

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02
Reading and Directed Writing

Key messages

- 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 is high. Most candidates had a clear understanding of the requirements of each exercise and were able to respond well to each question. Most candidates obtained high scores and there was only a small number who did not achieve satisfactory scores.

There were still some candidates who lifted an entire section of a passage as an answer, this sometimes meant that irrelevant elements were included, or that they left out important elements of an answer. When a candidate does this, they are not showing that they have understood the question and/or the passage. The reading comprehension questions require careful reading and careful selection of the relevant elements for the answer. Candidates should also always re-read the questions and their answers to check that they have answered the questions appropriately.

As in previous years there were some 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 their answers on the sides or bottom of the page. Candidates must remember to write their answers clearly so that the Examiner can understand what they have written.

Comments on specific questions

Part 1

Exercise 1 Questions 1 – 5

In this section candidates had to choose one right answer from four options. As in the previous year, most candidates gained full marks. Only a very few candidates did not, usually due to incorrect answers for **Questions 4 and 5**.

In **Question 4**, instead of **(d)** There is a cat sleeping on the table, a few candidates chose **(c)** There is a dog sleeping under the chair.

In **Question 5**, some chose option **(d)** The bag was too heavy instead of **(c)** The key was lost. This could be due to misreading **kucing** (cat) instead of **kunci** (key). Again, careful reading is very important.

Exercise 2 Questions 6 – 10

In this section, candidates had to match the situation described with the expression. Again, most candidates gained full marks.

Exercise 3 Questions 11 – 15

The majority of candidates performed very well and gained full marks.

Exercise 4 Question 16

In this exercise candidates were required to write an email to a friend about their experience staying at home alone. Candidates had to give information in the email based on the 3 pictures given.

A maximum mark of 5 was provided for this exercise; 2 marks for accuracy and 3 for communication. Most candidates addressed the rubric appropriately and gained full marks for both accuracy and communication. However there were some candidates who did not gain full marks because they missed out one or two points of communication.

For **Question (a): 'What did you do?'**, there were candidates who wrote that they were with friends. Others did not answer the question but described how messy their room was.

Most candidates gave correct information for **Question (b): What did you do next?**, saying that they tidied up. Some candidates gave the answer that he/she **was reading a book instead of tidying up**. This prevented them from gaining the mark. Others wrote that they **found a book and then read it before tidying up**. This was awarded 1 mark, because it still included the key idea, tidying up.

For **Question (c): What did your parents say when they came home?** The majority of candidates answered correctly. A few candidates did not read the question or looked at the pictures carefully enough, and wrote an inappropriate sentence.

As in the previous year, a few candidates wrote too much, or lost marks due to missing one or two communication points.

Part 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17 – 24

This section was a reading comprehension about Andre, a university student with a job.

The majority of candidates scored the full 10 marks. Those who did not tended to have difficulty with **Questions 18(ii), 19(ii) and/or 20**.

Some candidates answered **Question 18(ii)** with Andre had to go on the bus or missed the stop without included the fact that he had to walk for 2 km. There were also candidates who answered Andre has to jump over the gate. Quite a few answered Andre had to go to work and study.

For **Question 19(ii) and 20**, some candidates answered: There was a thief in Andre's room, instead of Andre thought there was a thief in his room.

Exercise 2 Question 25

Candidates were required to write between 80-100 words to a friend about a film they had enjoyed watching. Candidates were required to cover all 3 points.

Most candidates scored highly. There were a very few candidates who did not attempt this section.

Almost all of the candidates completed the tasks. Some explain in too much detail where they watched the film or what they did before they went to the cinema. Some were too carried away with the description of the film and forgot to recommend the film to his/her friend. A few ignored the word limit by writing either too little or too much, both of which could prevent them from gaining full marks.

Part 3

Exercise 1 Questions 26 – 31

In this section candidates were asked to decide whether the statements based on a letter written by a parent about their son were true or false. They had to provide a correction if they thought the statement given was wrong. Candidates should note that the correction was only required for false statements. However, as in previous years, there were candidates who also gave explanations for the true statements. Although it did not affect the mark, it was not a valuable use of their time in the examination.

Most candidates scored highly and some gained full marks. A few candidates answered 'false' for **Question 29** which was supposed to be 'true'. This could be due to misunderstanding the concept of 'did not believe' and 'did not know'. On **Question 31**, a few candidates gave a wrong correction: 'He was always noisy in the class.' Instead of a simple direct statement: 'No, the son always went to school'. A few candidates did not give a correction for the false statements which meant they could only score a maximum of 6 marks out of 10.

Exercise 2 Questions 32 – 40

This was another reading comprehension, about an archaeological find.

Most candidates understood the passage well and gained full marks.

Some candidates answered **Question 40** the wrong way round (What had been and will be done in order to protect the area? Give 2 details). This affected the mark in some cases.

As in the previous year, there were some candidates who lifted complete sections of the text even though some parts were not relevant to the question. This showed that they probably did not completely understand the text.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03
Speaking

Key messages

- Teacher/Examiners must use all the prompts in the Role Play.
- Teacher/examiners must not invent extra Role Play tasks.
- In the Role Plays, 3 marks for each task can only be awarded if the task is fully completed.
- Marks cannot be awarded for Role Play tasks invented by the teacher/Examiner.
- Role Play tasks should not be changed or embellished, but it is acceptable for the Examiner to rephrase tasks or “nudge” candidates to remind them to complete the tasks.
- 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

As in the previous year, the overall standard was very high. There was only a very small number of candidates who obtained a low mark. Most candidates had a clear understanding of the questions/requirements and were able to demonstrate a high level of linguistic accuracy for this level.

In general, teacher/Examiners carried out the examinations better than last year with regard to time keeping, language used, etc. Most improved their technique and followed the requirements. However, there were some who continued to ignore the correct timings, requirements and procedures.

As in the previous year there were some elements of the teacher/Examiners’ technique which were not helpful to the candidates, such as the use of slang, dialects and colloquial language, especially in the Topic and General Conversations.

In the Topic and Discussion and General Conversation there should be plenty of questions from the teacher/Examiners to cover all the areas required. The teacher/Examiners need to remember that the examination is to measure the candidates’ linguistic abilities therefore the teacher/Examiner should talk less than the candidates. The candidates need to be active and should be given the maximum opportunity to speak.

All the work involved including labelling the cassettes/CDs, etc. is appreciated by the moderators. In order to ensure that the examination process and administration is carried out correctly, it is worth reminding all teacher/Examiners that it is essential to follow the instructions in the **Teacher’s Notes Booklet**. As in the previous year, there were some concerns regarding administration.

- Moderators found many arithmetical errors and differences between marks on the Working Mark Sheets and the marks submitted on MS1/electronically. **All marks must be checked by the Centre** before being sent to Cambridge.
- Cassettes/CDs/files need to be labelled clearly with candidate name/number.
- On the Working Mark Sheet, candidates’ names should appear in the same order as on the MS1/print out of marks.
- The sample must include a range of achievement (high, middling, low), and the Working Mark Sheet should be annotated to show which candidates are high, middling or low.

- The quality of recording must be clear, and the microphone must favour the candidate, not the teacher/Examiner.

Comments on specific questions

Test 1: Role Plays

General

The majority of candidates scored well on this section. Most candidates performed very well and sounded like they were enjoying this section. As in previous years though, there were still some teacher/Examiners who added extra tasks beside the tasks provided by Cambridge. This disadvantaged the candidates as it could confuse and distract them, and there was a risk that a specified task would be missed out or not completed, resulting in lost marks.

A full mark cannot be given when candidates do not complete the tasks specified by Cambridge. Providing all the specified tasks are completed then full marks should be given. Unnecessary extra tasks created by the teacher/Examiner must not be considered in the marking.

There is no requirement to add more tasks or embellish the role plays. Clear points of communication, following the prompts given, are what needed.

Role Play A Cards 1, 2 and 3

At a mobile phone shop to buy a mobile phone.

Candidates were required to greet the staff member, explain why they are there, state the model/type and the colour of the mobile phone he/she wants, ask the price, say that it is too expensive and request to see another model.

Most candidates did very well. Some teacher/Examiners gave information before being asked by the candidates (colours of the mobile phone, price, etc.), which prevented the candidates from asking/completing the task.

There were a few teacher/Examiners who were so involved in his/her role of selling mobile phones that they talked at length about different models and prices of mobile phone! This also prevented candidates from completing the last task (requesting to see another model) and from gaining full marks.

Role Play A Cards 4, 5 and 6

Make a phone call to book a place at an Internet cafe.

Candidates were required to book a place via telephone. Candidates had to explain the reason he/she was phoning, state that he/she would come soon, choose his/her preference of room, say thank you and ask the closing time. Finally they had to state that they only need to be there for one hour.

Most candidates scored highly. Again, some teacher/Examiners gave incorrect prompts. Many teacher/Examiners missed out the prompts specified by the Cambridge or gave information before being asked by the candidate.

Role Play A Cards 7, 8 and 9

At a cafe to buy a drink.

Candidates were required to greet the waiter/waitress and tell him/her that he/she only wants to drink. Then he/she had to choose his/her preferred table (outside or inside) and order a drink for him/herself. Then candidates had to refuse to order food as he/she was not hungry, and to say thank you. At the end, the candidate had to pay.

The majority of candidates performed very well in their role. Most candidates gained full marks however there were some who missed out the last task where they should ask for the bill. On this occasion the teacher/Examiner should give the correct prompt by asking whether the candidate/s need anything else.

Some candidates did not gain full marks because the teacher/Examiner did not give the correct prompts, or missed out a prompt. Some teacher/Examiners were so carried away by giving choices of drinks that they forgot that their role was to guide candidates to obtain full marks simply by giving the correct cues and prompts to allow candidates to complete the tasks.

Role Play B Cards 1, 4 and 7

Phoning a friend to cancel studying/doing their homework together as he/she is feeling unwell.

The candidate was required to greet the friend, explain why he/she was phoning and say sorry for cancelling the meeting. The candidate then had to answer his/her friend's question about the reason for not being able to study together. Then the candidate had to explain that he/she does not know whether he/she will go to school the next morning and hopes that he/she will feel better tomorrow morning. Finally, candidates had to ask his/her friend to help with homework at school tomorrow morning, express his/her gratitude and tell his/her friend that he/she will phone again in the morning.

Most candidates gained full marks. Candidates and teacher/Examiners took their role seriously and realistically. However, as in the other role plays, it was frustrating to listen to some teacher/Examiners missing out the prompt/s specified or not prompting the candidates to complete the necessary task/s. Some candidates lost marks on task three because the teacher/Examiner did not ask the question (whether he/she will go to school the next morning).

As in the other role plays, some teacher/Examiners gave incorrect cues which could prevent candidates from completing the task/s, e.g. instead of giving the opportunity to the candidate to say that he/she will phone again tomorrow morning, some teacher/Examiners said this. Candidates lost their opportunity to say it and lost their mark. This could be avoided if the teacher/Examiners kept to the prompt/s given and did not rush.

Role Play B Cards 2, 5 and 8

Arriving home, the candidate realises that he/she has left his/her notebook at the library. He/she goes back to ask a staff member about the notebook.

Candidates needed to explain their problem and give the information required by the library assistant. The role play began with candidate greeting the library assistant and explaining the reason for coming back. He/she had to give two details of the book then ask if any of the other staff may have seen it. Candidates also had to respond to the staff member's query about his/her name, class and telephone number, and he/she had to explain the consequences if he/she did not find the book.

The majority of candidates and teacher/Examiners performed well. Both parties played their roles in a very realistic way and it was very entertaining and enjoyable to listen to. However, as in the previous year and in other role plays, some candidates did not gain full marks, mostly due to teacher/Examiners not being responsive to a missed task, or not giving the correct cues or following the prompts given. Some candidates missed out the last task (give their details: name, class and telephone number) as the teacher/Examiner did not ask for it.

Role Plays B Cards 3, 6 and 9

At a doctor's clinic to see a doctor regarding a stomach problem.

Candidates had to greet and explain to the doctor the reason he/she had come. He/she also had to answer the doctor's question about when he/she started to get the stomach pain and what he/she had been eating and drinking before getting the pain. The candidate had to express his/her relief to know that the doctor would give him/her the most effective medicine for the pain as he/she had to travel abroad by plane in two days. Finally, the candidate had to ask the doctor how the medicine should be taken (dosage, frequency, time of day).

Most candidates performed well and scored highly. However, there were a few teacher/Examiners who did not ask when the candidates started to feel the pain, and some candidates lost their mark because of this.

Again, the teacher/Examiners need to be aware of their role in order to enable candidates to complete all tasks required.

Test 2: Topic (prepared) Discussion

Over all, most candidates performed well and gained high scores. The majority of the teacher/Examiners were well prepared and conducted this section very well. There were some teacher/Examiners who ignored the timing and others who forgot that their role is to give the candidate the opportunity to speak as much as possible to demonstrate their language skills.

As in previous years, the topics chosen were very broad and interesting to listen to. 'My ambitions', 'My House', 'My Family' and 'My hobbies' were still the most popular topics beside 'My Country'. Some topics were very ambitious. It was clear that most candidates had a personal interest in the topic chosen and had prepared well.

There were Centres where candidates seem to choose more challenging topics as in the previous year (e.g. social, political, economic, environmental, moral issues, etc.). This of course would lead to more challenging questions and could disadvantage candidates if their knowledge of the issues/topics is limited, even if their language skills are adequate.

Teachers should not encourage candidates to choose over-ambitious topics, to avoid disadvantaging themselves. It is the candidates' linguistic abilities/skills which are to be measured, not their knowledge or other skills. Therefore, marks should be based on the candidates' performances in their language and not the knowledge of the subject chosen.

There were some candidates who sounded unprepared, or were not given enough opportunity to express their linguistic abilities as the teacher/Examiners talked more than the candidates. Some teacher/Examiners did not ask enough questions, either because of an excessively long presentation (teacher/Examiners should interrupt after the specified time), or because the teacher/Examiners thought that a few questions were enough, even though there was plenty of time left, especially with weaker candidates.

Many teacher/Examiners had improved their technique from the previous year, but it is worth reminding them again that they should always carefully read and follow the **Teachers' Notes Booklet**.

Finally, there was a great deal of Jakartan slang as well as colloquial Indonesian and English used. Teacher/examiners are advised to encourage candidates to use formal Indonesian language by example in this section.

Test 3: General (unprepared) Conversation

In general most teacher/Examiners conducted this section very well and as in the previous year most candidates scored highly. Topics of conversation were varied and covered the total number of subject areas required very well. Subject areas covered were similar to the previous year: family, studies, hobbies, plans for the future and general interests.

Some teacher/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.

As in the previous year, some teacher/Examiners asked over-challenging questions which were beyond the candidate's knowledge, and marked their knowledge rather than their language skills. If the questions are too challenging and candidates are not able to answer, this will affect their confidence and then their performance too will be affected.

The time allocation was usually well managed. However, there were some teacher/Examiners who did not use the time very well. Some only used one or two minutes of the available time, and did not ask more than two or three questions, or did not cover the three subject areas required. Teacher/Examiners are reminded that they need to cover 3 subject areas, not simply 3 questions.

A small number of teacher/Examiners conducted this session by giving the same questions to every candidate. This is not good examining practice and must be avoided.

Although most teacher/Examiners followed the instructions, there are still some who remain unfamiliar with the instructions. They are encouraged to read the **Teachers' Notes Booklet** thoroughly and to familiarise themselves with the requirements to enable them to assist candidates to do their best.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04
Continuous Writing

Key points

- Candidates should check that they have answered all parts of the question.
- The use of slang should be avoided.
- Candidates should check their work carefully for spelling errors and avoid using anglicisms.

General Comments

Most candidates performed very well on this paper.

Specific problems encountered by candidates included:

1. On several occasions, candidates lost marks by not addressing part of the question. In **Question 1a**, the second bullet point asks candidates to write about what they liked reading *and* where they obtained these reading materials. Or, if choosing **Question 1b**, candidates were asked to write about the kind of weather they liked *and* disliked. In both cases there are two parts to the question and both the first *and* second part of the question needed addressing in order to score full communication marks.
2. The use of slang should be avoided. The use of the suffix 'in' was used by quite a few candidates e.g.: 'saya bacain buku' instead of 'saya membaca buku', 'saya diajarin' instead of 'saya diajar' or 'saya diajarkan'. Similarly, candidates should not use abbreviated forms such as 'karna' instead of 'karena' and avoid slang terms such as 'keren' where a range of other possible descriptive words could be better used in its place.
3. There were some common spelling errors such as: 'tau' or 'tao' instead of 'tahu' (to know); 'serperti' instead of 'seperti' (such as); 'temen' instead of 'teman' (friend), 'menelfon' (or other variations instead of 'menelepon' (to phone); and examples of the letter 'h' being added where none is needed, e.g. 'kami harus belih', 'masah kecil saya' and 'duluh'. Several candidates used anglicisms or confused spellings with close sounding English words, e.g. 'restaurant' instead of 'restoran' (or 'rumah makan'), 'special' instead of 'spesial' (or 'istimewa') and quite a few ordered 'kue chocolate' instead of 'kue coklat'.
4. The use of prepositions has been noted in previous years, e.g. 'pada' followed by time, e.g.: 'pada hari Senin' (on Monday), 'pada pagi hari' (in the morning); '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' and incorrect to write the preposition as one joined word (thus dirumah, diatas, dimana-mana should all be written as: di rumah, di atas, di mana-mana).
5. There was some confusion in some candidates' minds as to the use of 'di' as a preposition and as a prefix to a verb. As a preposition it is a separate word, e.g. di sini (here), di sana (there) and see examples above, whereas as a prefix it is part of the verb and creates the passive; e.g. dibeli (bought), ditentukan (decided), disiapkan (prepared). Examples such as 'di beli', 'di tentukan' and 'di siapkan' are therefore incorrect.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Why I like reading.
This was well answered by most candidates. It was interesting to note that a very high proportion of candidates wrote that much of their reading for leisure is in English.
- (b) Describe the kinds of weather in your country.
A high proportion of candidates confused 'cuaca' (weather) with 'musim' (season) and described Indonesia as only having two kinds of weather. In their imaginary letter to a friend, describing the types of weather, candidates need to be more consistent on the kind of address being used: i.e. kamu or Anda (with a capital 'A'). A mix of the two in the same letter should not be used.

Question 2

You wish to arrange a party for your parents who will be celebrating their wedding anniversary. The task is about the planning of a future event and not, as interpreted by some candidates, about recounting a story which happened sometime in the past.

There was often confusion over use of 'kita' and 'kami'. Many candidates wrote about 'orang tua kita', 'pesta di rumah kita' and so on. Unless in the very rare case they were clearly talking to siblings, kita should be replaced with kami. There were examples of this being mixed within sentences, e.g. 'kita akan mengagetkan orang tua kami'; again this should be 'kami' in both cases.