

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02
Reading and Directed Writing

Key Points

- Even strong candidates should take care to avoid misinterpretation of questions and carelessness in answers.
- Candidates should always read the comprehension questions with care.
- Proofreading of answers is essential.
- Unselective “lifting” of material from the text will not always provide an acceptable answer to comprehension questions.
- It is important to be familiar with the particular requirements of Section 3, Exercise 1.

General Comments

As in previous years, the overall standard this year was high, with a majority of candidates performing very well, and there were some extremely high scores. The majority of the examination Centres are based in Indonesia and a large proportion of candidates is of native or semi-native speaker standard.

Most candidates had a clear understanding of the questions and were able to demonstrate linguistic accuracy for this level.

As in the previous year there were many candidates who simply lifted a section of the text related to the question: this sometimes included irrelevant or contradictory material, and therefore could not be rewarded. Candidates are reminded always to be selective in the material from the text that they use to form their answers. The questions on the reading comprehension required careful reading and the candidates should always re-read the questions and their answers to ensure that they are correct. When candidates lift from the text without carefully selecting the relevant elements it can be difficult for the examiner to establish whether the question and/or the passage were understood correctly.

As in previous years there were also many candidates with very small and cramped handwriting which was very difficult to read. On the other hand, there were candidates with very large and clear handwriting who ran out of space and continued the answers – not always legibly - on the side or bottom of page. Candidates must remember to write their answers in such a way that the Examiner can easily understand them.

Comments on Specific Questions

Part 1

Exercise 1 Question 1- 5

On this section candidates had to choose one right answer from four options. As in the previous year, most candidates gained full marks on this multiple choice section.

Exercise 2 Questions 6-10

Candidates had to match the person described with the hobby. Again, most candidates gained full marks.

Exercise 3 Question 11 - 15

Most candidates performed well and gained high marks on these questions. Candidates had to choose whether the statement was true or false based on the text.

Exercise 4 Question 16

On this exercise candidates were required to write a brief story based on 3 pictures. A maximum mark of 5 was available; 2 marks for accuracy and 3 for communication. Most candidates found no problem, addressing the rubric appropriately and gaining full marks for both language accuracy and communication. However there were candidates who wrote as a third person in response to the question '(a) What did you see?' by describing the action of two people passing by and what they did. Unfortunately most of the candidate who wrote as a third person then answered the following question '(b) What did you do' by describing what the two people (whom he/she saw) did, and not what the writer did. The failure to give full attention to the question in this case prevented them from gaining full marks.

As in the previous year, there were also a small number of candidates who seemed unclear about what they should do. As well as writing the story in the box /space provided they also answered the questions by the pictures, which was not necessary. A few candidates wrote more than the total word limit allowed and lost marks due to missing one or two communication marks.

Part 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17 – 24

The majority of candidates did very well in this Reading Comprehension Exercise about the Sumatran tiger, which was completed well on the whole. A few candidates gave answers relating to their general knowledge of Indonesian fauna and flora: answers must, of course, be based on information from the text. "Lifting" commonly occurred here: although sometimes it was unavoidable, and appropriately rewarded, irrelevant passages from the text were sometimes offered, presumably as a result of poor understanding of the question.

Exercise 2 Question 25

Candidates were required to write between 80-100 words about their childhood; who were they brought up by, likes and dislikes and a memorable event. They were required to cover all 3 tasks and use the word count well. A maximum mark of fifteen was available; ten marks awarded for communication by covering the 3 tasks stated (plus extra marks for further details) and five marks for accuracy which was based on the ticks given for the correct usage of verbs and affixes, adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, idioms, etc. Most candidates scored highly and some gained full marks.

On the whole, the majority of candidates did well. Almost all of the candidates gained full marks for accuracy and only a small minority of candidates lost marks for communication by covering only 2 or fewer of the tasks or as a result of disobeying the word limit by writing either too little or too much.

Part 3

Exercise 1 Question 26 – 32

On this section candidates were asked to decide whether the statements based on a story about Rima, a candidate from a poor single parent family, were true or false. This worked well as a series of true / false questions with only a few candidates failing to identify and correct the false sentences. Most candidates scored highly and some gained full marks.

As in previous years, there were candidates who also gave explanations on the true statements, which was not necessary. Although it did not affect the mark, however, it may have affected their timing in completing the other exam tasks. Others answered the statement correctly as false, but gave no corrected statement: it is therefore recommended that candidates should familiarise themselves with the demands of past papers before sitting the examination.

Exercise 2 Questions 33-39

This description of a hotel and its facilities was understood well by most candidates, and some gained full marks. Some candidates clearly made an effort to answer in their own words or to rework sections of the text to provide specific and precise answers to the questions. However, others were less ambitious. Those who understood the question and identified the correct section of the text, but then copied a lengthy, partly irrelevant chunk of text, risked losing marks unnecessarily.

Some candidates answered **Question 33** with two details of which only one was actually relevant to the question about "*guests who like swimming in the sea*".

The answer for **Question 36** required a specific answer about the fact that there were "*many places to eat within walking distance of the hotel*."

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03

Speaking

Key Points

- Teacher/Examiners must use all the prompts in the Role Play.
- Role Play tasks should not be changed or embellished.
- Teacher/examiners must not invent extra Role Play tasks.
- On the Role Plays, 3 marks for each task can only be awarded if the task is fully completed.
- Marks can not be awarded for Role Play tasks invented by the teacher/Examiner.
- It is acceptable for the Examiner to rephrase tasks or “nudge” candidates to help them obtain full marks for a Role Play task.
- In the Topic Discussion and Conversation, the teacher/Examiner should generally talk less than the candidate.
- In the Topic Discussion, over-ambitious topics may disadvantage candidates.
- In the General Conversation, candidates are not required to give a presentation.
- All teacher/Examiners should study the Teachers’ Notes closely before conducting the examination.

General Comments

The overall standard was very high, and there were only a very small number of candidates who obtained a low mark. As in the previous year, the majority of the examination Centres are based in Indonesia and most candidates are of native speaker standard. As in the previous year there were some elements which prevented them from obtaining full marks due to the use of slang, dialects and also colloquial language especially on the Topic and General Conversations, which should be carried out in formal language.

As in the previous year, generally, Centres carried out the exam well. All the detailed work involved, including labelling and packaging cassettes/CDs, is highly appreciated by the moderator. However, in order to ensure that the examination process and administration are carried out correctly, it is worth reminding all Examiners that it is essential to follow the instructions and requirements which are provided in the Teachers’ Notes.

Examiners need to study and follow the instructions given in all aspects in order to be able to carry out the examination process correctly (e.g. on role plays, there should be no questions omitted, extra tasks should not be avoided, correct cues must be given, marking must be in accordance with the guidelines, etc.) On the Topic and Discussion as well as in General Conversation there should be plenty of questions from the Examiners to cover all the areas required. Examiners need to remember that the purpose of the examination is to measure the candidates’ linguistic abilities, therefore the Examiner should talk less than the candidates. The candidates need to be active and should be given the maximum opportunity to speak and to demonstrate their linguistic skills.

As in the previous year, there were occasional concerns regarding the exam administration. Moderation can be difficult if, for example, there are any arithmetical errors (incorrect addition of marks), cassettes/CDs are not labelled or the files not labelled with the candidate’s name and number, role play numbers are not stated, candidate’s names are not in order or are not in the same order as in the MS. Although most Centres completed all the requirements, there were a few Centres did not send the copy of the MS1 for the Moderator. Centres also need to double check the addition to avoid arithmetical errors.

Overall, both Examiners and candidates carried out their roles realistically on the role plays and worked hard on the discussions and conversations. These were often interesting as well as informative and enjoyable to listen to.

Comments on specific questions

Test 1: Role Plays

General

The majority of candidates scored highly on this section. Most candidates performed very well and sounded as if they were enjoying this section. As in previous years, though, there were still some Examiners who added extra tasks beside the tasks provided by CIE. This could disadvantage the candidates as it would confuse them as well as running the risk of missing or not completing the specified tasks, which could result in lost marks.

The Examiners need to remember to not give full marks when candidates did not complete the tasks specified by CIE. Providing all the specified tasks are completed then full marks should be given even when the candidates did not manage to complete the Examiner's extra task/s. On the other hand, full marks should not be given when candidates do not complete the tasks given/set by CIE even if they successfully completed the addition tasks given by the Examiner/s. Examiners should not deduct a mark when the candidate fails to complete the extra task/s created by the Examiners.

There is no requirement to add more tasks or embellish the role play as this will create confusion for the candidates and could also result in not completing the specified tasks. Clear points of communication - following the prompts given - are what are needed.

Role Play A Card 1, 2 and 3

Candidate at a ticket agency to buy tickets for rock music concert

Candidates were required to state what they want, the total number of tickets, the day, and the preference of location of the seat/s in the building. Finally the candidates have to enquire about the concert or the facility (e.g. the starting time, car park, etc.).

Most candidates did very well. As in the previous year, when candidates did not manage to score full marks, usually due to missed/incomplete tasks, this was often caused by the Examiner who did not give the correct cues or failed to use the prompts given. Some Examiners added extra tasks or created their own prompts and missed the given prompts. Others gave the information before being asked by the candidates, which prevented the candidates from completing the task.

Role Play A Card 4, 5 and 6

Candidate was invited by a friend over the phone to go to a cinema together.

Candidates were required to respond to a friend's phone call invitation to go to the cinema together. Candidates have to offer their thanks and acceptance of the invitation, the preferred day to go, the type of film they would like to watch, where they should meet up and respond to the question about going to a restaurant afterward, asking what kind of food their friend would prefer to eat.

Most candidates scored highly. Again, when candidates who did not gain full marks it was mainly due to incomplete prompts given by the Examiners. Many Examiners missed giving the prompts specified or gave the information which should be provided by the candidates. Examiners should follow the prompts given, listen carefully to the candidate responses, and 'nudge' candidate/s or rephrase the question in order for candidates to complete the tasks and obtain full marks.

Role Play A Card 7, 8 and 9

Candidate was on holiday in Indonesia but felt unwell and needed to visit a doctor/ clinic

On this particular occasion the candidate needed to explain to the clinic receptionist why they came. Then the candidates was required to state how long they had been feeling ill, then to choose when they would like to see the doctor, state where they come from and finally to say thank you and ask whether there was a chemist near the clinic.

In general, the candidates found no problem in visualising the situation and performed well in their role. Most candidates gained full marks, however, there were a few who missed the last task where they had to ask about the chemist. In this situation the Examiner could have give a prompt by asking whether the candidate/s need anything else.

Some Examiners were engrossed in giving advice and forgot that their role is to guide the candidates to obtain full marks by giving correct cues and complete prompts to allow candidates to complete the tasks.

Role Play B Card 1, 4 and 7

Candidate was staying at a hotel, would like to eat out and ask the receptionist for a recommendation.

This role play begins with the candidate required to state what he/she wanted then answer how much money he/she wants to spend, then state/choose the type of restaurant he/she prefers. The B role plays are intended to be a slightly more challenging and involve explanation. The explanation required on this role play was that the candidate had to explain why he/she liked the chosen restaurant/food. Candidates are then required to ask directions to the chosen restaurant. Finally, the candidate is required to demonstrate enthusiasm and state the time he/she would like to eat.

Most candidates gained full marks and candidates as well as the Examiners took their role seriously and realistically. It was entertaining to listen to, although it was frustrating to listen to some Examiners who missed giving the prompt/s specified or let the candidates not complete the task/s and create/add their own tasks as well as talking more than they should. Some candidates lost their marks on the second task due to the Examiner missing out the prompt; not asking the question (How much money do you want to spend?) therefore many candidates did not state/ complete the task and consequently their lost the marks.

As in the other role plays, there were Examiners who gave incorrect cues which could prevent candidates from completing the task/s, e.g. instead of giving the opportunity to the candidate to ask the direction, Examiners gave the direction regardless. This should be the question asked by the candidates: however, when it was completed by the Examiners, the candidates lost their opportunity to ask the question and, therefore, their marks. This could be avoided if the Examiners kept to the prompt/s given and did not rush. Some Examiners missed out the prompt of asking whether the candidate would like the table to be booked.

Role Play B Card 2, 5 and 8

Candidate has booked a hotel in Indonesia but requested to change the dates he/she wanted to stay.

Again, the situation here involves a problem where candidates need to explain the problem and give the information required by the hotel receptionist why he/she wanted to change the dates. The role play began with the candidate greeting the receptionist and explaining the reason for his/her call and stated his/her name. Candidate also has to respond to the receptionist's enquiry about the date the hotel has been booked, state what changes he/she wanted and why, then had to give the new dates. Finally, candidates had to thank the receptionist and ask the opening time of the office.

The majority of candidates and the Examiners performed well. Both parties played their roles in a very realistic way and it was very entertaining and enjoyable to listen to. However, once again problems arose through Examiners' failure to follow the prompt material.

Role Play B Card 3, 6 and 9

Candidate phoning a friend who he/she was going to a cinema with explaining that he/she was going to be late.

Candidates need to make a phone call to her/his friend and explain the reason of phoning. The Candidate had to explain why he/she was going to be late. Candidates also had to say sorry and state the time they would be arriving at the cinema. Candidates then had to thank the friend and invited her/him to have dinner together at a restaurant after the film. Finally the candidate had to name and describe the restaurant near the cinema where they were going. Most candidates and Examiners kept to the outline of the script, although a few Examiners were carried away with the role play and disadvantaged candidates.

It cannot be emphasised too strongly that Examiners need to be aware of the roles and should always be observant of the situation in order to enable candidates to complete all tasks required.

Test 2: Topic (prepared) Discussion

Overall, most candidates performed well and gained high scores. The majority of the Examiners were well prepared and conducted this section very well. Although there were a few Centres which did not include the 1-2 minutes topic presentation but went straight to discussion instead, and other Centres which combined the two conversations together (topic discussion and general conversation), in general the performance of most Centres was better than in the previous year. Most Centres kept closely to the specified timings: this aspect was a lot better than the previous year, although there is still a minority who continue to ignore the correct timing and procedures.

As in previous years, the topics chosen were very broad and interesting to listen to and very informative. Nevertheless 'My ambitions' and 'hobbies' were still the most popular topics beside 'My Country' and other topics which sometimes were over-ambitious. It was very clear that most candidates have a personal interest in the topic chosen and have really prepared for it. At the same time, there were candidates who sounded unprepared, or were not given enough opportunity to express their linguistic abilities because the Examiners talked more than the candidates or because too few questions were asked due to excessive time given to the presentation.

Although most Examiners did well and conducted the examination accordingly, there were a few Examiners who forgot that the core of the test is the performance of the candidates and not of the Examiners. Some Examiners sounded unprepared and some did not seem to understand the format of the test. Again, it is worth reminding Examiners that they should always carefully read and follow the 'Teachers' Notes'.

As mentioned the choice of topics was probably broader than previous years. There were Centres where candidates seemed to choose more challenging topics (e.g. social, economical, environmental, moral issues, etc.). This of course would lead to more challenging questions and could disadvantage them, especially candidates whose knowledge of the issues/topics is limited, even if the language skills are adequate.

The Examiner should not encourage candidates to choose over-ambitious topics, so that they do not disadvantage themselves. However, as mentioned in the Teacher's Note that it is the candidates linguistic abilities/skills which are to be measured and not the candidates knowledge or other skills. Therefore, the marks should be based on the candidates performance of their language and not the knowledge of the subject chosen.

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

Test 3: General (unprepared) Conversation

In general most Examiners conducted this section very well and as in the previous year most candidates scored highly. Topic conversations were varied and the number of subject areas required was covered. Subject areas covered were similar to the previous year i.e.: family life, studies, hobbies, plans for the future, and their general interests.

Some Examiners used some of the information given in the topic to lead into the general conversation. This is acceptable provided these had not already been dealt with in the earlier discussion. Some Examiners, however, continued asking the same questions for the Topic and Discussion and for the General Conversation.

As in the previous year, there were some cases of over-challenging questions which were beyond the candidate's knowledge, affecting confidence and performance; and others where candidates were marked on their knowledge rather than their language skills.

The allocation of time was usually well-handled, although some Examiners only used up to one or two minutes of the time provided and did not ask more than two or three questions, or did not cover the three subject areas required. A small number of Examiners conducted this session as in Topic (prepared) Discussion where candidates have to prepare and present a presentation, which is not required.

Although most of the Examiners has already followed and complete the requirements, there were some who remain unfamiliar with the instructions and are encouraged to read the Teachers' Notes and to familiarise themselves with the requirements so that they can assist candidates to do well in all sections.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04
Continuous Writing

Key points

- The use of Jakartan slang should be avoided.
- Candidates should check their work carefully for spelling errors after writing.

General Comments

Compared to 2010, the 2011 Continuous Writing (0545/04) exam paper was of a similar level of difficulty, and, as in 2010, most candidates performed well.

The specific linguistic problems encountered by candidates included:

1. Slang – quite a number of candidates still used Jakartan slang, such as the use of the suffix ‘in’ instead of ‘kan’, e.g.: ‘dibeliin’ should be ‘dibelian’ (to be bought by); ‘bangunin’ should be ‘membangunkan’ (to wake up somebody). Likewise the use of some vocabulary, e.g.: ‘kasih’ should be ‘memberi’ (to give); ‘bilang’ should be ‘mengatakan/berkata’ (to say); ‘sama’ should be ‘dengan’ (with); ‘buru-buru’ should be ‘terburu-buru’ (in a rush/hurry) etc..
2. Spelling – care needs to be taken to avoid errors such as the following: ‘mengunakan’ should be ‘menggunakan’ (to use); ‘tingal’ should be ‘tinggal’ (to live in/at); ‘perkerjaan’ should be ‘pekerjaan’ (work/job); ‘menyari’ should be ‘mencari’ (to look for); ‘mentukar’ should be menukar (to change) etc..
3. Use of prepositions – ‘pada’ followed by ‘time’, e.g.: ‘pada hari Senin’ (on Monday), ‘pada pagi hari’ (in the morning); ‘kepada’ followed by ‘person’, e.g.: ‘kepada guru saya’ (to my teacher), ‘kepada kepala sekolah’ (to the head teacher); ‘di/ke’ followed ‘place’, e.g.: ‘di rumah’ (at home), ‘ke sekolah’ (to School). Thus, it would not be acceptable to say: ‘di hari Senin’ instead of ‘pada hari Senin’; ‘ke guru saya’ instead of ‘kepada guru saya’ etc..
4. Plural forms – the use of ‘banyak’ (a lot of, a number of), ‘semua’ (all) followed by nouns, e.g.: ‘banyak orang-orang’ should be ‘banyak orang’ (a lot of people); ‘semua murid-murid’ should be ‘semua murid’ (all candidates/candidates).
5. Personal pronouns – ‘saya/aku’ (first person singular = I): a lot of candidates still mixed the use of ‘saya’ (formal) and ‘aku’ (informal) in the same piece of writing.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1a

The word 'main' (to play) – in writing the report about the use of computers (**Question 1a**), quite a few of the candidates mixed the word 'mainan' (toys) and 'permainan' (games). Instead of using 'permainan komputer' (computer games) they used 'mainan komputer' (computer toys?)

Computer terms – candidates tended to use English vocabulary instead of Indonesian, e.g.: to upload (mengunggah), to download (mengunduh), website (situs web) etc. Quite a number of them also mixed both languages, e.g.: 'mengdownload permainan komputer' (to download computer games), 'bermain game di komputer saya' (to play games on my computer), 'membrowsing Internet untuk mencari informasi' (to browse the Internet to find some information) etc. For some terms, for example 'online' there is no Indonesian equivalent. Everyday language is obviously a mix of Indonesian and English terms.

Question 2

The word 'sarapan' (breakfast) is a *noun*, but a lot of the candidates used it as a *verb*, e.g.: 'Saya mandi lalu sarapan dengan cepat' should be 'Saya mandi lalu menyantap/makan sarapan dengan cepat' (I had a bath/shower and then had breakfast quickly).