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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 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.

**The more successful responses**

* used a range of linguistic structures and features accurately to achieve interest, cohesion, and flow
* responded in a culturally and socially appropriate manner where the audience was specified, such as using *kamu, Anda*, or *beliau*
* included a substantial amount of spontaneity in the oral interaction rather than memorised responses to a list of questions
* provided very specific and explicit reference to the assessment design criteria, which gave every opportunity for students to respond according to the performance standards.

**The less successful responses**

* showed limited use of a range of linguistic structures and features
* often based structures on word order derived from English when attempting to elaborate
* relied on the interlocutor to take the lead and maintain conversation in the oral interaction task.

**General information**

* To assist the moderation process, it would be ideal for teachers to provide the text(s) used for text analysis tasks.
* Teachers are encouraged to support students to achieve their best by providing a context, purpose, and audience for each task on the task sheet, as well as any other information that will assist students to demonstrate evidence against the standards.
* When developing text analysis tasks using past examinations, it is important that the texts and/or the questions are adapted to allow students to address all performance standards required to be assessed. Of particular note are questions and textual features that allow students to demonstrate evidence against the specific features IR2 and IR3.
* The most successful oral interaction tasks included extensive opportunities for spontaneous conversation with an opportunity for students to demonstrate evidence of their ability to handle topic shifts and unpredictable elements throughout the interaction. Teachers may instruct students in the class to ask questions during or following a short presentation, in order to produce an authentic interaction.

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.

As in the past, environmental topics and tourism in Bali 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, *noken*, Indonesian maids, *Ahok*, transgender issues, and *Upacara Pasola*.

**The more successful responses**

* produced critical and sophisticated reflective pieces focussed on language, culture, values, beliefs, and practices
* conducted a thorough investigation/research in line with the subject outline specifications
* presented their interpretations, analysis, and reflections on their topic in a creative, confident, and engaging manner, demonstrating their own interest and fostering their audience’s interest
* conformed to the appropriate word-count and managed to compose pieces that demonstrated their in-depth understanding of their topic.

**The less successful responses**

* produced a recount instead of a reflective piece in English
* demonstrated limited depth and breadth in their research topic
* recycled the ideas of the oral presentation in the written response in Indonesian, or vice versa.

**General information**

* Even though most of the topics chosen for research are standard topics such as *orang utan* or tourism in Bali, students are advised to bring a new perspective of these topics into their in-depth study.
* When setting tasks, teachers should be mindful of the role/persona that students are asked to write/to speak from. Some roles/personas were deemed by moderators to be outside of what students could reasonably be expected to comprehend.
* A transcript of a speech is not evidence of a student’s ability to present information orally.
* Students should be provided with task sheets specifying the context, purpose, and audience, and references to the specific features of the assessment design criteria by which the task will be assessed.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

**Oral Examination**

**Section 1: Conversation**

Generally, students were able to actively participate in the conversation; however, there was wide scope of ability to understand questions and provide detailed responses. A number of students achieved grades in the A band. The average score for this section was 77.79%.

**The more successful responses**

* demonstrated confidence and a propensity to ‘enjoy’ the conversation
* answered questions with relevant information and in detail, without needing to use the question ‘word for word’ in the response
* understood the language features common to this part of the examination, including ‘*percakapan ini akan direkam’*, ‘*ada lagi?*’, and ‘*sudah cukup’*
* used a variety of conjunctions well, for example, ‘*pada khususnya’, ‘tertarik akan’, ‘sebenarnya’, ‘bukan hanya … melainkan juga’*
* elaborated on their answers and offered opinions and feelings about the topic
* justified why they thought or felt a certain way
* were able to self-correct if necessary
* used passive first-person structures correctly.

**The less successful responses**

* were not able to elaborate beyond basic answers
* were not able to handle follow-up questions that may have been outside of what they had practised
* were only able to respond to questions that were phrased the same way as those in the SACE support materials
* commonly used incorrect word order, for example, ‘*saya pekerjaan’*
* commonly used incorrect word choice (e.g. ‘*menarik’* instead of ‘*tertarik akan’*, ‘*ke mobil’* instead of ‘*naik mobil’*)
* used a limited range of conjunctions
* often expressed that they could not understand, using ‘*saya tidak mengerti’* or ‘*bisa diulangi lagi’*
* relied on considerable prompting from the examiner(s)
* gave irrelevant answers due to a misunderstanding of the question, for example, confusing ‘*keluar dengan teman-teman’* with ‘*keluarga’*, therefore discussing family instead of going out with friends.

**Section 2: Discussion**

In this section, students shared research in a variety of topics including the Bali Animal Welfare Association, smoking, the effect of tourism in Bali, and many more. The average score for this section was 75.33%.

**The more successful responses**

* were able to show the depth of their research in their responses
* were able to analyse the sources used, stating why they were useful
* gave their opinion on what they found interesting and why
* had memorised a good range of keywords specific to their topic and were able to use these in responses.

**The less successful responses**

* were not able to go beyond the dot points listed on their in-depth study outline form
* demonstrated little or no reflection
* used photos, but were not able to elaborate on what the photos identified
* were not able to discuss the points listed on their in-depth study outline form in any detail.

**General comments**

* Students were limited by writing points such as ‘Why I chose this topic’ and ‘Sources used’ on their in-depth study outline form, as these are process questions that will be asked anyway. It is recommended that these dot points be a way of directing the examiner to the content of the research.
* Students were able to speak about the main points from their in-depth study outline form but found it more difficult to respond to other questions, even if they were phrased as they are in the SACE support materials.
* If students use film as a resource, they should show an understanding that film is not reality and therefore the information contained is not necessarily fact, unless it has been substantiated by other resources.
* If students conduct interviews, these need to be relevant to the topic. Some students used interviews with Australians in English as a source, but did not tie it in with their topic by comparing/contrasting attitudes or behaviours between Australia and Indonesia.
* When students prepare their in-depth study outline form, they need to write their discussion points legible in English.
* Schools needing to conduct phone interviews would benefit from trialling the technology with students beforehand, so that they are prepared for the oral examination.
* If students wish to use support objects, they should make sure that these are relevant to, and enhance, the discussion.

Written Examination

**Section 1: Listening and Responding**

Most students coped well with this section. The number of marks assigned to each question is a guide for the number of points to be addressed in the response; however, it does not limit the student from providing more.

***Question 1***

This text was an announcement about a train being delayed. Students were asked to identify the information given to passengers. The majority of responses were awarded full marks.

**The more successful responses**

* identified that the train from Jakarta to Bandung was delayed for 3 hours due to flooding
* identified that the train would leave from the platform at 11 am
* added further information, for example, go to the information office.

**The less successful responses**

* misinterpreted some or all of the information, for example, that the train was leaving at 3 pm rather than being delayed by 3 hours.

***Question 2***

This text was a conversation between two people about the *Kerja Bakti* that had occurred that day. This is a community service to prepare for Independence Day.

**The more successful responses**

* identified several reasons why the community of Klojen held the event
* added that it was a service to the community, which they inferred from the name of the work, *kerja bakti*
* identified the positive feelings and tiredness that Pak Arief felt about participating in the day, as well as the opportunity to chat and meet the neighbours.

**The less successful responses**

* missed the connection with community service, only picking up on the Independence Day information.

***Question 3***

This text was made up of two connected answering-machine messages.

**The more successful responses**

* identified the reason Novi made the call and cited evidence from the text to support the response
* identified the relationship between Novi and the person on the answering machine, using information about terms of address and the language used.

**The less successful responses**

* misinterpreted the relationship between the two speakers
* either did not cite evidence from the text to support their response, or generalised their citation without providing specific details (e.g. identifying that ‘formal language’ was used but not providing an example of this)
* indicated incorrectly that the purpose of the call was for Novi to leave her phone number
* indicated incorrectly that it was Novi, not her son, who needed the lift
* misinterpreted the word *bapak*, and indicated incorrectly that that the relationship was that of family (e.g. father and daughter).

***Question 4***

This text was an announcement at a shopping centre.

**The more successful responses**

* fully identified what customers were advised to do
* displayed an understanding of how the speaker used language to show respect, and gave examples including *terhormat, silakan, Anda, selamat malam, terima kasih, sampai jumpa*.

**The less successful responses**

* did not identify all of the correct information from the text, including the reminder not to leave belongings behind
* did not cite evidence from the text to support their response
* answered in general terms only.

***Question 5***

This text was an interview on a talk show. It was rare for students to identify all three points in part (a). Part (b) was answered very well, with many responses receiving
3 (full) marks.

**The more successful responses**

* identified why Diana was invited to speak on the program, including that she has recently returned from the program discussed, and can therefore give advice to others, encourage others to join the program, and raise awareness to promote the program
* were able to give details from the text about why Diana described this as a positive experience, including being able to make a positive difference to the lives of young Indonesian children, learn about the Indonesian culture and language, make lots of new friends, participate in a variety of activities, and have an unforgettable experience.

**The less successful responses**

* provided incorrect information in their response, often responding with information answering question (b) in question (a), and vice versa
* indicated incorrectly that Diana created the program herself, rather than being a volunteer on the program.

**Section 2: Reading and Responding Part A**

***Question 6***

This text was a poem posted on a blog, with responses to it. The text was about the smog from forest burning and its effects on life in the blogger’s world, and included a plea to the Indonesian President for help. The mean score for this question was 4.2/9.

**The more successful responses**

* identified that the text could be found on the Internet in a poetry blog or an online magazine and justified their response by citing evidence from the text (e.g. stating that there were comments with dates)
* identified that the outcome the author hoped to achieve was to raise awareness and seek support from the Indonesian President
* noted that public support was evident because people commented in a supportive manner on the poem, such as hoping that those affected would get support, stating that the situation had been like this for too long, begging for the situation to stop, and/or being moved to tears
* identified many techniques to engage the reader, including short, direct, impactful statements, clear meaning, beginning with ‘Mr President’, pleading with the president, clear descriptions of the impact of the smog, writing on behalf of all children, comments representing the sentiments of the public, graphic examples of the issue, imagery, repetition, and personal experience.

**The less successful responses**

* misunderstood the language and thought the text could be found in the arena of school/education
* thought that the text was encouraging students to stay in school
* did not provide examples from the text to support the response
* did not identify techniques used to engage the reader.

***Question 7***

This was an article about an encouraging finding that shows hope for an endangered animal. The mean score was 2.8/6.

**The more successful responses**

* explained that the quotations used increased the credibility of the article, provided authenticity, truth, and reliability, and emphasised the seriousness of the situation
* identified that *angin segar* was like the English ‘a breath of fresh air’, indicating a new injection of enthusiasm to interrupt the bleak situation of the endangered Sumatran rhinoceros.

**The less successful responses**

* seemed to misinterpret the purpose of the use of quotations, rather responding to the purpose of the text instead
* gave only a title for question 7 (b), without giving a reason for this title
* did not elaborate on, or justify, responses by citing examples from the text.

**Section 3: Reading and Responding Part B**

The text to which students were asked to respond was an article about Pak Iswaldi’s mobile library. Students were asked to write a diary entry, imagining that they had benefited from Pak Iswaldi’s service. Every student attempted this question and was able to write in response to it. The mean score for this section was 10.5/15.

**The more successful responses**

* responded to key information in the text, including the use of a mobile library, free service, Pak Iswaldi himself, when they used the service, hundreds of books to choose from, kept them busy and off the streets
* elaborated on points arising from the text and brought in their own relevant information to expand on the ideas and information
* communicated complex ideas with creativity and sound linguistic structures, such as *menjadi jendela dunia untuk saya, pikiran berkembang*
* used passive structures well, including in first person (e.g. *tidak akan saya lupakan*)
* used enhancers like *bukan hanya* *… melainkan juga*, *baik … maupun*, *pada umumnya*, *walaupun demikian*, *jauh lebih* …, *khususnya*
* used all of the correct conventions of a diary entry including using *aku* throughout, which is preferred for a diary entry
* structured the text well with good paragraphing
* used more informal language.

**The less successful responses**

* copied a substantial amount of the original text, rather than interpreting the meaning within the text and using the language provided to formulate their own ideas
* misinterpreted the text and thought that Pak Iswaldi was a bus driver or the writer of a book
* concentrated on only one or two points from the text, limiting the breadth
* used frequent incorrect expressions to communicate ideas and information, for example, *saya menarik* for ‘I’m interested’, *jam sepuluh* instead of *sepuluh jam*
* often used incorrect word order, for example, *Pak Iswaldi jasa*
* did not use the correct conventions of the text type
* used English.

**Section 4: Writing in Indonesian**

***Question 9*** asked students to write an email to an Indonesian friend, persuading them to travel around Indonesia with them after finishing Year 12.

Question 9 had the highest number of responses.

**The more successful responses**

* used the correct conventions of an email, including falsified attachments (e.g. ‘Borobodur.jpg’) to add to the authenticity of the text
* began with pleasantries then moved on to the request for the friend to travel with them
* elaborated on and justified each point
* used humour effectively
* used a variety of language functions and structures
* demonstrated the correct use of passive language structures, particularly in first person, utilising a great opportunity to do so
* argued the point with maturity and consideration, for example, ‘If we do not go now, when?’

**The less successful responses**

* did not use the basic conventions of an email
* did not consider that the friend they were writing to was Indonesian, and often identified ‘selling points’ that would not aid in convincing an Indonesian person. Students are encouraged to consider the relevance of their ideas in relation to the context, purpose, and audience
* used too much ‘small talk’ at the beginning of the email that was not relevant
* mixed *kamu* and *Anda* or used *Anda* throughout, which was too formal for the context
* used too much slang. Teachers and students are reminded that the subject outline specifies the use of ‘standard Indonesian’
* did not indicate ‘future’ as was necessary
* made frequent and basic errors in language (e.g. confusing *jangan* for *tidak*, using *tidak mempunyai* instead of *belum pernah*, *mau ke* instead of just *mau*), confusing nouns and verbs (e.g. *perjalanan ke* instead of *berjalan*, using *kesenangan* instead of *menyenangkan*), and word order problems (e.g. *bagus pengalaman*)
* wrote in general about Indonesia, without attempting to persuade
* often made mistakes when attempting to use complex language structures such as first-person passive (e.g. *yang kita* ***sudah*** *rencanakan* or *pengalaman yang kita* ***bisa*** *dapat dari*)
* used their in-depth study in a way that was irrelevant.

***Question 10*** asked students to write a review of an Indonesian restaurant. This was the least popular question.

**The more successful responses**

* could talk about a variety of Indonesian dishes and use language to compare and contrast them and to give a recommendation
* discussed a range of points in depth and breadth
* used the correct conventions of the text type (e.g. title, *ditulis oleh*, star rating).

**The less successful responses**

* did not use the conventions of the text type
* were limited in the points mentioned
* did not elaborate on what they had written, or justify their opinions.

***Question 11*** asked students to write the script of a dialogue they had with their Indonesian neighbour about a piece of breaking news that they had heard on the radio.

**The more successful responses**

* used the correct conventions of the text type
* provided detailed, relevant, and specific information, ideas, and opinions about a realistic ‘breaking news’ item
* were highly engaging, and created interest, flow, and cohesion, with each new line of the dialogue responding to the last.

**The less successful responses**

* seemed to be created out of an in-depth study topic that was not at all relevant to this task
* over-used and incorrectly used the dictionary (e.g. *kaleng* instead of *bisa*, *merek* instead of *membuat*, *satu-satunya* instead of *hanya*). Also, *tanpa* came up often, possibly because of a dictionary search for ‘was’ or ‘is’, where most dictionaries give *tanpa tekanan*
* made frequent errors in word order (e.g. *ada sangat kecil jalan-jalan, Indonesia kebudayaan*)
* incorrectly used *adalah* (e.g. *adalah lucu, adalah bagus, adalah puasa dan panas*)
* confused passive and active forms (e.g. *menyambut* used for ‘to be greeted’)
* confused *bahwa* and *yang*
* confused nouns and verbs (e.g. *harapan* instead of *berharap*)
* had spelling errors in commonly used words, for example, *mengungi* (*mengunjungi*), *selasai* (*selesai*).

## 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, please 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 or USB
* task sheets are attached to tasks or submitted as part of the teacher package.

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