouraged to provide some time during the year for preparation for the various sections of the oral and written examinations. For example, Conversation and Discussion, Listening and Responding, Reading and Responding A and B, and Writing.

Oral Examination

Section 1: Conversation

Students generally coped well with the conversation and were able to answer most questions in a way that demonstrated their level of proficiency in Indonesian.

Ideas

All students were able to contribute to the conversation about a range of topics. There was a great variety between students’ ability to maintain a rich conversation. This was due to the variety in the level of preparedness of the students. The distinction between the more successful and less successful conversations came with the following points:

* The less successful conversations had simple, superficial responses, for example, *Ya, saya suka membaca*, instead of expanding into details such as what type of book they might like to read, and so on.
* The less successful conversations had only one or two points, for example, concerning facilities in their school, rather than a discussion of the details of a range of facilities, and how the benefitted of them.
* The more successful conversations had a wealth of knowledge to share, for example, about where to go if the student went to Indonesia and what they might wish to see, do, and experience, compared to simply mentioning Bali or Jakarta and being unable to say why.
* The more successful conversations had students taking control by being willing and keen to expand on their ideas, compared to being unable to do this, and therefore relying on the next question being accessible.
* Examiners noted increased engagement when students elaborated on their answers, creating a student-generated take on familiar topics.
* Poorly prepared students struggled to bring engaging content to the conversation, whereas this is where the better prepared students were able to really show off their language resources.
* Less successful students latched onto key words in questions which sometimes led to irrelevant answers, instead of showing competent understanding of questions.

It is recommended that students prepare well for possible topics, practise extensively, and consider what else they can bring to the conversation. They need to be able to elaborate on their answers and engage the examiners.

Some students had photos to supplement their conversations and these were good conversation starters. However, some students were unable to answer questions asked about their photos, instead ignoring the question and presenting a memorised statement about them. This meant that the examiners were unable to gain more information through questioning and therefore the breadth of the student answer was lacking.

Students need to be given sufficient opportunity to practise listening to and responding to questions delivered in a variety of forms, so that they are not thrown by a question which diverts from what they are used to.

Expression

Pronunciation was generally good and students pronounced words like *ke*, *karena*, and *warna* correctly. Object-focus construction on the whole was not handled well, particularly for first person, and students generally stayed in the active voice.

It is recommended that, to maintain as natural and interactive a conversation as possible, eye contact should be a priority. This engages the interlocutor. Strategies to ask for help were evident and well handled by most students; however, some students resorted to English for this. It needs to be stated that students must avoid using English during the examination. It is a useful skill to be able to ‘talk one’s way out of’ a tricky situation and this needs to be practised by students.

Many students displayed a lack of understanding of the different forms of words and when to use them, e.g. *pelajaran/belajar*, *pekerjaan/bekerja*, and *menarik/tertarik akan*. Misuse of *adalah* was evident, e.g. *ya, saya adalah sedih*. Explicit teaching of parts of speech is a useful strategy to address this.

It was noted that there was a correlation between ability and confidence. Lack of accuracy affected confidence levels. Preparation and practice are essential.

Some students lacked relevant vocabulary for particular topics. Students with a larger bank of vocabulary were able to offer more depth in their responses.

Whether or not answers were lengthy, coherence and structure were generally good.

Section 2: Discussion

Students did not perform as well in this section. The most successful responses were better prepared, showed evidence of a variety of sources used, and showed a high degree of reflection.

Ideas

In addition to those in-depth study topics mentioned in the school assessment section above, there were a range of other topics this year that demonstrated depth and breadth in the treatment of ideas, including comparing strategies for saving tigers by two different organisations, various ethnic ceremonies, the status of women in Indonesia, spirituality, media and advertising, family planning, *anjal*, Timor-Leste, obesity, the Balinese perspective on schoolies’ week, and palm oil.

A number of students brought in artefacts and images to show and discuss which enhanced their one-minute introductory presentation. It is recommended that students who bring in an object are able to discuss it at length.

Students who tackled an issue were able to deliver a broader perspective on their topic compared with students who chose a narrower topic.

Teachers need to note that students who have the same topic for their study (e.g. a class topic) need to have a different focus, by distinguishing their focus from the other students.

A lack of preparedness seemed to contribute to students not performing as well in this part. Many students had difficulty talking about the points on their in-depth study sheet, or were unable to elaborate further on each point or give examples. Many students lacked the vocabulary to discuss their research, therefore resorting to saying *saya tidak tahu* or *maaf*. A general observation was that many students struggled to answer when asked ‘Tell me about your in-depth study’.

Students who are less confident may consider the opportunity to use the one-minute introduction for their topic.

Expression

Due to the more complex and research-driven nature of the vocabulary needed for this part of the examination, students really need to have committed their subject-specific words to memory, and be able to deliver them when needed. Many were able to convey the content accurately. Some students resorted to using base words to convey their ideas. It is to be noted that even though many words that students discover throughout their study are derived from English, it is important to pronounce them correctly in Indonesian, e.g. *ekonomi*, *industri*, and *tradisional*.

With questions, some students were unable to pick up key words like *pendapat*, *kesulitan*, and *sumber*. When examiners diverted from the sample questions, many students struggled to understand the question. The ability to handle this situation is a distinguishing factor. Many students relied heavily on stimuli from the examiner; however, the more spontaneous conversations offered natural answers, not rehashing the examiners’ question, which is often unnecessary.

It is important to note that use of sophisticated language is important in both the conversation and discussion sections of the examination and is not confined to the written examination.

Interpretation and Reflection

Although this is an area of great opportunity for students, many were not able to use it. Many could not cite the sources they used, nor comment on their usefulness. Many students were unable to give their own opinions on the topic, nor answer why the topic was important or interesting for them.

There is opportunity here for students to engage the examiners, even teach them, about what they have learned. Students have a willing and keen audience. It is a chance to share the revelations they have had from their own perspective. Some students did this very well, others superficially.

The more successful responses had references to texts used, the challenges faced in translation, and the victories the student had in the growth of new vocabulary. The student expressed interest in their topic, especially if the topic came from an area of interest for themselves. They were able to make comparisons with their own experience and express their ideas in a sophisticated manner. Some were even able to show how their in-depth study might enhance or contribute to an area of their future.

Written Examination

Most students were able to access the content of the written examination and answer in a way which allowed them to show their ability in Bahasa Indonesia.

Section 1: Listening and Responding

Many students were able to answer most questions in this section to some degree. More successful answers contained references to the text and appropriate detail, and elaborated if required by the question.

Students should not assume that the marker will understand the points they write, if they are too general. Students need to be specific in the detail they use, to ensure their point is made clearly. Students should also remember that any notes they make in the boxes need to be transferred to the answer section in order for them to be counted in the answer.

Question 1

This question was answered quite successfully.

1. To be most successful, students needed to identify that the relationship between Santi and Heri was in some way familiar. They needed to explain that names were used, *kamu* was used, and base words were used, indicating a more formal tone. Most students were able to identify the relationship and justify this with some information.
2. The most successful answers here stated that Heri needed to bring drinks including juice, for seven people to Santi’s house tomorrow. Many did this; however, some students let themselves down by summarising information rather than being specific using the actual details from the text.

Question 2

Students showed a good understanding of this text.

1. The most successful answers stated that the type of person who is likely to buy the product Silko were cat owners, people who deal with or love cats, or someone who wants the best for their cat, and gave reasons from the text for this answer.
2. Four selling points of the product needed to be identified for the 2 marks. Most students could identify at least two and some tried to make a point stretch into more than one. Possible points were: twelve special ingredients; six different flavours; makes cats’ fur silky; delicious; no ordinary food; your cat will love you.

Question 3

Generally, students struggled with this text, with a number achieving zero marks.

1. Responses to this question needed to include that it was a gossip or celebrity news segment, or a ‘what’s happening in the celebrity world’ segment, evidenced by a radio announcer enjoying the gossip and the news stemming from fans who had seen the celebrities shopping together. Most students inferred that it was radio gossip; however, some named the segment instead of stating what type of segment it was. Few were able to support their answer with evidence from the text.
2. Students needed to identify the attitude of the speaker toward the breaking news, then justify their answer with reference to the text. Possible answers included curious (excited about the information and asks questions at the end), sarcastic (the doubt about the seriousness of this relationship as Mas Rivan is single ‘again’ and asks if it is possible he has found his soulmate, implying that he goes from one relationship to another), joking or light-hearted (laughs and asks ‘where’s my invitation?’), or enthusiastic or excited (similar answers as above). The most successful answers contained detailed information from the text, offering a detailed description of the attitude of the speaker and justifications for this.

Question 4

Students also struggled with this text, with a number achieving zero marks.

1. Most students identified that the news was that the company Sinar Gunung would provide (donate) solar lighting for the community’s oval. Some missed the solar lighting and instead just mentioned the oval’s popularity.
2. This part required the students to mention the letter from 10-year-old Siti asking for help, how she mentioned healthy choices for her community with recreation availability if lighting was given, and how impressed the company was with Siti’s bravery in writing the letter. Some students missed that it was a letter from Siti which motivated the speaker. Some heard the word ‘son’. Many included the content of the letter, indicating good listening skills.

Question 5

This text allowed students to perform best.

1. Most students answered this question correctly, that the text was in a classroom setting.
2. The duration of the course was 3 days, from Monday to Wednesday. Some students misheard this, indicating numbers revision is needed.
3. Many could not list four points the teacher emphasised to encourage students to attend, instead only listing one to three points. The points could include: focusing on the necessary examination skills; convenient location; free to attend; the teacher wanted them to attend; native speakers to practise with; and the teacher would take the emailing of the forms out of their hands.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part A

Question 6

Many students struggled to extract enough information from this text, which was a journal entry about experiencing floods in Jakarta, with most achieving around 4 or 5 marks out of a possible 8.

1. This question required the student to list the emotions expressed in the text, and to give examples from the text to support the answer. Possible answers included upset/frustrated/disappointed/regretting the trip (travelled a long way to visit Jakarta and wants to see and do a lot but can’t because of the floods; wants to eat *bakso* but may have to postpone that; couldn’t visit other areas of Java because trains and other transport have been cancelled), appreciative (of the experience; while at the centre wants to go home but ends up finding value and joy; liking the experience), amazement (at what is witnessed). Most handled this question well, generally focusing on the more negative emotions. The positive emotions were mostly missed. Some wrote about the emotions of the Indonesian people, confusing the fact that it was a journal, and the emotions being expressed would be from the writer’s point of view.
2. Most students successfully answered this question, citing that the writer wanted to see the sights of Jakarta and the tourist attractions (listing them), try *bakso* from a street vendor, and see other parts of Java using public transport.
3. This question was generally handled with a lack of depth. Students talked in general terms, guessing how a flood might affect a city. Possible points to include, based on the text, were: no street traders in the streets; no people in the streets as roads have been blocked by rising flood waters; traffic lights stopped working so traffic affected; school being used for an evacuation centre, not a school; no public transport available; and *Monas* filled with brown water and rubbish.

*Question 7*

This text was handled better than Text 6 by students, with a high percentage achieving 5 or 6 marks out of a possible 7.

1. Students mostly identified the register of the text, justifying their answer with the use of *Anda*. Many missed the use of *apakah*, and the use of full verbs.
2. Most students stated the benefits of acting in films according to Dewi, mentioning shooting in exotic locations with natural beauty, escaping the busy city, interesting characters, and storylines full of action.
3. This question was also handled well, with students mentioning Dewi having to go to the gym five times a week to prepare, getting up early to memorise the script, eating healthily and nutritiously, and being away from her family as reasons Dewi finds her job difficult.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part B

The text requiring response for Question 8 was an article about the life of a bike courier in Jakarta. It required students to write a blog post as a university student who works for the courier company. They needed to evaluate the points mentioned in the article.

Ideas

Students who attempted the task wrote with sufficient length and wrote responses of a good standard. It was evident that students were not confident writing a blog post on the whole, with many recounting what was in the text only, without a personal perspective. Some even wrote their response like a job interview, and many focused on Dede, the bike courier in the article, like a story, or a ‘where are they now?’. Also present as responses were letters and articles.

A blog post needs a heading, with personal, informal language. It needs to keep the reader in mind, in this case advising about the pros and cons of courier work in Jakarta for this company.

Most responses engaged the audience with their ideas and the better responses showed a good understanding of the requirements of the task, addressing all points in the article. They also developed their ideas and provided explanations for the ideas and the opinions they expressed.

Copying large blocks of text occurred in many responses, indicating a need for making sure that students understand how to reorganise the information they read and to build their own ideas into their response to make it their own.

Less successful responses identified key ideas but did not develop them adequately to provide depth to the text they created.

Expression

The language used in most responses was well-developed.

More successful responses:

* used passive constructions competently, relevantly, and appropriately
* used a range of cohesive devices including *selain itu*, *walaupun*, *sebenarnya*, *lagipula tentunya*, *pastinya*, *berikutnya*, and *yang kedua.*

Less successful responses:

* translated directly from English
* used incorrect dictionary meanings, such as ‘to leave’ = *cuti*
* confused nouns and verbs including *kerja/pekerjaan*, *pelajar/belajar*, *perjalanan/berjalan*, and *memakai/pakaian*

Some particular errors were *beRkerja*, *berkerjaan*, *ingin untuk mencoba*,and *membicarakan dengan.*

Section 3: Writing in Indonesian

Students coped quite well with this task. The questions seemed to offer students a chance to show what they knew within their level of competency.

Question 9 required students to write an article for a sister school’s newsletter, discussing the suitability of their school and local area for students from the sister school.

Question 10 required students to write the script of a Year 12 graduation ceremony speech, reflecting on the highs and lows of the students’ school years.

Question 11 required students to write a narrative telling the story about what happens after a telephone call from an unknown number.

Of the fifty-two students who sat the exam, fifteen students chose Question 9, twenty-four chose Question 10, and thirteen chose Question 11. Students who chose Question 10 appeared to complete this task more successfully than those who chose the other two options.

Ideas

Overall students coped well and understood the tasks. Many responses were at the highest level of performance in this criterion. Most students were able to observe at least some of the required text-type conventions. This was most commonly done well with Question 10, the speech.

A common omission came with Question 9, the article, where a title and author, *ditulis oleh*, were often missing.

Some excellent Question 11 stories were written, certainly engaging the readers with humour, suspense, and phone conversations which created a mood, gained interest, and made the reader want to continue reading. Many students allowed the phone conversation to take over the narrative, which was not the correct text type. However, where ideas aligned with the theme of the question, students achieved satisfactory results.

Some students used what seemed to be discussion and conversation content in their responses. It is advised that if this happens, to make sure that the way it is used is of course relevant, and goes beyond its original purpose to suit the purpose of the task. It should not be contrived, random, or forced, but natural. This requires rewording and reworking, demonstrating a good command of the language for the purpose.

It was noted that elaboration of ideas was lacking in many cases. Statements need to be backed up, justified, and explained. Literacy tools such as TEEL paragraphs (topic sentence, explanation, example, link to the question) support students with this.

With Question 10, the speech, the most outstanding pieces were those which included some personal and group insider jokes which were general enough to be able to be understood by the all the graduates. Responses that were not as successful were highly personal and deviated from the context and purpose.

Expression

In the less successful responses, word order was often an issue, as well as finding the correct words in the dictionary for the meaning needed. It was quite common for students to place an object first in a sentence but not use the passive voice. Use of cohesive devices was quite limited, even in some of the more successful responses. Confusing *mengatakan* and *berkata* in Question 11 was common.

Markers noted that students who had written a plan in the boxes provided wrote responses which flowed better and showed more logical progression and sequencing.

There was some use of non-standard Indonesian, such as *lagi ngapain?*, *gue*, *kok*, and *trus* blended in the same passage with formal Indonesian such as *Anda*. It is necessary for students to be aware of the register in which they are writing and to honour that. Confusion with nouns and verbs was common, such as confusion between *ber*- and *pe-*. Also some incorrect word choices from dictionary searches were evident including *sumur* for *jadi,* and *akhir* for *tamat*. Double plurals, such as *banyak hal-hal*, were noted in many of the responses, which are incorrect.

## Operational Advice

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.

When submitting materials for moderation, it is ideal to ensure that:

* all materials are labelled clearly
* individual audio files for each student, not a continuous audio file for the class, are submitted on a CD, DVD, or USB drive
* task sheets are attached to tasks or submitted as part of the teacher package.

Teachers are encouraged to attend professional learning opportunities, such as clarifying forums, in order to ask questions, gain useful information, and engage in professional dialogue.

For external assessment tasks, students must not identify themselves by using names, teacher names, or school names in their writing.
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