

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02
Reading and Directed Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should always read the comprehension questions with care.
- Proof reading 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 2**, Exercise 2 and **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.

There were still some candidates who lifted an entire section of a passage as their answer, and 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. 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 correct answer from four options. As in the previous year, most candidates gained full marks.

Exercise 2 Questions 6 – 10

In this section, candidates had to match the situations described with the appropriate method of travel. 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 day out. 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 one or two communication points.

For **Question (a): What did you do?** Most candidates gave a satisfactory answer.

For **Question (b): What happened next?** Most candidates gave correct information, e.g. *it started to rain, there was a storm* or other acceptable explanations. A few candidates skipped this part and therefore lost one communication point.

For **Question (c): What did you do when you arrived home?** The majority of candidates answered appropriately.

As in the previous year, a few candidates wrote too much which resulted in them missing out on one or two communication points. Candidates need to be aware that only the first 40 words will be assessed (or up to the end of the sentence / end of phrase if it is an excessively long sentence) and no marks are awarded thereafter.

Part 2

Exercise 1 Questions 17 – 24

This section was a reading comprehension about Pipiet and her gardening.

The majority of candidates scored the full 10 marks. Those who did not tended to have difficulty with **Questions 17** and/or **24**.

Some candidates answered **Question 17** with *because studying botany is Pipiet's aspiration* instead of the correct answer of *she wants to learn how to grow plants that can be eaten by the Indonesian people* or *because Pipiet's favourite subject is biology*.

For **Question 24**, some candidates answered because *Pipiet makes money from selling fruits and vegetables* instead of *Pipiet gains a lot of knowledge and experience (in growing plants)*.

Exercise 2 Question 25

Candidates were required to write between 80-100 words about a holiday at their grandmother's, and express gratitude for her kindness. Candidates were required to cover all 3 points.

Almost all of the candidates completed the tasks and most candidates scored highly. The main reasons why some candidates did not get full marks were:

- they did not express gratitude as instructed in the question
- in response to **Question (b)** they did not show / indicate the difference in degree of enjoyment (what they enjoyed *most*) while staying at their grandmother's
- a few candidates wrote a very short passage which did not contain enough additional details worthy of extra marks.

Part 3

Exercise 1 Questions 26 – 32

In this section candidates were asked to decide whether the statements based on a text about an elephant were true or false. They had to provide a correction if they thought the statement given was false. 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. On **Question 26**, a few candidates gave a wrong correction *because the monkey was always happy* instead of *the monkey was popular and had many friends*. A few candidates answered 'false' for **Question 28** which was supposed to be 'true'. This could be due to confusion over *a special tree* and *Zonga tree*. A few candidates did not give a correction for the false statements which meant they could only score a maximum of 7 marks out of 10.

Exercise 2 Questions 33 – 37

This was another reading comprehension about a letter of complaint.

Most candidates understood the passage well and gained full marks. The main reasons why some candidates did not obtain full marks were:

- candidates used *we* as a subject instead of *the writer* when answering the questions; this showed that candidates probably did not completely understand the text and/or the question and simply lifted answers from the text
- for **Question 33**, a few candidates answered (i) *because the writer paid with a credit card* and (ii) *because the order arrived late* instead of the acceptable answers of *s/he had paid for express delivery; they were a wedding present; or s/he had to buy another gift*
- for **Question 34**, a few candidates gave an inaccurate answer, e.g. *the plates received were bigger than what s/he ordered*
- for **Question 35**, a few candidates gave an inaccurate answer, i.e. *the writer will return the goods* instead of *the writer returned the goods*
- for **Question 36**, a few candidates simply repeated the same answers they gave for **Question 34** whereas the answers should have been (i) *the cost of returning the goods* and (ii) *the inconvenience / trouble (that the writer has experienced)*
- for **Question 37**, a few candidates gave an incomplete answer, omitting the key word (*local*) newspaper, e.g. *the writer will write a letter (to report the poor service)*.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/03

Speaking

Key messages

- Teacher/Examiners must familiarise themselves fully with the contents of the Teachers' Notes booklet.
- Teacher/Examiners should stick to the role play tasks as set out in the Teachers' Notes.
- If an element of a Role Play task is omitted, an appropriate prompt may be given.
- Teacher/Examiners should make a clear distinction between Test 2 and Test 3.
- Failure to stick closely to the set timing may disadvantage candidates.
- Teacher/Examiners should vary the topics covered and should not ask all candidates the same series of questions.
- Candidates should be asked both expected and unexpected questions.
- To achieve the highest possible mark candidates do not have to be of native speaker standard.

General comments

This Speaking Test was common to all candidates, whether Core or Extended, and, as in previous years, a range of performance was heard by the Moderator. The majority of candidates displayed excellent levels of competence and their range of communication skills was extremely good. They had been appropriately prepared for the test and were familiar with its requirements.

Administration

Regrettably, an increase in the number of administrative errors has been noticed by the Moderator.

- Errors in addition of marks: Centres are reminded that they must ensure that the addition of each candidate's marks is checked before transfer to the MS1 Mark Sheet.
- Centres are reminded of the need to include the name of the conducting teacher/Examiner(s) in the space allowed on the Working Mark Sheet (Oral Examination Summary Mark Sheet).
- Incorrect candidate numbers: it is crucial that names and numbers on all documentation are correct.
- Use of more than one teacher/Examiner per Centre: where large Centres wish to use more than one teacher/Examiner, permission to do so must be requested from CIE well before each Speaking Test examination session. Where permission is granted, Internal Moderation procedures will need to be put in place in the Centre to ensure that candidates follow a single rank order. Such Centres will then submit a recorded sample of 6 candidates, across the range, in the usual way, but ensuring that the work of all teacher/Examiners is covered. Some Centres with more than two teacher/Examiners, however, did not carry out any Internal Moderation and this extended the time of the normal moderation process.
- Missing MS1 (computer-printed) Mark Sheets: the Moderator's copy of the MS1 Mark Sheet must be included with the materials for moderation to allow the Moderator to check that totals have been correctly transferred from the Oral Examination Summary Mark Sheet.
- Missing examination details and labels on cassettes/CDs: Some Centres did not put any details or labels on cassettes/CDs, making it very difficult for the Moderator to find the recordings. This is even more difficult for Centres with bigger numbers of candidates.

Quality of recording

The vast majority of Centres had taken great care to ensure the audibility of their samples, but work received from a very small number was inaudible/ muffled in places. This was sometimes the result of poor positioning of the microphone/ tape recorder. Centres are reminded of the need to check all equipment prior to the test in the room in which the examination will take place. There were also some background noises which affected the moderation process badly. Teacher/Examiners should also remember to announce the name and number of each candidate on the recording – the candidate him/herself should not do this. Once started, the recording of each candidate should be continuous, for example, the recording must not be paused/ stopped during an individual candidate's examination. Some Centres, unfortunately, did not spot check their recordings before submitting them to Cambridge, as some elements of the examination were not available for moderation as the recordings were incomplete or stopped abruptly.

Timings

Timings were usually good (15 minutes per candidate). Some tests were too long and became quite tedious for candidates. Please remember that in order to ensure fair treatment of all candidates, the tests should keep to the times stated in the Teachers' Notes Booklet.

Preparation of candidates

Most Centres had prepared their candidates in an appropriate way and there was evidence of spontaneous, natural conversation in the two conversation sections. There were, however, a small number of Centres in which all candidates presented the same topic in the Topic Presentation/Conversation section. Centres are reminded that candidates should be encouraged to choose a topic they are interested in, and should avoid topics which might then limit the General Conversation, such as "Myself". It was pleasing to note that in the large majority of Centres, teacher/Examiners managed to engage their candidates in a lively, spontaneous and engaging way, following up leads wherever possible. Such teacher/Examiners used a variety of questions with different candidates and pitched the level of questioning according to the ability of the candidate being tested.

Role Plays

It is essential that teacher/Examiners do not miss out tasks or create extra ones. The role plays must be carried out as specified in the Teachers' Notes Booklet.

Regrettably there were still some teacher/Examiners who did not follow these instructions. This confused candidates who had prepared themselves well for the examination but lost marks as they struggled to follow the teacher/Examiners' own newly created tasks.

Application of the mark scheme

The mark scheme was generally consistently applied in Centres.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/04
Continuous Writing

Key messages

- Candidates should check the imagined situation described by the rubric and decide whether the use of kami or kita is appropriate to that situation. Beware also of the common spelling errors, shown below.
- Candidates need to take care over use of prepositions, particularly using 'di' and 'ke', and when using 'di' in its very different form as a prefix to create the passive.
- As the aim of this paper is to test written accuracy as well as communication, candidates should continue to avoid using the kind of slang common in informal, spoken language.

General comments

Most candidates continued to perform well. The great majority of candidates had no difficulty in imagining the situations required, in completing the tasks within the word limit and in using language showing a high level of fluency.

Specific language problems encountered by candidates are listed below.

1. There is frequent misuse of or confusion over the use of kami versus kita. In many cases, candidates mixed the use of these two forms within the same sentence and paragraph, for example, a candidate is imagining meeting a famous pop star whilst out shopping with a friend: 'kita merasa sangat senang dan kami lari ke toko itu'. The same error was frequently made in using kami or kita in the possessive: for example, again in referring to the pop star as 'dia idola kita', whereas the writer is describing the reactions of himself and friend to the reader and, as such, kami should be used.
2. Several spelling errors, noted in previous years, remain common, for example: 'tau' or 'tao' instead of 'tahu' (to know); 'serperti' instead of 'seperti' (such as); 'temen' instead of 'teman' (friend), 'kasih' (love) where it should be 'kasi' (colloquial version of to give), 'menelfon' (or other variations instead of 'menelepon' (to phone). There were several variations of spelling for 'telepon genggam' and HP was accepted as an acronym, though 'hape' was not considered correct. 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').
3. The use of prepositions has been noted in previous years, e.g. 'pada' followed by 'time': 'pada hari Senin' (on Monday), 'pada pagi hari' (in the morning); 'di/ke' followed by 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, disana, dimana-mana should all be written as: di rumah, di atas, di sana, di mana-mana).
4. Following from point 3, there was some confusion in some candidates' minds as to 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), dirayakan (celebrated), ditraktir (treated). Examples such as 'di beli', 'di rayakan' and 'di traktir' are therefore incorrect.
5. Most candidates correctly wrote the possessive forms of 'nya' and 'ku' as suffixes attached to the noun, however, a noticeable few separated these. Correct examples are: 'saya jalan-jalan dengan teman-temanku' (not 'teman ku') and 'kami senang dapat tanda tangannya' (not 'tanda tangan nya').

6. This year, the use of slang was rare and whilst in a letter –as when writing to a grandfather- the language is not formal, the aim in the writing exam is still for ‘Bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar’. Occasional examples of slang included shortened versions of common words or the occasional addition of ‘in’ as follows: ‘gimana kabar’, ‘saya pengen merayakan pesta’, ‘saya lupain saja’, ‘kita tidak tahu mau ngapain’, ‘kita mau dibuatin pesta’.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1(a)

This was well answered by most candidates, nearly all of whom mentioned the need to do school homework and then helping with a variety of other tasks ranging from helping with the washing-up to helping wash the car.

Question 1(b)

Candidates had to write a letter to their grandfather saying what they would buy with the money he had sent to them, how they would celebrate their birthday and the kinds of present they would like. Again, this was generally well answered. Mobile phones featured highly as sought after presents (various words were accepted: telepon genggam, ponsel or HP).

Question 2

This was a question that seemed to work well for candidates in that it dips into popular teenage culture and allowed a range of ideas to be communicated whether in fairly simple or more complicated language. Agnes Monica or Justin Bieber came across as the two most popular stars candidates wrote about, though there was a wide variety of others mentioned, including some dead such as Michael Jackson and Bob Marley. This task allowed for plenty of imagination though most chose to go into the shop and take photos (usually with mobile phones with the results being posted on Facebook and Twitter) and ask for the pop star’s signature. Here, as in last year’s paper, candidates were sometimes confused about whether to use kami and kita.