# Indonesian (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

## Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the previous year’s assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

# School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

Characteristics of better responses:

Interaction

* students understood topic of the interaction and were able to correctly and fluently speak with appropriate intonation
* students responded confidently and spontaneously throughout the interaction, rather than only responding to scripted questions
* students handled topic shifts and unpredictable elements throughout the interaction
* students spoke with confidence and enthusiasm, made eye contact, and used engaging visuals to successfully engage the audience

Text Production

* writing displayed good coherence and flow, cohesive devices and a natural, well-controlled variety of complex language

Text Analysis

* provided in-depth answers with direct reference to the text, including quoting from the text to justify and support responses
* provided in-depth analysis of linguistic and cultural elements of the text(s)

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

Interaction:

* difficulties or mispronunciation of simple words
* incorrect terms of address e.g. *kamu* when addressing the teacher
* incorrect intonation
* relied on the interlocutor to take the lead and maintain the conversation

Text Production

* displayed a poor grasp of word order
* confused nouns and verbs
* over-reliance and misuse of *adalah* and *yang*

Text Analysis

* displayed limited analysis, rather a basic comprehension of the text(s) only
* demonstrated little interpretation of meaning and/or reflection on the text
* displayed little cultural understanding and/or the connection between language and culture when analysing texts

Teachers need to ensure that the text(s) selected for the text analysis, and the corresponding questions, allow for deep thinking, elaboration and critical analysis of language and culture.

Teachers are encouraged to:

* reiterate with students the’ polite’ culture in written and spoken Indonesian, and the correct terms of address
* ensure students understand their spoken pieces of work to ensure correct intonation and fluency

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

All In-depth studies adhered to the themes of the Indonesian-speaking Communities or the Changing World. Topics included, but were not limited to: forms of entertainment, LGBT communities in Indonesia, the Jokowi presidency, and celebrations and ceremonies.

Characteristics of better responses:

* demonstrated a good command of the topic-specific language
* showed a variety of complex linguistic structures and cohesive devices
* conducted a thorough investigation into the chosen topic in line with the subject outline specifications
* used a variety of sources
* showed the depth of knowledge gained by outlining and elaborating on a range of ideas and opinions
* demonstrated insight through making connections with own learning when writing the reflection in English

Characteristics of weaker responses:

* demonstrated disinterest when presenting information orally
* demonstrated a limited understanding of the vocabulary related to the chosen topic, thus relied on dictionary translation and word order derived from English
* produced a recount of the experience of research in the English reflection rather than a critical personal reflection of learning

Teachers are encouraged to provide:

* clear task design and task sheets specifying the context, purpose and audience, with references to specific features of the assessment design criteria by which the task will be assessed.

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Oral Examination

Section 1: Conversation

Generally students communicated information on familiar topics with varying degrees of accuracy and depth of treatment, and used language and terms of address appropriate for the formal situation.

Overall this was the stronger of the two sections

Students should be reminded that the examiners will not provide feedback on their performance at any stage during or after the oral examination.

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* demonstrated an ability to expand on ideas and justify opinions
* showed a good command and understanding of the language by responding to questions which were phrased differently than those listed on the SACE Board website
* reflected on interests and prior learning and made connections with future aspirations
* incorporated language to compare and contrast ideas
* conversed with the examiners in a natural way, adapting responses to different situations and responding to follow-up questions with ease

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* demonstrated a reliance on prepared answers and an inability to deviate from these particularly if the nuance of the question required slightly different information
* understood the main ideas of the question but misinterpreted the question word such as *siapa* or *mengapa* which reduced the relevancy of the response
* often resorted to ‘lists’ with repetitive structures. For example, “My mum’s name is … her age is … . My dad’s name is … his age is …“ etc.
* used a substantial number of anglicisms and English

Expression

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* used passive structures correctly
* demonstrated a range vocabulary and sentence structures with a high level of accuracy
* used a range of cohesive devices such as *terus terang,* *bisa dikatakan bahwa*, and *baik … maupun* etc*.*

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* used nouns as verbs e.g. *saya perjalanan* or made errors with the form of words such as *pengaruh* instead of *mempengaruhi*
* omitted or confused prepositions such as *di*, *ke* and *pada.*
* struggled with basic word order
* used direct English translations such as *pergi ke universitas*
* confused personal pronouns and used *Anda* instead of *saya*
* stated *maaf* only when further clarification was required, instead of asking for a question to be repeated

Section 2: Discussion

It was noted that students who chose a topic that related to their interests and/or future career pathway appeared to be more engaged and better prepared for this section. They were more passionate and could discuss their topic in depth.

Some of the more interesting topics chosen this year included:

* LGBT rights in Indonesia
* Wamena
* Indonesian education system
* Film industry
* Balinese street dogs
* Midwifery support in rural communities
* 10 New Balis project

Students are reminded to use the In-depth Study Outline for Oral Examination form to assist the examiners in directing the discussion to topics they have studied.

The majority of students did not bring in support objects to complement the discussion, but those who did, used them with good effect to support their explanation of aspects of their topic.   
  
Ideas

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* offered opinions and supported them with reference(s) to source(s)
* answered questions in depth and breadth using a variety of sentence structures
* provided opinions on what is being done or what could be done to improve a situation and/or predict what a situation may look like in the future

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* lacked depth and provided only brief overview statements at a superficial level
* repeated statements rather than expanding on ideas

Expression

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* showed a good understanding of topic-specific vocabulary
* used linking expressions and comparative language

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* regularly misused passive sentence structures
* omitted words, which impeded meaning
* used incorrect affixations i.e. confusing nouns with verbs

Interpretation and Reflection

Most students were able to reflect on which sources were useful, including interviews conducted with members of the Indonesian-speaking community.

As in previous years, topic choice needs to be considered carefully. Student with topics that were too broad or lacked a clear focus tended to struggle in this section to demonstrate the depth required to meet the higher grade bands of the performance standards.

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* explained, with detail, the usefulness of the source(s)
* detailed appropriate evidence to support arguments
* made contrasts and comparisons between countries/cultures/languages
* explained key learning(s) from a particular source
* reflected on what was surprising and/or new and how this affected learning

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* tended to stick to facts and did not give personal opinions
* stated where information could be found but did not give examples of sources
* lacked thoughtful reflection on language and culture

Written Examination

Section 1: Listening and Responding

# Text 1: Announcement in a shopping centre

Question 1

1. Most students were able to comprehend that the text type was an announcement, although the ambulance caused several to believe the announcement would be heard in a hospital.
2. This was one of the most successfully answered questions of the section, with the majority of students able to provide a range of details such as the colour and registration of the car and that the owner was asked to move it immediately as it was blocking the entrance for the ambulance.

# Text 2: Conversation between a student about to go on exchange and his host mother

While almost all students were able to identify that this was a conversation about an upcoming exchange, several students confused the locations, hearing Jakarta rather than Yogyakarta. Some students also misunderstood that Tom was in Indonesia and coming to Australia for an exchange.

Question 2

1. Most students were able to identify that this was a conversation for Tom to introduce himself, but few went further to say that it was also to make plans for his upcoming visit.
2. On the whole, students were able to identify the tone of the conversation and respond that yes, they thought Tom would enjoy the trip.

The more successful students were able to elaborate on this and give examples which included:

* using examples of his eagerness to agree to suggestions made as an indication that he was excited and likely to enjoy the experience;
* that Tom was keen to go surfing and liked warm weather;
* that he showed his excitement by already having had looked at photos of temples on the internet and was keen to visit them.

# Text 3: An advert for a transport service for women

Question 3

The majority of students were able to identify that this was a service for women. Most students were able to provide some reasons for this, but several misheard *mudah* as *murah* and wrote that the service was cheap instead of ‘easy to use’.

# Text 4: Phone banking

This was the least successfully answered question.

Question 4

A common error in this section was that the customer was requesting information about a product which cost 50 million rupiah. The number itself was often misunderstood, with a mixture of 5 million, 5 thousand and 50 thousand included in responses.

# Text 5: A conversation between two students about plans for the future

Question 5

1. Students successfully identified that the relationship between Jack and Siti was one of friendship, and most used the informal language of *kamu* and *aku* as reasons for this.

More successful students provided extra evidence such as:

* they were discussing their upcoming test and plans for the future so obviously were school friends;
* while they were friends, they couldn’t have been too close as they didn’t know each other’s plans for the future yet as close friends would.

1. There was a lot of detail in this text that could have been used by students to support their answers. Once again, some students confused location, writing that Jack and Siti were planning on going to study in Australia. Some students made the mistake of not focusing on the parents’ thoughts, as the question stated, and instead wrote of what the speakers themselves were interested in doing.

More successful students were able to compare and contrast Jack and Siti’s parents’ thoughts on their plans.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

Part A

Text 6 was a blog by an Australian about their experience with coffee culture in Semarang

Question 6

1. The most common response to this question about creating atmosphere was the ‘business’ of the café and that it was full of people in groups or on their own using free Wi-Fi. More successful students were able to identify that it was the writer’s appeal to the reader’s senses that created ‘atmosphere’ i.e. late at night, streets almost empty, air still humid but there was still a light shining from the coffee shop etc.
2. The majority of students could identify that the main difference was the amount of choice in coffee beans; however, once again, several mistook the setting, writing that the blogger was in Australia and the choice in Australia was greater than that in Semarang. The more successful responses identified that there were many coffee growing areas in Indonesia, each with its own flavour as an additional point of comparison.
3. This question was almost universally answered correctly, with students able to successfully compare the taste and aroma of the two coffees.

Text 7 was an article about a program which aims to facilitate students in different countries working together to educate each other about the importance of environmental conservation.

Question 7

1. Most students were able to identify reduction of plastic waste as an aim, but several confused the dot points that showed the program’s success as the aims.

Only one or two students correctly identified the use of the word *saling* (indication of a reciprocal action) in identifying that students were educating each other, not being educated by the program, about the importance of preserving the environment.

In trying to identify 3 aims, several students split ‘environmental conservation and reduction of plastic use’ into two separate aims. The most commonly omitted of the 3 aims was that for students to become leaders in their schools.

1. In this section, the word which created most confusion for students was *gelas*, which was misinterpreted as glass and not a cup/glass. This word order confusion resulted in several students writing glass and plastic bottles were banned instead of plastic bottles and cups were banned.

Most students identified the success of one of the schools in reducing plastic waste by 40% as evidence of success. The most commonly missed piece of evidence was that bottle refill stations had been established.

1. While almost all students were able to correctly translate the phrase *warga dunia* as ‘global citizen’ or similar, the more successful students were able to elaborate that in this context it referred to the opportunity for students to work on important projects with students from other countries to create a greater impact in their own and others’ communities now and for the future.

## Part B

The text required students to write a review of the event, Indonàle. Generally students were able to respond to this text in some capacity. Several students wrote of their experience at the festival but failed to address the question, which was to evaluate whether or not the event met its aims.

Coherence in structure and sequence

Most responses engaged the reader and kept the context in mind; however, the audience itself was not always clear. Some responses read more like blogs or journals due to the personal nature of the content and language used. A feature of this text type is a title. More successful responses had catchy titles which added to the interest of the reader, but many failed to include a title at all.

Depth of treatment of ideas, information, or opinions

In general, students were confident to discuss their experiences with music, food and dance, but the puppet theatre was only mentioned by a few. The depth of students’ responses was usually closely related to their relevance.

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* included additional information in terms of detail, ideas, and information, and this lent itself to engaging, and creating interest on the part of, the reader
* went beyond recounting experiences to evaluate the aims and suggest ideas for improvement in the future
* expanded on activities on offer, adding one or two more pieces of relevant information. For example, when discussing the food available at the festival, more successful responses provided actual examples of food and hinted at their tastiness or described whether they liked them or not.
* evaluated all items in the stimulus text that need addressing

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* repetitive and lacked depth of treatment
* copied large chunks from the stimulus text into their response

Capacity to convey information accurately and appropriately

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* utilised a range of cohesive devises to connect ideas
* used a variety of adjectives and grammatical structures to describe and evaluate experiences
* demonstrated correct use of the passive voice

Characteristics of weaker responses:

* used the first word found in the dictionary, which is always a noun (kb), for example, *Saya* *harapan* … for, ‘I hope …’
* accuracy of expression affected incorrect verb forms. Common errors included p*etunjukan* instead of *menunjukkan, lihat* instead of *kelihatan* and b*elajar* instead of *mengajar*
* translated directly from English , for example m*empunyai kesenangan* when trying to communicate ‘have fun’
* used ‘kurang bagus’ instead of ‘kurang pandai’ to indicate they were not particularly good at an activity
* made errors when attempting to use passive voice, especially when the use of *yang* was involved. For example *makanan yang saya mencoba/memasak,* and, *tarian yang saya menonton*.
* not able to show competence in basic word order
* confused *bahwa*/*yang*, *kami*/*kita*, *kapan*/*waktu*, and *kalau*/*apakah*

Section 3: Writing in Indonesian

Students had a choice of 3 questions. Only a small number of students chose Question 9 or Question 10. The majority of students chose Question 11.

**Question 9** required students to write an imaginative text which included the phrase, ‘Kalau … saya bawa!’

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* referred back to and used the phrase, ‘If only I had brought my …’ several times in their response
* introduced characters, sequenced events and expressed feelings to create suspense and engagement for the reader

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* demonstrated difficulty with cohesion and structure
* forcibly incorporated the target phrase and where it was incorporated, it was rarely the focus
* showed a limited range of expression - fiction demands a high level of expression

**Question 10** required students to write the opening text of a debate about whether or not teenagers are just concerned with themselves and their gadgets.

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* introduced themselves and other speakers on their team
* made it very clear if they were arguing for or against the topic
* produced complex answers that were cohesive and used a range of expression
* discussed the issue critically from more than one perspective, and could examine cause, effect, and suggest solutions, as well as give clear examples

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* made it unclear if they were arguing for or against the statement
* did not always include the language required for this text type

**Question 11** required students to write an email in which they gave advice to a friend on how to make friends in a new city and encourage them to get involved with local life.

*Characteristics of better responses:*

* included suggestions on both how to make new friends and ways for their friend to immerse themselves in culture
* personalised both the content and language used
* adhered to basic conventions, such as addressing the recipient and signing off
* made cultural comparisons and wrote about cultural adjustment and assimilation, such as comparing politeness of younger people towards their elders in Indonesia and Australia, social engagement, communicative classrooms and critical thinking etc.

*Characteristics of weaker responses:*

* offered suggestions of things to do without referring to making new friends
* relied heavily on rote expressions
* resorted to talking about hobbies and suggested just talking with people to make friends
* wrote about pre-rehearsed, familiar topics that had little relevance to the question
* lacked cohesion. For example, a new paragraph was inserted without attention to cohesion.

Common errors in language structure and vocabulary included:

* whilst verb phrases were generally used to good effect, -kan/-i presented an issue, particularly benefactive -kan
* ter-, peN-an, per-an, -an, ke-an, were rarely attempted
* there was overuse of some phrases including *baik … maupun* … which was used inconsistently with the chosen register within the form
* students commonly struggled with first/second person passive constructions
* appropriate word choice was a frequent issue indicating that students had limited capacity in dictionary use
* words/phrases/structures that were distinctively Malay should not be used.