



Part 1 – Reading and Responding

Question 1

- (a) Three parts to this answer required, i) ‘the public you’ *Anda*; ii) parents (deductively reasoned from ‘those accompanying children’); iii) Grandparents (same reasoning) – ‘those accompanying grandchildren’.
- (b) Four components to this answer: i) nutritional value; ii) fat; iii) carbohydrates; iv) salt. Some problems experienced translating *Nilai gizi* for non native speakers.
- (c) First edition (*pertama*)
- (d) Public favourites: donut, cake and pizza restaurants – two of the three words are exactly the same in English – no problems with this question
- (e) ‘increased knowledge about the nutritional value of favourite foods’ – is a word for word translation of the correct answer in the text.
- (f) Four pieces of information required for full marks. This required the candidate to differentiate from the previous question which used the words ‘gain’ (as distinct from ‘benefits’). Some of the English translations of the four points were less than effective.

Note: the word *panduan* in hindsight could have been generously included in a word list.

Question 2

- (a) *ratifikasi* from the English ‘ratify’ in the context of *iklim Kyoto* should have been enough to allude to its meaning. Some candidates however had no idea what a protocol was nor its link to Kyoto.
- (b) The newspaper was not ‘The Australian’ rather an unspecified Australian daily. (*sebuah harian...*).
- (c) Few candidates experienced difficulty with the translation of *permintaan maaf* given the context of *Rudd...aborigine...* (and) *...kulit putih Australia*.
- (d) Slightly harder to translate, but the central part of the answer word for word could be taken from the text (*...cerminan dari liputan media massa...*)
- (e) Large part of the answer (*bulan madu*) effectively contained in the word list.
- (f) The word list word, the English name (Brendon Nelson) and the figure (9%) all pointed squarely to the answer. Candidates who answered wrongly simply did not have sufficient text attack skills.

Question 3

- (a) The first part to this question was gifted in the title. The key word for the second part of this answer *swasta* should be known. *Swasta/umum* are high frequency opposite adjectives at the 5C level.

- (b) A possible word difficulty in the question and in the text. ('Trainee' being effectively synonymous for 'potential'. An answer of 'farming' or 'agriculture' was accepted.
- (c) The question is plural therefore requires all three parts in order to obtain the full mark. In hindsight this was a solid amount of information for just the single mark.
- (d) Does not specifically state. This is an inference question with a degree of deductive reasoning required to answer it. Where the company's HR was placed (Jakarta) and where its businesses operated (Sumatera and Kalimantan) are different places. Potentially a traineeships might be based in Jakarta because applicants had to be prepared to work anywhere in Indonesia. A candidate needed this line of answer to obtain full marks. Clearly a good question for top candidates only.
- (e) Knowledge of occupations and fields of study is required – level 3 coursework.
- (f) As in (e)
- (g) The word (answer) provided in English provided a soft one mark.

The topics were: Food and eating culture; Australia in the world/Australia internal affairs; The world of work in Indonesia – all in accordance with the syllabus and all well adapted for the level and the purpose (external exam). The word lists were balanced, poignant and helpful. The text types were suitably varied. The nature of the questions allowed true differentiation of levels of language expertise (PA – EA).

NOTE: Candidates for whom English is not their first language would benefit contextually from reading of a wider array of print/electronic media.

Part 2 – Writing in Indonesian

Thirteen from sixteen scripts displayed moderate to high levels of proficiency in standard formal Bahasa Indonesia. Two scripts were borderline and one reached a preliminary level of understanding.

Some candidates comfortably wrote more than the recommended word limit. Whilst they were not overly disadvantaged by doing so, no advantage in most cases was accrued because no greater language knowledge or variation was displayed. Some candidates (non-native speakers) 'dug deep' and systematically 'patched' an article, story or diary entry (journal) together. This showed determination and method. No marks were lost due to 'blockiness' of style if correct grammar was applied.

Question 6 was interesting inasmuch it asked candidates not for the standard letter response about locale, rather an email about opinion. In some ways the request could be construed as inconsistent given that, email produced by young people in the 21st C. is increasingly written in a *different code* (abbreviated form/ text language) and not in the standard formal. Whilst emails and letters are generally stylistically interchangeable for mature aged candidates, this is increasingly less the case for candidates under the age of twenty. In future, *email* in a writing question should not be seen as seamlessly interchangeable with the request for a *letter* on any given topic.

Some candidates took heed of the advice to master writing in the passive voice 1st/2nd and 3rd person. Those that applied these devices and even those who made genuine attempts but produced ‘performance errors’ were still rewarded. It is not and has never been the resolve of markers and the Chief Examiner to respond punitively to candidates scripts in all facets of the exam.

Part 3 – Listening and Responding

Again, an overwhelming number of candidates passed well. Clearly, aural competency in Indonesian was displayed. No doubt the experience and transferability of formal and informal Malaysian came into play in this part of the exam.

Question 9

Uniformly well handled. Malaysian should be made aware that the phrase ‘*petang*’ is not as commonly used (in this setting) in Bahasa Indonesia.

Question 10

A lengthy set of information which most candidates processed well in the requests a) through d). Fruits, weights, numbers, items and times in conversation provided few challenges.

Question 11

Announcements are usually noun dense and verb rich. This example was no exception This then requires a higher level of concentration, note taking and note making skills in the construction of the final compartmentalised answer given that announcements are monologues whose rate of delivery is generally quicker than that of conversation. Candidates should be exposed to and prepared for these presentations.

Candidates were offered five separate pieces of information of which four were requested. This represents an intelligent way of structuring the written response question. Most candidates responded quite successfully.

Question 12

In this case a minimum amount of information was required from the text, asking candidates to use different listening attack skills. The word ‘*lucu*’ in the announcement would have been better translated contextually by candidates as ‘cute’ not as ‘funny’.

Question 13

This conversation required note taking and note making in order that full answers could be provided in parts (b) and (c). The first part of the question (multiple choice) can be done simply by a process of elimination after careful listening to all three presentations rather than taking a 'stab' at the answer after the first reading.

The content focussed on culture and geography – two aspects of the course that many background speakers may have erroneously perceived as less than necessary.

Oral Examination

Background and area speakers have considerable advantage over their non-background speaker counterparts. However, this should not be construed as a reason not to practice and develop standard formal Bahasa Indonesia speaking and listening skills. Increasingly, Malaysian candidates cannot consistently differentiate or demonstrate the formal, the standard informal and colloquial Malaysian because in many cases Malaysian represents their third language of choice even though in many cases it has been the medium of instruction in schools during their formative years. As this is the case they are urged to pay special attention to and to practice, listen and respond to standard formal spoken Bahasa Indonesia at every possible opportunity in the course of the academic year.

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Tasmanian Qualifications Authority
PO Box 147, Sandy Bay 7006
Ph: (03) 6233 6364 Fax: (03) 6224 0175
Email: reception@tqa.tas.gov.au
Internet: <http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au>