

Indonesian (continuers)
2009 ASSESSMENT REPORT

Languages Learning Area

INDONESIAN (CONTINUERS)

2009 ASSESSMENT REPORT

ASSESSMENT COMPONENT 3: ORAL EXAMINATION

General Comments

One hundred and six students from South Australia and the Northern Territory sat for the Indonesian continuers examination in 2009.

Sufficient time was given to each student to demonstrate his/her skills in Indonesian. As has occurred in previous years, the more successful students were able to handle all questions, even when they were structured using the object focus.

Examiners commented on the rehearsed nature of less successful students and the inability of these students to comprehend questions when worded differently from the sample questions on the SACE Board website. Throughout the year teachers are advised to introduce students to different styles of questioning in preparation for the examination.

It was also evident that the less successful students had a limited understanding of basic grammatical structures expected at this level of their studies of Indonesian.

Section 1: Conversation

The mean score for the conversation section was 14.74/20 which was one mark lower than the mean score in 2008. Seventeen students received 20/20 for this section, and seventeen students received a score of 10 or less.

The most successful students were able to converse at a more natural level with the examiners, communicating beyond rehearsed or familiar patterns. These students demonstrated a high level of grammatical accuracy, breadth of vocabulary, and sentence structure. They were also able to comprehend and answer fairly complex questions, which required some analysis and opinion. They were able to use passive sentences and more complex structures, including a wide range of vocabulary.

Less successful students answered questions in a very rehearsed and predictable manner, and were unable to elaborate on ideas or give opinions. Grammatical inaccuracies marred their expression in Indonesian. It was noted that students who had learnt their answers by heart spoke too quickly. Examiners understand that students may be nervous; however, intonation and pronunciation all contribute to the success of an oral examination.

Some students demonstrated a good range of communication strategies such as '*itu pertanyaan yang sulit tetapi . . . Apa artinya . . . ? Maaf, bisa tolong diulangi?*' Students generally used appropriate formal forms of address with examiners.

When in doubt most students used *bisa ulangi*. However, some students just looked puzzled when they did not understand a question, even when it was rephrased.

Some students made mistakes and uttered *maaf* instead of asking/seeking further clarification. Other students used informal Indonesian instead of formal Indonesian vocabulary and structures.

Some speakers had problems with basic word order, for example, *perempuan adik* instead of *adik perempuan*, *saya bapak* instead of *bapak saya*, *kami* instead of *kita*, and *menarik* instead of *tertarik* to mean interested in something.

Anglicisms such as Kup Asia instead of Piala Asia were also used in some answers about sport and hobbies.

Most students were aware of the differences between *selama*, *untuk*, *sejak* when expressing time.

Overall, most students responded effectively with some degree of fluency to familiar and predictable questions about family, school, future aspirations, and hobbies. They were able to maintain a coherent conversation and seemed well prepared. Support materials such as photographs were rarely used.

Section 2: Discussion

The mean mark for the discussion was 7.08/10. Twenty-three students received 10/10, and twenty-five students received a score of five or less.

The most successful students were able to go beyond facts and put forward and justify their ideas/opinions as well as show a depth of understanding about the information they presented. More impressively, these students were able to maintain the flow of the discussion and adjust or elaborate on their comments or opinions in response to reactions from the examiners.

The less successful students presented some relevant information and a limited range of ideas on their chosen topic. Their answers were quite basic and showed minimal understanding of the topic beyond broad statements. These students chose topics that were too broad and thus they could not elaborate beyond basic information. If talking about AIDS, street kids, or homelessness in Indonesia, students should give specific statistics rather than say 'there are a lot of'.

It is recommended that teachers encourage students to vary their vocabulary and structures.

It should be noted that the research must be about Indonesia. Comparisons with Australia can be made, but *this should not be the focus of the research*. Teachers should not cover the same aspects of the one topic in a class. The focus of the topics could be more defined to reduce sweeping generalisations that students might make.

When a whole class chooses the same topic, teachers must ensure that each student has a different focus and uses different resources. When this is not done, the result is very repetitive and rehearsed. It is strongly recommended that teachers promote a more investigative style of learning that engages students and forces them to seek information and give opinions.

Examiners noted that students who chose their own topic were certainly more engaged in the discussion section than students whose topic was chosen by the teacher.

The in-depth study outline form was useful; however, some students had too much information and others had only two or three points. The very few students who used supporting materials used them well.

Teachers must ensure that there is evidence of ongoing research. Many students could not give specific details about their topic. Students must be able to discuss the points they have listed on the in-depth study outline form they give to the examiner. More successful students were able to use specialist vocabulary related to the topic. When asked 'What was the most interesting aspect of your research?', a number of students simply repeated the overview of their research rather than considering the most interesting aspect of it. Some students could not go beyond a rehearsed response, and others could not give details of the resources used.

Topics chosen should allow students to explore aspects of the language and culture of Indonesian-speaking communities. Students are also expected to make reference to the texts studied. The topic and texts chosen should also take into account students' language capacity, their interests, and, most importantly, enable the student to express ideas and opinions. It is important that the texts are in Indonesian and are substantial enough for students to gather sufficient information to discuss their topic.

ASSESSMENT COMPONENT 4: WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Section 1: Listening and Responding

The mean mark for this section was 12.79/20. The four texts included an advertisement, a message on an answering machine, a speech, and an interview. The topics included the promotion of an energy revitalising product, the recounting of an accident, the initiative of a school cooperative, and the effects of a natural disaster on an Indonesian town.

Texts 3 and 4 proved to be the most difficult for students.

Text 1

Most students were able to comprehend that the product aimed to give people more stamina.

Text 2

Question 2(a) Not many students were able to provide appropriate detail. Although all students knew a rambutan was involved, many confused who was affected, thinking that it was her friend. Another common area of misunderstanding was that the rambutan had been eaten and made her sick or that she had crashed into a rambutan tree.

Question 2(b) Most students were able to pick up on '*maaf*' to indicate that she was feeling guilty. Few students were able to elaborate that this was a result of having being told previously not to climb trees and many missed out that she was worried about her injuries.

Text 3

Question 3(a) Most students were able to identify that it was an address by a school principal trying to introduce a new program.

Question 3(b) Most students were able to identify that uniforms were being sold, that it would be cheaper than in the markets, and that healthy food would be available but little else. The fact that parents would be employed and students could get work experience was understood only by the more competent students. Few students picked up that uniforms could be paid for in instalments.

Text 4

Question 4(a) Most students did not provide sufficient detail in answering this question. Students should be reminded to use the marks allocated to each question as a guide to the

level of detail required. Common omissions included the number of victims and that there was no sign of life.

Question 4(b) Some responses to this question were confused. Several students did not understand that Mr Nurhadi had lost his house and rice fields, thinking they were just damaged and he was repairing them. Few students mentioned government assistance.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part A

Texts 5 and 6 proved to be the most challenging in the whole examination for students. The mean mark for both texts was the lowest in the examination.

Text 5 was an interview with a famous Indonesian soap opera actor. The mean mark was 3.88/8. Only two students received full marks. Thirty-one percent of students received a score of three or less in this section.

Question 5(a) Less successful students did not understand the expression '*kariernya yang melesat seperti meteor*', meaning his career has shot up like a meteor and that Vanno left his studies at the Surabaya Technical Institute in 2007 to pursue a career in the entertainment world in Jakarta. Some students wrote that Vanno had moved to Jakarta to study.

Question 5(b) Some responses did not include the information from the text detailing Vanno having to abandon his studies after only a semester into the course, and leaving his family in Surabaya and living alone in Jakarta. In addition, because of his filming commitments, Vanno has had to reduce his sporting hobbies.

Question 5(c) Many students did not include information from the text to support their answer. Vanno believes physical appearance is very important because even though people say one should not judge a book by its cover, the first time we meet someone, their physical appearance is the first thing we see and once the person attracts our attention, his/her capabilities can be shown.

Words in the text that created some confusion for students were:

bintang sinetron — soap opera star

syuting — shooting (of a scene in a soap opera, film or television series)

bugar — healthy, fit

bangku kuliah — university course

nggak — more colloquial form of *tidak*

melesat seperti meteor — shoot up like a meteor.

Text 6 was a profile of Putri, a street child in the streets of Jakarta. The mean mark was 3.77/7. Only one student received full marks. Forty-two per cent of students received a score of 3 or less.

Question 6(b) proved to be most challenging. Most students mentioned that Putri was hopeful that she would not live on the streets forever and that she felt embarrassed every time her friends crossed the street. Most responses did not include the information from the text that described her colourful accessories that say something positive about her personality despite her family's financial position.

Words in the text that created some confusion for students were:

cepit rambut — hair clip [form of a claw]

menyolok — bright
ditolak — pushed away/rejected
diusir — chased away/evicted/thrown out
perlakukan — treat
sapalah — greet.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part B

Text 7 required students to write a letter to the editor in response to an article on cheating in examinations. The mean score was 9.30/15. Fifteen per cent of students received full marks, and 55% of students received a score of 7 or less.

Most students were able to understand what the task required of them, but less successful students failed to analyse and respond critically.

Competent students were able to agree or disagree by providing detailed reasons with examples from the text. For example, the editor's view is one-sided, biased, and not based on sufficient evidence. Some argued that cheating would damage future generations and that these students would not cope with the real world of work. Some argued that teachers who cheat are not suitable to be role models. Interestingly, many students spoke very highly of their schools and their teachers in Australia and took a very determined stance on cheating in schools.

Most students used the appropriate formal form of address to the editor (*redaktur*). Paragraphs were used well in most responses. Successful students were able to use complex vocabulary and sentence structures, including the passive, for example, *dihukum*, *diawasi*. First and second person passives were largely used correctly, for example, *artikel anda saya baca*. Sentence connectors such as *namun*, *walaupun*, *padahal*, *sehingga*, and *sedangkan* were used by the more successful students. These students also presented their ideas/arguments by using phrases such as *pertama-tama*, *pada pihak lain*, *sebaliknya*, and *khususnya*.

There was some confusion with students using *sesudah* and *kemudian* in the wrong contexts, for example, *saya terkejut 'kemudian' membaca artikel anda . . .* There were some errors with *masuk universitas* or *bersekolah di SMU* where students used the incorrect form of *pergi ke*. Less successful students misused 'fair' for *pecan raya*, for example, *Ini tidak pecan raya untuk siswa siswi yang jujur/artikel ini tidak pecan raya*. Students are encouraged to consult their dictionaries to check that they have the right word.

Most responses were relevant, but less successful students were repetitious, limited to the ideas in the original text, and were unable to give alternative suggestions. Many students did not respond to the last point about a school's good name being damaged if many students fail.

With regards to the conventions of the text type, the most successful students presented their responses in clear letter format using *Redaktur yang terhormat* appropriately, making reference to the title of the article. Less successful students did not begin the letter correctly and in some cases there was no conclusion. *Kamu* should not have been used in this letter. Some responses did not meet the required length.

Less successful students use *ke* incorrectly, for example, *ke membeli*. *Ke* should never be followed by verbs. There is still a notable lack of prepositions and some students used *me-* instead of *di-*verbs, for example, *siswa-siswi mengawasi* instead of *diawasi*. There were some errors with *menduduki ujian*, meaning to sit for an examination.

Most students were able to spell words correctly, but some spelt words incorrectly despite them being in the original text. Some students failed to add another 'n' to words such as *temannya*. Students are advised to take care when copying words from the original text or from the question task. Although the question required the students to write to the editor of the newspaper, they were not expected to produce the formal letter format. It was enough to address the editor using the formal form of address.

Students are reminded that when writing with double spacing, it is necessary to clearly identify paragraphs by indenting them at the start of the paragraph.

Section 3: Writing in Indonesian

There were three questions in this section. Question 9 was the most popular followed by Question 8, and Question 10. The mean score for Question 8 was 11/20, for Question 9, 12.55/20, and for Question 10, 11.70/20.

Markers commented that most students did not proofread or edit their work on completion, as few changes were evident. Proofreading is a simple way to improve marks. Many students used subject focus and object focus incorrectly. The most successful students were able to use object focus and included a variety of grammatical terms in their writing.

Some students wrote in pencil, which was sometimes difficult to read. Students are encouraged to write legibly and neatly. Far too many students used their own name and several stated the school they attended and mentioned their teacher's name. ***Students are reminded that they should not identify themselves or their school.*** A couple of students did not list the question number to which they were responding, and many students did not meet the required word length.

Common Spelling Errors

- 'facilitas', instead of 'fasilitas'
- 'sampa' instead of 'sampah'
- 'terimah kasih' or 'kashi' instead of 'terima kasih'
- 'nomer' instead of 'nomor'.

Grammatical/Punctuation/Dictionary Errors

- Capital letters were not used properly. In some cases students did not begin a sentence with a capital letter.
- Several students did not use paragraphs
- 'ada tidak' instead of 'tidak ada'
- 'akan tidak' instead of 'tidak akan'
- 'selama' and 'untuk' confused
- 'menolong' and 'pertolongan' confused
- 'ke' and 'untuk' confused
- 'punya' and 'sudah' were confused
- 'mati' and 'meninggal' were confused
- 'kalau' and 'kapan' confused
- 'kelas' and 'tahun' confused
- 'bekerja' and 'pekerjaan' confused
- 'tradisi rumah' instead of 'rumah tradisi'
- 'Indonesia kebudayaan' instead of 'kebudayaan Indonesia'
- 'cantik' and 'indah' confused

- 'berjalan' and 'perjalanan' confused. Several students wrote 'Saya perjalanan ke Indonesia', instead of 'Saya ingin mengadakan perjalanan ke Indonesia'
- English words were included instead of their Indonesian equivalent (e.g. 'electric', 'school', 'government', 'report')
- 'nomor' used instead of 'jumlah'

Question 8

Many students were not familiar with the correct report format and did not adhere to the text type. Less successful students listed facilities in their area, but forgot to recommend how they could be improved. Some students listed the facilities they wanted to have in their area, rather than say how facilities could be improved. More successful students were able to present a convincing argument why the facilities in their area should be improved. Some even included imaginary 'statistics' or held 'surveys' with people from their suburb, asking them what they would like to see developed in the locality.

Question 9

A couple of students did not say that they were trying to earn a free trip to Indonesia and never once stated *why* they should be chosen. Many students did not detail how they would use their experiences in Indonesia on their return to Australia, and as such addressed only half the question. Less successful students merely listed the places in Indonesia they would like to visit and did not say why they wanted to go there or what they would learn from visiting those places. Many students referred to themselves as a *murid*, rather than a *siswa*, even though *siswa* was used in the question. An alarming number of students stated that they *belajar Indonesia* instead of *belajar bahasa Indonesia*. A couple of students incorrectly combined English and Indonesian! A few students said they would like to visit the 'kota Bali', rather than 'pulau Bali'. This error appeared in several students' responses. Some students did not know how to 'sign off' their writing.

Question 10

Less successful students did not fully understand the requirements of the text type — a film review. They did not include many of their own opinions on the film, state whether they liked or disliked it, or would recommend it to others. Only a couple of students chose to review a real film. Most students 'created' a fictional film, often along the lines of their in-depth study. Students who chose their own topic were certainly more engaged in the discussion section.

Overall, it was clear from the written responses in Indonesian that many students wrote in a repetitive manner, demonstrating a limited knowledge of vocabulary, object focus sentences, and general grammatical structures. In addition, many students did not adhere to the correct word requirements.

Teachers should introduce students to past SACE Board examination papers throughout the year in order to familiarise them with the requirements as well as the variety of text types that go beyond letter writing and diary entries.

Handwriting, spelling, and punctuation also need urgent attention. Greater use of connective words, temporal markers (*telah, sedang, pernah, akan, masih, baru, sudah*), verbal prefixes, and suffixes need to be consolidated during Year 12.

Chief Assessor
Indonesian (continuers)