Indonesian A: Literature

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 19	20 - 35	36 - 47	48 - 60	61 - 73	74 - 85	86 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 17	18 - 32	33 - 46	47 - 58	59 - 71	72 - 82	83 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The majority of extracts chosen by teachers were suitable, both in length and depth. Candidates were able to comment on them and were challenged to give their opinion in detail about the work. Generally, samples were well recorded, clear and in a good quality, however, in some cases there is some background noise.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of the extract

Generally, candidates were familiar with the poems and able to display their good knowledge and understanding about them.

Criterion B: Appreciation of the Writer's Choices.

Many candidates found this criterion was the most challenging. Although, they had a good understanding about the poem or passage, they were not able to bring into their discussion the literary aspects presented by the writer.

Some candidates relied on their good knowledge of figurative language in order to achieve good marks, but were no further discussion in other aspect of the literary devices.

Several candidates were looking at the grammar used by the writer, but the discussion was not about the writer's choice.

Criterion C: Organization and presentation of the commentary

In general, comments were focused and candidates were able to give examples from the poem to justify them. Many candidates started their commentary by giving the writers background at length, this is not recommended. Some candidates read their poem before starting their comment and all of these took their time away from discussion.

Criterion D: Knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion

Not all candidates had the opportunity to show their understanding in the discussion because of the way questions were asked. For example, after the candidates finish their comment the questions should not only focus on what has just been explained by the candidate. Some teachers were able to go further in their discussion by asking more depth about the work and the candidate's opinion rather than reiterate the previous discussion.

Criterion E: Response to the discussion questions

The responses in their discussion were varied, many were able to give a good response and give references regarding the works, however not many give their response in an original manner or independently thought.

Criterion F: Language

Generally, candidates were able to express their ideas in formal Indonesian language with good grammar and vocabulary, but some used the informal Indonesian without trying to correct themselves during discussion.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Read the criterion using for assessing internal marking and apply accordingly.
- Advice the candidates not to talk at length about the writer background unless has specific connection with the poem.
- Make sure that candidates respect the time allotted for the oral.
- Use formal Indonesian during the examination.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Extracts, texts and poems selected by teachers were appropriate and varied, giving plenty of room for candidates to make comments in depth. The guiding questions were also suitable and encouraged discussion. The majority of teachers offered a correct extract but in some cases, the extract were very long or too short (mostly poems).

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of the extract

Generally candidates were able to show their good understanding of the extract; however, achieving very high marks was difficult. As said previously, many candidates started their commentary by giving information about the author at length, and this did not have any relation with the work discussed. Some candidates have the same way of starting their commentary and follow by the same structures.

Criterion B: Appreciation of the Writer's Choices

Many candidates found this criterion was the most challenging. Although, they had a good understanding about the poem or passage, they were not able to bring into their discussion the literary aspects presented by the writer.

Some candidates relied on their good knowledge of figurative language in order to achieve good marks, but were no further discussion in other aspect of the literary devices.

Several candidates were looking at the grammar used by the writer, but the discussion was not about the writer's choice.

Criterion C: Organisation and Presentation

Generally candidates did a good job in organising their commentaries and focus. They usually started with the author's background (not necessary) and continued to discuss the work giving some reference to the work and able to draw conclusions. However, some candidates still presented difficulties in making their commentaries structured and interesting.

Criterion D: Language

Candidates were expected to use a formal Indonesian but many adopted an informal style with many colloquialisms. Some students were not aware that they used the informal Indonesian. The translation of the word character should not be "karakter" but "tokoh" and also the word characterisation is not "karakterisasi" but "penokohan", the same with characterisation: "penokohan" not "karakterisasi", message should be "amanat" and pesan for moral.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers should know that it is not necessary to talk about the author's biography at length for example about his/her achievements in her/his field. This is only relevant if there is a relation between the author's experiences and the work presented as an extract.
- Use formal Indonesian at all time.
- Make sure that time does not go over what is required.
- Prepare candidates in advance on how to speak without any hesitation
- Candidates should focus in the questions and the discussion should be based on the extract.

Higher level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The topics were moderately varied but most of them dealt with gender and family. It would be good to see more diversity. Sometimes students did not focus their analysis on the point of view of literature itself. There is room of improvement in this area. Teachers can prepare candidates by continuously giving exercises and simulations with various topics during class.

Candidate performance against each criterion

The most common weakness of the candidates was that they did not exploit the reflective statement, and they only provided a summary of the essay or the work they were discussing. Teachers should train the students to be able to write a reflection in every work they do in order for them to become more confident in doing this.

Criterion A: some candidates did not achieve good scores because they may not have been familiar with this assessment criterion (minimum-maximum word numbers, and that the reflection must be based on the oral interactive activities in class). However, comparing to last year, in average, the reflective statements were of a higher quality and followed the instructions much better.

Criterion C: in general, not much special attention was given to this criterion, and many essays presented a general opinion, not a deep literature analysis. Nevertheless, there were various students' essays which were focused, good, clear, and sharp.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

There are some recommendations for the teachers:

- Introduce to your class the assessment criteria as early as possible, discuss it in depth and give examples of the maximum scores if possible.
- Offer opportunities for oral interaction (discussions, debates, presentations, speeches, etc).
- Broaden their minds by searching new books or topics from old/recent books. Teachers could also regularly search in the internet for essays on certain works (e.g. Woman at Point Zero) to prevent plagiarism.
- Always provide opportunities for practice to students when they can write reflections and develop new knowledge and understanding to structure an essay.

Standard level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20	21 - 25

The range and suitability of the work submitted

In general, SL students could write good and effective statements and basic essays quite well. Unfortunately, there are some schools whose teachers did not give enough information and did not tell the students that their task is not World Lit anymore. There were many reflective statements which were more like statement of intent. The reflective did not show a development of their sense of culture that they supposed to get from the oral interactive activities in class.

Some schools have been using the same books for many years. I recommend changing the books to new ones in accordance with PLT. Self-taught students did quite well in understanding the reading text although their use of language was weaker.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Similar to criterion A, the ability to write reflective statements must be improved at SL, generally they write a work summary and/or a summary of their essays.

Criterion B: generally the knowledge is quite good however not all of them showed vast understanding. There are some who do not provide evidence for their arguments or analyze the work.

Criterion D; evidence is not always provided; this should be explained when giving instructions on the written assignment.

Criterion E: In general, the use of language is quite good, varied, and in accordance with the appropriate register. The common weakness is that students often ignore the grammar rules.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Make it a habit for students to always discuss and note important new points they get from the discussions and develop them after. During oral interactive activities candidates are supposed to communicate with each other.

Introduce the assessment criteria as early as possible, discuss seriously and give examples of the maximum scores.

Introduce various kinds of oral interactive activities (discussions, debates, presentations, speeches, etc).

Broaden their minds by teaching new books or topics. Teachers should also regularly check the internet about essays on certain works (e.g. Woman at Point Zero) to prevent plagiarism.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 20

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Candidates seemed to face a difficulty on Criterion B and Criterion C. First of all, candidates often did not show much understanding towards the intrinsic aspect of the text. This weakness indicates that the candidates have not fully understood and mastered the literature techniques in analysis. Secondly, candidates frequently failed to provide evidence to support their arguments and their ideas were often incoherent. This demonstrates that the effectiveness of their writing still needs more practice. Lastly, most candidates faced difficulty in showing their understanding in analysing the poem, which may be due to the fact that the word play in poetry is complex, the setting is abstract, and it can be interpreted in multiple ways. On the other hand, when candidates analysed poetry, they had difficulty in recognizing the poetic devices and only a few of them were able to explain how the devises had been used to contrast meaning. Candidates were less successful in interpretation as they tended to focus mainly on the literary surface only.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates were well-prepared specifically on Criterion D. Generally, candidates were able to use an excellent language – rich vocabulary and also appropriate register. However, sentences did not often flow cohesively. They were also more likely to show confidence in answering questions on prose instead of on poems, which may be due to the fact that the theme of the story (i.e. family or money problem, family setting) was more familiar to them.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

As previously mentioned, the strength of candidates lied in their excellent ability to use the right language and their general understanding of the extract given, in particularly the prose. Unfortunately, many students did not give an in depth interpretation of the extract, resulting in their essays appearing as more of a summary instead of an analysis. Despite this, those who selected the prose were able comment on the relationship with the protagonist and the adversary.

They were also able to use good quality language, imagery, and vocabulary when analysing the poem, although they were very weak in showing the connection between the extrinsic and intrinsic structure of the particular extract. In addition, candidates generally only mentioned the theory of intrinsic analysis but did not develop it well. Moreover, some candidates seemed to have distracted from the extract, resulting in an unfocused answer and the contents were often unrelated to the extract.

Candidates who wrote a commentary on poetry were likely to treat the poem as a piece of prose. They used the prose devices such as plot, characters, conflict and setting to analyse the poem. There were only a few excellent commentaries which demonstrated a sophisticated engagement with the poem and close reading to relevant devices to the genre.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers need to introduce the marking criteria for all the categories to ensure that the candidates are familiar with the quality that is expected of them. Secondly, teachers might help to build candidates' analytical skills up by exposing them to a wide variety of texts which displays a variety of language and the effect of writing style due to the period when the text was written. This method might enhance candidates' close reading ability. Lastly, candidates should also be taught extensively about the intrinsic aspects from the beginning and in every part of the subject. Allowing the students to develop their arguments (both in writing and verbally) at all times would help the students get used to express their ideas in an effective, coherent, and organized way.

Further comments

Some of the candidates' hand writing on the scripts was almost illegible. Students are strongly recommended to produce a legible commentary.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 17	18 - 20

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

The difficulties faced by candidates are often in Criterion A, Criterion B and Criterion C. They often provided a superficial analysis, which did not answer the guiding questions very well.

Frequently, the analysis did not include any text appreciation from intrinsic aspects and their arguments were also incoherent. Furthermore, for some candidates it was very difficult because of a language barrier in expressing their argument. Those who selected to analyse poetry did not seem to understand the passage as their commentary consisted of too much paraphrasing and did not have enough relevant analysis.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates were able to show some understanding of the text, although it did not reach the quality expected of them. Taking as an example the prose extract, candidates were able to do a commentary on corruption, but were unable to understand the relationship between the intrinsic aspects. Moreover, despite the language barrier for some candidates, generally they all were able to organize the writing in an organized way and answered the guiding question. For candidates who selected the prose passage, they were able to analyse the identity of the narrator and his characteristics as well as his motivation to stand up against injustice. In addition, most candidates were able to look through the details including narration and figurative language.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

As previously mentioned, the strength of the candidates is the diction and general understanding of the extract given, particularly prose extracts. Unfortunately, there were a lot of candidates who did not give a maximum interpretation, resulting in the essay to look more like a summary. On the other hand, when working on the poem extract, candidates on average were able to use good language, imagery, and vocabulary; however, they were weak in making connections between the extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of the extract. Another weakness that is worth mentioning is that intrinsic analysis was not developed fully; instead, it was only mentioned. Moreover, there were also some candidates who got distracted easily and gave answers which were not related to the extract. Lastly, some candidates presented their responses to the guiding questions in sections, instead of in a sustained commentary.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

From the start, it is essential to let the students know about all aspects of the subject and introduce them to the assessment criteria. This is important because it allows students to understand and know the level of quality expected of them. Moreover, teachers should also work with a variety of texts so candidates are able to understand a range of styles and the effect of time period on writing styles. By doing this, the candidates' analytical skills might be built up and their ability to read closely would also be enhanced. Besides that, teachers should also teach students the intrinsic aspects from the beginning and in every part of the subject. This can be done by allowing students to practice their arguments both in writing and verbally in order to be able to write in an effective, coherent, and organized way.

Further comments

Some of the candidates' hand writing on the scripts was almost illegible. Students are strongly recommended to produce a legible commentary.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 23	24 - 25

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Generally candidates were able to show their understanding about the works studied. However, in their response to the questions many students focused on the understanding about the works but not related to the question. The most difficult criterion was C. Not all candidates were able to integrate the literary devices analysis in their respond to make a coherent essay.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their ability to write a literary analysis essay. The use of language was good.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

The strength: understanding and displaying knowledge about the literary works studied with details in supporting their arguments.

The weakness: inability to write a convincing and thoughtful essay. It was hard for candidates to compare and contrast the works in relation to the question. Candidates at Higher Level are expected to give a lot more weight in the demand of the question, but failed to do so.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Make sure that candidates understand the demand of criteria B and C, they should be able to develop their answer systematically. Candidates need to be informed about the expectations of Higher Level, and practice more to meet the demand of the level.

Report from the statistic comparison with the 2013 Examination Results, this year results for Paper 2 was a little easier from the previous year, in which more students received a higher marks.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

The majority of students were able to understand the works studied and shown it in their answer, however, some still find it difficult to find the key elements and meet the expectation of the questions. Of all criterions, criterion C was the most difficult to achieve full mark.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Generally candidates understood the works studied and wrote in detail about them. The use of language was adequate and they did very well in criterion E. Language was very clear, effective and with a high degree of accuracy in grammar.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

The strength: understanding and displaying knowledge about the literary works studied and many candidates were able to recall the works in detail.

The weakness: inability to write a convincing and thoughtful essay. It was hard for candidates to compare and contrast the works in relation to the question. There was lack of strategy in answering the question, how to start the essay and develop it.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Explain in detail how to start an essay and what the demand of the question is, so that candidates can make a good plan when answering the question.
- Show the difference in responding questions from different genres.
- It is important to use a formal Indonesian when writing a literary respond with good grammar and sentence structure. Candidates should be very aware about the language use in their response.