

May 2013 subject reports

Indonesian B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 25	26 - 42	43 - 57	58 - 72	73 - 87	88 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 26	27 - 42	43 - 59	60 - 73	74 - 87	88 - 100

Higher Level Internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Overall, the candidates performed well. They clearly prepared themselves very well. Most of them were able to explain their views in an elaborate, clear and fluent manner.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A – Productive skills

Similar to previous year, the main area of challenge for this level remains sustaining formal register, as some candidates often lapsed into informal style or code-switch into English terms. Many performed excellently as they were able to successfully use more complex structures, as well as varied and idiomatic expressions in extended discourse, resulting in

distinctive language performance. Intonation and pronunciation were not a problem, and grammatical errors never interfered with meaning. Most candidates demonstrated a very good command of spoken language, producing fluent and authentic communication.

Criterion B – Interactive and receptive skills

Nearly all candidates demonstrated great performance in the interaction area. Most of the time, they understood the teacher's questions well and were able to keep to the flow of the conversation without much difficulty. In some cases, the responses could have been probed further so as to allow candidates to demonstrate their ability to engage in complex exchanges in extended discourse. The candidates were able to present interesting and relevant information coherently and effectively. They appeared to be very well prepared for the test. The topics were varied and appropriate to their level. When probed appropriately, candidates were able to provide further analytical responses incorporating complex thoughts and language formulation.

Further comments

In order to improve students' performance at this level, it is recommended that teachers focus on the importance of teaching code-switching into formal Indonesian. It is true that full communication can still be achieved using the informal style. However, students at higher level proficiency should also be made aware of the cultural implications of using (or not using) proper register.

Standard Level Internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most of the candidates performed well, with a few doing exceptionally so. They were able to express themselves in a comprehensible, generally fluent and logical manner. Errors rarely interfered with communication.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A – Productive skills

Most candidates demonstrated the use of a good range of vocabulary and simple structures. They were able to form simple sentences that clearly expressed their thoughts. There were

attempts to formulate more complex sentences, though these did not quite turn out successfully. However, a few excellent performers were able to proficiently use more complex structures and expressions in extended discourse, resulting in distinctive language performance. Sustaining formal registers seems to remain a challenge, both in terms of the use of formal verbal affixes which indicate formal speech, as well as the use of pronoun. For some, there seem to be lack of awareness on the importance of using proper pronouns in addressing second person as well as first person pronoun as a sign of respect. There was tendency to lapse to English in certain cases for lack of vocabulary. Almost all candidates performed well in terms of intonation and pronunciation.

Criterion B –Interactive and receptive skills

Nearly all demonstrated very good performance in the Interaction area. Most of the time, they understood the teacher's questions and were able to keep to the flow of the conversation without much difficulty. In some cases, the responses could have been probed further so as to allow candidates to demonstrate their performance in extended discourse. However, in most cases the candidates were generally able to present interesting ideas and opinions in clear manner. The conversations flow coherently in general; and topics were varied and appropriate to their levels.

Further comments

It is recommended that candidates be given more training in the area of verbal affixes which signify more formal speech and are often indicative of complex discourse. In addition, the formation of passive voice, while emerging, was still not solid. Thus, more exposure of this form would be highly recommended, followed by sufficient contextual practice.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 60

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

It appears that the main area of challenge for the candidates is vocabulary. Candidates made most mistakes when they did the word-focus task, such as filling in the blank with suitable words (e.g., text A, questions 7-12). It was rather clear that candidates arrived at their answers merely by pure guessing. To them, the word choices provided were largely unfamiliar. Likewise, similar performance issue was seen in text C, questions 31-35

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

In general, the candidates performed very well in answering open-ended questions, e.g. in text A question 1-2, text B questions 14-16, 24-25, Text C questions 26-27; Text D questions 43-46 and Text E question 52. This demonstrates their firm ability to understand straightforward and factual questions and to identify significant information/details in the text.

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

In Text A, candidates were able to answer most of the questions very well. As mentioned above, they struggled mostly on questions 7-12, a cloze passage of which the task was focused on vocabulary identification. Question 13 was also slightly challenging, which indicates a strong question with good distracters.

In text B, the candidates did well especially in the open-ended sections. However, the problematic area was in question 17-20. These questions were challenging as they are also vocabulary-focus type of task, i.e., finding synonyms. Other problem areas were in questions 21, 23. Those candidates who were unable to identify the correct answers may have had difficulty making inference from the text.

In general, the candidates did not seem to have problems in answering questions 26-30 in Text C. Most mistakes were found on questions 31-35 which are the vocabulary-focus task. Again, it seemed that candidates just selected their answers randomly, with the exception of question 35 (least number of mistakes compared to the previous items in the same section). This may be due to the fact that the correct answer, i.e., the word 'memilih' or to choose, is a very common, familiar word to the candidates. Questions 36 and to a certain degree, question 35 as well, also turned to be challenging for many. These are great questions that distinguished strong candidates from the rest as they require further inference skills.

The candidates performed well in Text D, there seemed to be no particular area/s where candidates made many mistakes. Similarly, they also overall did well in text E, except in section 53-56, i.e., finding synonyms.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There seems to be no major difficulty in the paper. The candidates seemed to have been prepared well with the various text and task types, as they performed with proficiency in most of the questions, with the exception of cloze passage. Many candidates found this part most challenging. Perhaps giving candidates more exercises of this type during preparation could help improving their performance.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 39	40 - 45

General comments

The candidates demonstrated excellent work, demonstrating high ability in producing complex language in extended discourse. In section A, the majority of candidates chose question 3; i.e., writing a letter. The next popular question was question 5, i.e., writing a diary entry, followed by question 2, i.e., writing a blog entry, and then question 4, i.e., giving a presentation. Lastly, question 1 was the least chosen item. In section B, question 6, the candidates also did very well.

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

In general, candidates did really well in all criteria: language, cultural interaction, and especially message. There is no major difficulty in the area of language. Errors did not interfere with meaning or communication. The few problems noted are as follows:

- Inconsistent use of formal register, sometimes candidates lapsed into informal style. For example, tidak 'nyadar', kayaknya...
- Inaccurate choice of diction, e.g., ... lebih 'bersedia' (should be 'siap') jika ingin bekerja. Both terms mean to prepare, but their usages are different. Likewise the use of 'menukar' (to exchange) ajaran mereka is not accurate. It should be 'mengganti or mengubah' (to replace).
- The use of 'yang – passive' construction in complex sentences. They still use the active voice in the clause, which requires the use of passive form. For example: ... yang Bapak menyediakan; ... yang aku ingin membicarakan; ... yang orang melakukan; ... yang mereka menemukan.
- The use of English expression translated into Indonesian which sounds unnatural or is not commonly used in Indonesian, e.g., Saya menjanji waktu yang luar biasa (I promise you a great time); menaruh para murid sebelum diri kamu (to put others before self); membuat teman (to make friends).

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

The candidates seemed to be well prepared in all areas of the examination. In all of the questions, the candidates were able to communicate their ideas clearly while fully addressing

and responding to the requirement of the task. They generated various ideas that are interesting and relevant to the task. It is worth noting that the candidates seemed to pay careful attention to the details of the questions. Their responses demonstrated good awareness in addressing each and every aspect of the questions.

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

As mentioned above, the large majority of candidates selected questions 3 and 5. It appears that candidates have had strong preparation in the areas of writing letter and diary entry. Those who selected questions 2 and 4 also indicated strong performance in tackling presentational format in the forms of giving speech and written blog. In addition, the topics for these questions are those that candidates seemed to be familiar with and close to their personal experience. Thus, they could relate well to each of the topics. The accounts they told in the writing were very interesting, realistic and insightful. For example, in question 1 they were able to make various cultural descriptions with convincing details. In question 2, candidates presented meaningful comparisons of their school lives and those in Indonesia. In question 3, they remarkably provided detailed accounts on the reasons why the canteen needs to modify their menu as well as supporting information on the kind of suggestions they put forward.

The only question that seemed to be most challenging is question 6. It may be due to the somewhat analytical and abstract nature of the topic. In this task, students may be required to analyze how political pressure may or may not influence teacher's performance. Not only they need to express their opinion, they also need to support their opinion. This is a good type of question which could distinguish the strong candidates from the rest.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In general, candidates were able to express themselves very clearly and fluently in this paper. They managed to present various interesting ideas and information in their writing. Candidates should aim to refine their language; in particular, more focused practices on accuracy of the language areas pointed out above. Assigning more extensive reading will help refine their dictions and expressions to produce discourse that sounds natural.

Higher level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 25

General comments

Candidates at this level performed well, both in terms of addressing appropriate text format as well as in the language area and content. They use complex language appropriate to this level where errors do not interfere much with meaning, while the content indicates advanced development that incorporate analysis rather than mere description.

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

There was no apparent difficulty in their performance. As expected, errors in the use of affixes are very common in Indonesian. The more advanced candidates use more complex sentences that call for the use of various affixes, otherwise the less advanced ones tend to avoid using them or used them incorrectly. In this year task, HL candidates demonstrated good development with usage of more complex forms and used them well. In some instances, the inaccuracy was not really attributed to wrong grammatical usage, rather, it is more of stylistic or choice of diction. The expression used sounded more like English sentences translated into Indonesian rather than using common Indonesian expression. For example, they wrote “Membenarkan kesalahan yang dibuat ..” which is English equivalent of “To correct mistakes that were made..” The more common Indonesian expression would be “memperbaiki kesalahan” (literally in English “to improve mistakes”). Another example, they used “mengganti hatinya ayah” (to replace father’s heart) instead of the correct form “mengubah hati ayah” (to change father’s heart).

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

As mentioned above, they seemed to have been prepared well in all areas, including handling various text formats, complexity of language as well as ideas. For example, in blog format, they were very aware that they need to address the followers of the blog, and thus, invite participation or interaction with them.

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

In the diary format, some candidates cleverly broke down theirs into shorter entries marked by different days of writing. This is clever as it resembles real-life diary entries. Others wrote one long entry, which is still fine since the content still addressed the requirements properly. In some cases, they provided impressive in-depth analysis resembling psychologist perspectives.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Good job preparing the candidates on this task. Perhaps giving candidates more reading task, particularly, extensive reading for enjoyment will serve to improve their language repertoire and heighten their sense of Indonesian language. Through reading, they will get more familiar

with common expressions used by Indonesian, rather than relying on grammatical manipulation which may not be wrong, yet pragmatically inaccurate.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 19	20 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 45

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

As can be expected, the main difficult area for the candidates is similar to the previous year/s i.e., the question format filling in the blanks with suitable words (Text D, questions 32-35). Even though the text itself may not have been very difficult, the task of filling in the blanks is always hardest. Over the years, I found that students always performed poorest in this type of task. Most students mainly guessed randomly; only very few students indicated true understanding in their answers.

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

Most candidates managed to provide correct responses to the open-ended questions, matching answers, as well as the multiple-choice one. Their facility to answer these questions gives good evidence that the candidates have successfully learned the strategy of finding main ideas and some supporting details from the text, especially those of direct and factual types.

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

In text A, many did not answer question 2 correctly. They only provided partial answer to this question, i.e., wastewater, instead of wastewater from tofu. The strong candidates knew that it was crucial to provide full answer as required in the question.

In text B, many candidates had problems with question 14, even though the question is factual and straightforward. It could be due to the key word in the question “yayasan” that is new to them.

Quite a few candidates selected incorrect options in question 12, especially options C and J. This indicates that the question is well-written with good distracters that unless candidates read carefully, the options may seem correct (but they are not).

In text C, there were no apparent difficulties with any of the questions. Even the task of finding synonyms was quite successfully performed, with the slight exception on question 24. Some still found the question on 'menanggapi' challenging. This is rather curious since its synonym, i.e., merespon, is derived from the English cognate 'respond'.

Likewise, some found question 29 difficult. The question itself is quite simple and straightforward, i.e., What is the purpose of this action? (Referring to the action mentioned in the previous question). Perhaps it is the key word to the answer, i.e 'semangat' that candidates were unfamiliar with.

In text D, the cloze passage, i.e., questions 32-35, as previously mentioned, has always proved to be a difficult task type for candidates. Question 38 appeared to be difficult for many. The question is clear and straightforward, however, the distracters are really good and plausible. Hence, it required careful reading and thinking to get this question correct.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates seemed to be able to handle literal questions, especially those that pertain to main ideas and some important details. Most of the problems/mistakes seemed to be related to unfamiliarity with key words, in the text as well as in the questions. This is an ongoing common issue in language learning. Perhaps giving more extensive reading would help in enriching their vocabulary.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 22	23 - 25

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

Although for the most part candidates were able to communicate their ideas that corresponded and were relevant to the task, they did so mostly in simple construction and/or structure. There were attempts to produce complex constructions, however with some errors resulting in less clear or coherent sentences. Another area of difficulty is morphologies. They still have issues with various verbal affixes, e.g., Meninggal dalam lingkungan sehat (to die in healthy environment). The sentence should be: Tinggal dalam lingkungan sehat (to live in healthy environment). Saya menghilang* (I disappeared) telpon. It is supposed to be: Saya kehilangan (I lost my phone)....

There are some mix-ups with noun affixes, e.g., fitur yang keuntungan (supposed to be 'menguntungkan'). This could be because in English both keuntungan and menguntungkan share the same word: benefit, as verb as well as noun.

It is worth noting that candidates seemed to be aware of the importance of using the verbal affixes to produce formal register/writing style. Nevertheless, the morphological formation needs to be developed further for consistency. The passive construction remains a constant challenge for most. The majority of candidates were able to express meaning without using this construction, while some made attempts to incorporate this construction in their writing with varying degrees of success.

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

As mentioned above, the majority of candidates were able to communicate their ideas clearly. In most cases, the content of their writing address and respond to the requirement of the task very well. They generated various rich ideas that were interesting and relevant to the task. It is good to note that the candidates seemed to pay careful attention to the details of the questions. Their responses demonstrated good awareness in addressing each and every aspect of the questions.

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

Question 5 was the most popular choice among the candidates, almost 70% of them selected this task. First of all, the email format is very familiar as it does not require fully formal register in writing. Secondly, the topic of technology, particularly new cell phones is certainly very dear to heart for people of their age. Therefore, they were able to utilize their background and common knowledge in responding to the task. It was remarkable to read the complete and detailed descriptions that most candidates were able to come up with. In general, their writings were most convincing, coherent and comprehensive! One could see that the candidates were truly passionate about this very topic.

Question 2 is the least popular. Only two candidates attempted this question. The topic itself is not a complicated one. Many Indonesian learners have learned about Lebaran. Moreover, the format is interview with a friend's family, thus it does not require a very formal register. The avoidance could be because the question itself was not very clear. In particular the setting/context of the question (which reads, i.e., You and your friend want to celebrate Lebaran just like how it is celebrated by Indonesian friends. So you are interviewing his/her family. Ask about: when, the background and tradition of the celebration...). The reason/purpose for the interview is unclear.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates can use more focused practices in order to better produce complex sentences, verbal affixes, and passive constructions, all of which are very common and expected in Indonesian written register.

Standard level written assignment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 25

General comments

In general, candidates did well on this task. Most of their writings were creative, insightful and some were even analytical. It was also nice that in some task such as making brochure, blogs the lay out and pictures drawn makes it resemble real-life brochure or blog.

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

In the weaker performance, I found that the work did not include rationale thus a few points were missing from these criteria. Some language problems occurred mostly with verbal affixes, some simply dropped the affixes (avoid using them by just using the root verb forms), some were mixed-up in their usage, as to be expected, as well as with passive construction. There were attempts to produce complex sentences, however, more errors were found in such sentences. In addition, candidates did not use the information from the sources, rather, they wrote based on their own ideas. Sometimes the rationale when present, may have appeared to be related to the sources, however, the content was not.

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

Most candidates were able to come up with suitable format according to the task requirement. In this respect, they seem to have received sufficient training as to how to address various text formats, such as brochure, interview, essay, letter, blog, with the exception of short story.

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

As indicated above, candidates did pretty well in producing texts in various format such as blog, brochure, essay, letter. However, they struggled in the format of short story as there was no clear plot in the story.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

More practice on formulation of sentences using verbal affixes which indicate proper writing style and a push toward complex sentence formulation. In addition, explicit explanation on short story format would be helpful