

## LOTE: Indonesian Second Language GA 3: Examination

---

### Oral component

The oral examination was handled well by most students. There were, however, a significant number of students who disadvantaged themselves by the narrow scope of their chosen discussion topic.

### Conversation

#### Strengths

- most students were able to participate in the conversation confidently
- students were able to keep the conversation going with little help needed to maintain the exchange.

#### Weaknesses

- students who waited for each question were less likely to expand their answer
- one-word answers
- terms of address used for assessors (e.g. *Kamu/Anda* not appropriate).

### Discussion

#### Strengths

- good discussion topics based on well researched detailed study topics allowed students to enter into a discussion confidently
- visual material greatly assisted students and assessors to establish the focus of the discussion. Those students who benefited most from the visual material they brought were those who were prepared to answer a wide range of possible questions.

#### Weaknesses

- the narrow scope of the chosen topic
- obscure topics taken from the Internet do not meet the requirements of a Detailed Study but also disadvantage students in terms of possible breadth of discussion. If the topic and information presented by the student was very narrow and obscure then it was very difficult to develop a broad discussion
- not all students were willing to offer an opinion when asked – reflecting either poor choice of topic or weak discussion skills
- some students expected specific questions to be asked and had not prepared their sub-topic sufficiently
- memorised responses to certain types of questions (or in some cases completely unrelated questions)
- some words need more attention with pronunciation, e.g. *penebangan* was often pronounced *penerbangan*, *pencemaran* was often given wrong emphasis such as *pencem – aran*
- the word '*dibahayakan*' as used by some students to mean 'endangered' rather than '*terancam*'.

### Introducing the sub-topic

As stated in the Indonesian Second Language Study Design, students need to indicate to the assessors the sub-topic chosen for detailed study and, in no more than one minute, briefly introduce the main focus of their sub-topic, alerting assessors to any objects brought to support the discussion. This introduction still posed problems for some students. Many students did not use the time to introduce their sub-topic wisely. Although this year the VET option was not undertaken, students need to indicate to the assessors the option selected for detailed study when introducing their sub-topic. The introduction is crucial to the focus of the discussion. If the introduction did not explain exactly what the student had studied or was there to discuss, then the assessors had to guess at the area of discussion. Setting the discussion in a broader context, whilst valuable in terms of depth of learning, drew attention away from the actual topic of discussion. Those students who stated what their sub-topic was set clear parameters for their focus. There were also some students, who had memorised the introduction but did not fully understand it. When they were asked questions that used words from their introduction they looked blank. Whilst the introduction may be memorised – it does need to consist of words/sentences that are suitable to individual students and completely understood.

### Resources

While most students were able to refer to their resources and answer further questions, a significant number seemed very vague about their texts. This year there was an increase in the number of students referring to the Internet as their source of information. This raised some issues and concerns that need attention. Many students who were unable to expand on questions asked about their resources were those who had mentioned the Internet as one or all of their sources. Many of these Internet resources were also in English. Resources in English are hard for a student to refer to when asked questions they might not expect. Combining a variety of resources as recommended in the Indonesian Second Language Study Design and not focusing just on the Internet is recommended. Internet sites that are of a dubious nature in terms of their information, sites that are too hard for the student to understand the language and thus spend too much time on translation as well as sites in English that detract from the focus on language should be avoided. The three main texts mentioned by students should be in Indonesian and they should be of a different text type (i.e.

book, article, video, audio, magazine, newspaper, internet article, internet site). Secondary texts in English, used by some teachers to start a topic are acceptable but should not be included in the main source material for students.

### **Sub-topics and the discussion**

The topics chosen were much broader this year but old favourites such as environment, tourism and urbanisation were often the ones that offered the best scope for discussion. Many confident students were able to place their topic into a broader context if asked. Topics such as 'Komodo dragon', 'Batik' or 'Sekaten' and other topics presented as factual material only were not suitable for a detailed study or an oral discussion and did not meet the requirements for the new VCE. If these topics had been placed in a broader context of, for example, conservation, place of modern versus traditional art forms or the place of customs and traditions in modern Indonesian society then the students might not have been struggling in their discussion. The discussion for the oral examination must also include opinion and not all students were willing to put forward an opinion when asked.

Those who said '*Saya tidak belajar itu*' unfortunately closed a door to their discussion. Whilst this phrase is legitimate if the question is 'completely' off the topic, the student should then add '*tetapi yang saya tahu ...*' or any other useful phrase to bring the discussion back to what they did know. Sometimes it seemed that students said '*saya tidak belajar itu*' when in fact they did not know what the question was. It was used to deflect difficult questions.

The number of students expecting certain questions was still high and this limited any discussion based on content. Superficially prepared sub-topics limited students' engagement in the discussion. As stated in the study design, if one sub-topic is selected for the whole class, it needs to be sufficiently broad to accommodate a range of interests and perspectives, so that each student can provide an individual response in the Discussion. Quite a few students prepared a talk or used topics that were suitable for the former VCE oral presentation. This is of great concern as the revised VCE is in its second year. Any student who presented a prepared speech was immediately disadvantaged by the fact that their speech was not appropriate and had to be interrupted and they were not able to take part in the discussion since they had not prepared for it.

## **Written component**

### **Areas of strength and weakness**

Strengths:

- students generally were better prepared for the Listening and Responding section
- most students responded in the correct language
- highlighting 'answer in Indonesian' or 'English' was particularly helpful for students
- the response to the letter in Reading and Responding Part B was answered well by most students
- the overall level of skill in writing section improved.

Weaknesses:

- better note-taking would have assisted during the listening section – valuable information was often excluded from responses, more practise with listening and note-taking is needed
- answers (in Indonesian and English) were often written carelessly and without thought to meaning
- students tended to translate texts in the reading and responding section line for line and would lose sight of overall context and meaning of the text (lack of attention to overall gist of a text)
- there was a lack of sophistication in the writing section
- often the choice of writing topic was not suitable to the student's knowledge and language skill level.

## **Section 1 – Listening and responding**

### **Part A**

This section was answered better than last year. The listening passages were also somewhat less demanding.

#### **Text 1**

Both Question 1 and Question 2 were answered correctly by most students.

#### **Question 1**

Open between 6–10 pm.

#### **Question 2**

Leave your name and telephone number.

#### **Text 2**

Some students had difficulty with Question 3 and 4 and either did not answer or made some guesses.

#### **Question 3**

The person is lost because they only just arrived last night and it is their first time in Indonesia. Also accepted was 'does not know the streets'.

#### **Question 4**

He is impressed that she speaks Indonesian/so well.

### **Text 3**

Most students were able to answer Question 5 and 6 correctly. Question 7 was not answered well and many students left Question 8 blank.

#### **Question 5**

(d) the plane will be late.

#### **Question 6**

(b) floods in Jakarta.

#### **Question 7**

Three things they are advised to do:

1. Pick up coupons/for food and drink/from information.
2. Take the coupons to the restaurant/on the second floor.
3. Leave their baggage at the Garuda office.

#### **Question 8**

Passengers will be informed as soon as possible/when info becomes available.

### **Text 4**

Most students were able to answer Question 9 and 10. In Question 11, the word 'diplomat' was missed by many students and they guessed this to be 'diploma' and linked that to the music and made him graduate with a diploma from Los Angeles. In Question 12, many students were able to answer although some not fully. To answer that they were both busy was not accepted.

#### **Question 9**

Gilang is a famous drummer and has made many hits. Also accepted was that he was being interviewed by the radio and that they said he was famous.

#### **Question 10**

The studio at the back is used for practise and recording.

#### **Question 11**

He studied music in Bandung and Los Angeles (when his mother was a diplomat).

#### **Question 12**

Gilang often travels and performs and his wife also travels/moves to different islands with her work with TV and the UN.

## **Part B**

### **Text 5**

Instructions were not always followed in this section and some students lost vital marks by not writing in complete sentences. In order to gain a high rating for Criterion 1, students needed to have completed all parts of the form and all questions on text 5 and 6, showing that they could identify key elements of the texts. In order to gain a high rating for Criterion 2, students needed to have written grammatically correct sentences with only one or two possible slips with spelling.

#### **Question 13**

Question 13 was usually answered well and required little structural input. *Alasan untuk kunjungan ke Indonesia: Belajar tarian tradisional dan bermain gamelan: Lama kunjungan Anda: 6 bulan: Apakah ini kunjungan pertama ke Solo?: Tidak*

#### **Question 14 and 15**

Question 14 and 15 were often not answered well. Accepted for Question 14 was the mention of *beasiswa/menerima uang* or *dana* or *uang dari pemerintah* etc. Students who did not know the word *beasiswa* or write it down were unable to respond.

### **Text 6**

This was the hardest of the texts and was not always answered clearly by students but overall most managed to gain something for their attempts.

#### **Question 16**

*Maksud utama pertemuan John Williams dengan Ibu Sri Sulastrri untuk memperkuat hubungan antara Indonesia dan WHO.*

#### **Question 17**

(Any three of these were accepted); *Pertemuan dengan Ibu Stri Sulastrri/ketua/berkunjung ke Gedung Institut Malaria/ melihat proyek air bersih/ makan malam/resmi.*

#### **Question 18**

*Isteri John Williams akan menghadiri Seminar Wanita Internasional waktu di Indonesia.*

## **Section 2 – Reading and responding**

### **Text 7**

#### **Question 19**

Victorian style houses, trams, extensive gardens/gardens and Yarra River.

As indicated by the wording of the question descriptive detail of the things seen in Melbourne was not required. What this kind of text and questions exposed; however, was a tendency for students to assume anything is possible in an examination and not check to make sure that what they write as an answer makes sense. ‘Very calm gardens which are vast’ to ‘Giant sleeping snakes’ did not make a lot of sense for students to answer. Potentially easy marks were lost by many students.

#### **Question 20**

The development of Indonesian Studies at University. The interest in studying Indonesian is increasing in high schools, there is a need for more Indonesian teachers and increase in number of students who are able to speak Indonesian and there are seminars at university.

This question was answered well.

#### **Question 21**

Two marks if the student answered ‘No’ and added ‘the study of language can also involve the study of culture, politics or music’. Students need to make sure they are specific in their answer and add as much information as the question requires. Most students gained 1 mark.

#### **Question 22**

Students can apply for a scholarship to study at an Indonesian university or they can go to Indonesia for an Intensive Language program. Students had to have both of these to receive 2 marks. Many students either did not answer this question or did not include more than one opportunity.

#### **Question 23**

The author of the text indicates that the study of Indonesian could help their language skills because they will be able to hear Indonesian all day long. This was a question that did require careful selection of wording from the text. Some students chose not to check the text but to guess the answer.

#### **Question 24**

Responses should have been similar to: ‘The author says to be careful not to say negative things in Indonesian on a tram about another passenger. If you do that passenger might in fact be able to speak Indonesian and therefore be angry because they understand what is being said.’ This question brought forth answers that showed a lack of understanding of what might be written in a text in an examination. Some students were willing to write down complete impossible scenarios that meant they had not paid enough attention to the text or their answer. Capable students wrote strange answers because they did not think about the whole meaning of the text they were reading but took the sentence in isolation and made some guesses. From answers that included ‘angry tram conductors’, ‘not calling tram drivers stupid’ to ‘catching trams early if you speak Indonesian’ – it was obvious that students had stumbled on the words in italics and then decided to just guess.

### **Text 8**

The questions on this text were generally answered well. Unfortunately some students forgot which language they were using to write their response and read the text in Indonesian and then answered in Indonesian instead of English.

#### **Question 25**

Two main types of facilities; sporting/seminar or meeting.

#### **Question 26**

By having large green gardens they are environmentally friendly. Accepted also: large area of greenery.

#### **Question 27**

Educational institutions (schools), government groups, community groups. Not accepted were ‘social groups’ or guesses at the types of groups that might attend including ‘football clubs’.

## **Part B**

### **Text 9**

In order to gain a high rating for Criterion 1, students needed to have responded to all questions (5) and referred to comments from the text in their answer. The most successful responses showed that the students had understood the text, context and response requirements and were in the format of a letter. They also included their opinion and ideas as asked in the letter. In order to gain a high rating for Criterion 2, students needed to have used a broad range and variety of language, made only one or two minor errors in grammar, made their response to Tina and drew vocabulary from the text as well as additional words relevant to their opinions and ideas.

## Question 28

Strengths:

- students generally answered this section well
- most students understood the content of the letter and responded accordingly
- those students who underlined or highlighted the questions in the letter were able to check as they wrote whether they had covered all questions or not
- the level of sophistication varied but most students realised that despite being a letter to a friend, the response still needed a similar level of sophistication as the original.

Weaknesses:

- not all students responded to all questions in the text
- some students wrote about completely different topics including tourism and family planning. Another wrote all about endangered turtles in Bali
- the use of the word *dibayangkan* which also sometimes occurred in the oral examination seemed to be connected to specific groups of students. Students appear to have incorrectly 'created' this word and should be using '*terancam*'.

## Section 3 – Writing in Indonesian

Strengths:

- the overall level of writing was improved
- students paid attention to the requirements of a text type such as title, author.

Weaknesses:

- students still need guidance on how to write well
- students are often not able to put clear thoughts together in a paragraph or present a strong introduction and conclusion
- the use of *ke*, *oleh* and *adalah*
- doubling words that are not commonly doubled any more and the one student that spelt *becak* as *betjak*. Whilst modern spelling is not such a great issue it is important that students are exposed to current language use. *Taman kafilah* as an Australian 'caravan park' often used for Question 29 was one example that students took for granted and did not double check the meaning of the word before them. Images of traditional camel trains/caravan residing in lush Victorian towns added an interesting touch. Students need more practise in how to use dictionaries during an examination as well as how to limit their usage where possible
- the use of '*banyak tahun yang lalu*', overuse of *harus* and *ada* and a few other slightly incorrect word usages seem to have become a part of 'Australian-Indonesian' to be avoided
- terms like '*walaupun, sebenarnya ... demikian*' are rarely used but very common are '*tidak dapat disangkal*', '*baik ... maupun, insyaallah, mau tak mau*'.
- the use of more conjunctions is needed by students
- time spent on how to write well will improve the students' writing, and this includes introductions and conclusions as well as linking paragraphs
- how to choose a topic suitable to the student's skill level and interests is also a valuable part of attempting this section of the examination paper. Less successful students wrote fictitious stories despite the fact that they are the hardest and should only be attempted by those who have story writing skills or have at least practised this style often in class.

## Question 29

This was the most common topic chosen by students. The writing pieces varied greatly. It was usually chosen as an easier option but in fact it was not. Those students who read the question carefully and set the 'home town' context and from there added the tourist attractions and so on wrote a very good piece. While students have been taught that this is the section to show off their language skills, there are still a number who are not lifting their language to the level that they are capable of (going by their answers to other questions in the examination paper).

### Criterion 1

All aspects of tourist attractions in a town or city covered, including reference to holiday makers and different types of accommodation. Expansion of these ideas and the use of a high level of sophistication in the language which included some description.

### Criterion 2

The writing needed to be set out in article format with title and author. Clear and appropriate introduction and conclusion used. Ideas were well organised in paragraphs with good links between ideas within the paragraphs.

### Criterion 3

Grammatically correct sentences (allowance for only one or two minor slips, e.g. affixes) used. Object construction used accurately and in appropriate context. High sophistication and accurate use of a broad range of vocabulary (including well placed conjunctions).

### **Question 30**

Less successful students often seem to choose a fictitious story when in fact it is probably the hardest topic to write about well. Therefore it was difficult for some students to gain full marks for any of the criteria. More guidance is required in choosing a topic that suits their level of language and how to approach different topics and still write well. The level of language and depth of content of this topic was sometimes very poor. Some students never mentioned being an actor or if they did they wrote only about going on shopping sprees and listed all the items bought and then lavish lunches and listed all the items eaten. Then there were the lists of other famous people such as Brad Pitt, Madonna, Tom Cruise and Jennifer Lopez. There was often no connection between the opening and the rest of the story or any connection between paragraphs. This was not just from less successful students but from students who had answered other parts of the examination paper reasonably well.

#### **Criterion 1**

Continuation flowed naturally from the opening line of the topic. The first person narrative was used. Students kept in context of being famous actor and expanded and showed understanding of being a 'story'.

#### **Criterion 2**

The response read as a story/personal account with obvious continuation of opening and continuation of the tense expressed in the opening line. Ideas were well organised in paragraphs and good links were made between ideas and storyline within the paragraph. It needed a good clear and appropriate introduction and ending.

#### **Criterion 3**

The piece was grammatically correct with only one or two minor slips with affixes. The first person narrative was used but more formal use of language including some object construction was used. The piece was of a high level of sophistication. It maintained readers' interest through variety and range of vocabulary.

### **Question 31**

There were some good responses although many students seemed to forget the 'persuasion'. The audience was also a very important factor in this topic and those students who completely ignored the audience showed little depth and gave little opportunity to expand their language skills.

#### **Criterion 1**

This was a persuasive speech and included the title and author. The piece included a wide range of benefits of hosting an Indonesian student.

#### **Criterion 2**

Ideas were well organised into paragraphs with good links between all ideas within paragraphs. Writing pieces showed a high level of sophistication appropriate to the speech test-type. The opening was appropriate for a speech to a particular audience.

#### **Criterion 3**

The writing was grammatically correct with only one or two minor slips with affixes. Personal/semi-formal language was used and persuasive techniques were included. Some object construction or other level of sophistication was obvious in the writing. A broad range and variety of vocabulary was used. Some colloquial language was included appropriately in relation to feelings or reactions.

### **Question 32**

#### **Criterion 1**

This piece included comparisons between sports in Indonesia and Australia and expanded on these. The piece read as an evaluative report and included a title and the author.

#### **Criterion 2**

The report was formal. Ideas were well organised into paragraphs with good links between ideas within paragraphs. The piece showed a high level of sophistication.

#### **Criterion 3**

The writing was grammatically correct with only one or two minor slips with affixes. It included the use of first or third person narrative. Formal language was adopted with only some informal language used where appropriate. Some correct use of object construction was demonstrated. There was a broad range and variety of language used.

Those students who chose this topic did manage to include some evaluation in their report. Generally, this question created the difficulty of having to know something of the sports in both cultures. Those students who obviously did not know a lot and chose this topic found that they ran out of information when they came to compare the two cultures. Students need to choose carefully and if they choose a comparison topic they must have enough information to compare.