



**B O A R D O F S T U D I E S**  
NEW SOUTH WALES

1999 HSC  
**Indonesian**  
Notes from the Examination Centre

© Board of Studies 2000

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

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9262 6270

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

March 2000

Schools may reproduce all or part of this document for classroom use only. Anyone wishing to reproduce elements of this document for any other purpose must contact the Copyright Officer, Board of Studies NSW. Ph: (02) 9367 8111; fax: (02) 9279 1482.

ISBN 0 7313 4440 5

200053

## Contents

2 Unit Z .....	4
Listening and Speaking Examinations.....	4
Listening Skills .....	4
Speaking Skills .....	6
Section I .....	6
Section II .....	8
Written Examination.....	9
Section I - Reading Skills .....	9
Section II - Writing Skills.....	10
2/3 Unit (Common) .....	12
Listening and Speaking Examinations.....	12
Listening Skills .....	12
Speaking Skills.....	14
Section I - Travel Abroad.....	15
Section II - My Personal World.....	16
Written Examination.....	17
Section I - Reading Skills.....	17
Section II - Writing Skills.....	19
Section III - Optio.....	20
3 Unit (Additional) .....	25
Listening and Speaking Examinations.....	25
Listening Skills .....	25
Speaking Skills.....	27
Written Examination.....	28
Section I - Reading Skills .....	28
Section II - Writing Skills.....	29
2/3 Unit (Common) (For Background Speakers).....	30
Listening Examination .....	30
Listening Skills .....	30
Written Examination.....	33
Section I - Reading Skills .....	33
Section II - Writing Skills.....	35
Section III – Contemporary Issues .....	36
3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers) .....	40
Written Examination .....	40
Section I – Novel .....	40
Section II – Poetry.....	42

# 1999 HIGHER SCHOOL CERTIFICATE INDONESIAN EXAMINATION REPORT

## 2 Unit Z

### Listening and Speaking Examinations

#### Listening Skills (30 marks)

##### General Comments

Some candidates displayed excellent listening skills at this beginner level and were obviously well prepared with relevant vocabulary and skilled exam technique. Some candidates conversely displayed only elementary listening skills, reflecting a very limited range of vocabulary and lack of listening practice. While many candidates seemed to have a global understanding of most items, some candidates had difficulty identifying all of the relevant details.

In 1999, for the first time a Candidate's Notes column was provided on the Listening Exam paper. Markers gained the impression that candidates who used the space provided were able to retain more information.

Basic vocabulary such as days and numbers continue to cause problems for some candidates.

Items 1, 2, 4, 5a, 8, 10, 12, 20, 24, and 25 were generally well answered and caused few problems.

##### Specific Comments

###### Item 3

*Dibuka* was unfamiliar to some candidates.

###### Item 5

*Potongan* and *alat* were not known by many candidates.

###### Item 6

*Hidup lebih lama* was unfamiliar to many candidates. Many candidates missed the detail *jarang* or confused it with *jangan*.

###### Item 7

This question was well done. However, many candidates who gave *pandai memasak* as a requirement did not translate *pandai*.

**Item 9**

Many candidates understood the global meaning of this item. However, in part (a) some candidates incorrectly interpreted the answer to be ‘the woman is told to stop *smoking*’ instead of ‘the woman is told to *move*’. In part (b) better responses conveyed the idea that the woman was smoking in the non-smoking area.

**Item 10**

*Selalu* was omitted in many responses.

**Item 13**

This item proved challenging for most candidates. Better responses demonstrated a global understanding of the item as well as providing relevant details.

**Item 14**

This item was well done but some candidates were unfamiliar with *mutu*.

**Item 15**

While most candidates understood that Ani’s bag had been stolen, many had difficulty including all of the details from *Di dalamnya ada hadiah ulang tahun untuk kawan saya* in their response. It appeared to markers that candidates who had made use of the Candidate’s Notes column gave better responses.

**Item 16**

This item was well done however *tanpa* was not familiar to many candidates.

**Item 17**

Many candidates did not express *habis* in their responses.

**Item 18**

*Pelayan ramah* and *suasana* were unfamiliar to many candidates.

**Item 19**

*Kakek* was often confused with *kakak*.

**Item 20**

This item was well done although many candidates referred to the easier facts rather than *dindingnya terbuat dari kaca*.

**Item 21**

Some candidates did not include essential details such as pencil *case* and *English* dictionary.

**Item 22**

*Perkebunan nasional* was unfamiliar to most candidates.

### Item 23

Better responses referred to involvement of the principal and teachers in this Saturday's basketball game.

### Item 26

In part (a), *pemotongan* was unfamiliar to most candidates. In part (b), most candidates had difficulty expressing the idea that the Balinese think that people who have long teeth look like animals. Some candidates confused *binatang* with *bintang*.

## Speaking Skills

(20 marks)

### General Comments

A wide range of abilities was evident from the varied quality of responses. A small number of candidates were obviously unprepared. This reinforces the need for regular practice of exam style situations. Exam-style situations can be found on the HSC Online website <http://hsc.csu.edu.au/indonesian/> in the 2 Unit Z Speaking section.

Candidates are reminded that clarity of speech is essential and they should speak audibly and confidently. Teacher examiners are reminded that they are required to check the recording before the candidate leaves the examination room. Furthermore, teacher examiners are reminded that they are not to prompt candidates or rephrase cues or questions.

### Section I

This section contained a good range of situations from various syllabus topics. Most candidates provided good approximations of the English cues. It was pleasing to see that candidates who were unfamiliar with the expression of certain words rephrased their responses to an intelligible, close approximation 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. The weaker responses were more hesitant and contained longer pauses.

Poor answers demonstrated minimal communication with little knowledge of basic grammatical structures and vocabulary. Presentation was laboured with frequent long pauses.

Candidates are reminded that for Section I they need only express the given cue in Indonesian. Elaboration is NOT required.

Teachers should encourage candidates to include in their responses the language functions required in the cues. Language functions included in Section 1 this year were: *Explain, Decline, Suggest, Agree* and *Comment on*. Candidates who attempted to use the language functions required were able to give more realistic responses. The Indonesian 2 Unit Speaking section of the HSC Online site provides a list of key question words and language functions.

Markers noted many examples of incorrect pronunciation in Indonesian particularly in polysyllabic words. Most frequent errors included incorrect renditions for *Borobodur*, *mengunjungi*, *pemandangan*, *pertunjukan*, *mengerjakan*, and *kee/ki/key* instead of *ke*.

Generally, candidates had the greatest difficulty phrasing the questions required. For example:

- Ask if you need to
- Ask how you'll get to
- Ask what time
- Ask if there are any
- Enquire where

Also, many candidates had difficulty with word order in expressions such as 'my friend's parents'.

### Question 1

This question was quite well attempted.

- Some candidates had trouble expressing 'only one', often using *hanya* incorrectly. The first cue was best expressed as *Saya hanya punya satu kopor*.
- Some candidates described the suitcase instead of the contents of the suitcase.
- When describing the contents of the suitcase candidates are advised not to give a long list of items rather to fully describe several items.
- Word order problems were common with *teman orangtua saya*.
- Many candidates confused *membuka* and *dibuka*. Cue 4 was well expressed using either *Perlu saya membukanya?* or *Perlu hadiahnya dibuka?*

### Question 2

This question was well attempted.

- Many candidates had trouble pronouncing *Borobodur* and *mengunjungi*.
- Word order problems were common with *candi Borobodur*.
- Many candidates omitted language functions such as 'decline', 'explain' and 'suggest'.
- Some candidates did not express 'next Friday' effectively.
- Cue 5 was well expressed using either *Bagaimana kita ke Borobodur?* or *Naik apa kita ke Borobodur?*
- Some candidates confused *kita* and *kami*.

### Question 3

This question was the most challenging for candidates.

- Many candidates were not aware that *enak* can be used to refer to a comfortable room.
- *Pemandangan* was often not known.
- *Jam berapa* was often confused with *Berapa jam*.
- 'Dance performances' was expressed well using *pertunjukan menari/tarian/sendratari*.
- In cue 5 *bisa* was often omitted.

## Section II

In this section candidates are encouraged to elaborate their responses in order to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge of vocabulary and structures. The better responses demonstrated a wide range of vocabulary and structures without undue repetition.

In 1999, Question 5 was the most popular question.

### Question 4 - Keluarga

- Part (a) Candidates are advised to memorise several names to be used in the situations. Some candidates deliberated over the names of the people in the picture.
- Part (b) Some candidates confused *sedang* for *senang*.
- Part (c) The better responses included detailed information about their family not just about the number of people in it.
- Part (d) Varied and elaborate responses were supplied for this question.
- Part (e) It was pleasing to see that this year most candidates were familiar with *mengerjakan*, even if it was mispronounced by some candidates.

### Question 5 – Pesta ulang tahun

- Part (a) The better responses answered the question directly, using words like *ramai*, *menyenangkan*, *hebat*.
- Part (b) In general, candidates answered this question well.
- Part (c) Many candidates used the picture on the paper to help stimulate a response to this question.
- Part (d) Most candidates approached this question confidently and gave good reasons why they had to go home at that time.
- Part (e) This question was well answered by most candidates.

### Question 6 – Mengadakan piknik

Few candidates attempted this question. However, those who did provided creative and competent responses. Candidates are reminded that pictures are provided as stimulus only. It is not compulsory to discuss the picture unless specified in the question.



## Written Examination

### Section I — Reading Skills (30 marks)

#### General Comments

Both questions in the Reading Skills section were not as well answered as in previous years. Weaker candidates were familiar only with predictable vocabulary and did not use context clues or grammar knowledge to help them recognise familiar base words in different contexts.

Candidates performed better in the short item style questions in Question 1. In Question 2 the passages were longer and the answers required more global interpretation which caused difficulties for many candidates.

Candidates are advised to read extensively. Short reading items similar to those in Question 1 can be found on the internet, on the HSC Online Website <http://hsc.csu.edu.au/indonesian> and also in Indonesian magazines and newspapers. Past 2 Unit Z HSC papers, especially those prior to the new syllabus (1995) also contain many culturally-based longer passages.

#### Specific Comments

##### Question 1

- Part (a) Some candidates translated *kerupuk udang* incorrectly as rice crackers and *sayur-sayuran* as salad.
- Part (b) *pecinta alam*; *pramuka* and *pekerja sukarela* were very rarely chosen. *kesenian* was translated as ‘craft’ or ‘painting’ by some candidates. The popular choices were: *berkebun*, *majalah sekolah* and *tari-tarian*.
- Part (c) *Makanan kecil* was often poorly translated as ‘small food’. Better responses were ‘snacks’ or ‘nibbles’.
- Part (d) This item was well answered.
- Part (e) Some candidates did not recognise *pemain* and translated it as ‘people’ instead of ‘actors’. Some candidates could not tell the time correctly. *Disebelah* was translated as ‘near, above or, on the opposite side’. Most candidates did not translate the word *paling* in *paling baik*, and translated the phrase as ‘good’ instead of ‘best’.
- Part (f) Some candidates did not translate *mulai dari*. *Minuman selamat datang* was mostly translated into ‘drinks’. Some candidates did not know *gratis*. *Pengalaman* was also not well understood.

### Question 2 (a)

- (i) Most candidates did not know *kebudayaan*. A few did not know *tempat-tempat menarik*.
- (ii) Most candidates did not understand *perhatikanlah nasehat; penduduk setempat*.
- (iii) Some candidates had difficulty with *pemilik*.
- (iv) The words *patung* and *perhiasan* created problems for most candidates.
- (v) And so did the words: *peta and wisata*. The better responses included lots of detail. There was evidence in this question of candidates guessing questions.

### Question 2 (b)

- (i) Most candidates did not understand the phrase *bulan keluar*. They tended to take the first 2 lines as the answers e.g.: the performance starts in half an hour's time - they came early, so they have to wait for half an hour.
- (iii) Most candidates did not understand *penuh sesak*, and *hawa* was understood as 'climate' or 'atmosphere'.
- (iv) & (v) Most candidates were confused in answering the similarities and the differences of the Ramayana which was performed in Bali and in Java.

### Question 2 (c)

- (i) This question proved challenging to most candidates who did not include information from the whole paragraph in their answer.
- (ii) Some candidates did not know: *Departmen Pendidikan*. Also the word *siswa* was not understood by some candidates.
- (iii) As most candidates did not understand *berpendidikan khusus* and *pengalaman* as well as *seniman*, this question was answered poorly.
- (iv) Most candidates only gave the first part of the answer required.

## Section II — Writing Skills (20 Marks)

### Question 3

On the whole, candidates handled the introduction and conclusion of the letter well. However, some candidates did not provide sufficient information in the body of the letter where they are expected to address the specifics of the question.

- Most candidates did not organise/make an outline so the result was repetitive or jumbled.
- The spelling of *bahwa* became *bahwah*, *berbelanja* became *berbelanjar*.
- Most candidates could not write sentences using passive construction correctly e.g. *membeli – dibeli; masak – dimasak*.

Also, phrases with possessive pronouns were often written incorrectly e.g. *saya rumah* instead of *rumah saya*. In better responses candidates wrote good accounts of places and events, others also asked about the conditions and political situation in Indonesia.

Some well-organised and confident candidates produced the following impressive phrases or sentences:

- *Sudah banyak makan garam dunia.* (in the figurative meaning)
- *Saya menulis untuk mengucapkan terima kasih atas ....*
- *Makanan yang disiapkan oleh Ibu selalu lezat*
- *Seperti sudah kita ketahui, wanita senang sekali berbelanja*
- *Saya belum mempunyai SIM, jadi kalau kita ingin kemana-mana, kita harus naik becak atau bemo*
- *Karena tanpa Melinda, saya tidak akan mampu pergi ke tempat-tempat yang menarik*
- *Peluk cium dari .....*
- *Anda dan Ibu adalah orang istimewa dan saya tidak akan melupakan kebaikan*

#### Question 4

All candidates attempted one of the three styles of writing required. A few candidates did not meet the required word limit for the narrative/diary entry or the dialogue.

Of the two topics, *Sahabat saya* was the more popular. However, those who attempted *Anda tidak suka kamar hotel Anda* wrote very good responses.

The common mistakes seen in both topics were:

- the use of prepositions especially *ke*, *ke pada*, *di*, and *dalam*.
- The use of *ada* and *adalah*, *ada* – there is/there are and *adalah* must not be followed by an adjective. In the weaker responses we saw the preposition, *ke* was combined with the infinitive: e.g. *ke menjadi*, *ke mencari*.
- The wrong use of *ke* in the expression to hand/give/something to a person e.g.: *Saya mengirim surat ke orang itu* instead of *Saya mengirim surat ke pada orang itu*. It should be stressed to candidates that *ke* is only used to indicate direction or location.
- In the case of the preposition *di*, it should be noted that it is used to indicate a place: e.g. *di kota Sydney*.
- In the context of *keluarga* it is better to use: *Dalam keluarga saya ada...*

Some good expressions used in the topic *Anda tidak suka kamar hotel Anda* were:

- *Bolehkah saya berbicara dengan anda tentang kamar saya?*
- *Kamar ini tidak rapih, saya suka kamar bersih.*
- *Di pesawat terbang saya didudukkan di dekat seorang bayi yang menangis selama sepuluh jam dan saya tidak bisa tidur.*
- *Pegawai resepsi berkata: Pelayan kami sakit, karena itu nyonya harus membawa kopor nyonya sendiri ke kamar nyonya.*
- *Di kamar mandi, hanya ada bak mandi. Tidak ada sabun dan tisyu gulung sudah habis. Handuknya kotor!*
- *Kami memesan kamar dengan pemandangan kebun, tetapi hanya ada tempat parkir!*

- *Pegawai hotel bingung, dia ikut ke kamar saya dan melihat ke dalamnya. Dia tersenyum dan berkata: Ini bukan kamar Anda, ini gudang.*

In spite of the exam conditions some students could still write with humour, describing humorous incidents when stating their discontent with their hotel room.

In the topic *Sahabat saya*, the better responses detailed the characteristics of their best friend, their relationship with their best friend and the conflict they faced with each other and how they solved their problems and differences.

Some useful expressions found in the better responses were:

- *Setiap kali saya sedih, marah atau senang, sahabat saya Dewi ada di samping saya.*
- *Tiga bulan yang lalu, kami menghadapi kesulitan besar!*
- *Sahabat saya main mata dengan pacar saya*
- *Karena saya orang cemburu, saya marah sekali!*
- *Dia bertengkar dengan pacarnya!*
- *Saya tidak suka bergaul dengan...*
- *Saya harap hubungan sahabat saya dan saya akan baik kembali*
- *Sayang sekali kalau saya kehilangan teman baik!*
- *Mudah-mudahan, pada masa depan, kami masih bersahabat.*

## 2/3 Unit (Common)

### Listening and Speaking Examinations

#### Listening Skills

(20 marks)

#### General Comments

Many candidates displayed a good general understanding of the Contemporary Issues topic. Candidates who scored well possessed a wide range of vocabulary and demonstrated a global understanding of the items.

In 1999, for the first time a Candidate's Notes column was provided on the Listening paper. Markers gained the impression that candidates who used the space provided were able to retain more information.

#### Specific Comments

Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 14 and 20 caused few problems for most candidates.

**Item 2**

Most candidates were unfamiliar with *kebangsaan*

**Item 5**

Better responses included details such as *sanak-saudara* and *makanan khas*.

**Item 7**

Part (a) was well done. Part (b) was challenging as most candidates did not understand *mengantuk* or *mengikuti pelajaran*.

**Item 8**

Part (a) was well done. In part (b), the better responses included references to *tidak lagi* or *mana-mana*.

**Item 9**

*Menambah kerja jantung* was best expressed as 'to increase the heart rate' or 'increase how much the heart works'.

**Item 10**

Some candidates did not recognise *perlombaan* or *mengarang*. *Penulis* was at times confused with *pelukis*.

**Item 11**

*Pramuwisata* and *terdaftar* were often not understood. Although *berpengalaman* was familiar to many candidates, those unfamiliar with *pramuwisata* attributed the characteristic to 'mountain climbers' instead of 'tour guides'.

**Item 13**

This item was well done. However, some candidates were unfamiliar with *remaja*. Also, some candidates confused *enam* with 'four'.

**Item 14**

Most candidates demonstrated a good global understanding of this item.

**Item 15**

Most candidates had a good global understanding of this item. However, there was some inaccurate rendering of the detail.

**Item 16**

Many candidates showed a good overall understanding of this item. However, most were not familiar with *Mas* as a term of address for one's husband. Better candidates understood that it was the woman's husband who spends too much time working and who needs to give more time to family matters.

**Item 17**

*Menjaga ketenangan suasana* was not widely understood. Many candidates confused *meninggalkan* with *tinggal*.

### Item 18

Almost all candidates demonstrated a good general understanding of this item. However, many omitted the idea that it was now peak time for phone calls or office hours.

### Item 19

This proved to be a challenging item. *Bagian tertentu badan* and *terkemuka* were unfamiliar to many candidates.

### Item 20

Many candidates demonstrated a good general understanding of the item. However, better responses included specific detail. Some candidates confused *perlengkapan standar* (standard equipment) with the idea of an increased standard of equipment.

### Item 21

*Rapor* was often not understood.

### Item 22

Although a challenging item, many candidates demonstrated a good global understanding of this item. Most candidates chose the easiest reason for the speaker's reluctance to leave his village. *Terdapat kuburan nenek moyang saya* (my ancestor's graves are there) was rarely given as a response. Many candidates confused *nenek moyang* with *nenek*.

### Item 23

Part (a) was well done. In part (b) better responses identified *bidang* as a clue to the answer.

### Item 25

This item was generally well done. However, some candidates were not familiar with *lingkungan* and *bulu binatang*. *Binatang* was at times confused with *bintang*.

## Speaking Skills

(20 marks)

### General Comments

A broad range of abilities was evident in both sections of speaking skills. Some candidates spoke accurately and fluently, while others demonstrated a very limited knowledge of vocabulary and structures.

Some important reminders in relation to the Speaking Skills Examination.

- Teachers must ensure that the equipment is in sound working order to ensure an audible recording.
- Candidates 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 doesn't advantage a candidate and can often lead to unnecessary repetition or a lack of focus to the response.

- Candidates are encouraged to maintain a fluent presentation in order to approach authenticity. A number of criteria are considered when marking candidates' responses. Whilst accuracy of vocabulary and structure are important, pronunciation, flow and intonation are among the criteria considered in establishing a final mark. Regular practice of speaking situations is essential for all candidates.

### General Comments on Language Usage

- Pronunciation problems e.g. *Ujung Pandang, bagian*
- Use of English for any unknown vocabulary item. Candidates must attempt to re-phrase or seek an alternative phrase.
- Problems with word order in expressions such as 'return ticket', 'traditional house'.
- Omission of 'can' and 'will' from several cues.
- Overuse of *itu*, which was often equated with 'it'.
- Confusion with the *me* and *di* forms.
- Overuse of *untuk*.
- Duplication after *banyak* was frequent.
- *kalau, ketika* and *kapan* used indiscriminately.
- Confused use of *bahwa* and *yang*.

### Section I – Travel Abroad

Candidates are **not** required to translate the heading of each situation into Indonesian. Stating in English 'Situation 1' is adequate.

The best responses in this section demonstrated 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 demonstrated a knowledge of the basic vocabulary and structure required, but presentation was hesitant with longer pauses, and mispronunciations occurred. Communication was still satisfactory despite the presence of some errors.

Poorer responses demonstrated minimal communication with frequent and long pauses, poor pronunciation and the use of some English. Basic vocabulary and structure were not known.

#### Situation 1

Difficulties were encountered expressing 'nothing to declare' and 'will open it'.

#### Situation 2

Candidates had difficulty with 'return ticket', giving the date of 26 November, 'window seat', 'non-smoking section!'. For some these were word order problems, for others it was a vocabulary issue.

Framing the two questions also presented problems to many candidates. Again both structural and vocabulary-based problems arose, e.g. 'each day' and 'how many'.

### Situation 3

'Never been' and 'tonight' were the most common problems for candidates, along with the failure to recognise *Torajan* as referring to *orang Toraja*. Many candidates used the expression *adat-istiadat Torajan!*

### Situation 4

Some difficulties were experienced with 'cannot make it', 'can come', 'bring a friend!'. Framing the two questions also proved to be a problem for many candidates as did the first cue line 'Thank your friend **for his invitation to dinner!**'

### Situation 5

'Queue', 'session', 'seats left' were the main problems in this situation, together with the concepts of 'how long' and 'a long time'. Rephrasing and thinking around a vocabulary item are to be encouraged by teachers, e.g. the session could be 'film', *pertunjukan* etc. The expressing of emotions does not require a literal translation such as *saya kecewa!*

## Section II – My Personal World

### General Comments

The best responses in this section addressed each part of both situations with some elaboration. Responses showed a broad vocabulary and accuracy of language structures. Candidates were able to sustain communication, replicate authentic Indonesian and manipulate language accordingly.

Average answers addressed most parts of both situations in a basic form. They contained only some elaboration and were quite predictable in their content. Some errors were evident and presentation was more hesitant.

Poorer responses displayed limited knowledge of vocabulary and language structures. Questions were not all clearly understood and communication was minimal.

### Situation 6 - *Perkawinan*

- The better candidates provided more than just a list of descriptions or desired qualities as adjectives, and structured their response to flow from the specific question, using *ke-an* form e.g. *kejujuran, kesetiaan!* Some also supplied reasons for these desired qualities.
- Some candidates did not fully realise the potential this question offered. They gave yes or no responses with a simple reason. The better candidates saw the opportunity to present an opinion backed with several reasons e.g. a number of alternatives to marrying early in life such as career choices, travelling etc.
- Better candidates commented on either the positive or negative role of parents in making this choice, giving clear reasons to support their view. Some candidates did not understand the intent of this question.



### **Situation 7 – *Pakaian dan Penampilan***

- The poorer responses included only a brief description (e.g. blue eyes) and a statement about whether the writer was happy or not with his/her appearance. The better responses linked features of appearance to support an argument for or against satisfaction. These responses included varied vocabulary including good qualifiers and a range of structures.
- The better responses provided more than a list of favourite weekend clothing and linked style of dress to the occasion or weekend outing. Variety of language was evident in these responses e.g. *pakaian santai, busana terbaru, tergantung pada kegiatan*.
- This question proved to be challenging for some candidates. Some of the better candidates interpreted the wider meaning of *penampilan* to include hairstyles, tatoos etc, and so gave greater depth to their argument. A number of candidates viewed their parents in the light of *ketinggalan zaman* or *tidak tahu busana*, and so gave good depth to their argument.

### **Situation 8 - *Merokok***

- This part was well handled by most candidates who attempted this situation, giving a variety of reasons and ensuing illnesses.
- A range of reasons was included in the better responses, mostly of a social nature, e.g. *trendi, tekanan dari teman-teman, untuk bergaul*. These responses also linked reasons to work and stress, e.g. *untuk mengurangi stres!*
- Although a challenging question, some responses were very detailed. Suggestions included *pendidikan, iklan-iklan melalui media massa, peraturan, barus dihukum, peringatan di bungkus rokok*.

## **Written Examination**

### **Section I - Reading Skills**

**(25 marks)**

#### **General Comments**

Candidates should be guided by the style of the question and the length of the space provided when formulating their responses.

Candidates are strongly advised not to give alternative answers. Where these are contradictory no marks can be awarded for the possible correct answer. An example of this is Question 5 (a) e.g. the middle or lower class.

Candidates need to be reminded to keep their answers consistent especially with regard to pronouns and gender. This was particularly relevant in Question 6.

Candidates are reminded to support their answers by a close reference to the relevant examples from the text. This particularly applied to Question 4 (a).

Candidates should be encouraged to carefully analyze the specific questions and focus on the question's key words, e.g.:

- Question 4 (a) compare
- Question 4 (b) statistics
- Question 6 (b) differ
- Question 6 (c) dilemma

Candidates need to be encouraged to avoid being too general in their responses but also not to translate word-for-word without showing understanding. This was a problem in Question 5 (c) in particular.

Candidates should be encouraged to practise deducing meaning from known base words

- e.g. *keamanan*, *pemadam* (Question 1)  
*pembelian* (Question 2)  
*meningkatkan* (Question 4)  
*pemotongan gaji* (Question 5)  
*tangani*, *menyakitkan hati* (Question 6)

Candidates need to be reminded to be especially careful when answering questions that include numbers.

## Specific Comments

### Question 1

This question proved challenging to many candidates. Not only was their comprehension hindered by challenging vocabulary items e.g. *taman kanak-kanak* and *keamanan* but in some instances by a lack of cultural empathy for Indonesia. Many candidates thought *pemadam kebakaran* referred to a barbecue.

### Question 2

This question was handled well by most candidates. Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the overall concept, with the exception of those candidates who confused the word *minumum* with *minuman*. Other vocabulary items that proved challenging for candidates were *bon belanja* and *juta*.

### Question 3

This question was well handled by most candidates. Most candidates found the three pieces of advice. The following vocabulary items were challenging: *penampilan*, *secara teratur*, *perhatian* and *sopan santun*.

### Question 4

This passage and its questions proved to be the most challenging one in the examination. Many candidates found part (a) particularly challenging. In relation to part (b) most candidates found some statistics even if they lacked global understanding. Part (c) was generally handled well. Many candidates' overall comprehension of this passage was hampered by a lack of understanding of the following: *meningkatkan kesejahteraan*, *bekerja langsung*, *kesempatan kerja tidak langsung* and *sumber daya alam*.

### Question 5

Part (c) and (d) of this question proved to be the most challenging in this passage for candidates, whilst parts (a) and (b) were handled well by most candidates. Challenging vocabulary items included: *kelas menengah, menabung, keperluan tak terduga, mengurangi kebutuhan, bekal, makanan istimewa* and *berburu*.

### Question 6

Most candidates demonstrated a good global understanding of this passage and found the vocabulary items contained within it quite accessible. Part (d) was generally done well by most candidates. Parts (c) and (e) proved more challenging. The following vocabulary items and structures proved challenging for some candidates: *diperlakukan, menikah, saudara sepupu, memutuskan janji, harus saya tangani sendiri, melicinkan jalan* and *menganggap*.

## Section II - Writing Skills

(15 marks)

### General Comments

A pleasing standard of language was attained by many candidates in the Writing Skills section. This year, many candidates far exceeded the recommended length of 200 words. Candidates are advised that lengthy compositions may rob them of valuable time to check over and correct their work or to complete other sections of the paper. Once again, it is recommended that candidates develop a rough plan before they commence their final draft.

In poor compositions the occasional use of English was evident. Candidates should avoid the use of English as it detracts from the overall impression of the piece of writing.

Some common errors included:

- misspelling of basic vocabulary items e.g. *selasai* instead of *selesai*, *sekerang* instead of *sekarang* etc
- problems with affixation e.g. *berkunjungi* instead of either *mengunjungi* or *berkunjung*, omission of suffix-*kan*
- confusion in relation to conjunctions of time for example *ketika, kalau, kapan, sambil, sedangkan*
- use of *suka* instead of *mau* to translate 'would like'
- use of *boleh* instead of *mungkin* to translate 'may' eg. I may go to Bali next year – *Mungkin saya ke Bali tahun depan*
- confusion with *makan* and *makanan*
- uncertainty about which preposition to use e.g. *tertarik di* instead of *tertarik kepada, di jam sepuluh* instead of *pada jam sepuluh*
- expression of the verb 'to have' e.g.:  
*mempunyai angka tinggi* instead of *mendapat angka tinggi*  
*mempunyai liburan* instead of *berlibur*

- use of *tidak* instead of *jangan* for the imperative form
- incorrect use of ‘please’ in statements like ‘May I go please’ – *Bolehkah saya pergi silahkan*

### Question 7

This was the most popular question. There were many good responses but some candidates did not address both parts of the question (i.e. going to university **and** moving out of home)

### Question 8

Some candidates did not handle the dialogue discourse form well and did not use or used inconsistently the correct register. It should be noted that *kamu* should not be used when addressing parents. They should be addressed as *Ibu/Bapak*.

### Question 9

Not many candidates attempted this question. The question required specific ‘film review’ vocabulary (e.g. *membintang, sutradara, efek khusus, jalan cerita* etc)

### Question 10

This question was also popular and quite well done. However responses often unnecessarily exceeded the word limit. The topic gave candidates the opportunity to show their knowledge of Indonesian geography, culture and etiquette. Good responses showed the candidates’ knowledge of language functions related to giving advice or instructions e.g. correct use of *...lah* (imperative), *lebih baik kalau...*, *sebaiknya anda ...*, *jangan lupa ...*

### Question 11

This question was not a popular choice. The question required a knowledge of vocabulary related to sickness and accidents (e.g. *mual, muntah, badan panas, dibawa dengan ambulans, diperiksa dokter*).

### Question 12

There were some good responses to this question. These responses displayed accurate and interesting knowledge of village life (e.g. *gotong royong, memanen/menanam padi, pak lurah, menonton pertunjukan wayang* etc).

## Section III – Options

(20 marks)

### Part A – Contemporary Writing

#### Question 13

This year candidates once again demonstrated a creditable knowledge of the play *Kisah Perjuangan Suku Naga*. A small number of candidates left this section of the paper unfinished, indicating a need for time management throughout the whole exam. It also needs to be stressed that candidates should not assume knowledge of the play on the part of the marker. They should answer questions in detail, translate quotes and substantiate their opinions with close reference to the text.

- Part (a) Subsection (i) Most candidates answered this question well. An accurate description of the Wijaya Kusuma hospital project, taken straight from the extract was all that was needed.
- most modern in S.E. Asia
  - offers plastic surgery
  - has heart pump machines
  - has all kinds of medicine
  - has large blood storage capacity
  - has artificial lungs
- Subsection (ii) Once again, the information needed to answer this question came from the passage.
- progress is not luxury
  - progress is even prosperity for all
  - what is not useful for the majority is a waste
- Subsection (iii) The answer needed to refer to the *dalang*'s role in this extract only.
- contradicts prime minister
  - clarifies/explains the true meaning of progress
- Part (b) There were many good responses to this question. Good responses included:
- identification of the two choruses
  - a description of various language techniques evident in each of the two choruses
  - reasons for the effectiveness of these techniques
- In their responses, candidates referred to the following techniques –
- Machine chorus
- short words (*bila kamu ganggu kami*)
  - hard consonants (*gigi, gerak, ganggu*)
  - repetition of sounds (*bum! bum! bum!*)
  - meaningless words (*ketoprak kepri-kepri*)
  - awkward rhythm (*gerak mesin bergedebum*)
  - onomatopoeia (*hongos hongos*)
  - use of *kamu, kami* - exclusive words

### Naga chorus

- use of *me* forms rather than base words
- soft gentle repetition and rhyme (e.g. *buah-buahan, kayu-kayuan*)
- soothing long vowels as in *u* and *a*
- soft consonants (p, y, m)
- use of *kita* instead of *kami*

In response to the effectiveness of the language candidates included these ideas:

- hard consonants, repetition etc show machines obsessed with work
- meaningless words show how society has been dehumanised
- use of *kamu, kami* sets the machines apart from the audience
- soft consonants and long vowels of Naga chorus create soft gentle images and sense of contentment
- use of *kita* creates unity with audience

### Part (c)

Subsection (i) To gain full marks candidates needed to explain:

- that Supaka and Setyawati were out of step with the other members of the Naga tribe
- how Supaka and Setyawati were at odds with the Hagas (Supaka – a widow who wanted to return to the city to trade. Setyawati - wanted to raise Abivara's and her children in the city)

Other similarities included:

- both characters were stereotypes of 'weak, whimpering women'
- both characters were more 3 dimensional than the other characters because of their flaws.

Such points were valid provided that the student substantiated these opinions by referring to the text.

Subsection (ii) Many candidates were able to explain that Rendra employed the characters of Setyawati and Supaka in order to allow Abivara and Abisavam to become the mouthpiece of his social philosophy. Candidates needed to give specific examples to gain full marks in this question, e.g.:

- Supaka asks Abivara if he has brought sunglasses etc. home with him allowing him to give his views on progress
- Supaka argues with Abisavam about selling her land allowing him to give his views on land ownership and exploitation of the village by the city
- Setyawati argues with Abivara about living in the city allowing him to give his views on entertainment, fashion etc.

Other possible responses were:

- Rendra is using a *wayang* technique – ‘goodies’ who have some bad characteristics
- Rendra is showing that we do not live in a perfect world – a balance of good and evil

Part (b) There were some excellent responses to this question. Most candidates compared the lack of freedom of speech in the Kingdom of Astinam with the freedom of speech allowed to the members of the Naga tribe. Candidates needed to give solid examples of the opposing attitudes.

Astinam examples included:

- Parliamentary faction chairmen – We’re cautious in what we say – Unity is more important than debate
- Colonel Srenggi – passing of law to stop negative voices concerning 4 Year Development Plan
- Banning of foreign newspapers
- Reference by Abisavam that truth can never be found in Astinam newspapers
- Exile of Carlos

Naga examples were:

- Opposition is dealt with by logical debate (e.g. Supaka, Setyawati)
- Abisavam’s comment to the President of Parliament ‘If someone expresses a different preference, don’t go around banning them.’

## Song Option

### General Comments

- Teachers need to remind their candidates of the importance of having a good working-knowledge of the language of each song. This is particularly important in questions such as (b) and (d).
- Candidates should be encouraged to carefully address the questions. For example, it is inappropriate to address language devices and choice of vocabulary in a question like (f).
- Time management is also an important issue. Candidates should be encouraged not to waste time by reproducing long quotes. Line references are satisfactory. In a question like part (d) subsection (i) candidates should not feel they have to rewrite the given quote.

## Question 14

Part (a) Better responses to this question addressed the following issues:

- the alternatives to nuclear power in light of the inherent problems.
- the specific problems associated with nuclear technology e.g. storage of waste, leakages and the long-term dangers.
- the fact that other nations are closing down their reactors and as a result Indonesia should not see the establishment of nuclear power plants as an issue related to prestige.
- the lack of information regarding such nuclear technology.

Better responses were well-structured and supported their ideas by giving line references throughout their answer. In relation to the issue of who the message was directed at, better responses often mentioned both the government and the people in general and supported it with evidence from the text.

Part (b) The meaning of this quote proved challenging for some candidates. The word *sedang* was often overlooked and *terjadi* was confused with *menjadi*. Better responses to part (i) addressed *sesungguhnya* when giving the significance of this quote.

### **Example**

This is a ‘multi-layered’ question.

Subsection (i) how much is **really** known about nuclear technology and its effects? (lines 5-8)

Subsection (ii) what effects will this technology have on Indonesia’s future generations? (lines 16 & 17)

Subsection (iii) What are the government’s **real** motives? Why is the government prepared to spend so much on this technology when countries with prior experience of this technology are closing such plants down? (lines 30-33)

Weaker responses to part (ii) simply stated that it was repeated for impact. Better responses linked the argument to the message of the song as a whole.

### **Example**

By repeating this line Fals is reinforcing the fact that there needs to be constant questioning of the entire issue; a constant need to reassess the motives behind establishing such reactors as well as a persistent quest for more detailed knowledge about nuclear technology and its effects on the society and the environment. The fact it also provides a break in the verses, thereby giving the audience a chance to look at a new aspect of the issue is also significant.

Part (c) Subsection (i) Weaker responses did not demonstrate an understanding of the term onomatopoeia. Better responses located several good examples and described why they were used and to what effect.

### **Example**

The repeated use of onomatopoeia creates a sound in our heads of the forest being destroyed. The once peaceful forest is now filled with the roar (*raung*) of bulldozers, the thundering of trees as they crash to the ground (*gemuruh pohon tumbang*) the screams (*jerit*) of the forest animals as their habitat is destroyed and the relentless screeching of



chainsaws (*gergaji tak pernah berhenti*). Not only is the audience presented with some very disturbing and vivid images but also a sound to haunt us.

Subsection (ii) Better responses to this question did more than just locate a number of examples, they mentioned the similarity between the *i* sound and the sound of the buzzing chainsaws, the screams of the forest animals and the laughs of the greedy clowns. Better responses also mentioned the tight/clipped/short nature of the *i* sound and in many cases compared it to the narrowing/destruction of the forests.

Part (d) Subsection (i) There was a large range in the quality of the responses to this question. Weaker responses showed a lack of understanding of the following vocabulary items: *gergaji*, *kantong pribadi* and *rejeki*. Better responses discussed the following issues:

- What Fals identifies as the motive behind deforestation i.e. greed
- The lack of concern for future generations of both human and animal life
- The unlikelihood of deforestation being discontinued in the near future

Subsection (ii) This question required candidates to locate and give the meaning of a suitable quotation. The significance of the quotation was not asked for. Better responses made reference to the following lines from the song: lines 3 & 4, line 16, lines 8-12 and line 26.

Part (e) Better responses addressed both songs as well as issues and concerns for **both now and** in the future. Better responses included examples from each song detailing the concerns held with relation to the use of technology and industry without conscience.

Part (f) Better responses focused on those aspects of each song's musical presentation which helped to (more effectively) convey the song's theme and message. Candidates were not required to address all musical features from line 1 right through to the song's end but rather concentrate on linking a few aspects of the song's musical presentation to the theme and justifying why this is done. For many candidates this type of question is still very challenging and requires practice. Comments on several key features carefully linked to the song is all that is required.

## 3 Unit (Additional)

### Listening and Speaking Examinations

#### Listening Skills

(10 marks)

#### General Comments

Most candidates responded well to the listening items, showing a depth of understanding of Contemporary Issues. It was pleasing to see that most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of

relevant vocabulary and a global understanding of items. However, some candidates demonstrated a knowledge of isolated vocabulary but did not put the words into context. At times, responses made little sense in English. Candidates are advised to reread their answers to ensure that they make sense.

In 1999, for the first time a Candidate's Notes column was provided on the Listening paper. Markers gained the impression that candidates who used the space provided were able to retain more information.

## Specific Comments

### Item 1

Part (a) was well answered. Some candidates did not include the idea that **current** international laws are being violated.

### Item 2

Most candidates understood *Hak-hak Asasi Manusia*. However, some had difficulty with the idea that Indonesia has a different understanding or way of thinking. This idea was conveyed in the expressions *pemahaman tersendiri* and *pemikiran ... berbeda*.

### Item 3

This item presented few problems however the better responses included the fact that women were dismissed before the men were.

### Item 4

Many candidates were not familiar with *meyakinkan* and had difficulty expressing in English *daya tarik*. However, most candidates demonstrated a global understanding of the item.

### Item 5

This item was well understood, although *mengemukakan pendapatnya* was not identified by many candidates.

### Item 6

This item was generally well answered. However, better candidates also included the idea that the government faces the challenge of using human resources in development.

### Item 7

Most candidates possessed a good global idea of this item. Better candidates addressed the issue of companies being dishonest in labelling *halal* foods. Part (b) was well done.

### Item 8

Many candidates were unfamiliar with *sistem pengangkutan yang hemat bahan bakar*. Better responses identified *mempkenalkan cara membangun*.

### Item 9

Part (a) was well done. In part (a) some candidates omitted the detail of *pelayanan kesehatan*.

## Item 10

Most candidates demonstrated a good overall understanding of this item. *Unjuk rasa* was not widely known.

### Speaking Skills

(10 marks)

#### General Comments

Questions 2 and 3 were slightly more popular choices in the 3U Speaking examination. Overall, responses were impressive, with very few exceeding the 10 minute suggested speaking time. Most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of their chosen Contemporary Issues, and could apply this knowledge to the specific questions.

Generally speaking, better responses presented a well-argued case supported by facts and examples. The argument was sustained with minimal hesitation. Vocabulary and structures were sophisticated and very accurate in usage. These responses demonstrated an accurate and sophisticated use of vocabulary and language structures.

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

#### Specific Comments

##### Question 1 – Australia – Indonesia Relations

A range of responses was evident, as some candidates only spoke about the economic crisis and the ensuing problems for Indonesia. Better candidates dealt with the economic crisis in the light of its impact on Australia – Indonesia relations.

##### Question 2 – Government

This question was approached from a range of perspectives, with better responses linking the past with the present in terms of the changes which have occurred. Some of these traced the chain of events leading up to Suharto stepping down and discussed the subsequent changes in the structure of the Government, political parties and elections.

##### Question 3 – Environment

A number of candidates limited their discussion to *pencemaran* and dealt mainly with the causes of pollution. Better candidates prioritised the environmental problems and organised their ideas around the affects of these problems on Indonesia and its people.

##### Question 4 – Religion

Candidates responded to this question in a number of ways. Some agreed with the argument, others disagreed and a few did a little of each. A small number of candidates spoke mainly of the Panca Sila as the basis of religious tolerance, however the better responses reflected a broader perspective.

## Written Examination

### Section I — Reading Skills

(15 marks)

#### General Comments

Most candidates handled both questions very well. On the whole, neither question proved to be more challenging than the other. The following vocabulary items did however prove challenging to some candidates:

#### Question 1

*daur ulang*  
*semboyan*  
*bernilai jual*  
*'payung'*  
*membiayai*  
*sejumlah*  
*dana terbesar*  
*dihancurkan*  
*tuntutan*

#### Question 2

*hasil ekspor*  
*sumber daya*  
*pendatang*  
*ucapan selamat*  
*rasa persaudaraan*  
*disintegrasi*  
*bangsa*  
*sesama umat beragama*

Questions 1 (c), 2 (a) and 2 (b) were good discriminators of the candidature.

#### Specific Comments

##### Question 1

- Part (c) Subsection (i) Better responses demonstrated an understanding of the following concept: *menggunakan 'payung' peduli lingkungan*.
- Part (e) Subsection (i) Weaker responses did not address or else incorrectly addressed the word *sejumlah*
- Subsection (ii) Weaker responses did not address the word *terbesar*.

##### Question 2

- Part (a) Weaker responses did not show an understanding of the following concept: *memberikan sebagian dari hasil ekspor daerah kepada negara*
- Part (b) Better responses identified what the writer saw as the differing causes of the social unrest.
- Part (c) This question proved to be the most challenging question on the paper.

## Section II – Writing Skills

(15 marks)

### General Comments

Question 3 was the most popular choice. Candidates who gained high marks demonstrated an excellent knowledge of their chosen topic, developed a well-organised argument and directly addressed the question that was asked. Better responses also demonstrated excellent control of Indonesian. Some candidates included irrelevant information. Candidates are not given credit for information which is irrelevant, even if it is factually correct. Some candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the Contemporary Issues related to the topic but did not manipulate grammatical structures accurately.

Problem areas included:

- incorrect use of *me* and *di* forms
- problems with affixation
- confusion with verbs which have a transitive/intransitive form e.g. *bertambah/menambah*, *meningkat/meningkatkan*
- misuse of *makin...makin*
- the structure *lebih* + adjective **but** *lebih banyak* + noun
- the different forms of *pengaruh* e.g.:
  - terpengaruh*
  - dipengaruhi*
  - mempengaruhi*
  - berpengaruh*
- lack of suitable concluding phrase to the essay such as *Sebagai kesimpulan*
- use of informal language e.g. *Pengaruh Barat ada dampak negatif* instead of *berdampak negatif*

### Question 3

There was a wide range of responses and a tendency to include irrelevant information. Good responses confined themselves to the reasons for the importance of *Keluarga Berencana*.

### Question 4

Weaker responses compared the traditional role of women with the role of women today and did not discuss in detail the obstacles confronting women today. Good responses referred to such obstacles as lack of education, religion, community attitudes (*Dharma Wanita* traditional role of women)

### Question 5

Most candidates who attempted this question had a good up-to-date knowledge of Indonesia's economic situation. Some problems were encountered with the interview discourse form, particularly in relation to the use of the appropriate register when interviewing an important person e.g. *Jelaskanlah keadaan ekonomi Indonesia* should be *Mohan dijelaskan keadaan ekonomi Indonesia*.

## Question 6

This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. Better candidates confined themselves to a discussion of western influence in big cities in the areas of technology, clothes, lifestyle, mass media, language, equality of women.

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

### Listening Examination

#### Listening Skills

(20 marks)

#### General Comments

Question 1, 2, 4 and 6 were well answered, with many candidates gaining full marks for these questions. Question 3, 5 and 7 were more discriminating questions, which required candidates to select information from various places in the text as well as analyse the presentation and language of the texts.

#### Specific Comments

##### Question 1

- Part (a) Most candidates identified the problem accurately as the decline in tourism. Better responses included details such as 'drastic' or 'by as much as 85%'.
- Part (b) Most candidates identified the riots as the contributing factor. Better responses explained that the fear of the riots recurring deterred tourists from visiting the country.

##### Question 2

- Part (a) Most candidates satisfactorily explained the overall impression of the two tourists, that they had encountered no problems. Good responses gave details of each tourist's opinion:
- that the situation was improving (first tourist)
  - that there were no problems, the situation was safe and everyone was friendly (second tourist)
- Part (b) Many candidates gave generalised answers about the situation returning to normal. Better answers included examples from the text, e.g.:
- the reference to the riots abating
  - the 75% increase in latest tourist figures to Bali

Some candidates drew on their general knowledge to comment on the underlying instability that remained at that time. Candidates are reminded that answers should be based solely on information from the text.

### Question 3

Responses to this question clearly discriminated between candidates.

The better candidates selected information from the texts as a whole to identify 4 main points:

- the guarantee of security by the Minister of Defence
- the provision of good, cheap tourist packages
- the use of Indonesians overseas (including embassies, companies, students) to promote tourism
- inviting world celebrities to visit Indonesia to encourage tourism

Good answers also included a brief explanation of how these measures would assist in promoting tourism. Some candidates identified minor details (e.g. the use of embassies, of students) as separate points to reach the 4 points required. Candidates are advised to consider the text in its entirety when answering broad questions such as this.

### Question 4

Good responses included two major obstacles mentioned in the text:

- the competition from overseas tourists destinations, such as China, Spain, Mauritius
- budgetary constraints on Indonesian tourist promotion

A significant number of candidates identified only the first point.

Some candidates included the implied obstacle of a continuing unstable political situation. Candidates are advised to base their answers closely on the text.

### Question 5

Many candidates found this question challenging, with some misinterpretation of the key words *peranan* and *setiap*.

Better answers identified and discussed each speaker (or set of speakers in the case of tourists) in turn, and clearly explained their role in the broadcast:

- the announcer introducing the topic of discussion and giving background information on the problem
- the two tourists confirming the announcer's statements that the situation was normal
- the interviewer posing the question that allowed the official to air his views
- the official reassuring, encouraging and promoting the tourist industry

A number of candidates identified the speakers only or commented generally on the overall function of speakers in a broadcast. Candidates are advised to read the question carefully and take time to identify the main focus of the question.

### Question 6

Part (a) Almost all candidates accurately identified the language used as colloquial, everyday speech, with some candidates repeating words in the question as supporting evidence.

Part (b) Most candidates accurately identified the words *kayaknya* and *ungkinan* to gain full marks for this question. Candidates who identified *ya* needed to explain the effect of the rising intonation of this word in this context.

### **Question 7**

This question clearly discriminated the better candidates. Good response commented on all three aspects in the question, *sikap*, *nada* and *bahasa*, and gave clear explanations of their choices, with supporting evidence from the text. Weaker responses mentioned a few points generally without direct reference to the text. A good answer is consistent and coherent in its discussion (e.g. ‘optimistic and positive, while still acknowledging the difficulties’ rather than ‘optimistic, positive and slightly worried’).



## Written Examination

### Section I - Reading Skills

(20 marks)

#### General Comments

Question 1 (a), (b), (c) and (d) were reasonably well answered, while Question 1 (e) and (f) were more challenging.

#### Specific Comments

#### Question 1

Part (a) Good responses focused on the content of the text and the extent to which a woman's appearance determines her role in society. Examples from the text included:

- beauty contests such as Miss Universe
- businessmen preferring female models to promote their products
- women being proud to be displayed in magazines

Many candidates discussed the message implied at the end of the text, rather than focusing on the actual situation described at the beginning of the text.

Part (b) Most candidates answered this question well, with better responses including a comprehensive range of substantiating evidence:

- that she is proud to be herself, regardless of her looks
- that she focuses on inner beauty and self-esteem
- that she is independent, self reliant and confident

Part (c) Most candidates accurately identified the language as teenage language. Better responses included details such as 'modern urban teenagers, interested in motor racing'.

Good responses gave a range of examples, such as *gue*, *cewek*, *nekats*, also *dragster-wati* 'drag-race'.

Some candidates identified examples of regional language, but did not relate these specifically to a teenage audience.

Part (d) Responses were generally better for Text B than for Text A.

Good responses for Text A included:

- the well structured argument, using factual examples, followed by the writer's opinion
- the clear statement of the message at the end of the text
- the use of rhetorical questions
- the subjective nature of the arguments
- the formal language, lending a serious tone to the argument
- in the form of an article or commentary.

Good responses to Text B included:

- the dominant role of the picture
- the prominent title in the form of a question
- the short, concise text
- the persuasive language
- the repetition of the message in the final statement
- in the form of an advertisement

Part (e) Better responses to the question included an interpretation by the student of the quotation given in the question, that women are responsible for taking charge of their own situation, that is ‘empowering’ themselves.

Good responses then related this statement to a discussion of each text separately.

In Text A, good answers referred to the direct message contained in the quotation and the writer’s message that women must change society’s perception of them as ‘decoration’ only.

In Text B, good answers discussed the woman’s independent attitude, her self-esteem providing her with her own ‘empowerment’.

In Text C, good answers explained how Rally Marina had gained ‘empowerment’ by breaking into the male-dominated motor racing field.

Part (f) Again, better candidates explained their understanding of the expression, the ‘in’ woman. They then applied their understanding of this concept to each text in turn.

Many candidates found this question challenging. Candidates are advised that they can agree or disagree with the statement in a subjective question, provided they give a clear explanation and supporting evidence for their answer.

In Text A, some candidates argued that the image of ‘woman as beauty queen’ was not a relevant image of the modern ‘in’ woman, while others argued that the ‘in’ woman was one accepted by most of society.

Better responses were consistent in their interpretation of the term, the ‘in’ woman, and depending on their response to Text A, argued either that the two women in Text B and Text C were very ‘in’ because they were modern, independent women who made their own place in the world or they argued that these two women were not ‘in’ (i.e. accepted by society in general) because they did not conform to society’s standards of what role a woman should play.

Weaker candidates presented contradictory views of the concept of the ‘in’ woman in relation to each text.

**Section II - Writing Skills**

**(20 marks)**

**Question 2**

The majority of candidates answered question (a). Candidates who answered question (b) needed to think carefully about the context of their dialogue, both in terms of time and place.

Most candidates answered in the appropriate genre of a dialogue, many choosing to write an interview, others a casual conversation. Some candidates wrote in prose style only or included very long prose introductions. Candidates are advised to read the instructions to the question **carefully** and to write only in the genre allowed by the question. Good answers engaged and maintained reader interest throughout. Their dialogue was natural and lively, with a well-sustained argument. They focused on the topic of ‘a man’s view of the empowerment of women’, although they also presented differing opinions, sometimes from women. Good responses also included a **short** introduction, setting the context, introducing the speakers. They then maintained the context and personae of the speakers throughout the dialogue, also maintaining the appropriate register (colloquial language if writing in informal conversation, more formal language if writing an interview).

Candidates are advised that reproducing large extracts from the reading texts will result in a low mark. Better responses presented the candidate’s original ideas on the subject and demonstrated a depth of knowledge and insight into the topic of discussion.

Candidates who transposed a prose-like discussion into dialogue form were not awarded as highly as candidates who produced a realistic and natural dialogue style’.

**Marking Criteria – Section II – Writing Skills – Question 2**

<b>20-17 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– style appropriate to genre</li> <li>– successfully maintains reader interest</li> <li>– attains or exceeds minimum length requirement</li> <li>– very well sequenced and sustained argument</li> <li>– uses a wide range of vocabulary, including the less predictable</li> <li>– Excellent control of syntax, uses complex structures</li> </ul>
<b>17-14 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– style generally appropriate to genre</li> <li>– attains minimum length requirement</li> <li>– well organised and sequenced argument</li> <li>– generally maintains reader interest</li> <li>– good control of syntax, uses varied structures</li> </ul>
<b>14-11 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Good to Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– style mostly suitable to the genre</li> <li>– language mostly accurate and coherent</li> <li>– content organised reasonably, some weaknesses with sequencing and linking</li> <li>– uses predictable and familiar vocabulary</li> <li>– limited attempt to maintain reader interest</li> </ul>

<b>11-8 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Below Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– style not always consistent with the genre</li> <li>– limited ability to organise content</li> <li>– often fails to attain minimum length requirements</li> <li>– generally predictable and familiar vocabulary</li> <li>– little attempt to adapt wording from passages on paper</li> </ul>
<b>8-4 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– fails to address the question directly</li> <li>– minimal attempt to maintain reader interest</li> <li>– frequent errors and poorly sequenced ideas</li> <li>– very limited range of vocabulary</li> <li>– heavy reliance on passages from exam paper</li> </ul>
<b>4-1 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Very Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– uses very poor range of vocabulary and very basic structure</li> <li>– uses only simple sentences</li> <li>– does not show understanding of the question</li> <li>– often incoherent</li> </ul>
<b>0 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Minimal Attempt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– not attempted</li> </ul>

### Section III – Contemporary Issues (40 marks)

#### Question 3

##### General Comments

About 60% of candidates answered question (a). Answers to both questions showed a good broad knowledge of the set text, *Kisah Perjuangan Suku Naga* and some evidence of wider reading. Candidates are advised however, to read the question very carefully and to choose examples from both the set text and their wider reading that are clearly related to the question. Candidates write better responses when they can relate the examples in the text to the examples from their wider reading as closely as possible.

##### Part (a)

Good responses included reference in the set text to:

- the planned mining project by Big Boss and Sri Ratu which threatened to destroy the natural environment in and around the Naga village – the rice fields, the lake, the trees
- the Naga’s respect for the natural environment, their regard for nature as their ‘brother’
- Carlo’s report on the consequences for the natural environment of unchecked development (pollution, barren soil etc.)

Good examples from wider reading included references to:

- the Freeport mining project and its destruction of the natural environment of the local population of Irian Jaya
- unchecked resort development in Bali with consequent sewage overflow in the local natural environment
- forest fires in Kalimantan and Sumatra caused by unchecked logging operations
- big housing estates in previously rural areas, causing environmental damage

Some candidates confused *lingkungan alam* with *lingkungan hidup*. Consequently their choice of examples were less relevant to the topic. Good answers maintained the focus on the natural environment, relating their discussion of the effects on the population to the destruction of their natural surroundings.

### Part (b)

Good answers to this question began by defining the quotation, putting it in its context in the play.

They then discussed various examples of 'luxury as a sign of progress' from the set text, including:

- products promoted by the overseas ambassadors to Astinam, such as tinned foods, synthetic vitamins
- shopping centres promoted by the ambassadors as symbols of progress
- the wearing of western-style clothes, although unsuited to Astinam's climate
- the building of the Wijaya Kusuma hospital with Western-style luxurious facilities, while Astinam needed many small, simple health facilities

Examples from wider reading included:

- the mushrooming of shopping centres in Indonesia, causing many small businesses to go out of business
- big luxury projects, such as IPTN and the national car, seen as unnecessary and inappropriate to Indonesia's present needs
- the building of luxury houses at the public expense as a status symbol for officials

In each question, better candidates discussed specific examples in detail, both from the set text and from their wider reading, showing a detailed knowledge of Contemporary Issues.

**Marking Criteria – Section III – Contemporary Issues – Question 3**

<p><b>20-18 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– fully addresses the set question</li> <li>– demonstrates excellent understanding of the text</li> <li>– displays clear evidence of wide reading/viewing</li> <li>– provides relevant and detailed reference to the text</li> <li>– uses relevant and clearly explained examples</li> <li>– shows high level of understanding of Contemporary Issues</li> <li>– very well organised and sequenced ideas</li> <li>– sustains coherent argument throughout</li> </ul>
<p><b>17-14 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– addresses most parts of the question</li> <li>– relates discussion to the set topic</li> <li>– displays evidence of wide reading/viewing</li> <li>– provides some relevant and detailed reference to the text</li> <li>– uses some examples</li> <li>– displays good knowledge of Contemporary Issues</li> <li>– Well organised and sequenced ideas</li> </ul>
<p><b>14-11 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– does not address all aspects of set question</li> <li>– discusses topic in general terms</li> <li>– displays some evidence of wider reading/viewing</li> <li>– limited reference to text</li> <li>– provides only a few examples</li> <li>– displays some knowledge of Contemporary Issues</li> </ul>
<p><b>11-8 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Below Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– little attempt to address question</li> <li>– fails to address all aspects of the question</li> <li>– little evidence of wider reading/viewing</li> <li>– minimal reference to text</li> <li>– displays limited knowledge of Contemporary Issues</li> <li>– poorly organised discussion</li> <li>– weaknesses in sequencing and linking ideas</li> </ul>
<p><b>7-1 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– fails to address the question</li> <li>– provides inappropriate examples</li> <li>– demonstrates little understanding of Contemporary Issues</li> <li>– limited length</li> </ul>
<p><b>0 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Minimal Attempt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– not attempted</li> </ul>

#### Question 4

Most candidates discussed the *dalang*'s role in the play in regard to at least one or two roles.

Better candidates included a comprehensive discussion of the *dalang*'s varied roles, giving clear and relevant examples from the play as supporting evidence.

These examples were clearly placed in context and their relevance to the discussion explained fully. Good responses also incorporated a comparison of the *dalang* in Rendra's play with the *dalang* in a *wayang* performance in their discussion, rather than discussing each one separately. Weaker candidates discussed the topic in very generalised terms, showing little evidence of knowledge of the play.

Roles of the *dalang* discussed included:

- as narrator, introducing new characters and scenes, a role similar to that of the traditional *dalang*
- as commentator, siding with the Naga tribe and criticising Sri Ratu's camp. Similarly, a traditional *dalang* supports the 'good' side
- as humorous relief, accentuating the caricatured portrayal of Sri Ratu and the Ketua-ketua Fraksi. In a traditional performance, the *dalang* incorporates contemporary humour
- as the voice of Rendra, conveying a clear message to the audience. This role is less evident in a traditional *wayang* performance

For each of these roles, better candidates provided relevant specific examples from the play.

Some candidates also mentioned the *dalang*'s role as a female character in the play as a strong counter to the weaker female characters. However, most candidates did not relate this to a comparison with the role of the traditional *dalang*.

#### Marking Criteria – Section III – Contemporary Issues – Question 4

<b>20-18 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– fully addresses the set question</li> <li>– provides relevant and detailed reference to the text</li> <li>– uses relevant and clearly explained examples</li> <li>– demonstrates excellent understanding of the text</li> <li>– very well organised and sequenced ideas</li> <li>– sustains coherent comparative discussion throughout</li> </ul>
<b>17-14 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– addresses most parts of the question</li> <li>– provides some relevant and detailed reference to the text</li> <li>– uses some appropriate examples</li> <li>– relates discussion to the set topic</li> <li>– well organised and sequenced ideas</li> <li>– some attempt to incorporate comparison in the discussion</li> </ul>

<b>14-11 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- generally addresses topic</li> <li>- provides only a few examples</li> <li>- does not address all aspects of set question</li> <li>- discusses topic in general terms</li> <li>- limited reference to text</li> <li>- little attempt to compare the two elements in the topic</li> </ul>
<b>11-8 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Below Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- little attempt to address question</li> <li>- fails to address all aspects of the question</li> <li>- weaknesses in sequencing and linking ideas</li> <li>- minimal reference to text</li> <li>- poorly organised discussion</li> </ul>
<b>7-1 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fails to address the question</li> <li>- provides inappropriate examples</li> <li>- demonstrates little knowledge of play</li> </ul>
<b>0 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Minimal Attempt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not attempted</li> </ul>

### 3 Unit (Additional) (For Background Speakers)

#### Written Examination

##### Section I – Novel

(25 marks)

##### General Comments

Candidates were required to identify the relevant theme (themes) from the novel and in their comparison of the two characters' lives, to relate their experiences to the theme of the novel.

Better candidates chose appropriate incidents in each character's life and discussed them in detail, demonstrating how those incidents illustrated the theme (themes) they had identified.

Themes identified were social divisions and the low status of women.

Examples relating to social divisions included Gadis Pantai's lowly status as a 'trial wife' in Bendaro's household and her denigration by Mardinah, her servant who came from the upper classes. The best responses discussed Mardinah's own lowly position within her own class and how, when uprooted from her familiar surroundings, she did not display the strength of character that Gadis Pantai did.



Examples relating to the lowly status of women included a description of Gadis Pantai’s marriage and her role in Bendoro’s household, to serve and please her husband to the exclusion of all else. This was then compared to Mardinah’s experience as a cast-off wife of the upper class, reduced to working as a servant and ‘agent’ of a neighbouring aristocrat and to her equally powerless position when married by force to one of the villagers.

Candidates who focused clearly on one of these two themes and discussed the topic coherently were generally more successful than those who attempted to combine a discussion of both themes.

### Marking Criteria – Section I – Novel

<b>25-21 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– fully addresses the set question</li> <li>– provides detailed and relevant reference to the text</li> <li>– uses appropriate and clearly explained examples</li> <li>– demonstrates excellent understanding of the text</li> <li>– very well organised and linked organisation of ideas</li> <li>– gives equal weight to each aspect of the question</li> </ul>
<b>21-18 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– addresses the question directly</li> <li>– provides some relevant and detailed reference to the text</li> <li>– uses some appropriate examples</li> <li>– well organised and sequenced ideas</li> <li>– attempts to balance various parts of the question</li> </ul>
<b>14-17 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– generally focuses on set question</li> <li>– provides only limited supporting examples of argument</li> <li>– does not discuss novel comprehensively or in depth</li> <li>– concentrates on plot rather than analysis</li> </ul>
<b>8-13 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Below Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– little attempt to address set question</li> <li>– concentrates mainly on plot summary rather than analysis</li> <li>– poorly organised discussion</li> <li>– internal inconsistency in argument</li> <li>– few, if any, appropriate examples</li> </ul>
<b>7-1 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– addresses question in vague general terms</li> <li>– little reference to novel</li> <li>– does not write at appropriate level</li> <li>– does not include appropriate examples</li> </ul>
<b>0 MARKS</b>	<p><b>Minimal Attempt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– not attempted</li> </ul>

**Section II – Poetry (25 marks)**

**General Comments**

To answer this question well, candidates needed to explain the significance of the quotation and to base their discussion on this interpretation. Choice of poems was very important in answering this question. Candidates are strongly advised to read the question carefully and choose poems which relate to the topic, in this case love poems. It is important for candidates to have studied the whole range of poems set to enable them to make the most appropriate choices. Good responses discussed each poem chosen in depth and detail, demonstrating a high degree of engagement with the poems as well as a detailed knowledge. Equal weighting was given to the poems discussed, with a clear comparison provided. Discussion of poetic technique was included in better responses.

Poems chosen appropriate to the question included:

- |                  |                     |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Toeti Heraty     | - Selesai           |
|                  | - Cintaku tiga      |
|                  | - Saat-saat gelap   |
|                  | - Penundaan         |
| Ajip Rosidi      | - Tretes malam hari |
|                  | - Bayangan          |
|                  | - Antara kita       |
| Putu Oka Sukanta | - Batas             |

Poems chosen by some candidates which were not appropriate included Nomer and Hanya dalam puisi. Overall, the standard of answers were pleasing. Only a small percentage of candidates demonstrated minimal knowledge of the poems discussed (including in some cases the title of the poem chosen!)

**Marking Criteria – Section II – Poetry**

<p><b>25-21 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– concentrates on focus of question</li> <li>– discusses relevant poems chosen in detail and depth</li> <li>– relates content of poem to topic</li> <li>– explains and discusses quotations from poems</li> <li>– includes discussion of poetic technique</li> <li>– give equal weight to each poem discussed</li> <li>– demonstrates engagement with the poems discussed</li> </ul>
<p><b>21-18 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– answers the question directly</li> <li>– discusses relevant poems in detail</li> <li>– relates discussion to the topic</li> <li>– attempts to balance various elements of the question</li> <li>– gives quotations to show knowledge of poems</li> </ul>
<p><b>14-17 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– generally focuses on question</li> <li>– discusses content of poems in general terms</li> <li>– does not discuss poems comprehensively or in depth</li> <li>– concentrates on content rather than poetic forms</li> <li>– discusses all areas of topic but not in equal depth</li> </ul>
<p><b>8-13 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Below Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– minimal attempt to focus on question</li> <li>– concentrates on certain poems (not all poems mentioned in question)</li> <li>– chooses poems unsuited to the question</li> <li>– discusses content of poems in very general terms</li> <li>– little specific reference to text of poems</li> <li>– displays little understanding of poetic technique</li> </ul>
<p><b>7-1 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– show little knowledge of poems</li> <li>– does not attempt to focus on question</li> <li>– does not write at appropriate length</li> </ul>
<p><b>0 MARKS</b></p>	<p><b>Minimal Attempt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– not attempted</li> </ul>