

**2004 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
Indonesian Background Speakers**

© 2005 Copyright Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales.

This document contains Material prepared by the Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the State of New South Wales. The Material is protected by Crown copyright.

All rights reserved. No part of the Material may be reproduced in Australia or in any other country by any process, electronic or otherwise, in any material form or transmitted to any other person or stored electronically in any form without the prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW, except as permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*. School candidates in NSW and teachers in schools in NSW may copy reasonable portions of the Material for the purposes of bona fide research or study.

When you access the Material you agree:

- to use the Material for information purposes only
- to reproduce a single copy for personal bona fide study use only and not to reproduce any major extract or the entire Material without the prior permission of the Board of Studies NSW
- to acknowledge that the Material is provided by the Board of Studies NSW
- not to make any charge for providing the Material or any part of the Material to another person or in any way make commercial use of the Material without the prior written consent of the Board of Studies NSW and payment of the appropriate copyright fee
- to include this copyright notice in any copy made
- not to modify the Material or any part of the Material without the express prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW.

The Material may contain third party copyright materials such as photos, diagrams, quotations, cartoons and artworks. These materials are protected by Australian and international copyright laws and may not be reproduced or transmitted in any format without the copyright owner's specific permission. Unauthorised reproduction, transmission or commercial use of such copyright materials may result in prosecution.

The Board of Studies has made all reasonable attempts to locate owners of third party copyright material and invites anyone from whom permission has not been sought to contact the Copyright Officer, ph (02) 9367 8289, fax (02) 9279 1482.

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

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au

ISBN 1 7414 7240 7

2005110

Contents

Section I – Listening and Responding.....	6
Part B.....	7
Section II – Reading and Responding	8
Part B.....	10
Section III – Writing in Indonesian	11

2004 HSC NOTES FROM THE MARKING CENTRE

INDONESIAN BACKGROUND SPEAKERS

Introduction

This document has been produced for the teachers and candidates of the Stage 6 courses in Indonesian Background Speakers. It provides comments with regard to responses to the 2004 Higher School Certificate Examination, indicating the quality of candidate responses and highlighting the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidature in each section of the course.

It is essential that this document be read in conjunction with the 2004 HSC Examination paper, the relevant syllabus document and other support documents which have been developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of Indonesian.

The marking guidelines, developed by the Examination Committee at the time of setting the Higher School Certificate Examinations and used at the Marking Centre, are available on the Board of Studies website.

In 2004, 106 candidates sat for the Indonesian Background Speakers examination.

General Comments

The paper was challenging and generated a range of responses from the candidates. Most candidates responded well in both parts of the listening and responding section. When responding by composing a new text, better responses showed the candidates' ability to extract the gist from the stimulus text/s and combine this with their opinion and then to express these ideas in the new form, with awareness of the text type, purpose and audience. Better responses also showed thorough knowledge of the prescribed texts and the ability to link this to the theme in their analysis. Furthermore, they demonstrated the ability to analyse how language is used to convey the ideas contained in the texts. Better responses also demonstrated the ability to organise ideas to compose a well-structured text. In the writing section, better responses demonstrated the ability to write for a specific context, purpose and audience and also showed originality, creativity and excellent control of the Indonesian language.

Section I – Listening and Responding

Part A

Question 1

General Comments

This question assessed candidates' ability to:

- identify main points and detailed items of specific information
- analyse the way in which language is used to convey meaning.

This question required candidates to answer in English and all candidates did so. Whilst their level of English varied, most candidates did not face significant difficulty in responding clearly.

Specific Comments

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify the socially acceptable behaviour for dating in Purwodadi. They mentioned that going to the cinema in a group of four or five was acceptable. They also mentioned that holding hands was common, as long as it was not done in public.

Some candidates mentioned that couples dating not in the company of friends risked being forced to marry by the head of the neighbourhood (Pak RT). Some candidates also contrasted dating behaviour in Purwodadi with common behaviour in Jakarta, noting that couples in Jakarta had much more freedom.

- (b) Many candidates answered this question well. Better responses were able to explain fully the interviewer's attitude, providing examples to support their views. Some interpretations were:
- He treated her as a big brother/father would treat a younger sister/daughter. He was concerned for her welfare and he gave advice, warning her not to go to the mall too often.
 - He was curious, and wanted to know about her life and experiences in Purwodadi and Jakarta.
 - He was condescending and treated her as a naïve and innocent girl from the village who did not understand life in a big city.
 - He was sceptical.

Weaker responses identified the interviewer's attitude, but did not provide supporting evidence from the text. A few candidates did not identify any attitude, and addressed their answer to aspects of language style and register.

- (c) This multiple-choice item was correctly answered by the majority of candidates.

- (d) Better responses demonstrated a perceptive understanding of the language used by both speakers, and provided relevant and specific examples from the text. These responses also showed an ability to draw conclusions about the relationship between the speakers as well as their individual backgrounds.

Weaker responses made general statements about the language, but failed to provide specific examples to support their statements. Some responses concentrated on one speaker only.

While most candidates commented on the informal and colloquial language used, many did not provide sufficient examples. Better responses mentioned that the language of the interviewer was appropriate to the teenage audience, and mentioned the conversational markers used, eg. *sih*, *kok*, *lho*, *deh*, and the use of colloquial words, eg *bener*, *gitu*, *nggak*, *aja*.

Candidates mentioned Dina's use of *cak* and later *mas* to address the interviewer. Better responses linked this to her Javanese origins, and also indicated that the interviewer was older than Dina.

Many candidates mentioned Dina's use of *opo yo* reflected her Javanese origins. Other examples of regional words were given, eg *Cak*, *risi*, *lho*, *kaget*, *aku*, *lha mangkanya*, *banter* and *banget*.

Many candidates noticed the change of personal pronouns. Dina began with *saya* and later changed to *gue* reflecting her move to Jakarta, and the influence of Jakarta dialect. Other examples of bahasa Jakarta included *nongkrong*, *ngerabain*, *nyiumin*, *nggak*, *udah*, *liat-liat* etc.

Part B

Question 2

General Comments

This question assessed candidates' ability to:

- compare and contrast information, opinions and ideas
- compose a well-structured argument supported by textual reference
- convey information and ideas accurately and appropriately.

Specific Comments

The majority of candidates answered this question well. While most candidates wrote their response in the right text type, the registers used varied from formal language in a formally structured letter to colloquial language in an informal letter. Either variation was appropriate as the type of the magazine was not specified.

Better responses were able to resource well from both texts. These responses mentioned the selection criteria, if not all, then at least the cultural components. They

then commented that the criteria must be taken into consideration with caution because of the experience of previous participants, for example Nani's friend Dewi. Dewi spent months preparing two traditional dances to perform in Australia, and was frustrated that the audience did not appreciate them, some even shouted 'boring'. Better responses then addressed the purpose by giving suggestions to prospective applicants and also by appealing to the Depdiknas to have a wider and more applicable interpretation of cultural values.

Weaker responses did not mention any of the selection criteria outlined in the first text. Others gave their own criticism of the selection criteria and failed to focus on the main issue of the letter which is to comment on the applicability of the criteria to the real experience of the participants of the exchange programme. Weaker responses also confused the target audience of the letter. Some wrote the letter as if directly addressed to Depdiknas.

Section II – Reading and Responding

Part A

Question 3

General Comments

This question assessed candidates' ability to:

- identify and analyse specific information
- analyse the way in which language is used to convey meaning
- compose a well-structured argument supported by textual reference.

Specific Comments

- (a) Better responses were able to link Unyeng's statement '*Lebih baik Den Bagus pulang saja*' to the social divides between the rich and the poor. These responses explained that Unyeng was making the statement because of difficulties and troubles he and Gempol would face due to the low regard the rich have for the poor. These mentioned that there might be accusations of kidnapping if Andri were to go with them.

Weaker responses stated that the reason might be because Unyeng and Gempol did not want to be burdened by Andri as their life was already difficult.

- (b) This was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to state that Gempol was with Andri enjoying a ride on a train when the authorities demolished the settlement and took Gempol's family away. Better responses explained why the authorities had done this, namely to clean and beautify the city for the Independence Day celebrations.

Weaker responses only stated that Gempol was not with his family during the demolition.

- (c) Candidates found this part challenging. Better responses explained that the *rumah proklamasi*, which was old and considered ugly, was demolished to make way for a new building which was more beautiful and appropriate. Parallels were drawn with the poor, who were likewise considered unattractive and were driven away to leave the city ‘clean and beautiful’.

Some better responses stated that *rumah proklamasi* was the symbol of freedom – freedom from poverty and oppression. When this symbol was demolished so too was the hope of the poor to be freed from poverty and oppression.

- (d) Many candidates experienced difficulties in fully answering this part. Better responses were able to state that most of the time Gempol, Andri and Unyeng used informal language and that this showed their close and friendly relationships. They also mentioned that some Javanese words were used by Gempol and Unyeng which showed they were from the same ethnic background.

Better responses also mentioned the terms of address the characters used when talking to each other. Gempol used *mbah* to address Unyeng. This showed that Unyeng was older and also that his role was like a grandfather to Gempol. Unyeng used *Den Bagus* to address Andri showing their different social status.

Better responses also mentioned the imagery, especially *masyarakat bekicot*. They then explained that it was Unyeng and Gempol who were compared to *bekicot* clinging to whatever and spoiling the view.

Weaker responses only discussed the register or the language features or the imagery and did not give examples or explain how these were used to reflect the relationship of the characters.

Question 4

General Comments

This question assessed candidates’ ability to:

- analyse features of text
- analyse the relationship of text to the prescribed theme
- analyse the way in which language is used to convey meaning
- compose a well-structured argument supported by textual reference.

Specific Comments

Most candidates showed familiarity with both texts, a short story and a song. Most were also able to identify the theme in both texts, namely the destruction of the environment caused by development.

Better responses addressed the question effectively and did not just regurgitate the plot of the short story. They were able to identify the development proposed for the

area where Ngoro Den Ayu lived. Ngoro Den Ayu had to leave her house because an airport was to be built there instead. They also mentioned that the longan trees had to be felled. These trees were the physical symbols storing the memories of the events involving the family over a relatively long period of time. Without the trees, the memories would only live in the mind.

When discussing the song, better responses explained that the irresponsible logging done in the name of development had stripped the forest bare and that there would not be a habitat left for plants and animals. The forests, the plants and the animals would then only live on in the minds of the people and be part of the bedtime stories for the children.

Better responses then supported their explanation of the theme by giving examples or references taken from the texts. These responses also analysed the way the author or song writer portrayed the theme, by discussing the techniques used in both texts. For example mention was made of the symbolism in *Pohon Lengkek*, that every tree symbolises an event. When the tree went, the event would only live as a memory in the mind. Toso's death also was a symbol of the irreversible destruction. In referring to the song, better responses cited lines showing how the songwriter conveyed the theme.

Better responses also gave a balanced discussion between the two texts and organised the ideas coherently.

Weaker responses only told the plot of the short story. When they discussed the theme they did not give any supporting examples or they failed to analyse the techniques applied by the composers. Weaker responses were not balanced in their discussions of the texts. Some discussed the short story in more detail and only provided a superficial discussion of the song. Others did the reverse. Ideas were also not arranged coherently.

Some candidates discussed the texts at length, but actually failed to address the question. They analysed the texts in a broad or general way and did not focus on analysing the specific theme related to the idea that development results in irreversible destruction of the environment until it remains only as a memory. Some candidates also wrote a very long introduction to their essay that was not necessary.

Part B

Question 5

General Comments

This question assessed candidates' ability to:

- exchange information in response to opinions, ideas and information
- compose a well-structured argument supported by textual reference
- convey information, opinions and ideas accurately and appropriately.

Specific Comments

Overall this question was challenging. Better responses demonstrated the ability to compose a new text in the specified text type, a radio advertisement. The advertisement was in the form of a dialogue/conversation or a monologue. The audience of the advertisement was not stipulated and candidates chose various target audiences including general public, young people, people planning their holidays, tourists both local and overseas.

Better responses applied a register appropriate for their chosen target audience. They also applied language features suitable for an advertisement using emotive words and a persuasive tone.

Better responses were also able to meet the purpose of the advertisement that was to increase community awareness of the link between tourism and culture, and did not compose an advertisement for a tourist destination. Better responses were also able to source the stimulus text without regurgitating it. Some gave other examples from different tourism destinations

Weaker responses tended to be vague in their target audience and did not use an appropriate register. These also did not apply the language features suitable for the text type.

Weaker responses were not clear in their purpose of the advertisement and ended with advertising Kota Gede as a tourist destination or a package tour. Weaker responses were not able to explain the link between tourism and the preservation of culture.

Some weaker responses did not refer to the text at all, whereas some others just regurgitated the stimulus text.

Section III – Writing in Indonesian

General Comments

This question assessed candidates' ability to:

- write texts appropriate to context, purpose and audience
- sequence and structure information and ideas
- demonstrate a range and control of language structures and vocabulary
- maintain reader's interest.

The majority of the candidates chose to answer Question 7, while Question 8 was the least popular.

Specific Comments

For all questions, better responses showed a clear awareness of the context, purpose and audience. They were then able to apply an appropriate register. For example, for question 7, better responses took into account the fact that they were writing a description as a part of a presentation paper to interschool SRC members. These

responses displayed the use of descriptive language and recognised that the register would be neither too formal nor too informal.

For question 6, many candidates did not understand the concept of *rumah singga* resulting in various interpretations ranging from an orphanage to a holiday camp. Better responses showed an understanding of the context and wrote a description as part of their report after a school excursion for the PMP subject. These were able to describe the facilities, atmosphere and the street kids who frequented the *rumah singgah* (drop-in house).

These better responses also applied descriptive language often combined with emotive language that was appropriate to evoke sympathy, given that this is for the PMP subject. Better responses were also creative, for example some inserted a conversation with the users of the *rumah singgah*, and so included direct speech in their description.

Weaker responses did not describe all components asked for in the question. These usually also did not use a suitable register. Weaker responses clearly showed less awareness of the context, purpose and audience.

For question 7, most candidates understood the concept of an ‘internet café’. They were also able to identify, in varying degrees, the impact of an internet café on the students at the nearby schools. Most candidates mentioned the decline in the motivation to study and the danger of soliciting prohibited web-sites.

Better responses included descriptions that gave many interesting examples, or created more interesting contexts. These showed the application of an appropriate register and used appropriate computer and internet café jargons.

Weaker responses did not demonstrate a high level command of Indonesian and fell into simple and basic descriptions. Some did not apply the right register. Weaker responses were often confusing in their descriptions. Instead of describing the impact the internet café had on the students, some described the internet café and what services were available there.

Question 8 was the least popular among the three in this section. Better responses showed an awareness that the description was part of an application for a scholarship to study at the Engineering faculty of a university of technology. These were then able to apply an appropriate register and also were able to describe the type of housing development that would be environmentally friendly, from the point of view of an engineering student.

Weaker responses showed less awareness of the context, purpose and audience. These also then failed to use the right register. Weaker responses also showed unfamiliarity with technical matters of housing development that resulted in inappropriate suggestions for the task.

Indonesian Background Speakers

2004 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
Section I — Listening and Responding			
Part A			
1 (a)	2	Youth culture — interview	H3.1
1 (b)	2	Youth culture — interview	H3.3
1 (c)	1	Youth culture — interview	H3.1
1 (d)	5	Youth culture — interview	H3.6, H3.7, H4.1
Section I — Listening and Responding			
Part B			
2	10	The place of the individual in the wider community — advertisement/interview — letter	H2.1, H2.3, H3.2, H3.4, H3.5
Section II — Reading and Responding			
Part A			
3 (a)	2	<i>Langitku Rumahku</i> — film	H3.1, H3.2
3 (b)	3	<i>Langitku Rumahku</i> — film	H3.1, H3.2, H3.6
3 (c)	4	<i>Langitku Rumahku</i> — film	H3.3, H4.1
3 (d)	6	<i>Langitku Rumahku</i> — film	H3.7, H4.1
4	25	Tourism in Indonesia — article	H2.1, H2.3, H3.1, H3.2, H3.3, H3.4, H3.7, H3.8, H4.1
Section II — Reading and Responding			
Part B			
5	15	The benefits of cross-cultural contact — newspaper article/advertisement	H1.2, H2.1, H2.3, H2.4, H3.8
Section III — Writing in Indonesian			
6	25	Social equality and inequality today — description	H2.1, H2.2, H2.3, H2.4, H4.2
7	25	The influence of an urban or rural environment on youth — description	H2.1, H2.2, H2.3, H2.4, H4.2
8	25	The relationship between the physical environment and lifestyle — description	H2.1, H2.2, H2.3, H2.4, H4.2



2004 HSC Indonesian Background Speakers Marking Guidelines — Written Examination

Section I — Listening and Responding Part A

Question 1 (a)

Outcomes assessed: H3.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Fully identifies the socially acceptable behaviour for dating	2
• Identifies some relevant information from the text	1

Question 1 (b)

Outcomes assessed: H3.3

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Fully explains the interviewer's attitudes with examples	2
• Provides an example or an explanation	1

Question 1 (c)*Outcomes assessed: H3.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• (A)	1

Question 1 (d)*Outcomes assessed: H3.6, H3.7, H4.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• Demonstrates perceptive understanding of the language styles used by the speakers by identifying and explaining specific and relevant language features	5
• Demonstrates a good understanding of the language styles used by the speakers with some relevant examples	3–4
• Identifies some features of language without examples or gives some examples with little elaboration	1–2

Section I — Listening and Responding

Part B

Question 2

Outcomes assessed: H2.1, H2.3, H3.2, H3.4, H3.5

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the issues raised in the texts and a sophisticated level of ability to compare and contrast them• Composes a coherent argument demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the texts• Demonstrates a highly-developed understanding of context and audience• Demonstrates an excellent control of vocabulary and language structures	9–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identifies the main issues in the texts and compares and contrasts them in a lucid way• Composes an effective argument with close reference to the texts• Writes effectively for the context and audience• Demonstrates an appropriate knowledge and understanding of language structures and vocabulary	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coherently compares and contrasts information in the texts• Writes coherently and with some appropriate textual reference• Relates information to context and audience• Writes using a range of language structures and vocabulary	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compares and contrasts some opinions, ideas and information in the texts• Demonstrates a limited ability to structure and sequence information and ideas• Demonstrates an awareness of context and audience	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the texts and the ability to compare and contrast information• Shows some evidence of the ability to organise information	1–2

Section II — Reading and Responding

Part A

Question 3 (a)

Outcomes assessed: H3.1, H3.2

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Fully explains the reason why Andri should return home	2
• Partially explains the reason why Andri should return home	1

Question 3 (b)

Outcomes assessed: H3.1, H3.2, H3.6

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Fully explains the context including reasons why Gempol was separated from his family	3
• Gives some details about how Gempol was separated from his family	2
• Gives limited detail about how Gempol was separated from his family	1

Question 3 (c)

Outcomes assessed: H3.3, H4.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
• Fully explains the intent of Unyeng's statement with regard to the lower class in society	4
• Gives some explanation of the comparison between the fate of the building and the plight of the lower class	2–3
• Shows a limited understanding of Unyeng's statement and its relevance to the plight of the lower class	1

Question 3 (d)*Outcomes assessed: H3.7, H4.1***MARKING GUIDELINES**

Criteria	Marks
• Demonstrates excellent understanding of how language shows relationships between characters, by identifying and explaining relevant language features and imagery	5–6
• Demonstrates some understanding of how language shows relationships between characters by identifying and explaining a few relevant language features and imagery	3–4
• Demonstrates little understanding of how language shows relationships between characters and offers little explanation of relevant language features and imagery	1–2

Section II — Reading and Responding

Part A (continued)

Question 4

Outcomes assessed: H2.1, H2.3, H3.1, H3.2, H3.3, H3.4, H3.7, H3.8, H4.1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a highly developed ability to analyse how the theme is represented in both texts • Demonstrates a perceptive and insightful ability to analyse the way in which language is used to portray the theme • Composes a coherent and sophisticated argument demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of both texts 	21–25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the ability to analyse how the theme is represented in both texts • Analyses the way in which language is used to portray the theme • Composes an effective argument with appropriate textual reference 	16–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the ability to identify and discuss how the theme is represented in both texts • Discusses ways in which language is used to portray the theme • Supports the discussion of the question with some appropriate textual reference 	11–15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies with some elaboration examples of the theme in both texts • Identifies some examples of the way in which language is used to convey the theme • Attempts to compose an argument with reference to the text 	6–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some ideas and information relevant to the theme in both texts • Demonstrates some ability to structure and sequence ideas 	1–5

Section II — Reading and Responding

Part B

Question 5

Outcomes assessed: H1.2, H2.1, H2.3, H2.4, H3.8

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the issues raised in the text • Responds with a sophisticated level of ability to the opinions, ideas and information in the text • Composes a coherent argument demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the text • Demonstrates a highly-developed understanding of context and audience • Demonstrates an excellent control of vocabulary and language structures 	13–15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies the main issues in the text • Responds lucidly to the opinions, ideas and information in the text • Composes an effective argument with close reference to the text • Writes effectively for the context and audience • Demonstrates an appropriate knowledge and understanding of language structures and vocabulary 	10–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchanges information in response to the opinions, ideas and information in the text • Writes coherently and with some appropriate textual reference • Relates information to context and audience • Writes using a range of language structures and vocabulary 	7–9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to some opinions, ideas and information in the text • Demonstrates a limited ability to structure and sequence information and ideas • Demonstrates an awareness of context and audience 	4–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the text • Shows some evidence of the ability to organise information 	1–3

Section III — Writing in Indonesian

Questions 6–8

Outcomes assessed: H2.1, H2.2, H2.3, H2.4, H4.2

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writes perceptively for a specified audience, context and purpose Demonstrates an excellent control of vocabulary and language structures Demonstrates a highly developed and sophisticated control of Indonesian vocabulary and syntax Demonstrates flair and originality in the selection, presentation and development of ideas 	21–25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writes effectively for an audience, context and purpose Demonstrates a well-developed command of Indonesian with a comprehensive range of vocabulary and syntax Demonstrates the ability to manipulate language Demonstrates originality in the selection and presentation of ideas 	16–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writes original and interesting text appropriate to audience, context and purpose Demonstrates a satisfactory command of Indonesian, with a sound base of vocabulary and syntax Demonstrates the ability to organise and express most ideas reasonably, but with a number of weaknesses in sequencing, linking and grammar 	11–15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates an awareness of audience and context using only a narrow range of information and ideas Uses a limited range of predictable vocabulary and language structures to express ideas Attempts to sequence and link ideas 	6–10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates a limited range of ideas with little attempt to organise and sequence material 	1–5