2019 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

Interaction

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided spontaneous answers to questions as a result of effective task design
* handled topic shifts and unpredictable elements throughout the interaction with the appropriate use of interjections and clarification phrases
* spoke with confidence and enthusiasm, made eye contact and engaged the audience, particularly with the use of props
* included feedback sheets so the audience could evaluate their presentation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided spontaneous answers to questions as a result of effective task design
* misunderstood the meaning which led to incorrect intonation
* relied on the interlocutor to take the lead and maintain the conversation
* demonstrated a lack of accuracy of pronunciation and flow in their use of language and sentence structure
* provided responses that lacked depth.

Text Production

The more successful responses commonly:

* adhered to the correct text type
* engaged the audience by using appropriate tone/register
* used a wide range of cohesive devices to connect ideas, as well as a wide range of complex language including object-focus sentences
* used formal Indonesian language appropriate to the text type
* applied Indonesian grammar effectively, particularly in regards to word order, to produce a good cohesive flow within the text(s)

The less successful responses commonly:

* made basic spelling and grammatical errors highlighting a lack of proof-reading
* lacked a connection with their audience
* showed a confusion over which is the appropriate form of address — *Anda* or *Kamu*
* used colloquial Indonesian or Malay rather than language specified in the subject outline.

Text Analysis

The more successful responses commonly:

* made direct reference to the text to support their answers, including quoting from the text to justify arguments and opinions
* provided detailed responses to questions about tone, formality, inferred meaning, cultural nuances etc. within the text(s)
* covered all aspects of Interpretation and Reflection in their response.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked a connection between students’ own culture and beliefs and that of Indonesia and how to compare and contrast these within texts
* provided a limited analysis of text(s), instead demonstrating only a basic comprehension
* lacked examples from the text to justify their response.

Teachers are encouraged to:

Reiterate with students the polite culture in written and spoken Indonesian, and the correct terms of address, particularly in regards to *Anda* and *Kamu.*

Ensure students understand the meaning of their spoken pieces of work to ensure correct intonation and fluency.

Ensure that the text(s) selected for the text analysis, and the corresponding questions, allow for deep thinking, elaboration and critical analysis of Indonesian language and culture and the meaning behind the language used.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

The more successful responses commonly:

* involved an interesting/unique topic that held the students’ interest
* demonstrated a good command of the topic’s specific language
* conducted a thorough investigation using a wide range of sources
* ensured they engaged the audience by adhering to the specific text type and using the correct tone/register
* demonstrated insight through making direct connections with own learning when writing the reflection
* made direct reference to the texts studied when writing the reflection
* reflected on researched information and used this to justify and evaluate the effectiveness of their topic.

The less successful responses commonly:

* produced a simple recount when writing the reflection in English
* expressed disinterest in the topic when presenting information orally, and therefore disengaging the audience
* demonstrated a limited understanding of the vocabulary related to the chosen topic
* used a limited range of sources when studying their chosen topic
* did not refer to the texts studied in their reflection.

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.

Student samples submitted for moderation should include all pieces of work for all tasks in an assessment type.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Oral Examination

Section 1: Conversation

Once again, Section 1 was the stronger of the two sections for the majority of candidates. Examiners noted that most students’ general ability to handle questions was satisfactory and responses were generally relevant to the questions.

Students are encouraged to ask examiners in the target language for clarification if they are unsure of a question. However, it is not appropriate for students to ask the meaning of Indonesian words/phrases used by examiners or to ask for the Indonesian of a particular English word/ phrase they wish to use.

Malay speakers are reminded that Malay words are not relevant to the Indonesian (continuers) SACE curriculum and should not be used.

On the whole, students used language and terms of address appropriate for a formal situation.

Ideas

More successful responses commonly:

* recognised that questions asked are really a prompt for them to expand on their response by offering more information that is relevant to the question, thereby enabling examiners to ask tangential questions
* contributed to, and maintained, the conversation
* incorporated language to compare and contrast their ideas
* justified their opinions or thoughts
* provided responses that were consistently relevant to context, purpose and audience.

Less successful responses commonly:

* provided rote-learned responses to questions about themselves and then struggled when they had to deviate from their prepared script, even when questions were phrased exactly as written in the examples questions
* misidentified key words in questions and formulated responses around a misinterpretation of these key words
* required the examiner to rephrase simple questions or asked many follow up questions to try to get an appropriate level of detail in responses
* provided short rehearsed responses that did not contribute to maintaining the conversation
* listed information about themselves instead of focusing on unique or interesting parts of their life.

Expression

More successful responses commonly:

* drew on a few different communication strategies
* displayed control over a variety of language structures even in non-rehearsed responses
* demonstrated a range of cohesive devices to make their sentences flow well.

Less successful responses commonly:

* did not recognise when their sentences needed an object focus construction
* mispronounced words similar to English (e.g. tradisional, biologi, oksigen)
* used formulaic expressions and often struggled when language conventions differed from these
* used adalah as a substitute for the English ‘is’
* omitted or confused prepositions such as ‘di’ , ‘ke’ and ‘pada’
* used an incorrect word order consistently, which impeded meaning. For example; ada tidak, sekali menarik, saya guru
* over used ‘tolong diulangi’.

Discussion

Examiners noted that this year a high number of students found it difficult to cope with the Discussion. In many cases, there was a marked discrepancy between a students’ performance in the Conversation and their performance in the Discussion. Examiners noted that the majority of students were under-prepared for this section and could only give evidence of a very superficial study of their topic.

There was a pleasing variety of new, current and interesting topics this year. These included:

* the issue of plastic disposal
* Jakarta sinking
* the importance of raising teaching standards in Indonesia
* women artists
* LQBTQ community in Indonesia
* skin whitening products
* fake news in Indonesia.

Teachers are advised to help students to prepare effective outline sheets for the in-depth study. Points such as ‘*Why I chose this topic’* and ‘*Resources used’* don’t help examiners to frame appropriate questions and allow students to do their best. Appropriate points can also help students to channel the discussion in their preferred direction.

There was limited use of support objects such as maps, charts, photos. Students who did bring a support object were able to use these well to direct the conversation towards topics they were comfortable with.

Ideas

More successful responses commonly:

* conveyed information effectively as they had developed a wide-ranging bank of key vocabulary
* talked about the issue from a variety of perspectives, including their own
* drew upon examples and statistics to support their ideas
* supported and justified opinions with complex ideas.

Less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to expand on or address the points contained on the outline sheet
* were unable to explain what they had learnt beyond brief overview statements
* showed a lack of evidence of learning beyond general knowledge on the topic and could not support ideas with evidence or examples.

Expression

More successful responses commonly:

* could draw from a large broad vocabulary base due to exposure to a variety of language over the course of their In-depth study
* used linking expressions and comparative language.

Less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to formulate relevant answers when questions deviated from what students had expected or had practiced
* used the question, including the question word, in their response
* used an incorrect word order
* omitted words which impeded overall meaning of the sentence.

Interpretation and reflection

More successful responses commonly:

* could show evidence of IR1 –Interpretation of meaning in texts and IR3 – reflection on their topic
* were prepared to respond to questions which were intended to illicit responses which show reflection and interpretation
* were able to draw upon example and statistics to support their ideas
* were able to talk about their sources, give examples of what they learnt from them and which was the most useful rather than merely just listing them
* were able to reflect on how what they had learnt, surprised or affected them.

Less successful responses commonly:

* were unable to refer to any Indonesian sources that they used to research their topic
* could say where they found information but could not give examples of sources
* lacked thoughtful reflection.

Written Examination

Section 1: Listening and Responding

Text 1: A speech welcoming scholarship students

Question 1

1. Very few students were able to identify the text type as a speech.
2. Most students were able to identify that the aims were to become more fluent in Indonesian and make new friends. More successful students also were able to pick up that they hope they will become ambassadors for the importance of studying Indonesian in their own countries.

Text 2: Advertisement for a traffic app

Question 2

1. The majority of students were able to identify that this was an app for showing how to avoid traffic.
2. While most students could identify the use of rhetorical questions, few were able to go beyond this to identify other techniques such as speaking directly to the audience – use of kamu (informal ‘you’), appealing to emotions (frustrasi), encouragement – jangan terjebat macet lagi. Downloadlah…

Text 3: A speech announcing a competition

Question 3

1. Very few students identified that the occasion was the Hari Ulang Tahun (birthday) of the company.
2. It was interesting that while many students had the correct answers to this question in their notes section, these were not transcribed correctly into the answer. More successful students were able to identify that there was both money and chocolate for first and second prizes and could specify the amounts.

Text 4: A conversation about Halal tourism

Question 4

1. Most students could successfully identify the features of Halal tourism.
2. Students were generally able to identify that one of the reasons the Ani concludes that Indonesia is the perfect place for Halal tourism is that it has a majority Muslim population. More successful responses elaborated with details of the number of mosques and the ready availability of halal food.

Text 5: A conversation about food delivery

Question 5

1. Students successfully identified the service offered.
2. Students generally identified that the restaurant had run out of chocolate martabak but only the more successful responses identified the second issue of road works on the delivery route.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

Part A

Text 6: A blog about the Chicken Church

Question 6

1. The majority of students could identify that the text was informal and cited the informal personal pronoun use ‘aku’ as a reason. After this, many students struggled to identify further evidence such as Ya, aku harus mengakui – yes I will admit it and Seperti sudah kalian tahu – as you know.
2. Most candidates were able to recognise that Gereja Ayam was not an appropriate name for the building and could justify why – it is not a chicken but shaped like a dove to represent peace; it is not a church but a place for people of all religions to worship.

Text 7: An article about The International Year of Languages

Question 7

1. The majority of students could identify the event and its intended aim.
2. Students were generally able to identify that there were 719 languages spoken in Indonesia and that almost all Indonesians speak 2 languages. Only the more successful students could identify that only 10% of Indonesians spoke Indonesian as their first language.
3. This question required students to show how both texts reflected the values of Unity in Diversity. In general students were more successful at using evidence from Text 6 to support this than Text 7. Students needed to pick up on themes such as people having different beliefs can all worship in one place; the importance of maintaining local languages and valuing all languages; Indonesia not belonging to one group, one religion, or one set of customs, but to all Indonesians.

Part B

Question 8

The text required students to write a letter to the editor in response to a newspaper article about Indonesians working as domestic help in Singapore. Generally, students were able to respond to this text in some capacity providing information with a high degree of relevance to the stimulus text. It is recommended that students take clear note of the requirements of the task, and then take a few minutes to plan their response in order to ensure that all elements of the task are addressed.

More successful responses commonly:

* included additional supporting details or examples by way of elaboration on important components of the response
* included interesting and relevant content which helped to engage the reader
* responded in a positive way and provided evidence of their experience
* adhered to the conventions of the text type
* made reference to some of the issues identified in the text and were able to elaborate with examples of ‘personal’ experience.

Less successful responses commonly:

* needed to address more aspects of the stimulus text to enable them to provide sufficient depth and breadth in their response
* used incorrect conventions of the text type starting with ‘Hai …’ or ‘Halo …’, which were far too informal instead of ‘Redaktur yang terhormat’ or something similar
* failed to include an appropriate closing
* used ‘kamu’ to address the Editor of a newspaper and ‘aku’ to refer to themselves
* used ‘ke’ before a verb throughout
* showed incorrect dictionary use and could not distinguish between nouns and verbs (e.g., ‘pekerjaan’ and ‘bekerja’), adjectives and verbs that can function as adjectives (e.g., ‘lelah’ and ‘melelahkan’), and nouns and adjectives (‘macam’ or ‘baik hati’ for ‘kind’).

Section 3: Writing in Indonesian

Students had a choice of 3 questions. While Questions 9 and 10 were the most commonly chosen, markers noted a broader spread than in previous years.

Markers noted that in all questions an overreliance on dictionaries was evident in less successful responses. This resulted in students choosing incorrect constructions, presumably picking the first option offered in the dictionary without investigating whether the sentence required a noun or a verb form. Some students were unable to adhere to basic conventions of word order, literally translating word for word from English conventions.

Question 9: Letter to village head requesting permission to stay in the village

In order to produce an appropriate response, candidates needed to use formal language.

More successful responses commonly:

* effectively used appropriate conventions to address a person of high status in a letter and used culturally appropriate pronouns
* included a justified explanation of why they wished to stay in the village
* wrote in future tense and first person
* used persuasive language.

Less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth of ideas
* used informal language that was inappropriate to the context.

Question 10: Email to a friend to suggest auditioning for a reality TV show

More successful responses commonly:

* included persuasive reasons to encourage their friend to join them
* used encouraging language and phrases
* used appropriate register (more familiar and informal language), emphatic particles, and culturally appropriate phrases (salam buat keluargamu etc).

Less successful responses commonly:

* expressed simple ideas
* used simple sentences often with incorrect word choice and word order issues
* showed limited ability to use cohesive devices.

Question 11: A speech opposing the development of a mall on the site of a local market

More successful responses commonly:

* applied correct text type conventions (script for a speech)
* were able to convey appropriate levels of formality and develop their arguments assertively but respectfully
* made reference to why replacing the local market with a shopping centre is a good/bad idea and provide specific examples.

Less successful responses commonly:

* wrote in basic, single sentence ideas
* misinterpreted the text type or did not adhere to conventions.