

Written examination

The written examination consisted of three sections, with candidates required to attempt all questions in Sections One and Two (Part A and B).

Attempted by 58 candidates	Mean 64.41%	Max 95.29%	Min 15.83%
----------------------------	-------------	------------	------------

Section means were:

Section One: Response: Viewing and reading	Mean 57.41%		
Attempted by 58 candidates	Mean 22.97(/40)	Max 37.00	Min 10.50

Section Two: Written Communication Part A: Stimulus response	Mean 71.67%		
Attempted by 56 candidates	Mean 17.92(/25)	Max 24.17	Min 3.33

Section Two: Written Communication Part B: Extended response	Mean 70.2%		
Attempted by 57 candidates	Mean 24.57(/35)	Max 34.12	Min 13.12

General comments

Generally, candidates performed better in the written examination than the practical examination. There was a difference of 4.62% between performance in the practical and the written papers this year compared with only a 1.5% difference in 2017.

Practical examination

The majority of candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of the syllabus content. There was a wide range of abilities and skills amongst candidates but most were able to respond to the questions with the relevant information required. A minority struggled to respond appropriately.

Generally, candidates did not perform as well in Part B as they did in Part C, where they were better prepared to answer questions on broader topics of syllabus content. A small number of candidates did not understand very simple questions or were unable to answer questions due to a lack of vocabulary knowledge and grammar skills.

Candidates' strengths overall included relative confidence and well-rehearsed responses in answering a range of questions. They demonstrated familiarity with a broad range of syllabus topics which were covered in Part C and they were able to communicate answers with satisfactory elaboration. Most candidates provided explanations in Indonesian only, even when they were struggling, and did not readily revert to English.

General weaknesses included many candidates having difficulty with fully understanding the audio text or understanding the questions, and not taking sufficient or effective notes during Part B which led to insufficient details being provided in their answers. There were a number of candidates who did not use appropriate terms of address to the examiner, using '*kamu*' instead of '*Ibu*' or '*Bapak*'.

Candidates tended to 'jump in' with rehearsed answers in Part C, without comprehending the details of the specific question. Questions related to prediction or aimed at the creative level and applying to their future were often misunderstood, with responses communicated in present tense rather than future. Higher order questions were often misinterpreted or totally misunderstood. There were a number of candidates who had difficulty forming properly structured sentences.

Advice for candidates

- Listen to as many Indonesian podcasts online as you can, away from the classroom. Ask your teacher for some useful sites for this activity.

- Look for opportunities outside of the classroom to speak informally and ‘off-the-cuff’ with native speakers of Indonesian.
- Practise using a range of repair strategies in Indonesian, such as asking the meaning of a word, or asking the examiner to repeat the questions, so that you do not resort to using English in interview/conversation situations or are unable to say anything in response to questions. However, do not rely too much on constantly using these strategies.

Advice for teachers

- A repertoire of repair strategies for dealing with comprehension difficulties needs to be taught to students instead of just saying ‘*tolong ulang!*’ or ‘*Saya tidak tahu!*’. However, candidates should not rely too much on these rehearsed questions as responses to questions.
- Prepare a bank of questions for each content area of the syllabus for students to answer. Do not focus too much on literal questions. Move quickly into the higher order levels of questioning: applying, analysing and evaluating.
- Provide frequent and varied sessions in class for students to practice speaking Indonesian and listening to Indonesian on topics relevant to Units 3 and 4.
- Ensure that students practise the use of correct syntax (applying the rules, principles and processes that govern the structure of sentences in Indonesian) and pronunciation.
- Ensure that students practise the use of appropriate terms of address in the various contexts. Some candidates used inappropriate term of address to the examiners, such as ‘*kamu!*’, ‘*tolong ulangilah!*’. ‘*Kamu!*’ should be used amongst friends, not to a teacher or examiner. ‘*Tolong ulangilah!*’ is giving an instruction to repeat the question. This should not be used by a candidate when speaking to an examiner.
- Encourage students not to use English at all. It should become natural to them to keep ‘having a go’ at understanding by using Indonesian only, even when struggling.

Written examination

In Section One, a number of candidates were unable to synthesise information from the texts to provide explicit answers, instead quoting facts directly from the texts. Questions 4, 5 and 7 had the highest percentage of candidates attaining a mark of zero. Some candidates wrote the answers for Question 3 in the space for Question 4. Additionally, some gave inaccurate answers to Questions 2 and 5 because they misread or misunderstood the questions.

In general, candidates’ performances were better in the written communication section of the examination in Section Two. Candidates generally provided well-organised extended responses which demonstrated a clear understanding of the syllabus content and preparation in responding to the unit topics. Candidates addressed a range of topics in the extended response question, including poverty, education, health, pollution/plastic rubbish, global warming, smoking, tourism, conservation, defence, trading, politics, government, law, human rights, media and communication, international relationships, economics and criminology.

Overall, syntactic and semantic errors in writing included:

- Negating a linguistic item incorrectly in a response, such as ‘*ada tidak harapan!*’ or ‘*dengan tidak pendidikan!*’ rather than expressing correctly as ‘*tidak ada harapan!*’, ‘*tanpa harapan!*’ or ‘*kurang berpendidikan!*’ or ‘*tanpa pendidikan!*’.
- The incorrect application of ‘*ber!*’ and ‘*me!*’: For example, ‘to change’ – *berubah*, *merubah*.
- Constructing active and passive sentences.
- Incorrect application of noun and verb forms:
 - ‘change’ – *berubah*, *merubah*, *perubahan!*;
 - ‘knowledge’ – *pengetahuan*, *ketahuan!*;
 - ‘addition’ – *pertambahan*, *menambah!*;

- 'creeping' - *penjalaran, menjalar*;
- 'stress' – *tekanan, menekan*;
- 'responsibility' – *pertanggungjawaban, bertanggung jawab*;
- 'experience' – *pengalaman, mengalami*;
- 'hope' – *pengharapan, mengharap, mengharapkan*.
- Incorrect application of verb and adjective forms:
 - 'lose' - '*kehilangan, hilang*';
 - 'interested' - '*tertarik, menarik*';
 - 'useful' – *bermanfaat, manfaat*;
 - 'dead' – *mematikan, mati*.
- Incorrect use of noun forms, e.g. *persediaan* versus *penyediaan* as a result of not understanding the function of the circumfix and how it relates to the base word and the verb, i.e. the circumfix *per-an* forms the noun from the *ber* verb (*bersedia* – 'being prepared' and *persediaan* – 'preparations') and the circumfix *pe-an* forms the noun from the *me-kan* verb (*menyediakan* – to prepare [something] and *penyediaan* – the act or process of preparing [something]).
- Incorrect structure using comparatives for nouns, e.g. writing '*lebih orang*' or '*lebih film*' instead of '*lebih banyak orang*'.
- Using the rule of pluralisation, incorrectly; eg. duplicating words for plurals in phrases such as '*banyak orang-orang*' and '*banyak isu-isu*'.
- Incorrect use of transitive verbs: eg '*kita harus menghentikan sekarang*' instead of '*kita harus menghentikan something/object sekarang*'.
- Incorrect expressing of well wishes/hope: eg '*saya harapan*' or '*saya semoga moga*' instead of the correct '*saya berharap bahwa*'.
- Incorrectly using '*adalah*' before an adjectival description.
- Using '*ada*' instead of '*adalah*' and vice-versa.
- Misusing '*kebanyakan*' for the word '*banyak*'.
- Using '*kedua*' to say 'both x and y' instead of '*baik...maupun*' or other accepted expressions.
- Using the '*ter*-verb' form and '*di*-verb' form interchangeably.
- Using '*bernafsu*' to describe a passion for a topic instead of the word '*semangat*'.
- Using '*meminta*' to ask questions.
- Using '*bahwa*' in place of '*yang*' means 'which'.
- Incorrect word order.
- Literal translation from English.

Advice for candidates

- Use a dictionary to choose the appropriate word or phrase, making allowances for non-literal (figurative) meanings. Crosscheck using both English to Indonesian and Indonesian to English dictionaries. Practise this technique during the year so that it will become second nature during the examination.
- Do not use online translators when drafting your writing.
- Adhere to the suggested working time printed on the examination paper for each section to ensure that you provide an answer to all questions in the examination paper.

Advice for teachers

- Provide students with substantial practice in writing under timed conditions reflecting the suggested working times on the different sections of the examination paper, e.g. for a stimulus response answer of 150 words, allow candidates 15 minutes, for an extended response of 200 words (essay, letter, script etc.) allow candidates approximately 35 minutes. Adhere to these times and provide many opportunities throughout the year for students to write under these conditions.
- Encourage students to express opinions appropriately in the written form.

- Develop questions related to the text types, based on lower to higher order questions intended to illicit relevant and targeted information and responses from your students. Try to hit all levels of thinking, from knowledge/comprehension through to analysis, synthesis and evaluation.
- Ensure that when previewing or reading, students know what information they are seeking. Ensure a coverage of short questions from literal and inferential through to analysis, synthesis and evaluative.
- Teach the specific syntax of Indonesian (word order and creating well-formed sentences not based on English syntax).
- Provide opportunities for students (both inside and outside the classroom) to read short Indonesian articles or excerpts from books and various written genre (related to syllabus topics) on a regular basis to improve their comprehension of written texts.
- Provide opportunities for students to write a range of text types and develop awareness of specific conventions relevant to each text type. This includes how to construct appropriate questions (e.g. in interview scripts), and not to translate the questions or expressions from English into Indonesian literally.
- Students need to be proficient in writing about syllabus content by describing real-life examples in clear, simple Indonesian.
- Encourage students to prepare at least one issue for every topic in the syllabus.
- Expose your students to contemporary Indonesia and challenge stereotypes, in order that they have the background knowledge to speak and write about contemporary and up-to-date images of Indonesia.

Comments on specific sections and questions

Practical examination

Part B: Discussion prompted by stimulus (25 Marks)

Candidates performed best against the speech criterion (flow, pronunciation and intonation); however, there was a wide range of ability. They performed most poorly against the response criterion (relevance and depth of information). Candidates had the widest range of performance against the comprehension criterion.

Part C: Conversation (25 Marks)

Candidates demonstrated better overall results in Part C compared to Part B. They performed best against the comprehension criterion and most poorly against the language accuracy criterion.

Written examination

Section One: Response: Viewing and reading (40 Marks)

A number of candidates had difficulty with questions that required them to synthesise information from the text as a whole (as opposed to extracting facts from the text directly). Although several candidates implied some meaning in their answers, they were required to explicitly state their answers (usually when question asked them 'based on the text').

Section Two: Written Communication Part A: Stimulus response (25 Marks)

This section was performed well by most candidates. Most were able to use suitable language to outline their views.

Section Two: Written Communication Part B: Extended response (35 Marks)

Candidates were required to complete both questions in this section of the examination. Their performance was similar in both questions. Many types of field work or occupations was suggested by candidates in Question 11 and a wide range of issues chosen for the interview in Question 12.