



BOARD OF STUDIES
NEW SOUTH WALES

1998

HSC

EXAMINATION
REPORT

Indonesian

© Board of Studies 1999

Published by
Board of Studies NSW
GPO Box 5300
Sydney NSW 2001
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

February 1999

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 4209 7

99057

Contents

2 Unit Z	4
Listening and Speaking Examinations	4
<i>Listening Skills</i> (30 marks)	4
<i>Speaking Skills</i> (20 marks)	6
Section I	7
Section II	8
Written Examination	9
Section I <i>Reading Skills</i> (30 marks)	9
Section II <i>Writing Skills</i> (20 marks)	11
2/3 Unit (Common)	13
Listening and Speaking Examinations	13
<i>Listening Skills</i> (20 marks)	13
<i>Speaking Skills</i> (20 marks)	15
Section I <i>Traveller Abroad</i>	15
Section II <i>My Personal World</i>	16
Written Examination	17
Section I <i>Reading Skills</i> (25 marks)	17
Section II <i>Writing Skills</i> (15 marks)	18
Section III <i>Options</i> (20 marks)	20
3 Unit (Additional)	25
Listening and Speaking Examinations	25
<i>Listening Skills</i> (10 marks)	25
<i>Speaking Skills</i> (10 marks)	26
Written Examination	27
Section I <i>Reading Skills</i> (15 marks)	27
Section II <i>Writing Skills</i> (15 marks)	28
2/3 Unit (Common) (For Background Speakers)	30
Listening Examination	30
<i>Listening Skills</i> (20 marks)	30
Written Examination	33
Section I <i>Reading Skills</i> (20 marks)	33
Section II <i>Writing Skills</i> (20 marks)	35
Section III <i>Contemporary Issues</i> (40 marks)	38
3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers)	42
Written Examination	42
Section I <i>Novel</i> (25 marks)	42
Section II <i>Poetry</i> (25 marks)	44

1998 Higher School Certificate

INDONESIAN EXAMINATION REPORT

2 Unit Z

The 1998 2 Unit Z examination was the fourth to follow the new 2UZ syllabus. Students generally appeared more familiar with the examination format. There were great variations in the quality of responses, ranging from the exceptionally well prepared down to non-attempts in the writing skills section. 1998 once again saw an increase in the number of students presenting for 2UZ Indonesian and it is very pleasing to see new centres presenting candidates.

Listening and Speaking Examinations

Listening Skills (30 marks)

The 1998 Listening Skills section contained 24 items. Responses were generally of a high standard, although a wide range of responses was evident. Some students displayed excellent listening skills at this beginner level and were obviously well prepared with relevant vocabulary and had practised past papers diligently. Some students conversely displayed only elementary listening skills, reflecting a very limited range of vocabulary and lack of listening practice. In addition, some students had difficulty identifying all the relevant detail in some questions.

Times and numbers continue to cause problems for some students.

Items 1, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20 and 23 were generally well answered and caused few problems.

The following items caused difficulties for some students.

Item 2

Time continues to confuse some students. *Kurang* was confused with *lebih*. *Enam* was also confused with *empat*.

Item 3

The expression *saudara sepupu* was unfamiliar to some students.

Item 4

Di ujung jalan caused problems and many students translated *pabrik* as fabric.

Item 6

Seratas and *seribu* were confused. Students must be confident in their use and understanding of their numbers, so they can identify them quickly and correctly.

Item 7

The symptom *sering ke W.C.* was only familiar to a few students. *Makanan laut* appeared unfamiliar to many students, some thought *laut* was the name of the restaurant.

Item 8

Many students did not correctly translate *mesjid* as a mosque. Also *bersembahyang* caused many difficulties.

Item 10

In part (b) *Menjual perhiasan* was not correctly explained by many candidates.

Item 12

Many students did not provide sufficient detail in their answers to this question. Two complete reasons were required in the answer.

1. There is a chemistry test tomorrow and the speaker is not good at chemistry, and
2. There is sport tomorrow and the speaker hates sport.

Item 14

The colloquialisms in this conversation caused problems for some students: *Gimana* and *yuk*. Also many did not recognise *kanu oblong* as a t-shirt.

Item 15

This question proved very challenging for most students. Many were unfamiliar with *merayakan Hari Ibu*, *peserta* and some confused *menggambar* with *melukis*. *Lomba* or competition was given in the question but many students did not put it in context. In fact many of the answers to this ‘fill in the gaps’ question, made little sense in English. Students are advised to reread their answers to ensure that they make sense.

Item 17

The word *ganten* was unfamiliar to some students and others had difficulty expressing *Bukan main indahnya pakaian*.

Item 18

In part (a) *daerah pegunungan* caused problems and in part (b) *segar* was often mistaken for cigar. More able students also added all details such as *berwarna-warni*, colourful.

Item 19

In part (b) many students did not know *jas hujan* and some had difficulty with the idea of a matching or suitable colour – *warnanya cocok*.

Item 21

Very few students knew the words for a cremation ceremony *Upacara pembakaran mayat*.

Item 22

The phrases *pulang ke kampung penuh sesak* and *jalan macet* were challenging for most students. Few students scored well on this question.

Item 24

Many students did not recognise that it was a wedding anniversary *Ulang tahun perkawinan* that was being celebrated. Many simply wrote birthday.

Speaking Skills (20 marks)

General Comments

Responses to the speaking skills questions were varied in quality, suggesting a wide range in the ability of students and in their preparation for this examination. A small number were obviously unprepared and lacked practice in speaking. This reinforces the need for teachers to constantly practise exam-style situations and questions with their students each week in class and with the regular recording of homework tapes.

Clarity of speech is essential and students should try to sound confident. Quality recording devices are also recommended as poor recording quality makes the marker's task more difficult. Teacher examiners are reminded that they are required to check the recording before the student leaves the examination room.

Markers also noted many examples of incorrect pronunciation in Indonesian, most frequent errors included *kadang-kadang* instead of *kadang-kadang*, *ki* instead of *ke* and incorrect renditions for *pergi*.

Section I

This section contained a good range of questions from various syllabus topics, with most students providing good approximations of the English cues.

The best responses in this section demonstrated excellent communication with an accurate command of structure, vocabulary and pronunciation. Answers maintained an even flow and approximated natural rhythm and intonation.

Average answers contained occasional mispronunciation and evidence of the ability to use most vocabulary and structures required. They often contained some hesitation and longer pauses.

Poor answers demonstrated minimal communication with little knowledge of basic grammatical structures and vocabulary. Pronunciation was poor, English was sometimes used and presentation was laboured with frequent long pauses.

Teachers should encourage students to use titles when addressing people, to make their answers more natural. Generally students had the greatest difficulty phrasing the questions required. For example:

- ask the price
- ask if the price can be lowered
- ask how far
- ask if you can walk.

Question 1

This question proved the least difficult for students.

Word order problems were common with *merah sarong* instead of *sarong merah*.

Expressing surprise was best said with *Wah, mahalnya!*

Many students had trouble asking if the price could be lowered, some talking around the question and managing to convey a similar meaning.

Once again confusion with numbers. Many students said *lima ratus* instead of *lima ribu*.

Question 2

This question was well attempted. Problems arose with '3 days ago' and '2 older sisters'.

The best expression for line 4 was *Saya akan menginap di hotel kecil*.

Some students also confused *kakak* and *kakek*.

Question 3

This question was the most challenging for students. Common errors included:

- *baik restoran* instead of *restoran baik*
- omission of *menukar uang* to change money.

Various expressions were successfully used to translate ‘how far away’. For example, *Berapa jauhnya?* or *Berapa kilometer jauhnya?*

Section II

General Comments

In this section there is a choice of three situations each with five Indonesian questions, of which the students must choose one. In this section students are encouraged to go beyond a short, direct response to each question, and to use their imagination to extend their responses. Without expansion, students cannot display any breadth of knowledge of vocabulary and structure. The better students elaborated on each part of their chosen question in a way that varied structure and vocabulary and avoided repetition. Speaking flowed naturally and there was minimal hesitation.

In 1998, question 5 was the least popular with questions 4 and 6 being equally popular.

Question 4 — Menonton Televisi

- Part (a) *Kapan* was not understood by some students who therefore did not answer this question correctly.
- Part (b) Varied and interesting responses were supplied for this question.
- Part (c) *Kamar* and *rumah* were confused by some candidates.
- Part (d) The wording of the question caused problems for some students, who had trouble starting their response.
- Part (e) *Mengerjakan* caused problems and was often mispronounced.

Question 5 — Pakaian

Not a popular choice, but it was generally well done by those who chose it.

- Part (a) Good uniform descriptions were provided.
- Part (b) Interesting varieties of ‘weekend’ wear were given. For example, *baju bermerek nike, kemeja kotak-kotak*.
- Part (c) Good explanations were given of who bought the clothing and where it was purchased .
- Part (d) As per part (c).
- Part (e) Some students misunderstood *meminjam pakaian*. The better students provided creative responses to this question.

Question 6 — Rumah Makan

- Part (a) Some students restricted their answers to Indonesian food. Better responses included a variety of foods.
- Part (b) Difficulties arose when students sought to explain how regularly people went to restaurants, for example, *dua kali sebulan*. In the second part of the question, many students merely listed people without using proper sentence structure.
- Part (c) *Pernah* was not understood by some students.
- Part (d) Generally predictable and unimaginative responses were given to this question.
- Part (e) This question gave more able students a greater opportunity to showcase their language skills with often imaginative and detailed responses being given.

Written Examination

Section I — Reading Skills (30 marks)

General Comments

Most students were able to score well in question 1, which contained short items. There were considerable numbers of students who had great difficulty answering all the parts in question 2 where the two passages were considerably longer and required more sustained reading than those contained in question 1. Teachers are advised to ensure students practise reading a variety of text types, similar to those which have appeared in past papers. Students should be trained to reread the question after they complete their answers in order to ensure they have directly answered the question.

Question 1

- Part (a)
- (i) Not many students recognised the word *kesenian*.
 - (ii) Although not all students understand the abbreviation *s/d* (= *Sama dengan*), more able students managed to work out its meaning from the dates given, which were 8, 9, 10, *Mei*, thus still mentioning Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Weaker responses contained the names of only two days or the dates.
 - (iii) The word *minuman* was well recognised but *makanan kecil* was often translated as ‘a little bit of food’ in the weaker responses.
 - (iv) The word *gedung* was often mistaken for *gunung*; thus in weaker responses, the tickets were bought in the office on the hill.
- Part (b)
- (i) Most students were able to recognise *suami / isteri* but some translated *pasangan* as ‘de facto’.
 - (ii) Only a few students recognised the word *seterika*. *Halaman* was often translated as ‘garden’.
 - (iii) This question was very well answered.

- (iv) Weaker responses did not refer to the '3 bedrooms above the restaurant'. *Luar negeri* was often translated as 'outside the area' instead of 'overseas'.
- Part (c) This question was well understood and was done very well.
- Part (d) (i) The word *berita* was understood, but *dunia* was only recognised by the more able students.
- (ii) The phrase *beraneka macam* confused some students, but many recognised *tanaman*.
- Part (e) (i) Few students recognised the superlative prefix *-ter* plus adjective, for example, *terbaru*.
- Part (f) (i) The word *lagu-lagu* was well recognised, but many students wrote the music of the 1960s as well as the 1970s. The correct answer was the music of the 1960s.
- (ii) This part was well answered.
- Part (g) Very few students knew the meaning of *selendang*. Students were expected to write the reasons in complete detail to obtain full marks. Weaker responses contained only what the *sarung* was used for.

Question 2

- Part (a) Generally these questions were discriminating with a wide range of reading abilities evident.
- (i) Most students recognised the phrase *tanah pertanian* as the farm. However the phrase *di daerah pedesaan* was often misinterpreted.
- (ii) The phrase *jauh dari mana-mana* was well answered but weaker responses did not contain nearest neighbour one and a half hours away. The phrase *tidak seperti di Indonesia* was often left out.
- (iii) Not many students knew *Bukan main keringnya tanah di sini* and instead chose to use the phrase *cuacanya panas seperti di Indonesia* in their answer.
- (iv) This question was well done.
- Part (b) Generally the scene setter was useful.
- (i) Students are advised to read the title carefully, then look at the questions one by one before starting their answers as some key words might be given in the questions.
- (ii) To gain full marks, students had to mention that Linda watched the bride's hair being made up in a traditional way with jewellery and flowers.
- (iii) Able students described the wedding gown correctly according to the passage.

Traditional Javanese wedding clothes, consisting of batik cloth sarong, black traditional top and gold jewellery. Weaker responses contained made up answers.

- (iv) Most students knew *jas hitam*, but did not recognise *topi khas Jawa* and the word *pinggang*. *Keris* was often translated as magic sword.
- (v) Many able students knew that the bride was not allowed to join in the ceremony, but misunderstood *dari kedua pengantin* as second marriage. Weaker responses did not understand *upacara* as ceremony, and therefore did not answer the rest of the question correctly.
- (vi) This question was well answered. Not many students recognised the phrase, *keperluan hidup* and therefore did not answer that the husband has to work and missed out on the complete significance of the custom.

Sub-sections (i), (ii) and (iii) were reasonably well attempted. Average students were only able to give some correct information in sub-sections (iv), (v) and (vi) which discriminated the candidature well.

Section II — Writing Skills (20 marks)

General Comment

With a few exceptions, most students were able to attain or exceed the minimum length required and to relate their writing to the topic. The degree of creativity was impressive. Narratives were usually of a better standard than dialogues because they allowed the students to display more flair and creativity in their use of the language.

Generally speaking the better answers:

- related directly to the topic
- used accurate and authentic language
- organised and sequenced their ideas well
- displayed a wide variety of vocabulary and structures such as the object focus constructions, the correct use of conjunctions and prepositions such as *pada*, *selama*, *di* and *ke*.

Satisfactory answers:

- dealt with some aspect of the topic
- used familiar and predictable vocabulary and expressions, but often with errors
- demonstrated some organisation and sequencing of ideas.

Poorer answers:

- used basic and limited vocabulary and structures
- were repetitive with numerous errors and use of English
- did not properly observe discourse forms
- did not fully or closely address the topic.

Question 3

Students were faced with the different task of writing about Australia. Most students handled this change provided they had the vocabulary required for such a prescriptive task. Better students had a good command of the language used to begin and end a letter.

Question 4

Part (a) This question gave scope for students to use a wide range of ideas and vocabulary from several topic areas in the syllabus.

More creative and able students took the opportunity to display their wide knowledge because of the open-ended, non-prescriptive nature of the question.

Poorer responses generally contained one topic area, most often sickness, to address the question but often lacked sufficient vocabulary to sustain an interesting piece of writing.

Part (b) Was not as popular a choice. Students found it hard to display a wide range of vocabulary and structures, because they felt limited to a description.

2/3 Unit (Common)

Listening and Speaking Examinations

Listening Skills (20 marks)

General Comments

The 1998 Listening Skills items covered a wide range of syllabus areas and generally moved from less challenging to more challenging as the examination progressed. Items from the contemporary issues topic area caused problems for weaker students, who often guessed gist rather than including all details from the item on the cassette. Once again a wide range of responses was evident, with well prepared candidates who commanded a wide range of vocabulary scoring well.

Items 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19 and 20 caused few problems for most students.

Item 2

Tamat was often not translated and weaker responses did not mention what the speaker was worried about, that is, insufficient jobs in the engineering field.

Item 3

Terletak di tempat rendah was often not understood, thus impeding total comprehension of this item.

Item 4

Sajian or offerings was often not understood. Some students did not mention the important religious ceremony which was said at the beginning of the item.

Item 7

Weaker responses omitted details about the restaurant, which were contained in the last line.

Item 12

To obtain full marks in this question students needed to supply the appropriate verb form, for example, *menguasi*, *hindarilah*, *jangan malas* or *jangan biarkan*.

Item 13

Students needed to include both the speakers' and her parents' wishes, which were opposing, in order to gain full marks.

Item 14

Students needed to be aware that the Internet is connected via phone lines to fully understand this item. Many responses did not correctly answer this question.

Item 15

Polusi was confused by a few students with *polisi* and *udara* with *utara*.

Item 16

Weaker response did not include details of the accident and its cause.

Item 18

Hidangan yang disediakan lezat was rarely given as a response. Most responses chose the easier two reasons for travelling Eva Air.

Item 21

Very few students recognised the description of Australian houses being made of bricks which were not painted or cement rendered. This proved to be a very challenging item.

Item 22

Jodoh was unfamiliar to many students.

Item 23

This proved to be a challenging item. *Melestarikan* was quite often translated as ‘to preserve’ rather than ‘to protect’.

Item 24

This item required global comprehension, many students did not provide relevant detail in their answers.

Item 25

Another challenging item, particularly in part (b) where detailed statistics were required in the answer. In part (a) ‘*menyelam*’ was not known by many candidates.

Speaking Skills (20 marks)

General Comments

A range of abilities was evident, with some students responding using accurate and flowing language, and others who had difficulty communicating their ideas in Indonesian.

Some important reminders must again be given to students and teachers with respect to the Speaking Skills Examination.

- Teachers **must** ensure clarity of recording and that the equipment is in sound working order;
- Students must not identify themselves or their schools in any way;
- The testing time of 10 minutes must be adhered to. Greater length of speaking time rarely advantages a student, as most repeat themselves or do not remain focused on the specific question;
- Students must remember to state that the test is now concluded before stopping their tape. This is clearly written in the Examination Procedures.

General Comments on Language Usage

- Some pronunciation problems frequently appeared with *dokter* and *restoran*;
- *Kalau*, *ketika* and *kapan* were used quite indiscriminately;
- Overuse of *itu*, which was often equated with 'it';
- Pronoun usage was not always sound.

Section I — Traveller Abroad

Students should be aware that it is **not** necessary to translate the heading of each situation into Indonesian. Just stating situation 1 'In a Restaurant' is adequate.

The best responses in this section showed excellent communication in Indonesian, accurate, and clear pronunciation, a good command of vocabulary and structure whilst maintaining an even flow which approximated natural rhythm and intonation.

Average answers showed evidence of an ability to use most vocabulary and structures required. These contained some hesitation and longer pauses, but communication was still satisfactory.

Poorer responses demonstrated minimal communication, poor pronunciation, frequent and long pauses and the use of some English. Often basic vocabulary was not known.

Situation 1

Students had difficulty with vocabulary items such as 'view of the rice fields', 'vegetables', and 'performance'.

Situation 2

'Feeling nauseous' was not widely known. Also expressing the idea of 'have not eaten for two days' caused difficulties.

Situation 3

Students again experienced difficulty expressing the concept of 'for a long time'. The main vocabulary problems were 'cremation' and 'drink seller'.

Situation 4

Framing the question 'what you need to do now?' presented most difficulties. Other problems arose with 'lost your passport' and 'pickpocketed'.

Situation 5

Some difficulties were encountered with 'towel', 'left a message' and most frequently with 'requesting a key', where a number of students used *mempunyai* = may I **have** a key.

Section II—My Personal World

General Comments

In this section the best answers addressed each part of each situation with some elaboration. Responses showed accuracy of language structures and a broad vocabulary. Students were able to sustain communication, replicate authentic Indonesian and manipulate language accordingly.

Good responses contained adequate answers to all questions with some attempt to elaborate. Despite a number of errors a good flow was maintained throughout the response, and students made some attempt at sophisticated vocabulary and structures.

Average answers addressed most questions in a basic form. They contained little elaboration and many errors, and were quite predictable in their content.

Poorer answers showed evidence of not understanding some questions and limited knowledge of vocabulary and language structures. In some cases communication was minimal and occasionally barely intelligible.

All three situations were fairly equally selected by students, with situation 2 being slightly more popular.

Students are again reminded to be creative and not to remain bound to their own real life experiences.

General Comments on Language Usage

- Problems arose with affixation
- Duplication after *banyak* was often used
- Pronunciation problems with *ideal*, *berkemah* and *karena*
- Indiscriminate usage of *menikmati*, *menyenangkan*, *bersenang-senang* and *menyenangi*.

Situation 1 — Olahraga

Better responses used the object focus in the first person to answer part (a) (ie *olahraga yang paling saya senang...*).

In part (b) it was promising to hear students address physical (*jasmani*) and spiritual/mental (*rohani*) health, rather than just health in general.

In part (c), a number of students did not develop their opinion on the use of illegal drugs beyond the statement of their use being *bodoh*. Better responses commented on the spirit of competition, the danger, negative effects and so on.

Situation 2 — Liburan

Most students could discuss their holiday plans and ideal holidays quite well. Some found it difficult to develop an argument to support holidaying in Australia or overseas.

Better responses were well-planned to avoid an overlap in content and vocabulary. These responses drew on ideas such as economic factors, experiences, background culture and so on, to formulate an argument for part (c).

Situation 3 — Tempat Tinggal Anda

Most students offered a number of points of description of their ideal home. Better responses gave details of location, rooms and exterior features. Some students did not appear to understand the intention of *untung-ruginya* in part (b).

Part (c) gave students the chance to develop good arguments, dealing with issues such as *biaya sewa telpon, tinggal gratis dengan orang tua, tidak diganggu oleh adik-adik, harus mencari nafkah sendiri, harus bertanggung jawab* and *teman-teman harus membagi tugas-tugas rumah tangga!*

Written Examination

Section I — Reading Skills (25 marks)

General Comments

Weaker responses did not provide sufficient detail. Students should be encouraged to include all relevant information. Specific rather than general answers are what is required. Students should also be encouraged to draw answers from the text, rather than from their general knowledge, and to use concept clues to assist them in finding their answers.

Question 1

This question was handled well by most students. In general, students were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the concepts and vocabulary in this question and they were not phased by the use of acronyms. The following vocabulary items proved challenging for some students: *benda-benda alam dunia, cerita* and *Cerita* was confused with *artikel*.

Question 2

This question proved challenging to many students. Many saw the title *Lindungi Alam Kita* and immediately made assumptions about the content. The following vocabulary items were not handled well by some students: *handuk*, *bahan kimia*, *nusantara* and *gantungan*.

Question 3

Part (b) required very specific information which most students were able to provide. There was a tendency for some students to rely on their general knowledge of the topic to answer this question.

In parts such as part (c) where the question requires fewer examples than are given in the text, students are encouraged to give all the examples in the event that one may be incorrect. Students are not penalised if additional information is incorrect. The word *lama* and the concept *milik kita yang paling berharga* proved challenging to many students.

Question 4

This question was a good discriminator of the candidature. In part (a), whilst almost all students understood the meaning of *bersepeda*, weaker responses did not demonstrate an understanding of the concept of *paket wisata bersepeda*. Other vocabulary items that proved challenging for some were *prosesi*, *sawah* and *pura*.

Question 5

This question proved the most challenging. Many students did not demonstrate an understanding of the main idea of the text. Vocabulary that proved challenging included: *keseharian*, *gelisah*, *bijaksana* and *pengarahan rohani*.

Question 6

This question was generally handled well by most students, though some students read *krisis ekonomi* and began to make general assumptions about the content. The expression *Jalur darat* proved challenging.

Section II — Writing Skills (15 marks)

Most students demonstrated an adequate standard of Indonesian in the Writing Skills section. There were no ‘non-attempts’ and some students achieved full marks. All questions were attempted. Question 9 was the most popular and question 12 was the least popular.

Students are advised to:

- not identify themselves or their schools in any way
- write legibly
- develop a rough plan before they commence their final draft.

This year responses generally met the required length of 200 words. If compositions do not exceed the word limit students have more time to re-read and correct errors. Writing on every second line also gives students more room to make corrections.

Some common errors included:

- misspelling of basic vocabulary items for example, *terimah kasi* instead of *terima kasih* and *bawah* instead of *bahwa*;
- incorrect word order with possessives and adjectives;
- inconsistent use of pronouns (eg. changing from *saya* to *aku* or *anda* to *kamu*);
- incorrect use of register (eg. referring to the principal as *kamu*);
- the use of *itu* to mean it;
- *Maaf, saya tidak pergi ke pestamu*;
- *Saya harap itu bagus* rather than *Saya harap pesta itu bagus*;
- incorrect use of *makin...makin*;
- confusion in relation to conjunctions of time for example, *Sedangkan saya di Jakarta* instead of *Waktu saya di Jakarta ...*;
- use of *terima kasih untuk...* instead of *terima kasih atas...*, for example, *Saya senang sekali di Australia, dia berkata* instead of *Saya senang sekali di Australia, katanya*;
- direct translation of English idiom into Indonesian, for example, ‘homesick’ incorrectly translated as *rumah sakit*; ‘to have a good time’ incorrectly translated as *mempunyai waktu yang bagus*; and ‘to come to an agreement’ incorrectly translated as *datang ke persetujuan*;
- confusion with the use of ‘too’ and ‘like’, for example, *terlalu* used instead of *juga* and *suka* used instead of *seperti*.

Topic 1 — Personal World

Question 7

Although not many students attempted this question, those who did wrote amusing and creative dialogues. Some students did not use the correct register.

Question 8

Writing a magazine article based on an interview was a discourse form which was unfamiliar to a significant number of students.

Question 9

This was a very popular question and most students were familiar with the informal letter discourse form. Some responses were too long and wandered off the topic.

Topic 2 — Travelling in Indonesia

Question 10

This question lent itself well to a variety of discourse forms, for example, dialogue, diary entry, narrative and letter. Those students who attempted this question generally performed well.

Question 11

This question invited students to demonstrate some knowledge of the geography and ethnic groups of Indonesia. Lack of accurate knowledge made this question an unsuitable choice for some of the students who attempted it (eg the choice of *Yogyakarta* as a tourist destination ‘because it is not in Java or Bali’).

Question 12

The students who attempted this question generally handled this discourse form well and the better responses included a title for the article. Students discussed various levels of hotel accommodation but did not mention Indonesian style accommodation (*ie Losmen*).

Section III—Options (20 marks)

Part A—Contemporary Writing

Question 13

In general, students demonstrated substantial knowledge of the play *Kisah Perjuangan Suku Naga* and some students gained very high marks. However, as in past years, some students who demonstrated a good knowledge of the play lost marks because they did not read the questions carefully, inadvertently omitted questions or gave incomplete answers.

It needs to be stressed once again that:

- students should translate quotes and should assume that the marker knows nothing;
- students do not gain marks for irrelevant information.

Part (a) (i) Most students answered the first part of this question well. An accurate description of Mr Joe, taken straight from the extract was all that was needed. The second part of the question was more challenging as students needed to understand Sri Ratu’s comment—*Asal orang penuh pengertian kami pasti menghargainya*. The words *asal* and *pengertian* were key words for this answer.

This question was well done. Most students understood the concept of ‘double-speak’ and gave an example from Mr Joe and the *Menteri Pertambangan*. However some students did not translate or explain their examples.

- Part (b) (i) To answer the first part of this question students did not need to look beyond the extract given. However students sometimes did not include all the information given. In particular they omitted that Abivara's father was pleased that he spoke well (simply but to the point). The second part of the question required an analysis of Paman's and Abisavam's comments. Students handled this well if they had successfully answered the first part of the question.

Most students understood the humour of Paman's 'slip of the tongue' and successfully explained it by referring to the Dalang's statement in the Prologue that this story did **not** happen in Indonesia. When mentioning two other humorous incidents involving Paman, some students did not give sufficient detail (eg 'Paman is funny when he imitates the queen and the army' was not considered an adequate response).

- Part (c) This question was well done and a number of students gained full marks. In the first part of the question some students did not refer to Carlos' role in the struggle (ie that he exposed the intentions of The Big Boss and the Astinam government in regard to the foreign press). Students did extremely well in the second part of the question which required them to give their own stage directions. It must be stressed that reasons for the stage directions had to be given.

- Part (d) Good responses to this question chose **three** issues brought up by Rendra in his play (eg corruption in government, destruction of environment for personal gain, obsession with *kemajuan*) and gave a brief description of these issues as they were revealed by the characters in the play. They then related these issues to modern day Indonesia (eg wealth of Suharto's family and his friends, mining and logging issues and hi-tech industry in Indonesia.)

Part B — Song Option

General Comments

- Teachers should be encouraged to train students on how to respond to questions like parts (a), (b) and (d). Despite questions like this regularly appearing in past examination papers, many students are still finding such questions challenging.
- Students should be advised to read all questions first and confine their answers to the questions asked. Some better students spent too long on the earlier questions, often giving information relevant to later questions, in particular parts (d) and (f). Students are not credited for answers that are not relevant to the question, even if they may be factually correct.

Question 14

- Part (a) Weaker responses simply provided a translation of the song's title without making any reference to its relevance in relation to the song's theme.

The better responses gave the meaning of the title and explained that this was a reference not only to the tall, glass-fronted modern city buildings but also to the Green House Effect (*Efek Rumah Kaca*). An explanation was then given stating why such a title is appropriate, for example, when one considers that the two major issues/themes addressed in the song are the oppressive effects of increasing organisation on the singer's environment and how the glass buildings mirror and reflect heat and thus contribute to the green-house effect, this title is most appropriate.

- Part (b) Again some students were not sufficiently familiar with the vocabulary of the songs. The words *menyengat*, *sirna* and *tergilas* were not understood by some students. Better responses explained the meaning of each quotation in turn and also gave details of their relevance in relation to the issues and themes presented in the song. There is no need to comment on the song's musical presentation in such a question.

Example relating to lines 9 and 10. 'The heart of my city has now disappeared. Crushed by crazy plans with no pattern'. These lines are a direct reference to the unplanned city development which Astria believes is destroying the heart of her city. She views this as a tragedy, carried out without any thought or concern for the environment and its inhabitants. The use of the personal pronoun *ku* shows the singer's close connection to the situation, the use of the *ter* verb shows the lack of control she feels she, and others who share her pain, have over the situation.

- Part (c) This question proved challenging to many students. Weaker responses showed no understanding of the concept of personification, often confusing it with the use of the personal pronoun *ku*. Better responses not only provided examples of personification from the song but were also able to outline the purpose behind its use.

Example relating to line 4 — *cantik* is used here to describe the earth: *cantik* is a word usually used only in relation to people. Its use here is particularly effective since it helps to remind listeners that like human beings, the earth/environment is a living thing which should be protected. Through its use, it is hoped that a greater empathy will be felt for those like Astria who have to suffer under such conditions.

Example relating to lines 7 and 8 — here Astria used *kau* in reference to glass-fronted buildings. This provides an interesting paradox. Whilst the glass-fronted buildings remain robust and soaring, in contrast the human inhabitants of the city are at the same time growing more and more helpless, their lives restricted by overcrowding (line 19), heat (line 17) and congestion (line 18). Their suffering is so much that they are even incapable of expressing their disappointment at the situation (lines 23–24). This paradox really helps to highlight the problems caused by the largely unplanned ever-increasing urbanisation.

- Part (d) This question was not handled well by many students. The weaker responses simply drew on one or two lines from the song and explained their meaning on similar lines to that of part (b). The better responses commented on such language devices as alliteration, use of pronouns, abbreviations, imperatives, use of anglicised terms and so on, then went on to explain how each was used to support the theme of the song. Students should be reminded that in a question such as this they must show they have an understanding of the song's theme.

Example responses included:

- The use of alliteration of the harsh k sound, for example, *kerja keras, keluh kesah* etc, is representative of the harshness and coldness of a robotic society where people seemingly live only to work and have no time even to express their emotions.
- The use of rhyme, for example, *waktu, dituju, angka, p'rintah, citamu, pikiranmu* is reminiscent of the regularity of machines.
- The use of the pronouns *kita* and *mu* helps to involve the listener in the song and aims to encourage them to unite, to rebel against the government.
- The song also makes use of anglicised terms such as *modern, mesin* and *robot*. Words such as these are creeping into the Indonesian language, just as western technology is encroaching on Indonesian society and is now, according to Fawzi, attacking the foundations of the traditional Indonesian way of life.

Part (e) Weaker responses to this question addressed the issues in a very general manner and did not make any reference to the urgency that both Astria and Fawzi see as necessary if the situation is to be remedied/improved in the near future.

Better responses made reference to the following issues in relation to *Rumah Kaca*.

- Astria recognises that there is an urgent need for governments and developers to recognise the suffering experienced by city dwellers due to their largely unplanned unthoughtful urban development (line 10). She hopes that through her song they will become more aware of and sensitive to these issues.
- Urgency is required because the results of this development are devastating. There is overcrowding (lines 1 and 2) to the point where even the movement and breathing of the city's inhabitants are restricted (lines 19 and 20) and the city is being stripped of its beauty (lines 3 and 4) and its essence (line 9). Further to this are the problems caused by the growing number of large glass-fronted buildings that mirror and reflect heat and therefore burn the bodies and kill the spirits of the city's inhabitants (lines 16 and 17) as well as burn their property (line 20).

Better responses made reference to the following issues in relation to *Manusia Robot*.

- Fawzi believes there is an urgent need to break free from the restraints of western technology and modernisation which he sees as a threat to the traditional Indonesian way of life and values, for example, *jam karet* as a concept is now very much threatened by the hectic pace of modern life which now overwhelms us (see lines 1–5).
- Fawzi also stresses the urgent need to regain control over the situation (lines 28–35) before it becomes too late, before the process of dehumanisation has gone too far. He wants to take control of the situation before our lives are not that dissimilar from the life of a robot who does as programmed (line 13).

Part (f) Again students found this question challenging. Teachers need to remind students to refer closely to the question and address only those aspects of the music relevant to the question asked. In addition all students should be encouraged to listen to the songs more regularly so that they have a greater aural memory of each one. Better responses drew on some of the examples that follow to support their answers.

Rumah Kaca

Voice – in general the voice is very strained. It is as though it could break at any moment. The desperation in Astria's voice is obvious. At times it almost sounds choked and very forced, the effects of the congestion and pollution of the city perhaps. At points she is almost screaming (line 13). The strained *pan-a-a-as* at the song's conclusion and at the end of stanza 3 are a clear expression of the urgency that she feels is required. The repetition of the oh, oh, oh, a technique also used in Manusia Robot equates to an expression of pain and further adds to the urgency. Don't let us suffer any longer seems to be the message.

Instrumentation – the voice and instrumentation are often in competition creating a tension and a suspense in the city, an issue Astria wants to see immediately addressed.

The use of unharmonious sounds is indicative of the uncontrolled development in the city, another issue that requires urgent attention.

The heavy drums in the background push the voice along, emphasising the helplessness of those who are suffering.

The piercing and noisy sounds of the xylophone are representative of the destructive nature and harshness of the building's burning rays.

Manusia Robot

Voice — in comparison with the soft and plaintive voice quality in the opening 28 lines of the song, the voice in lines 29 to 37 becomes more empty, decisive and prominent. In this section of the song Fawzi hardly takes time to breathe. The urgency is obvious. The purpose being to arouse the listeners to take immediate action. There is no time to waste.

Instrumentation – the synthesized down beat urges the voice along as does the repetitive keyboard base and the lead guitars which provide aggressive fillers between each line. This further emphasises the need for urgency.

The guitar riff before the final stanza also helps to increase the urgency.

3 Unit (Additional)

Listening and Speaking Examinations

Listening Skills (10 marks)

Most students responded well to the listening items, showing a depth of understanding of the Contemporary Issues studied and a sound knowledge of relevant vocabulary.

Item 1

Some students had difficulty with the idea of *memperkenalkan pendidikan Australia* and only managed to locate one clear reason for the visit.

Item 2

Some candidates did not grasp the overall idea of this item and failed to see the relevance of *pengaruh kepercayaan animisme*, and *agama Hindu dan Budha yang masih kuat* to the development of orthodox Islam.

Item 3

Part (b) was well-answered. In part (a) the reminder not to cut down trees which are not in housing development areas was missed by some students.

Item 4

This item presented few problems, however some students did not know *tenaga kerji!*

Item 5

Some students had difficulty with the concept of *penciptaan lapangan pekerjaan baru*.

Item 6

Part (a) was well done. In part (b) the idea of Aboriginal batik with Javanese designs was not widely understood.

Item 7

This item was well understood and well explained.

Item 8

Puskesmas Lengkap and *Puskesmas Pembantu* were not identified and understood by many candidates. Part (b) was well done.

Item 9

Part (a) was well answered. In part (b) *kesejahteraan* was not widely known.

Item 10

Some students answered with only the issues of *pencermaran lingkungan* and *sumber daya alam*! It was necessary to address the concept of ‘controlling’ or ‘preventing the destruction of’ to formulate a complete response.

Speaking Skills (10 marks)

General Comments

Questions 2 and 3 were by far the most popular choices in 3 Unit Speaking examination. Overall, responses were impressive, although a number did continue for in excess of 15 minutes. Students must again be reminded that succinct responses which keep within the time allocation and remain focused on the specific question are well-rewarded.

Generally speaking, better responses were able to present a well argued case supported by facts and examples. They sustained their argument with minimal hesitation. Vocabulary and structures were sophisticated and very accurate in usage.

Satisfactory responses were marked with some errors, and showed little elaboration or evidence of an argument. They presented a general discussion of the topic, rather than focusing directly on the question asked.

Poorer responses displayed a limited understanding of the contemporary issues, with the specific question either not understood or not addressed. There was a limited grasp of the language needed to express key ideas, and communication was hesitant.

Question 1 — Australia–Indonesia Relations

Some students addressed only the first part of this question, expanding and elaborating on Indonesia as a ‘threat from the north’. They gave little or no advice on how this view could be changed.

Question 2 — Social Change

Better students were able to formulate a well developed opinion, focusing on the key words *persamaan hak* and *kenyataan*. Examples were drawn widely and were well developed including:

- *diskriminasi kalau berjuang melawan ketidakadilan*
- *buruh pabrik*
- *pelecehan seksual*
- *pengaruh Islam*
- *usia perkawinan dan kehamilan*
- *dijodohkan tanpa keinginan sendiri*
- *gaji*
- *kodrat, martabat*
- *peran di bidang politik.*

Question 3 — Population Pressures

Some students spoke generally on population pressures, and elaborated on possible solutions — family planning and transmigration were discussed at length by some. However, better responses focused on the broad spectrum of problems which have resulted from rapid population growth.

Question 4 — Economy

Responses to this question varied from those who spoke generally about the Indonesian economy and its current problems, to those who could relate their knowledge, supported by facts, to develop a clear argument which addressed the entire question. The issue of export products and industry could not be ignored.

Written Examination

Section I — Reading Skills (15 marks)

General Comments

In general, question 2 proved to be a lot more challenging than question 1. The interview format of question 1 seemed to help to guide the students to the answers. With the exception of question 2, part (d), all answers showed a good general comprehension of the passages.

Question 1

This passage was handled well by most students. Students were able to use their knowledge of the language to work out the meanings of difficult concepts such as *aturan yang rasional*, *bersifat kerakyatan*, *perut bumi*, *berkemauan baja* and *bertangan*. Additional vocabulary that proved challenging included *latar belakang*, *warisan* and *ketidakseimbangan*.

Question 2

Parts (a), (b) and (c) of this question were generally handled well. Part (d) proved very challenging for most students. Despite being directed to paragraphs 3 and 4, many students' responses were very general and made little or no specific reference to the text. To answer this question successfully, sustained reading was required. This is an important 3 Unit reading skill that teachers should be encouraged to develop. Students need to be made aware of the fact that there is more to reading than simple recognition of vocabulary. The following vocabulary items proved challenging *cuti*, *haid*, *lembur*, *paksa*, *lisan*, and *secara sepihak*.

A Final Comment

On many occasions, students did not pay careful enough attention to little words like *belum* (question 1) and *belum pernah* (question 2) and were therefore giving completely incorrect information. For example: *Langkah – langkah pembangunan yang dilakukan pada 15 tahun pertama kepemimpinan Pak Harto belum menimbulkan ketidakseimbangan antar yang kaya dan yang miskin yang luar biasa* (question 1).

Tidak hanya itu, pihak perusahaan juga belum pernah menegeluarkan ijin untuk itu (question 2).

Whilst a good 3 Unit student must show competency in handling high level language, they must also pay attention to little words like *belum* and *belum pernah* which give sentences a context.

Section II — Writing Skills (15 marks)

General Comments

The four composition questions were attempted by equal numbers of students. Students who gained high marks demonstrated a good knowledge of their chosen topic, had a well-developed line of thought with appropriate paragraphing and used accurate and authentic Indonesian. Some students demonstrated excellent knowledge of vocabulary and grammar but in weaker responses an inability to manipulate grammatical structures accurately was evident.

Problem areas included:

- incorrect use of object construction *me / di*
- problems with affixation
- confusion with verbs which have a transitive and intransitive form, for example, *berhenti / menghentikan*
- misuse of *makin...makin*
- incorrect use of *walaupun* instead of *namun / walaupun begitu / walaupun demikian*

Students should be reminded of the need to formulate a rough plan of their composition so that they can organise their ideas logically into paragraphs. An organised composition gains higher marks than a disorganised re-writing of pre-learned facts.

Question 3

This question was generally well done. Most students addressed each part of the question. However some students needed to pay more attention to the reason for forest fires.

Question 4

Better students related this question to the issue of women's rights, the injustices and inequalities faced by Indonesian women and tied it into the difficulties an Indonesian woman would face in the world of business. Some students only compared the traditional role of women with the role of women today and did not mention the business world at all. Better students handled the interview discourse form well.

Question 5

Better students had a sound knowledge of the cause and effect of the *krisis ekonomi* and linked it to recent events in Indonesia. They also suggested possible solutions to the *krisis ekonomi*.

Question 6

This question was treated from different perspectives, from the role of religion in the current socio-political climate. Weaker responses only mentioned the duties of a Moslem and did not mention other religions in Indonesia.

2/3 Unit (Common) (For Background Speakers)

Listening Examination

Listening Skills (20 marks)

General Comments

Questions 1–4 were well answered by the majority of students. Questions 5 and 6 discriminated widely among the students.

Question 1

This question required students to summarise the whole text and identify the major labour issue discussed in the broadcast.

Most students mentioned that the UMR (regional minimum wage) was very low and often insufficient to cover the needs of the workers.

Better responses went on to mention problems in the implementation of UMR and the attitude of the employers, many of whom would rather pay the fines than pay the minimum wage.

Question 2

This was a straightforward question.

Part (a) Better responses gave two points, viz:

- although wages have risen, so have prices; and
- the minimum wage was not sufficient to meet the needs of a family.

Weaker responses mentioned only one of these points and did not mention the rise in prices.

Part (b) This was not answered as well as part (a). Better responses gave two points, viz:

- her wages were not enough given the high cost of rent; and
- allowances for meals and Sundays had not been paid.

Weaker responses omitted the details about the rent and confused the allowances, for example, saying that transport had not been paid.

Question 3

Better responses gave three points relating to the lack of success in the implementation of UMR:

- although some progress had been made, the wages were still below those of neighbouring countries;
- many companies chose not to implement the program;
- the fines and sanctions were inadequate to discourage non-compliance.

Some students missed the comparison with Thailand and the Philippines, and others combined the second and third points without giving all details.

Question 4

Most students were able to give two reasons to show why employers do not value their workers:

- they consider them as machines;
- they pride themselves on giving low wages, although labour costs are only 10–20% of production costs.

Some students thought that wages should be increased by 10–20%, not understanding that wages were 10–20% of production costs.

Some students noted that the attitude of the employers was not *murni*.

Question 5

This question discriminated well among students. It required them to explain four techniques used by Pak Wina to convince the listeners to adopt his point of view.

Weaker responses gave several examples of the one technique or confused the content with the way the content was conveyed.

Better students were able to give a variety of techniques and explain how these convinced the listener.

Examples of techniques adopted by Pak Wina to lend credibility to his argument included:

- the serious / neutral / objective tone;
- his confident approach;
- reference to labour laws and regulations;
- the sequencing of ideas *pertama... kedua*;
- the use of statistics and percentages;
- the use of *kita* includes the listener in the discussion;
- the use of comparisons with the situation in neighbouring countries;
- the inclusion of predictions.

Question 6

This question required students to compare the language used by Pak Wina and the two workers focusing on aspects of *bahasa resmi* and *bahasa sehari-hari*.

Some students did not read the question on the paper carefully enough and addressed aspects of music and background noise. These aspects were relevant to the final question from the preceding year's paper.

Better answers gave examples of the two levels of language and explained why these examples were formal or colloquial.

Some students gave a definition of formal and colloquial language but did not give any examples from the text.

Other students gave examples of the two levels of language, but did not draw their examples from the text.

Some students confused levels of language, for example, the phrase *agak ringan* was thought to be an example of *bahasa sehari-hari*.

Most students were able to state that the two workers used colloquial language and that, for the most part, Pak Wina used formal language. Better responses mentioned the two varying registers used by Pak Wina.

Examples given included:

- words borrowed from other languages by Pak Wina, for example, *cost*;
- *kata serapan*, for example, *revisi*, *manajemen*;
- legal jargon, for example, *yuridis*;
- *kata-kata non-baku*, for example, *nggak*, *dikasih* and so on;
- incomplete sentences;
- short, interrupted delivery with frequent repetition;
- the accent of the speakers.

Written Examination

Section 1 — Reading Skills (20 marks)

General comments

The four texts were linked by a common theme, aspects of education in contemporary, Indonesia.

Question 1

Part (a) Most students answered this question in some detail. Sometimes they wrote too much considering the mark allocation indicated on the paper.

Better students were able to summarise the similarities and differences of opinion of the three teenagers in their own words rather than merely copy details from the text.

Better responses gave reasons to explain why Billy, Vonny and Dita held these views.

Part (b) Many students found this question difficult, possibly because of the word *beleid*.

The question required them to explain the quotation in the context of the whole text. Better students were able to explain this: although the gift of the video series was made with the good intention of improving students' knowledge about their own country, it was ill-conceived because many schools still did not have TV and video facilities to show the programs. Some added that the money spent could have been used for more basic priorities, such as looking after the welfare of teachers.

Weaker responses showed the misunderstanding that schools were being forced to buy the video series.

Part (c) This question required students to give their own interpretation of the cartoon and to write a suitable title for it. Students needed to look carefully at the cartoon and consider all elements in the picture, rather than focus on just one of these.

Better students were able to identify the idea of education as an expensive commodity, as portrayed by the dummies in the shop window. They further inferred that it was beyond the reach of the son and father outside the shop and by extension beyond the reach of most Indonesians. To support this conclusion they referred to the look of shock on the face of the father and noted that the clothes they were wearing symbolised ordinary Indonesians (the father's *peci* and the son's uniform showing that he attended a *sekolah negeri*).

Many students took this one step further and pointed out that the dollar signs and English words (*open, push*) on the door indicated that the education being marketed was probably from overseas.

Weaker responses did not show an appreciation of cartoons to critically portray a message through symbolism and humour. They described the cartoon literally as the boy wanting his father to buy the clothing. Some students thought that the academic gown was trendy clothing.

Some good suggestions for the title included:

- *Ilmu yang diperbeliulkan;*
- *Pendidikan yang sama dengan konsumerisme;*
- *Bayar mahal sekolah? Sip!;*
- *Pendidikan tinggi butuh biaya besar;*
- *Pendidikan berbau kemewahan.*

Part (d) This question required students to address three aspects, the target audience and both the text and graphics appearing in the advertisement.

Better answers explained that the advertisement was aimed at parents (rather than the students themselves) and particularly at parents from the middle to upper class who could afford to educate their children overseas.

Elements of the text which were considered to make the advertisement effective were:

- the bold text to emphasise the safe environment of the school and its success rate in preparing students for tertiary entrance;
- the reassuring tone to overcome the worries of parents about the supervision and pastoral care of their children by emphasising the family atmosphere of the school.

Elements of the graphics which were considered to make the advertisement effective by supporting the message of the text were:

- the photo of a group of happy students from diverse backgrounds;
- the photo of the beautiful school buildings and grounds;
- the photo of a graduate student with her proud parents.

Part (e) Most students were able to rewrite the highlighted section in formal language, although students frequently omitted to change *jadi* to *menjadi*.

Students should, however, be aware that they do not have to alter the text more than is required to convert it from colloquial to standard language.

Part (f) Many students did not attempt to answer this question in which they were required to identify four words borrowed from another language. This was surprising given the many examples from which they could choose. Possible examples included words borrowed from English (*kaset, video, televisi, film, protes, memprioritaskan*), Dutch (*beleid*), Arabic (*mubazir*), and Javanese (*ngawur*).

Many students confused borrowing from other languages with slang, jargon and colloquial language.

Of the students who did identify some borrowed words, few mentioned the origin of the borrowed words or the effect created by their inclusion. Some students limited their response to giving the meanings.

Part (g) This question required students to draw a conclusion about education in Indonesia after reading all texts.

While most students made appropriate comments in their responses, better students were able to refer to all four texts and link their comments coherently.

Common references to text A mentioned education in Indonesia from the students' point of view. While they were generally satisfied, the facilities needed to be improved.

From text B they concluded that there were discrepancies between government policy and the implementation of the policy in schools. Some also commented on the lack of facilities as shown by text B.

From text C they concluded that higher education was an expensive commodity beyond the reach of most Indonesians.

From text D they concluded that many Indonesians wanted to educate their children overseas.

Section II—Writing Skills (20 marks)

In 1998, unlike past years, students were not offered a choice of topic in this section. However the topic, whether it was better to study overseas or in Indonesia, was one of relevance and within the personal experience of every student enrolled in this course.

Students were able to adopt many different approaches to the topic. These approaches included:

- adopting various personas eg a student, a parent and so on;
- taking an objective or subjective view;
- defending education in either Australia or Indonesia;
- choosing to write to different types of magazines and consequently selecting a register and approach appropriate to that magazine, for example, the style required for a letter to *Gadis* differed from the style required for a letter to *Gatra* or *Tempo*.

Some students confused the elements of letters to the editor and letters to an advice column. Some students introduced their letters inappropriately and a few did not even couch their response in the form of a letter.

Students are strongly advised to avoid identifying themselves or their schools in any way. In the case of this question some signed the letter in their own names, rather than using a pseudonym. If a letter question were to appear in future exams, students should sign under a pseudonym.

Students who did not mention the name of a magazine in their opening salutations and merely wrote *Kepada Redaksi* had more difficulty in adopting and maintaining an appropriate level of language in their response. Other students invented names for the magazine to whom they were replying. Letters addressed to *Redaksi majalah blabla* made it difficult to judge whether the level of language used was suitable for the publication.

Better responses addressed the topic to the readers of the magazine, avoiding the temptation to write an essay and append opening and closing salutations for a letter. They also followed a

particular line forcefully and consistently.

Some of the better responses referred to an earlier, imaginary article on the issue of education in the magazine and responded accordingly.

Students are advised that originality and ability to maintain reader interest are paramount in this section.

Marking criteria — Section II — Writing Skills — Question 2

A mark out of 20 using the following criteria.

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Excellent response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Style appropriate to genre; |
| 18–20 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Successfully maintains reader interest;• Uses very well sequenced and sustained argument;• Uses a wide range of vocabulary, including the less predictable;• Excellent control of syntax and use of complex structures;• Attains or exceeds minimum length requirement. |
| Good response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Style generally appropriate to genre; |
| 14–17 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally maintains reader interest;• Uses well organised and sequenced argument;• Good control of syntax and use of varied structures;• Attains minimum length requirement. |
| Average response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Style mostly appropriate to genre; |
| 11–14 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited attempt to maintain reader interest;• Content organised reasonably, some weaknesses in sequencing and linking;• Language mostly accurate and coherent;• Uses predictable and familiar vocabulary. |
| Below average | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited ability to organise content; |
| 8–11 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally predictable and familiar vocabulary;• Little attempt to adapt wording from passages on exam paper;• Often fails to attain minimum length requirements. |
| Poor response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fails to address question directly; |
| 4–7 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimal attempt to maintain reader interest;• Poorly sequenced ideas;• Limited range of vocabulary;• Heavy reliance on passages in the exam paper. |

- Very poor response** • Does not address question;
1–4 marks • Does not show understanding of demands of question;
• Uses very limited range of vocabulary and structures;
• Poor sequencing of ideas — often incoherent.

Section III — Contemporary Issues (40 marks)

Question 3

This question required students to discuss the quotation in the context of the play and then discuss whether or not it is still relevant to contemporary Indonesia, supporting their arguments by drawing on their readings from other sources about contemporary issues. Although similar questions have appeared in past years, it proved challenging to many students.

Many students did not address the question fully in their responses and used the quotation as a general ‘launch pad’ for a generalised discussion about a variety of current changes in Indonesia. In so doing some students were carried away by their personal emotions.

Students are advised to focus carefully on the quotation before deciding which direction their discussion will take and which points and examples will be used as supporting evidence.

While many students discussed the rich natural resources of Indonesia and the increasing amount of industry in Indonesia today, only a few interpreted the main aim of foreign capital, *uang modal*, as a means to exploit these resources and sell manufactured products to developing countries such as Indonesia.

Many students gave various examples from their contemporary reading which were not related to the focus of the question, that is, they wrote about the decline and commercialisation of culture, environmental problems, political chaos and racial tensions.

Many students did not refer to the play to show the similarities and differences between Rendra’s imaginary country of Astinam and Indonesia today.

Marking criteria — Section III — Contemporary Issues — Question 3

A mark out of 20 using the following criteria.

Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully addresses the set question;
18–20 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates excellent understanding of the text;• Displays clear evidence of wide reading/viewing;• Provides relevant and detailed references to text;• Includes relevant and clearly explained examples;• Shows high level of understanding of contemporary issues;• Well organised and sequenced ideas;• Sustains coherent argument throughout.
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses most parts of the question;
14–17 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relates discussion to set topic;• Displays evidence of wide reading/viewing;• Provides some relevant and detailed references to the text;• Uses some examples to support argument;• Displays good knowledge of contemporary issues;• Well organised and sequenced ideas.
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not address all aspects of set question;
11–14 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discusses topic in general terms;• Displays some evidence of wider reading/viewing;• Limited reference to text;• Provides only a few relevant examples;• Displays some knowledge of contemporary issues.
Below average	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little attempt to address question;
8–11 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fails to address all aspects of the question;• Little evidence of wider reading/viewing;• Minimal reference to text;• Displays limited knowledge of contemporary issues;• Poorly organised discussion with weaknesses in sequencing and linking ideas.

Poor

1–7 marks

- Fails to address the set question;
- Provides inappropriate examples;
- Demonstrates little understanding of contemporary issues;
- Limited length.

Question 4

In this question, students were required to relate the events in the play *Kisah Perjuangan Suku Naga* through the eyes of either Sri Ratu or the Big Boss.

Overall students answered this question well. Many were able to show a sound knowledge of the plot, providing detailed and specific references to incidents in the play. They were also able to describe the characteristics and attitudes of either Sri Ratu or the Big Boss. Most chose to discuss events from Sri Ratu's point of view.

Best answers combined the two elements of plot and characterisation in a coherent and often entertaining coverage of the events by directly projecting themselves into the character and writing from a first person perspective. By revealing the plot through the eyes of the character they were able to reveal insight into the character.

A good example of this was: *I don't understand why the common people don't agree with my plans to build the luxury Wijayakusuma hospital – they are just old-fashioned and don't understand what progress really means. They ask why build such a hospital when more clinics are needed in the outlying areas. When they ask what will poor people do when they get sick, I simply say "Don't get sick!"*

Some students merely summarised the plot and did not address the attitudes of Sri Ratu or the Big Boss.

Some students discussed the attitudes of the characters in relation to the themes of the play. These answers did not score as highly as those that adopted the persona of a character and commented on events through that perspective.

Marking criteria — Section III — Writing Skills — Question 4

A mark out of 20 using the following criteria.

Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully addresses, the set question;
18–20 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates excellent understanding of the text;• Provides relevant and detailed references to the text;• Uses relevant and clearly explained examples;• Very well organised and sequenced argument;• Sustains coherent argument throughout;• Adopts persona of chosen character throughout response.
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses most parts of the question;
14–17 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides some relevant and detailed references to the text;• Uses some appropriate examples;• Relates discussion to set topic;• Well organised and sequenced argument;• Some attempt to respond from point of view of chosen character.
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses topic in general terms;
11–14 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides only a few appropriate examples;• Does not address all aspects of set question;• Limited reference to text;• Little attempt to respond from point of view of chosen character.
Below average	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little attempt to address set question;
8–11 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not address all aspects of set question;• Weaknesses in linking and sequencing ideas;• Poorly organised discussion;• Minimal reference to text.
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fails to address set question;
1–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides inappropriate examples;• Demonstrates little knowledge of play.

3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers)

Written Examination

Section I — Novel (25 marks)

General Comments

This question required students to explain how the author portrayed the development of Gadis Pantai's changing awareness of her position and role in society as a result of her experiences.

Most students were able to demonstrate a satisfactory knowledge of the events in the novel and make some comment on the changing role and position of Gadis Pantai.

The best responses discussed the development of her awareness of her role and position by referring to a coherent sequence of events in the novel or examples of the influence of other characters contributing to her growing self-awareness. Some good responses referred to Gadis Pantai's *kedudukan sebagai keturunan kaum Hawa dan sebagai orang kebanyakan*.

The best responses also included the techniques Pramoedya used to show the character development of Gadis Pantai. These included discussion of particular incidents, discussion of individual characters, discussion of the various titles and ways in which Gadis Pantai was addressed throughout the novel, discussion of comparison, flashback and foreshadowing.

When referring to particular incidents, students should think carefully about how to incorporate comments into their discussion as this can make the difference between a response which fully addresses the question and one which consists of retelling of the plot.

The way in which students express their ideas determines the marks awarded. Students should address the question directly, and explicitly state the links and comparisons they are drawing, rather than make vague implications and leave it to the markers to infer their meaning. Students are advised to practise their essay writing skills and hone their answering technique. Use of appropriate literary terms is to be encouraged.

Overall the best responses dealt with the stages in Gadis Pantai's life which shaped her awareness of her role as a child, wife/concubine and mother and her position as a commoner (*orang kebanyakan*) in an aristocratic (*priyayi*) social environment. These included a brief description of her life as a naive village girl, her ignorance when she first entered Bendoro's house, the teachings of the old servant about her role as a mistress and concubine, her realisation of her position as the commoner wife of an aristocrat, her growing insecurity about her position in the household (especially after the dismissal of the old servant and the arrival of Mardinah), her alienation from the villagers when she returned home, her awareness of her responsibilities as a mother and finally her realisation of her lack of worth when she was thrown out of Bendoro's house. Many different examples were used to illustrate these stages.

Marking criteria — Section I — Novel — Question 1

A mark out of 25 using the following criteria.

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Excellent response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully addresses the set question; |
| 21–25 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates excellent understanding of the text;• Provides detailed and relevant reference to text;• Uses appropriate and clearly explained examples;• Ideas very well organised and linked;• Sustains coherent argument throughout response. |
| Good response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers the question directly; |
| 18–21 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides some relevant and detailed references to the text;• Uses some appropriate examples;• Well organised and linked ideas;• Attempts to balance the various parts of the question. |
| Average response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally focuses on set question; |
| 14–17 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides only limited supporting examples and argument;• Does not discuss novel comprehensively or in depth;• Concentrates on plot rather than analysis. |
| Below average | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little attempt to address set question; |
| 8–13 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concentrates mainly on plot summary rather than analysis;• Poorly organised discussion;• Internal inconsistency in argument;• Few, if any, appropriate examples. |
| Poor response | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses set question in vague, general terms. |
| 1–7 marks | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little reference to novel;• Does not write at an appropriate length;• Does not include appropriate examples. |

Section II — Poetry (25 marks)

This question required students to select one poem from each of the three poets studied. The poems are for inclusion in an anthology reflecting socio-cultural aspects of Indonesian society. Students also had to discuss the techniques used by the poets to create images of contemporary Indonesian society.

The question was straightforward and most students understood what was required. However a few students misread the question and discussed one poem, or several poems, by only one poet.

Most students were able to choose appropriate poems. The commonly chosen poems were *Pria*, *Pesta Ulang Tahun* and *Sebuah Departemen* by Toeti Heraty, *Bali dalam puisi*, *Orang orang desa itu* and *Catatan harian* by Putu Oka and *Terkenang topeng Cirebon* by Ajip Rosidi.

Better responses discussed each poem in some depth and detail, provided accurate quotations and combined discussion of poetic technique with the socio-cultural theme portrayed in each poem.

Average responses tended to concentrate on the content of the poems only, often in general terms, with a very brief comment on the socio-cultural theme and one or two points about technique, often not closely related to the main discussion.

Poorer responses showed very little knowledge of the poems and no understanding of poetic techniques.

Marking criteria — Section II — Poetry — Question 2

A mark out of 25 using the following criteria.

Excellent response	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concentrates on focus of question;
21–25 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discusses chosen poems in depth and detail;• Explains and discusses quotations from poems;• Includes discussion of poetic technique;• Gives equal weight to each poem discussed.
Good response	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers question directly;
18–21 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discusses relevant poems in detail;• Attempts to balance various elements of the question;• Gives some quotations to show knowledge of poems.
Average response	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally focuses on question;
14–17 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discusses content of poems in general terms;• Does not discuss poems comprehensively or in depth;• Concentrates on content rather than poetic forms;• Discusses all areas of topic but not in equal depth.
Below average	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimal attempt to focus on question;
8–13 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concentrates on certain poems (not number of poems mentioned in the question);• Discusses content of poems in general terms;• Little specific reference to text of poems;• Displays little understanding of poetic technique.
Poor response	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shows little knowledge of poem;
1–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not attempt to focus on question;• Does not write at appropriate length.

ISBN 0 7313 4209 7



9 780731 342099