

CONTENTS

<p>Group 1 Languages</p>
--

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN	2
Paper 0545/02 Reading and Directed Writing	2
Paper 0545/03 Speaking	3
Paper 0545/04 Continuous Writing	6

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INDONESIAN

Paper 0545/02

Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

The overall standard remains very high. As mentioned in previous years, where written answers are required, there is still a tendency for candidates to write at great length where short answers, and not necessarily full sentences, will do. Marks are likely not to be awarded where whole chunks of the original text have merely been copied as an answer. What is important is that a candidate can consistently show that he understands the question and can pinpoint the answer – (and not include lots of irrelevant material in that answer, leaving it to the Examiner to select and reward what is relevant).

Comments on specific questions

Section 1

Questions 1 - 6

These 6 multiple-choice questions caused few problems. Though one or two candidates did confuse left and right (there was a purse *di laci paling atas sebelah kanan*).

Questions 7 - 13

Candidates scored highly – they had to match a hobby to a description of that hobby.

Questions 14 - 20

These multiple choice questions required candidates to match people to one of three areas, they were either from Bali, Java or Minang, based on the brief cultural information given.

Question 21

Candidates had to write a brief postcard describing a short car journey to see a volcano. There were five pictures and indications beside each picture of what should be included in the narrative. For example, the last picture showed the volcano erupting and the two sightseers turning round and driving off, (one assumed fairly quickly to a safer place). Intriguingly, several candidates saw the eruption as merely interesting and no cause to leave in a hurry. Provided they conveyed the clear message of an eruption (*meletus* was best, though *meledak* was accepted) they still gained communication marks. A few candidates did not know the word for rice fields.

Many candidates wrote far too much. The rubric stated *Tulislah kira-kira 40 kata*. In **Section 1**, clear message is the key aim, not lengthy, stylistic writing.

Section 2

Questions 22 - 30

Candidates had to read a text about food in Indonesia and write short answers to questions. This was done well by most candidates. However, some saw this as more of a cultural quiz and gave answers based on their knowledge that were not in the text. For example: *Mengapa orang memilih makan di restoran?* was answered with: *Karena restoran bebas polusi* or *Kesehatannya lebih terjamin*. These answers were not marked as correct because not supported by any evidence in the text.

Question 31

Candidates had to write 80 to 100 words about a holiday which they enjoyed. Again, please note that word count is important as marks for accuracy are only given for the first 100 words (though candidates could still score for communication beyond this). Accuracy marks are awarded for correct spelling, use of time frames (*tiga tahun yang lalu, pada bulan Juni* etc) and in the use of structures, notably prefixes and suffixes. Spelling very rarely caused problems, occasionally *karna* for *karena* and, unusually, *taon* for *tahun* did surface. The use of slang was not an issue (apart from the use of *gimana* for *bagaimana*).

Candidates seemed to find it relatively easy to gain communication marks and many described holidays to Bali, some to Singapore or elsewhere and did explain why they enjoyed themselves.

Section 3

Questions 32 - 37

Questions involved a reader's letter to a magazine (concerning a problem) and a psychologist's answer. Each of the multiple-choice answers carried 2 marks. **Questions 35** and **36** caused difficulties, correct answers were **B** and **C**. There can be a fine difference in meaning here. In **36**, for example, the answer *tidak akan ada kemajuan dalam waktu yang singkat* is not the same as the psychologist's advice *jangan mengharapakan kemajuan yang luar biasa dalam waktu yang singkat*.

Questions 38 - 44

Few candidates scored the full 11 points in these questions about problems experienced by a visitor to Kintamani. Most candidates understood what had happened: that the visitor had been overcharged and a confrontation had almost ensued. However, the questions carrying 2 marks required fuller answers, usually explaining **why** something had happened. The answer given to **Question 42** (*mengapa si penulis berusaha membujuk tamunya supaya jangan marah?*) was often half correct, typically e.g. *karena penulis tidak mau kejadian yang tidak diinginkan* was fine for one mark. The full picture was explained by concern from the author that *beremosi tanda kalah*.

Questions 45 - 64

It is always intriguing to see how well many candidates handle this gap fill exercise which tests grammar, vocabulary and idiom. A tip is to read it through a second time after completion as a word filled in which might work within a phrase will affect the meaning later as one reads further. The text must make sense as a whole.

Paper 0545/03

Speaking

General comments

The overall standard remained very high. A significant number of candidates were of native or near native speaker ability and displayed local cultural knowledge e.g. of Indonesian food, the norms of politeness, and of local arts and entertainment. This in no way detracted from the achievements of candidates who were studying the language at a greater distance and who, either through travel or study, had acquired a good awareness of both Indonesian language and culture, and could, for example, call a waiter and order local kinds of food in a restaurant. The latter kind of candidate had the potential to score just as highly.

There were some concerns this year with exam administration. Where Centres had taken time over this, their efforts were much appreciated. New Examiners will find clear instructions in the A4 booklet 'Teachers' Notes' which contains all the role plays as well as the administrative arrangements and marking instructions. Moderation was difficult if, for example, cassettes were not labelled or candidates not introduced – with a name and number – as the exam began.

Comments on specific questions

Role plays

Role play A, cards 1, 2 and 3

Telephone call to hire a tent at a campsite

As with all role plays, the Examiner started the conversation, allowing for a check that the given situation had been understood. Phone calls inevitably began with a greeting and brief explanation for phoning. Examiners are reminded that if candidates, in their enthusiasm, include extra information, that will be required later, in an utterance, e.g. on this occasion saying when they were arriving **and** how many nights they wished to book within the first sentence, this information does not then need to be repeated and marks should be given. Utterances do not have to follow the exact order shown – though marking is easier if they do.

Some candidates experienced difficulty in spelling their name – *Katakan nama Anda dan ejalah nama Anda* – which was needed when making the booking. Problems were also caused, on occasion, by the need to complete two different tasks in one prompt, e.g. after giving and spelling their name, candidates then had to ask the price of a tent. If they forgot, a nudge in Indonesian was acceptable, e.g. *Ada sesuatu lain yang Anda ingin tanyakan?*

Role play A, cards 4, 5 and 6

Ordering a meal in a restaurant

Again, the Examiner initiated the conversation, playing the role of waiter/waitress. There were no obvious problems, though candidates did need to correct the waiter at one stage who 'forgot' to bring one course. Normally this was done assertively but politely. The range of foods ordered was intriguing, e.g. *Saya mau pesan medium sirloin steak dan spaghetti untuk teman saya*. The candidate was not marked down for using English in this context, but where Indonesian examples are readily available, candidates should be encouraged to use them. The Teachers' Notes booklet states that 'phrases from the candidate's first language should be avoided'.

Role play A, cards 7, 8 and 9

Buying a ticket at a railway station

The Examiner began the conversation and played the role of ticket seller. This role play was done well, the only occasional problem being that some candidates did not ask – or understand the instructions about asking – for a student discount. As discounts and bargaining are part of buying items this kind of vocabulary needs to be prepared.

Role play B, cards 1, 4 and 7

Candidate reports a stolen bag at the police station

The B role plays are intended to be slightly more challenging. Typically, in this situation, time, place (of theft), description (of bag and contents), and contact details (where the candidate was staying) were needed. A few candidates had problems imagining themselves into the role and giving, for example, the imaginary name and address of a hotel. These things simply needed to be made up.

Role play B, cards 2, 5 and 8

Telephoning an Indonesian friend to organise a visit

Again, this was a situation in which time, place and contact details were needed (namely, arrival of plane at airport, flight number and proposed meeting place). The practicalities needed to be visualised – a good example for a meeting point was *Saya tunggu di lantai satu di depan MacDonald*. Anything which was clear, unambiguous and communicated in good Indonesian worked well.

Role play B, cards 3, 6 and 9

Candidate phones landlord having lost keys to their flat

Again, the situation required the candidate to provide information on time and place (when and where keys were lost) and then suggest a meeting to obtain spare keys. The language of politeness was important here as candidates had to apologise for losing keys and offer to pay for a replacement. However, essential language was given in the instructions on the role play card: *Minta maaf sekali lagi dan katakan bahwa Anda akan memberi uang ganti-rugi kepada si pemilik*. Careful reading of the instructions made this relatively easy and most candidates managed well.

Topic (prepared) conversation

Examples of typical favourite topics were recent holidays – often abroad – and pastimes. As mentioned in the Teachers' Notes booklet, it clearly helps if candidates have a personal interest in the topic, as it brings the whole delivery alive and gives the candidate lots to talk about. One Centre in particular went for more ambitious kinds of topics dealing with social issues (e.g. from unemployment and poverty in Jakarta to urban pollution). These were impressive and suited to the ability level of these particular candidates but went beyond what is required at this level. While the topic should be appropriate to the candidate, all topics benefit from preparation. A candidate saying '*... terus kami ke New Zealand*' could easily have prepared by learning the Indonesian name of the country visited, and so on.

The Examiner's role is to extend the candidate by asking more probing questions (why? what do you think about? tell me more about ... etc.). On occasions, more able candidates were not sufficiently stretched in this way and did not use a 'wide range of mostly accurate structures, vocabulary and idiom'. One fluent sounding candidate kept repeating the word *bagus* to describe a country visited, the food and the landscape.

General (unprepared) conversation

This year, Centres managed the allocation of time well (with the Topic and General conversation sections lasting approximately 5 minutes each). Conversations were wide ranging, many covering issues to do with school and studies as well as family and home life. Some more unusual conversations mentioned the bomb attack in Bali, not in terms of precise factual information (which is not required) but on a more personal level. Questions were naturally adjusted to a candidate's ability – as happens in normal conversation. There were one or two examples of candidates reverting to English to ask for help or seek clarification, e.g. 'How do I say x in Indonesian?' to which Examiners cannot respond. The Examiner's role is defined in the Teachers' Notes booklet as being that of a 'well disposed native speaker with no knowledge of the candidate's first language'.

Exam administration: issues arising and suggestions

Issues with form MS1

Examiners are required to complete this in pencil to show candidates' final marks. In some cases these were not completed (or not sent), or total marks copied onto the MS1 were different from those on the Examiner's working mark sheet.

Suggestion: a colleague should be asked to check the figures – both that the marks on the working mark sheet have been added up correctly and that the totals have been correctly copied to the MS1 mark sheet. A tip: it is best (and helpful as part of the checking process) if candidates are examined in the same order as their names appear on the MS1 – which is candidate number order.

Issues with recording

Most Centres followed the instructions in the Teachers' Notes booklet and introduced recordings by stating Centre number and name, then exam number (0545) and name (IGCSE Foreign Language Indonesian), followed by name of Examiner, date and candidate details. Where candidate details were not given aloud on cassettes, it became very difficult to know who was speaking when. Examiners should also state 'no further recordings on this side' when they have finished recording on one side of the cassette.

Suggestion: Examiners should imagine themselves in the Moderator's situation and give as much information as possible – i.e. candidate number, name, role play card, as well as introducing the various parts of the exam as they occur. One Centre used the helpful formula '*dan sekarang kita beralih ke...*'. Examiners should also make a point of checking, not only before but after the exam, that the recording equipment is working. Cassettes with no sound do occur.

Issues with labelling

Some Centres took immense care over this – for which they are thanked by Moderators. Some cassettes, however, did not have candidate names and numbers written on them.

Suggestion: that the blue cassette labels (supplied by CIE) are completed before the exam begins as the running order is known in advance. Examiners should aim for two candidates per side of cassette rather than trying to cram three on a side of 45 minutes and overrunning. Examiners are requested to state whether candidates are on side A or side B.

<p>Paper 0545/04</p> <p>Continuous Writing</p>
--

General comments

The standard remains high. Most candidates are now writing within the word limit (140 words). This emphasises quality over quantity and requires candidates to deliver the message (of a letter or narrative) within a tighter framework. Although many candidates are of native speaker ability, others, for whom Indonesian is clearly a foreign language, also scored highly.

Common spelling errors (corrections are given in brackets):

- The most common errors seem to revolve around the letter 'h' e.g. *rumah saya jau (jauh), kami tidak tau (tahu), saya akan memberitauh (memberitahu), setiap taon (tahun), di sekola saya (sekolah), kami mahu (mau), saya tidak mambawah dompet (membawa, and which is sometimes confused with bahwa).*
- *Makan (makanan).* Examples: *kami pesan makan, makan saya enak*
- *Menelpon (menelepon)* Yet *telepon* is usually written correctly.
- *Kolam berenang (kolam renang)*
- *Kerena (karena)*
- *Bingung (binggung)*
- Finally, candidates should avoid the slangy ending 'in' e.g. *kami sering dimarahin*, often heard in speech and attached haphazardly to verbs.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates chose option **(a)** a letter to a penfriend about their school in preference to option **(b)** of writing a letter of complaint to a hotel.

It is important that a letter should look like a letter. There should be a recognised beginning and ending (though dates and fictional addresses are not necessary and are ignored in the mark scheme). Four marks are then awarded for communicating information for each of the four bullet points. Most candidates scored these fairly easily.

The risk in writing to a penfriend is to use slangy Indonesian or abbreviations common in emails or text messaging. 'Short cuts' such as: *kpd* (*dia tanya kpd pemilik restoran*), *dgn* (*saya punya janji dgn teman*) and *yg* (*orang yg saya kenal*) do not score. (These examples come from **Question 2**, but using a style carried over from the first question.) Candidates should not use words in English, unless unavoidable, e.g. the name of an overseas school, and need to be wary of using borrowed words, e.g. *guru favourite saya* is an awkward mix of languages, *guru chemistry* is more obviously wrong, *murid di sekolah ini sangat discipline* still does not work though if changed to *sangat berdisiplin* this would be fine. An intriguing and common complaint against some teachers was that they gave too much homework!

The letter to a hotel was perhaps more difficult as it required more formal language. The use of *kamu* did not score, e.g. *hotelmu kurang bersih*, as *Ands* is more appropriate. The reasons given for complaining were various and imaginative, though in nearly all cases the letters were polite (but assertive) and would have been taken seriously by a real hotel manager.

Question 2

This required candidates to describe how they got out of the situation of being about to pay in a restaurant, but discovering they (and a friend) had lost their money. Most candidates wrote that they phoned a friend and arranged for him or her to come and pay. In several cases, they had to leave a valuable object *sebagai jaminan* while one person left to get cash. Others had to wash dishes. Several candidates answered the question in the conditional form *bila masalah ini terjadi pada saya dan teman saya, maka saya akan menelepon ...* which gained a few additional marks for use of time markers and prepositions.

The communication marks are earned here for giving clear information as to what the writer did, for including reactions (and/or reasons) and for writing as a narrative. It must have a logical thread and an outcome. If candidates wrote too little they did not score as well as they might, if they wrote too much they risked describing an outcome beyond the cut off point of 140 words. A balance is needed.