

Indonesian B

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 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 - 57	58 - 73	74 - 88	89 - 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, choosing relevant, interesting and varied topics to discuss. 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 areas of challenge for this level remain as:

- sustaining a formal register, some candidates often change into informal style in the use of pronoun 'aku' instead of 'saya', and the choice of diction, e.g., 'ampe' instead of 'sampai', 'kayak' instead of 'seperti'.
- transfer of English structure, e.g., mengambil di tangan sendiri/take matters into your own hands or code-switch into English terms.

- the proper uses of affixes, e.g., efek negatif bisa mengkurang (should be 'berkurang')
- the use of passive voice, e.g., masalah yang timbul oleh hal-hal ini (should be .. 'ditimbulkan' oleh hal-hal ini)

Although the informal register carries similar meaning as the formal one, candidates at the HL should be able to speak with a formal register. However, many candidates who performed exceptionally were able to use more complex structures successfully, as well as varied and idiomatic expressions in extended discourse, resulting in a distinctive language performance. This year, some candidates even used various Indonesian proverbs or sayings which gave more flavours to the speech. 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.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

In order to improve students' performance at this level, it is recommended that teachers focus on the importance of teaching 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 exceptional orals. Students were able to express themselves in a comprehensible, generally fluent and logical manner. Errors rarely interfere 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. The main issues lied with the verbal affixes, getting the correct one in their effort to form complex sentences was sometimes hard, e.g., orang yang bertinggal di negara berbeda (people living in various countries), as well as the use of passive with yang, e.g., yang mereka membutuhkan (... which is needed by them), and the use of yang in relative clause, e.g., lingkungan yang saya belajar di dalam (the environment where I was studying).

In addition, they tended to transfer English sentence structure into Indonesian which made the sentence sounds awkward (e.g., membagikan bahagia sama keluarga - to share happiness with family). 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 seemed to remain a challenge, both in terms of the use of formal affixes which indicate formal speech, as well as the use of pronoun. Choice of diction was also problematic as they tend to use the informal words where they should have used the formal forms, e.g., the use of kayak (instead of seperti), udah (instead of sudah), membikin (instead of membuat), etc. 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 section. 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.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

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, particularly the use of 'yang' in passive construction. Thus, more exposure of this form would be highly recommended, followed by sufficient contextual practice.

Those who are used to using informal vocabulary (especially the heritage speakers), can have more focused practice in switching to formal register. They may be asked to identify the informal forms which then should be converted to their formal counterparts.

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

This year, candidates at this level performed very well in various aspects, including producing the appropriate text format as well as language and content. Overall, they managed to produce strong rationale for the assignment, and most candidates were able to use complex language appropriate to this level where errors do not interfere much with meaning, while the content indicates advanced development that incorporate critical 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 used more complex sentences that call for the use of various affixes; otherwise the less advanced ones tended to avoid using them or used them incorrectly. Very similar to last year's performance, 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 use; rather, it is more of stylistic or choice of diction. In some cases, the expressions used sounded more like English sentences translated into Indonesian rather than using common Indonesian expression. For example, candidates wrote "membuat teman baru ..." which is English equivalent of "To make new friends..." The Indonesian expression would be "berkenalan dengan teman baru" (literally in English "to get to know new friends"). Another example would be the use of "gadis-gadis ingin mengusulkan aku" (the girls would like to propose to marry me). However, the word 'mengusulkan/to propose' is only used in the context of proposing ideas, not marriage proposal. In the marriage context, the proper term for proposing is 'melamar'.

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 the blog format they were aware that they needed to address the followers of the blog, and thus, invite participation or interaction with them. It is remarkable to see their creativity in coming up with various text formats such as talk show, article, speech, book review, story within story, letter, and of course, the popular format of diary entry.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates seemed very well prepared for this task. Perhaps giving candidates more reading tasks, 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 in Indonesian, rather than relying on grammatical manipulation which may not be wrong, yet pragmatically inaccurate.

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 very well on this task. Most of their writings were creative, insightful and some were even analytical. It was also nice that some task such as brochures, blogs, etc. resembled real-life material.

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

Overall, the candidates did not seem to have any significant issues with this WA. They fulfilled the expectations in the criteria and requirement for this task. Unlike last year, the rationale was always included in their work. Some common 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 well as with passive construction. There were attempts to produce complex sentences, however, more errors were found in such sentences.

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

Almost all of the candidates used the resources effectively. They were able to extract significant information from the texts, some in more detail than others. Most candidates were able to come up with suitable formats according to the task requirement. In this respect, they seem to have received sufficient training as to how to address various text types, such as brochure, interview, essay, letter, blog, etc.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

We recommend providing opportunities to practice formulation of sentences using verbal affixes which indicate proper writing style and a pushing toward more complex sentence formulation. In particular, special attention could be given to the passive voice in the yang clause.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

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

The main area of challenge for the candidates remains vocabulary section. 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 7-10). To them, the word choices provided, with the exception of some cognates, were unfamiliar. Likewise, similar performance issue was seen in text C, questions 28-32

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

As usual, the candidates performed very well in answering open-ended questions, e.g. in text A question 1-3, text B questions 14 (which everyone answered correctly), 18-19, Text C questions 22-14; Text D questions 33-34, 41, and Text E question 42-45. This demonstrates their 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, especially the open-ended section. Even the True/False section was performed remarkably, indicating that candidates understood this passage well. As mentioned above, they struggled mostly on questions 7-10, a cloze passage of which the task was focused on vocabulary identification. Question 8 was slightly less challenging because of the cognate 'kolaborasi', of which the meaning is quite obvious for the candidates. Question 9 was extremely problematic, as the majority of candidates did not recognize the meaning of 'animo'.

In text B, the candidates did well again in the open-ended section. However, the problematic area was in questions 15-16. These questions were challenging as they were not a straight-forward factual type of question. In fact, question 15 concerned with a saying (proverb) which required inferential understanding. Question 16 was also referential type of question, while at the same time it was a 'negative' question which called for careful reading on candidates' part. Those candidates who were unable to identify the correct answers may have had difficulty making an inference from the text.

Text C seemed to be the more challenging as compared to the other texts. Candidates made more mistakes in the open-ended section which they generally perform well. About a third did not answer questions 20-21 correctly, indicative of some difficulties in comprehending the passage. But the main issue was in the vocabulary section, especially questions 30 to 32. It could be that candidates had never encountered the words 'menghayati' and 'mendesah'. These are, however, great questions that distinguished strong candidates from the rest.

The candidates performed very well in Text D, there seemed to be no particular area/s where candidates made many mistakes. Questions 35-36 appeared a bit challenging as there were several key words such as 'dahsyat' and 'makna' which were of literary type of language.

Candidates performed well in text E, almost as good as in text B. They did very well on the open-ended questions 42-45. They also did pretty well on finding synonyms in questions 46-49. The True/False section seemed a little challenging, especially question 53, perhaps due to a distractor in

the same paragraph, i.e. the number 1000 (as opposed to one million), thus it worked well as discriminator for strong candidates.

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 well prepared to work with various texts and task types, as they performed with proficiency in most of the questions, with the exception of the cloze passage. Many candidates found this very challenging. Perhaps giving candidates more exercises of this type during preparation could help improving their performance.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 19	20 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 39	40 - 45

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

The main difficult area for candidates is the question format of filling in the blanks with suitable words (Text A, questions 6, 8, 9; Text C, questions 24, 25, 27, and Text D, questions 37, 38, 41). While the texts themselves may not have been very difficult, the task of filling in the blanks was the hardest because students had to employ different skills, including of close reading and vocabulary knowledge.

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

The open-ended questions were answered correctly most of the time. Matching answers was the second category candidates mostly succeeded. We can infer from this 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, almost every candidate answered question 2 correctly, but 9 out of 56 did not answer question 1 correctly. Many did not answer questions 2 correctly. Some failed to give a correct answer to questions 6, 8 and 9, filling in the blank, and surprisingly, fifteen candidates failed on question 10, which is matching answer. Although text A seems simple and straightforward, the narrative construction, i.e. chronological listing of events, can be tricky to those who don't read it carefully.

In text B, half of candidates failed in question 11, which was a chronological question. About 11 candidates did not succeed in answering question 12, the reason being they already used the answer

for 11. Most answered questions 15-17 correctly (open-ended questions) but many answered question 18 incorrectly. This question was rather tricky because, even though it is straightforward, candidates have to infer the text.

In text C, open-ended questions 21-22 seem to pose no problem. But the filling in the blank questions (23-27, questions 24, 25, and 27) where students had to find a synonym had many incorrect answers. Question 25, for 'aplikasi' candidates should have answered 'penerapan'; however, students seemed to be more familiar with English-derived technological terms, which are used widely in Indonesian, than its equivalent in 'native' terms. Question 27, where 'gabungan' was the synonym for 'kerja sama', proved to be tricky as well. It is true the two words are not directly synonyms, but if students succeeded in recognizing that it was used here as a noun, not as a verb for which it is most commonly used, they should be able to answer correctly.

For questions 28-32, True/False with evidence from the text, did not cause trouble.

In text D, questions 33-36 (open-ended questions) seem to pose no problem for students. As previously mentioned, the filling in the blank questions, particularly 37, 38, and 41, were difficult for candidates. They seemed to be less familiar with the words asked.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates performed well in tasks related to skimming (finding main ideas) and scanning (finding details or evidence from texts), but when the questions asked them to infer from a chronological narrative, presented in a rather complex structure, many did not succeed. Vocabulary enrichment, as evidenced from the number of incorrect filling in the blank questions, is another area for improvement. One of the many ways to help is to encourage them to read as many different types of texts from different genres as possible. Teachers can help by selecting texts rich with Indonesian terms, avoiding those with many English-derived words.

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 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 45

General comments

Candidates performed extremely well on paper 2 again this year. They did an excellent job, demonstrating high ability in producing complex language in extended discourse. In section A, the majority of candidates chose question 1 (writing a letter to a friend), and similarly, another popular question was number 5 (writing a blog entry) followed by question 3 (writing about interview), and subsequently only a few selected question 2 (writing an article for the school bulletin). No one selected question 4, (writing a brochure about traditional game from their home country). In section B, the candidates generally 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, message, and especially format. There is no major difficulty in the area of language. Errors did not interfere with meaning or communication. The few problems noted in the area of language are as follows:

- Inconsistent use of formal register, sometimes candidates lapsed into informal style; for example the use of:
 - informal diction: kayak (vs. seperti), bikin (vs. membuat), gendut (vs. gemuk)
 - informal suffix -in: dibanyakin (vs. diperbanyak)
- Incorrect choice of verbal affixes.
 - affix meN-i vs. meN-kan (mendekati hubungan yang jauh vs. mendekatkan hubungan..)
 - affix meN- vs. ber- (Ini sangat memanfaatkan dalam belajar vs. Ini sangat bermanfaat...; Anda bisa berbicara dengannya vs. Anda bisa berbicara...)
- The use of active vs. passive construction in complex sentences. For example: semakin susah untuk kami mengikuti (it should have been passive form 'kami ikuti'), menjual poin yang diuntungkan mereka (it should have been active form 'yang menguntungkan mereka).
- Transfer from English in prepositional phrases in complex sentence, e.g., memilih siapa kita berbicara dengan (to choose who we are talking to), lingkungan yg saya belajar di dalam (the environment I studied in).

It is noted that no candidate attempted question 4. It could have been that the topic of traditional game from their home country was not something that was appealing or relevant to the candidates' current circumstances. In addition, candidates may have avoided a loaded question as it seemed to ask for a greater number of details to be included (when, where, who, why and how) as compared to the other questions.

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

Candidates seemed to be well prepared in all areas of the examination. In all of the questions, they 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 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. They were able to convey the message clearly while addressing the required details stipulated in the questions. It is good to note that almost all candidates managed to produce appropriate and recognizable text type. They seemed to have been especially well prepared in writing letters, blog entries. Even the few who chose to write an interview and/or article performed well also.

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

As mentioned above, the large majority of candidates selected questions 1 and 5. It appears that candidates have had strong preparation in the areas of writing letters and blog entries. Those few who selected questions 2 and 3 also had a strong performance in tackling their format in the forms of interview and article.

Popular topics for these questions are those with which candidates seemed to be familiar or which are close to their personal experience, like those related to the benefits of studying with international classmates. Likewise, the topic of social media and computer games were also very close to their daily lives. This applies also to the topic of becoming vegetarian in question 3. The experience of participating in Hari Raya holiday may also be real and relevant to their lives. All in all, candidates could relate well to each of the topics, hence the message in their writing was very interesting, realistic and insightful.

Similarly, they seemed to be familiar with the topic of question 6. Not only were they able to express their ideas clearly but they also came up with meaningful and reasonable arguments supporting their views.

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 expressions to produce discourse that sounds natural.

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 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 25

General comments

Candidates' performance in this year paper was excellent. Candidates fulfilled what was required from the exam questions; they communicated their ideas clearly within the format asked. The 5 questions had been appropriately designed to give candidates enough options to choose the format they were most familiar with, and none of these options seemed to pose any problem to candidates. Even when linguistic inaccuracies were found, they rarely interfere with meaning. All of them succeeded in using simple forms/constructions, with one significant difficulty in using passive sentence construction, especially in complex and long sentences.

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

As mentioned above, one area where many candidates made mistakes was in the passive construction, particularly when used as independent clause in a complex construction. An example of this would be: “Kabar yang dia menyampaikan di email sangat mengejutkan.” Some candidates failed to recognize that the subordinate clause “yang dia sampaikan di email” is in fact a passive construction and therefore cannot take the meN- affix.

Another area of linguistic difficulty concerns affixation, for example, using the ber- affix when the meN- affix should be used and vice versa. Furthermore, many still had difficulty forming complex structures. It does not mean they have to write long sentences, but the subject verb construction has to be correct when used in long sentences.

Although in terms of organization of essay most candidates did well, many did not do successfully at a paragraph level. It is good to remind students that a good paragraph contains a thesis statement, focusing on one thought/idea, with supporting sentences that illustrates or extends the thesis statement. While the diary format of question 5, the most popular among students, allows them to use a freer style, good paragraph writing still needs to be observed.

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

Most, if not all, candidates were able to communicate their ideas clearly. In most cases, the content of their writing addresses and responds to the requirement of the task very well. They mostly adhered to the required format, be it a more formal for school magazine to the more free style of diary entry. All of them generated interesting details to support their ideas/arguments, using their background knowledge and real-life experience, which made their writings enjoyable to read.

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

All of the questions dealt with familiar topics and formats for young people these days, from article for school board, blog entry, dairy, email, to leaflet.

Most candidates selected question 5, it was the most popular choice since diary writing format may be familiar to candidates and it does not require a formal register when writing it. It does not require a rigid style, unlike essay writing, for example, where organization of ideas into introduction, body and conclusion, is crucial. Those that stood out included more descriptive narrative such as how the sky and the air felt on that particular day they wrote about in their diary. Some, not many, had difficulty with registers. For example, ‘saya’ and ‘aku’ were used interchangeably, making the writing rather awkward, even jarring. Diary writing should be a good venue to exercise informal and colloquial Indonesian and the writing should be closer to spoken Indonesian. Learners of Indonesian are usually more familiar and at ease with informal Indonesian. In addition, diary writing provides ample opportunities for displaying their creativity. However, most did not use this opportunity well. The topic about advantages and disadvantages of social media is also close to young people. They expressed their ideas clearly and their arguments for advantages of social media were convincing.

Question 3, as expected, was the least popular. Only 4 candidates attempted this question. Leaflet writing requires more rigid organization and formal register. The topic about maintaining health is also the most serious, and perhaps less interesting, of other 4 topics. But those who chose this topic displayed good organization, with the introduction, paragraphs, and conclusion easily identifiable.

The second most popular question was number 1 (an article for a school board magazine), followed by question 2 (an email to a friend). Most did well in terms of organization, but a few candidates forgot to give titles to their articles for school board magazine.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The recommendation from the examiner for the same subject in May 2013 has perfectly summarized what needs to be done in 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.” Another suggestion is to give them more practice in creative writing, particularly in writing descriptive narrative.