

# Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages

Volume 28



National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages

**Danko Šipka, Editor**  
**Antonia Schleicher, Managing Editor**  
**Charles Schleicher, Copy Editor**  
**Olutayo Ajayi, Production Editor**

Please address inquiries concerning advertising, subscription, and  
issues to the NCOLCTL Secretariat at the following address:

**National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages**  
**601 S Woodscrest Dr. Bloomington, IN 47401**

Copyright © 2020, National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages  
(NCOLCTL)

The Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages, published annually by the Council, is dedicated to the issues and concerns related to the teaching and learning of Less Commonly Taught Languages. The Journal primarily seeks to address the interests of language teachers, administrators, and researchers. Articles that describe innovative and successful teaching methods that are relevant to the concerns or problems of the profession, or that report educational research or experimentation in Less Commonly Taught Languages are welcome. Papers presented at the Council's annual conference will be considered for publication, but additional manuscripts from members of the profession are also welcome.

Besides the Journal Editor, the process of selecting material for publication is overseen by the Advisory Editorial Board, which consists of the foremost scholars, advocates, and practitioners of LCTL pedagogy. The members of the Board represent diverse linguistic and geographical categories, as well as the academic, government, and business sectors.

### **JNCOLCTL Advisory Editorial Board**

**Elizabeth M. Bergman**

*Miami University of Ohio, Arabic*

**Richard Brecht**

*American Council for International Education, Russian and Language  
Advocacy*

**Stephane Charitos**

*Columbia University, Language Technology,  
Greek*

**Victor Friedman**

*University of Chicago, Balkans and Caucasus  
Languages*

**Michael Hillmann**

*University of Texas-Austin, Farsi, Tajik*

**Scott McGinnis**

*Defense Language Institute, Washington DC,  
Chinese*

**Rajandra Singh**

*University de Montreal, South Asian languages, Theoretical Approaches*

The Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages is a refereed publication. The editors invite submissions of articles, book reviews, and advertisements for future volumes. To be considered for publication, manuscripts should be typed, double spaced, with margins of at least one and one-half inches. Articles should include a 150-word abstract and should be about 20 typewritten pages. All references and notes should follow the latest edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA)  
See <http://www.apastyle.org/manual/index.aspx>

### Manuscripts should be:

- A maximum of 20 pages (excluding references, charts, notes, etc.) and submitted electronically as a Word-document via e-mail attachment.
- Double-line spaced throughout, including notes, references, and tables, using 12-point **Garamond** font with an inch left margin. (*Please ensure that this specified formatting is followed*).
- Accompanied by a 150 word (or less) abstract and a cover sheet containing the manuscript title, name, address, office and home telephone numbers, fax number, email address, and full names and institutions of each author. (*Because the manuscript will be blind reviewed, identifying information should be on the cover sheet only, and not appear in the manuscript*).

All manuscripts should be electronically submitted via email to the Editor at: [Ebru.Turker@asu.edu](mailto:Ebru.Turker@asu.edu) and copied to the Secretariat at: [secretariat@ncolctl.org](mailto:secretariat@ncolctl.org).

Subscriptions and address changes to the journal should be sent to

*Dr. Antonia Schleicher*  
*National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*  
*601 S Woodcrest Dr, Bloomington, IN 47401.*

### Subscription Rates:

1 Year	Individual	U.S. \$60
1 Year	Institutional	U.S. \$200

**Journal of the National  
Council of Less Commonly  
Taught Languages**

Volume 28

**Table of Contents**

<i>Editor's Introduction</i> Danko Sipka	ix
Bruna Sommer-Farias, Ana Carvalho, Adriana Picoral <i>Portuguese Language Program Evaluation: Implementation, Results and Follow-up Strategies</i>	1
Edvan P. Brito, Rachel Mamiya Hernandez <i>Perspectives on Reduced Forms Instruction in Portuguese</i>	51
Ellen Rafferty, Erlin Barnard, Juliana Wijaya <i>Developing Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines</i>	81
Hezi Brosh <i>The Arabic Writing System: Understanding the Challenges Facing Students and Teachers</i>	118

## Authors' Contact Information

1. Bruna Sommer-Farias, Ana Carvalho, Adriana Picoral *Portuguese Language Program Evaluation: Implementation, Results and Follow-up Strategies –*  
[brunasommer@email.arizona.edu](mailto:brunasommer@email.arizona.edu);  
[anac@email.arizona.edu](mailto:anac@email.arizona.edu); [adrianaps@email.arizona.edu](mailto:adrianaps@email.arizona.edu)
2. Edvan P. Brito, Rachel Mamiya Hernandez *Perspectives on Reduced Forms Instruction in Portuguese -*  
[brito@uark.edu](mailto:brito@uark.edu); [rmamiya@hawaii.edu](mailto:rmamiya@hawaii.edu)
3. Ellen Rafferty, Erlin Barnard, Juliana Wijaya *Developing Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines -*  
[emraffer@wisc.edu](mailto:emraffer@wisc.edu)
4. Hezi Brosh *The Arabic Writing System: Understanding the Challenges Facing Students and Teachers -*  
[brosh@usna.edu](mailto:brosh@usna.edu)

## National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOLCTL)

NCOLCTL is an organization dedicated to the teaching and learning of Less Commonly Taught Languages. Membership is open to individuals and organizations that share this interest.

---

### NCOLCTL Homepage

<http://www.ncolctl.org>

---

### NCOLCTL Officers

President: An Chung Cheng, *University of Toledo*

Vice-President: Luis Gonçalves, *Princeton University*

Secretary/Treasurer: Susan Schmidt, *University of Colorado*

Executive Director: Antonia Schleicher, *Indiana University*

Executive Board:

Patrica Sabarwal - Member-at-Large

*University of Kansas*

Hye Young Shin – Member-at-Large

*American University*

David Bong - Member-at-Large

*CEO Avant Assessment*

---

### NCOLCTL Mission Statement

NCOLCTL's mission is to increase the number of Americans who choose to learn one or more of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) as a means of enhancing cross-cultural communication among citizens of the United States. NCOLCTL's work focuses on the less commonly taught languages which are becoming increasingly vital to the economic, social and political welfare of the United States. Furthermore, NCOLCTL seeks to improve the teaching and learning of these languages and to make them more generally available. We are the national voice for organizations and individuals who represent the teaching of these less commonly taught languages.

Both the collegiate and precollegiate level. NCOLCTL also promotes the use of technology, especially computers and the Internet, to enable a new era in cross-cultural understanding, communication, and language education.

NCOLCTL constitutes a national mechanism devoted to strengthening the less commonly taught language professions through enabling NCOLCTL members to work toward “shared solutions to common problems.” NCOLCTL principally directs its efforts toward building a national architecture for the LCTL field and in making the field’s resources easily accessible to language programs and individual learners around the United States.

### **Activities of NCOLCTL**

Since its establishment in 1990, the NCOLCTL has carried out a variety of activities to raise awareness about the importance of less commonly taught languages. NCOLCTL achieves its goals through the following activities:

- Annual Conference in conjunction with Delegate Assembly
- Conducting research to promote and facilitate the learning and teaching of the LCTLs
- Planning for and establishing a national policy for building the national capacity for the study of the LCTLs
- Enhancing the capacity of existing LCTL national associations, and organizing new ones
- Establishing a system for networking and communication among member organizations, and facilitating their collective efforts to solve problems in the LCTL field
- Developing language learning frameworks to guide teacher training, curriculum design, materials development, and seek ways to address problems of articulation among different levels of the American educational system
- Working, on behalf of the members, with government agencies, foundations, and the general foreign language community on policy issues and to seek funding to establish effective standards for the less commonly taught language field
- Fostering national and international linkages within and across the various language areas

- Online Teaching Courses designed primarily for new instructors of LCTLs at postsecondary level and a useful resource for experienced instructors.
- 

### **Becoming a member of NCOLCTL**

Both individual and organizational Membership Application forms for the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages are available online at:

<http://www.ncolctl.org/membership>



## Editor's Introduction

Danko Šipka  
Arizona State University

The spring 2020 issue features eight papers and one review article, representing various topics of interest to the entire NCOLCTL community and various languages in the field, and it comes in two volumes. In this volume, the first two papers discuss Portuguese, with far-reaching conclusions about program evaluation (*Portuguese Language Program Evaluation: Implementation, Results and Follow-up Strategies*) and reduced forms (*Perspectives on Reduced Forms Instruction in Portuguese*). The paper titled *Developing Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines* addresses the question of standards, which is increasingly of interest to all LCTLs. The issues of teaching writing systems are discussed in the final paper, titled *The Arabic Writing System: Understanding the Challenges Facing Students and Teachers*.



# **Developing Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines**

**Ellen Rafferty**

*University of Wisconsin-Madison*

**Erlin Barnard**

*University of Wisconsin-Madison*

**Juliana Wijaya**

*University of California, Los Angeles*

## **Abstract**

This paper reports the results of a national project to develop Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines, describes the modified oral proficiency interview rubric used to gather the language data, and describes the characteristics of novice, intermediate, advanced, and superior level speech samples. The paper concludes with comments on the pedagogical significance of the project's findings and includes an appendix of the Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines that emerged from this project.

## Introduction

This paper reports on the methods, procedures, and results of a project to define language-specific descriptors of Indonesian oral proficiency levels from novice to superior. The Indonesian OPG project<sup>1</sup>, which occurred from 2008-2010, was jointly sponsored by the national organization, *Consortium for the Teaching of Indonesian (COTI)*<sup>2</sup>, its member institutions, and the host institution, the University of Wisconsin- Madison. The primary objective of the project was to write descriptors for oral proficiency levels based on interview data collected from students studying Indonesian in the U.S. The *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)* 2012 generic descriptions of oral proficiency levels were the basis for rating proficiency levels of collected language samples. A secondary objective of the project was to refresh the understanding of the ACTFL rating terminology among Indonesian language teaching community and in so doing to standardize the oral proficiency assessment procedure in the U.S. The OPG thus would provide a national standard, making the placement of students who move from one program to another more reliable. Finally, this evidence-based project yielded a detailed description of the language features that characterize each of

---

<sup>1</sup> Funding for this project came primarily from the U.S. Department of Education funded National Resource Center at UW-Madison, WI.

<sup>2</sup> COTI, which was established in 1976, is a national organization that promotes the field of Indonesian language teaching, with interests in the development of programs, materials, and assessment tools. Member institutions include Arizona State University; Cornell University; John Hopkins University; Northern Illinois University; Ohio University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Hawai'i; University of Michigan; University of Washington; University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Yale University.

the proficiency levels and stimulated discussion of curricular needs and pedagogical principles among the COTI members.

## Literature Review

In the early 1980s, the *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages* (ACTFL) and the *Education Testing Service* (ETS) created an assessment tool for measuring language proficiency based on the *Interagency Language Roundtable* skill level definitions (ILR scale) which were developed in the 1950s by the *Foreign Service Institute* (FSI). The ACTFL proficiency scale expanded the 0 to 3 levels of the 5 point ILR scale because the 0-3 levels were the most relevant in the academic setting.<sup>3</sup> The ACTFL generic Oral Proficiency Guidelines (OPG) were first published in 1982 and have been revised in 1986, 1999, and 2012 in response to studies of language-specific guidelines that suggested that the original guidelines were too Eurocentric. Critiques of the ACTFL OPG also included discussions of validity, reliability, circularity, and inter-rater reliability<sup>4</sup>.

In reaction to some of these criticisms, the U.S. Department of Education funded a number of projects to develop language-specific guidelines for non-European languages such as Russian, Hindi, and Arabic, broadening the database on which the ACTFL generic oral proficiency guidelines (OPG) were built. Some of the specific points that were troubling included the roles and timing of some of the oral proficiency level descriptors such as the acquisition of grammatical features (e.g., tense and gender) and the

---

<sup>3</sup> ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Guidelines. *ERIC Digest*  
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED347852.pdf> Accessed January 8, 2015.

<sup>4</sup> Liskin-Gasparro, Judith, 2003, The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and the Oral Proficiency Interview: A brief history and analysis of their survival, In: *Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 36, no 4, pp 484-486.

acquisition of cultural appropriateness. Thompson and Johnson (1988:1) point out that, "The two most obvious problems are: 1) a bias toward grammatical categories of western European languages, such as tense and gender; and 2) the concern that learners would require much time to master the principles and mechanics of non-Roman writing systems." Thompson and Johnson (1988:2) further state that, "theoretical problems in adapting the generic guidelines to a particular language include complex morphologies in Russian, diglossia in Arabic, and the presence of Hindi-English code-switching at high levels of proficiency among educated, native Hindi speakers." Another critique has been that proficiency assessments over-emphasize grammatical accuracy and appropriateness of vocabulary over features such as fluency, discourse structure, and sociolinguistic competence (Liskin-Gasparro 2003:486). As will become clear in the descriptions below the acquisition of proficiency in Indonesian relies on the acquisition of socio-pragmatic rules that govern the use of registers, appropriate pronominal choices, and discourse structures.

Many of the above-mentioned critiques have been addressed by federally-funded projects for the development of language-specific guidelines for the well-enrolled LCTLs such as Russian, Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese<sup>5</sup>. The languages with lower enrollments (i.e. the least-commonly-taught languages such as Thai, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Indonesian) have received less funding to investigate the process of acquisition of proficiency<sup>6</sup>, and it is this lacuna that the

---

5

<sup>65</sup> ACTFL. (1987). Chinese Proficiency Guidelines. "Foreign Language Annals," 20, issue 5, 471-487; ACTFL. (1987). Japanese Proficiency Guidelines. "Foreign Language Annals," 20, issue 6, 589-603; ACTFL.

Indonesian project hopes to address. COTI embraced this project to develop language-specific oral proficiency descriptors as a means of moving toward a more communicative approach that emphasizes language competencies. The creation of oral proficiency guidelines is intended to support a national shift from a grammar-translation approach to a communicative approach.

### Procedure

The project to develop language-specific oral proficiency guidelines for Indonesian was initiated by COTI and the host university in order to develop guidelines based on data obtained from students of Indonesian across the United States. The project consisted of two annual workshops with interview data collection and rating of the interviews in the intervening year. The first workshop which was in the spring of 2008 offered training to Indonesian language instructors<sup>7</sup> on the use of the rubric used for the modified OP interview and the rating of the interview data. The rubric consisted of two parts: first, the OP interview; second, a presentation based on either an illustration or an article given to the interviewee. Each interview was transcribed and then rated by the interviewer and one additional instructor. The raters noted the global

---

(1988). Russian Proficiency Guidelines. "Foreign Language Annals," 21, issue 2, 177-197; ACTFL. (1989). Arabic Proficiency Guidelines. "Foreign Language Annals," 22, issue 4, 373-392; ACTFL. (1990). Hindi Proficiency Guidelines. "Foreign Language Annals," 23, issue 3, 235-252.

<sup>6</sup> There is significant federal support from the U.S. Department of Education to the National Resource Centers (NRC) that focus on the field of Southeast Asia Studies, but this support is primarily allocated for language teacher salaries not for language research or materials development.

<sup>7</sup> The teachers doing the interviewing and rating were members of the national organization, *Consortium for the Teaching of Indonesian (COTI)*.

tasks/functions, context, content/topics, accuracy, and text type. A few short quotes from each interview were noted to substantiate the rating. Prior to the second workshop, interviews with inter-rater discrepancies were reviewed and a third rating was obtained. The objective of the second workshop was to discuss the results of the ratings, resolve any inter-rater discrepancies, and write the descriptors of the proficiency levels based on the data collected. The descriptors for all the levels of proficiency were written and supported by short quotes from the interviews to exemplify the language characteristics of each level.

### **Participants**

Instructors at the COTI member institutions were invited to participate in this project as interviewers and raters of the data, and students of these instructors made up the pool of interviewees. COTI members who volunteered to participate in the project attended the two workshops in May 2008 and May 2009. Of the fifteen Indonesian language instructors in the U.S., eleven agreed to serve for two years on the Indonesian OPG committee to do the interviews, rate audio files, and write the language specific descriptors for the proficiency levels (novice through superior).<sup>8</sup> All of the eleven language instructors are experienced teachers of Indonesian and are familiar with the ACTFL/ILR guidelines and oral proficiency interview procedures.

---

<sup>8</sup> The eleven member OPG committee included Erlin Barnard, Amelia Liwe, Jolanda Pandin, Ellen Rafferty, Desiani Pauli Sandjaja, Margaretha Sudarsih, Indiyu Sukmono, Peter Suwarno, Melisa Tjong, Juliana Wijaya, and Elisabeth Arti Wulandari.



## Results

Twenty-seven interviews were collected within the one-year period; 22 of these were determined to be ratable and were sent out to be rated. The unratable interviews were not included in the analysis; most were not ratable because the stipulated procedure of this project was not followed and/or because of technical problems, e.g., unclear audio, cut offs in recordings, or too much background noise.

Table one below describes the breakdown of the ratings and the number of interviews at each level from novice to superior.

*Table 1: Oral Proficiency Levels and Number of Interviews*

<b>Ratings</b>	<b>Number of interviews</b>
Novice low	0
Novice mid	2
Novice high	1
Intermediate low	2
Intermediate mid	5
Intermediate high	2
Advanced	5
Advanced high	1
Superior	4
<b>Total interviews</b>	<b>22 interviews</b>

Note that no interview is rated at the novice low level and only one at the levels of novice-high and advanced-high. The lack of any novice high samples is largely due to the fact the acquisition of Indonesian at the beginning level proceeds quickly; students gain the ability to communicate simple ideas using formulaic expressions, simple phrases, and sentences quite rapidly. If an instructor does not conduct an interview early in the first semester, there will likely be no novice-low speakers available. As noted above, the advanced category was divided into two sub-levels (advanced and advanced-high) rather than three (low, mid, and high) because most raters were more familiar with this earlier formulation of the ACTFL oral proficiency guidelines.

## **Discussion**

The descriptions of each proficiency level resemble the ACTFL generic guidelines but also offer a number of Indonesian-specific characteristics that enhance our understanding of the process of acquiring Indonesian proficiency as evidenced by the interview data collected. The results of the OPG project have been beneficial to the field of Indonesian language teaching by offering U.S.-based programs a nationally agreed upon standard for oral proficiency assessment and facilitating placement in domestic and abroad programs. The Indonesian summer language program at the South East Asian Studies Summer Institute (SEASSI) and the Indonesian Flagship program have incorporated oral proficiency goals and “Can Do” statements into their syllabi in an effort to inform students of realistic expectations and to encourage student self-assessment. See the appendix of this article for the Indonesian oral proficiency guidelines that were

developed by this project, including sublevel descriptions. It should be noted that the authors realize that database for the current guidelines is limited and that COTI is currently collecting additional OPI interviews to supplement and expand on the number of ratable interviews<sup>9</sup>. Additional interviews are particularly important to collect for the following proficiency levels: Novice Low, Novice Mid, Novice High, Intermediate High, and Advanced High, where the COTI database only has 2 or fewer interviews on which to develop the description of the level. Thus, this report is presenting these guidelines as an initial yardstick on which scholars in the field can build.

The **Novice level** speaker as defined in the 2012 ACTFL generic guidelines is able to communicate in a reactive manner using words and phrases in response to contextualized, concrete questions about everyday events. The Indonesian novice-mid speaker is able to create communicative utterances using words and phrases. See the following novice-mid utterances describing a city scene that are communicative despite grammatical errors. *Ini kota ramai.* ‘City this is busy.’ *Mobil tidak bagus.* ‘Car is not good.’ *Ini ada jalan.* ‘Here is a street.’ *Dia teman banyak.* ‘He has many friends.’ *Banyak orang-orang.* ‘There are many people.’

---

<sup>9</sup> The *Southeast Asian Language Council (SEALC)* with funding from a Henry Luce Foundation grant is sponsoring an Oral Proficiency Guidelines (OPG) project for five Southeast Asian languages (Indonesian, Filipino, Thai, Vietnamese, and Burmese). A 4-day ACTFL OPI training workshop occurred at UW-Madison in December 2019 and the development of the OPGs are projected to be completed by early 2021.

Common errors of the novice speaker include incorrect word order, pronunciation influenced by English, and incorrect recycling of question words in the answer. For example, *Ehm... Saya **dari mana** kota besar Vancouver.* ‘Ehm, I am **from where** large city Vancouver.’ The interlocutor must be patient and accustomed to non-native speech because of the frequent errors. In the following sentence, incorrect word order is followed by self-correction, *Saya **nama**, nama saya Kathleen.* ‘**I am name**, my name is Kathleen.’ Inaccurate word choice and the use of English are also common. In the following sentence, the word for family (*keluarga*) is initially pronounced *keluar* (‘go out’), the word *empat* (‘four’) is used for *enam* (‘six’), and the English word ‘no’ is inserted as a comment. *Ehm... Saya keluar, **no**, keluarga saya, emm... enam orang, **no**, empat.* ‘Ehm... I go out, **no**, my family, ehm, is six people, **no** four.’ In the following sentence, the English word ‘church’ is used and the negation for predicates, *tidak*, is used instead of the nominal negation *bukan*. *Ehm... ibu saya bekerja di ehm... **tidak** masjid ... tetapi **church**.* ‘Ehm... my mother works at ehm... **not** a mosque... but a **church**.’ While the novice level Indonesian speaker can produce communicative utterances about common survival topics, s/he requires a well-supported context and a sympathetic interlocutor to deal with the inaccuracies in pronunciation, word order, and word choice.

The **Intermediate level** speaker as defined by the ACTFL generic guidelines is able to ask and answer simple questions about familiar topics using sentences or strings of sentences, typically in the present time. The Indonesian data show that the intermediate speaker can use the three major time frames (past, present and future). S/he has good control of the time frames but is not able to shift time frames. The

discourse of the intermediate speaker is characterized by a limited range of vocabulary, an emerging control of the verbal prefixes, *meN-* and *ber-*, and some use of prepositions, but the speaker lacks control of the passive construction, the verbal suffixes (*-i*, *-kan*), and definite markers (*ini*, *itu*, and *-nya*).

Indonesian does not mark tense and aspect on the verb; past, present, and future time frames are indicated by auxiliaries, adverbs of times, or context. For example, the past time frame is indicated by using adverbials such as *kemarin* (yesterday), *dulu* (previously) or *tahun yang lalu* (last year). Some examples of the use of the past time frame from the data include: *Saya belajar bahasa Indonesia di sini di UW **tahun yang lalu***. 'I studied Indonesian here at UW **last year**.' *Saya punya pacar **dulu** di Singapura*. 'I had a boy/girlfriend **in the past** in Singapore.' Frequently used questions employing the past time are well-controlled by the intermediate speaker. See the following examples from the data. *Ben, **sudah** berapa lama di Madison?* 'Ben, how long **have** you **been** in Madison?' *Saya **sudah** empat bulan*. 'I **have been** (here) four months.' To discuss an event in the future, the speaker may use a modal such as *mau* ('will/want'), *akan* ('will'), or an adverb of time such as *besok* ('tomorrow') or *lusa* ('the day after tomorrow'). The following examples of utterances in the future time frame are found in the data. *Saya **akan** pergi ke Korea Selatan dan menikah*. 'I **will** go to South Korea and get married.' *Saya **mau** bepergian*. 'I **will** go on a trip.' *Saya **mau** belajar konflik ke Kolombia dan Afghanistan*. 'I **will/want to** study conflict (in) Columbia and Afghanistan.' Note that in this utterance the preposition *ke* (to) should have been *di* (in) preceding Columbia. While the intermediate speaker can express events

in the present, past, and future time frames, s/he continues to require a sympathetic interlocutor.

The discourse of the intermediate speaker when discussing familiar topics such as family, school, travel, and leisure-time activities is characterized by limited vocabulary and a lack of definite markers that relate the statements to the social context. See the following examples that demonstrate the lack of control of definite markers that point to references. *Kakak perempuan bernama Kelly.* ‘Older sister has name Kelly.’ *Ini rumah keluarga.* ‘This is family house.’ In these two sentences, the speaker does not identify whose older sister or whose family house is being discussed. In the following sentence, the speaker intends to assert that there are seven members in the family, but due to his limited range of vocabulary, he omits the words ‘member.’ *Jumlah keluarga ini tujuh.* ‘Total of this family is seven.’ As the above examples demonstrate, the discourse of the intermediate speaker requires a sympathetic listener who can relate the utterance to the social context in which it is spoken in order to understand the speaker’s intent.

The Indonesian intermediate speaker shows emerging ability to use the verbal prefixes, *meN-* and *ber-*, the commonly used connectors, *dan*, *tetapi*, *jadi*, *karena*, and the comparative construction *X lebih Y daripada Z* ‘X is more Y than Z,’ but is limited by a narrow range of vocabulary. The language features that are most challenging for the intermediate speaker are the use of definite and reference markers, prepositions, and the *di-*passive verbal construction. As exemplified in the following examples, the verbal prefixes *meN-* and *ber-* are frequently used. *Ibu sedang mengajar anak perempuan yang lebih kecil.* ‘Mother is teaching the younger daughter.’ *Mereka menonton televisi.* ‘They

watch television.’ In the following example, the speaker inaccurately uses the *meN-* prefix where the passive prefix *di-* and the passive construction syntax should have been used. *Artikel mereka membaca.* ‘The article was read by them.’ The intransitive *ber-* prefix is also commonly used, for instance in this sentence: *Anak laki-laki sedang bermain* computer game. ‘The son is playing computer game.’ Note the use of the English phrase, ‘computer game’, and the lack of a definite marker on that phrase. The intermediate level speaker can make simple comparisons such as *Universitas Chicago lebih kecil daripada Universitas Wisconsin.* ‘The University of Chicago is smaller than the University of Wisconsin.’ Another ability of the intermediate speaker is the use of a few basic connectors such as *dan* ‘and’, *tetapi* ‘but’, *jadi* ‘thus/so’, *karena* ‘because’, and *terus* ‘then/next’. For example, *Sesudah program ini, saya akan pergi ke Korea Selatan dan menikah dan pergi ke Bali.* ‘After this program, I will go to South Korea and get married and go to Bali.’ The intermediate speaker is also able to offer simple explanations or reasons. For example, *Saya suka Chicago sekali. Mengapa? Karena Chicago besar dan banyak orang, banyak university.* ‘I like Chicago very much. Why? Because Chicago is big, and has many people, many universities.’ As exemplified here, the intermediate speaker frequently inserts English words or an inaccurate word choice. See the following inaccurate word choices which are bolded. *Saya berpergian di New York sedikit hari.* ‘I went to New York for a few days,’ and *Ada kucing yang putih, dia<sup>10</sup> menonton satu burung.* ‘There is a white cat, he is watching a bird.’ In addition, the intermediate speaker struggles with the use of definite markers.

---

<sup>10</sup> Indonesian does not have the pronoun ‘it.’ The use of *dia* to refer to a cat is incorrect. The thought requires a more complex structure or ellipsis to make correct reference to the cat.



For example, *Ini pagi Sabtu di tempat saya...* ‘This Saturday morning at my place....?’

In summary, the Indonesian intermediate speaker is an active, but unequal, partner in conversations, responding to questions with short replies while using a limited range of vocabulary. S/he is able to create simple descriptions and narrate events in the present, past, and future time frames and shows emerging ability to use the verbal prefixes, *meN-* and *ber-*. There is an emerging ability to state a simple opinion, make a comparison, and use connectors to join ideas.

The **Advanced level speaker** as defined by the ACTFL generic guidelines is able to produce paragraph-length descriptions and narrations using the major time frames (past, present, and future) while speaking about a wide variety of concrete topics from personal to societal issues. The advanced speaker controls many of the basic grammatical structures, uses generic vocabulary, and can be understood without difficulty by an interlocutor not accustomed to non-native speech.

The advanced level Indonesian speaker is an active and strong conversational participant, able to participate in a wide range of communicative tasks, discussing a broad range of topics. The advanced speaker controls most of the key grammatical constructions including verbal and nominal affixation (verbal prefixes *meN-*, *di-*, *ber-*, *ter-*; verbal suffixes *-i*, *-kan*, and nominal affixes *peN-* *per-an*, *peN-an*, *ke-an*). In the following sentence, note the complex sentence with the use of connectors and nominalization. *Sekarang adalah era globalisasi, jadi untuk orang-orang yang bekerja di industri perdagangan atau manufaktur, ada banyak masalah.* ‘Now is the age of globalization,

so for people who work in trade or manufacturing, there are many problems.’ In the following sentence, the speaker uses the nominalizing *ke-an* circumfix and the *di-* verbal passive construction, but is unable to accurately communicate the intent which requires control of time shifting frames. *Biasanya kebanyakan tarian atau musik itu dipakai untuk upacara, tapi setiap malam ada pertunjukan.* ‘Usually most of those dances and music are used for ceremonies, but every night there is a performance.’ The intent of this sentence is to state that the dances and music were formerly used for rituals while now they are predominantly performed for entertainment. The following utterance incorporates the *ke-an* nominalization, the *di-* verbal passive, and ends with the English phrase, ‘who knows’, showing the speaker’s breakdown. *Kemiskinan sangat sulit dipecahkan karena who knows.* ‘Poverty is very difficult to solve because **‘who knows.’**’

The advanced speaker can narrate and describe using complex sentences with subordinate clauses. For example, *Biaya sekolah terlalu mahal, dan karena itu, dia tidak bisa bersekolah lagi.* ‘School expenses are too expensive, and **because of that, he is not able to continue in school.**’ The following sentence demonstrates the increasingly complex sentence structure that incorporates verbal affixation, reported speech, and an embedded clause. *Artikel ini melaporkan pada tahun dua ribu dua, Indonesia punya kira-kira empat juta pekerja anak dan kebanyakan anak-anak yang bekerja menjadi pembantu rumah tangga, kuli pengangkut barang, atau bekerja pada industri yang terkait dengan pelacuran.* ‘This article reports that in 2002, Indonesia had about four thousand child workers and most of them worked as domestic servants, day laborers, or worked in an industry connected with prostitution.’

The advanced speaker overall has excellent fluency that is characterized by an ease using highly functional connectors such as *dan*, *atau*, *tetapi*, and *karena*, to create well-formed paragraph-length discourse. The discourse is sometimes punctuated by self-corrections, hesitations, inappropriate register shifts, and incomplete thoughts. In the following sentence, the speaker self-corrects the verb morphology, indicating his understanding that the verb must be transitive and formal in this context. *Dan dia tidak bisa **selesai**, menyelesaikan SMA karena keluarganya miskin.* ‘And he is not able **finish** high school because his family is poor.’ Note also the inappropriate use of the phrase *beli uang* ‘buy money’ and the hesitation in the middle of the following sentence. *Jadi dia harus cari uang, beli banyak uang di.... mungkin nggak tahu di mana tapi di tempat lain.* ‘Therefore, he has to find money, **buy** money at ... maybe he does not know where but in some other place.’

Although the advanced speaker often controls the *di-*passive construction well, he may not have good control of the passive verb in a subordinate clause. In the following utterance, the active verb, *memberi* ‘to give’, incorrectly appears in an embedded relative clause that requires the passive voice form. *Mungkin kemiskinan menjadi persoalan yang pemerintah bisa **memberi** bantuan.* ‘Perhaps poverty has become a problem which can **be aided** by the government.’ The advanced speaker does not yet fully control registers even though there are signs of emerging awareness of register. If the advanced level speaker is to be understood by a speaker unaccustomed to non-native speakers, he must begin to control register differences. The ability to shift registers is a challenging area for the Indonesian advanced speaker because it requires a broad range of vocabulary, basic understanding of the

linguistic forms used in standard and colloquial forms of Indonesian, and a good understanding of the cultural contexts that demand a shift in register.

In summary, the Indonesian advanced speaker is a fluent conversationalist who produces paragraph-level discourse about numerous concrete topics in all three major time frames, controls most major grammatical constructions, and is easily understood by native speakers. The passive construction remains challenging in some contexts, but the most challenging aspect of the language is learning the form and function of registers.

The **Superior level** speaker, as defined in the ACTFL generic guidelines, is able to accurately and fluently communicate a wide range of concrete and abstract topics in formal and informal settings. Although the superior speaker may still show some influence from his/her first language, there are no patterned errors in the basic grammatical structures. Any errors that occur do not interfere with the comprehensibility of the superior speaker's discourse.

The Indonesian superior speaker is able to present and support concrete and abstract ideas, use nuanced connectors, a broad range of vocabulary, and native-like discourse strategies such as particles that express meta-comments enhancing engagement with interlocutors. The superior speaker controls the major verbal and nominal affixations (i.e., *meN-* *di-* *ter-*, *-kan*, *-i*, *peN-an*, *per-an*, *ke-an*, *peN-*). It is important to note that the superior speaker does not yet fully control the use of registers but has emerging control of register differences. Superior speakers occasionally insert English words for abstract and/or infrequently used words such as

*interdisciplinary*. For example, *Saya merasa ini, pusat studi interdisipline ini, menjadi sangat penting*. ‘I feel that this center for interdisciplinary study is very important.’

The superior speaker’s discussion of concrete and abstract topics includes supporting opinions with significant details. Topics such as conditions of street children, differences in educational institutions, and aspects of the tourism sector in Indonesia are found in the interview data. The following paragraph about street children illustrates a number of features of the superior proficiency level such as a detailed description and the correct use of passive voice (*ditanya*, *ditangkap*, and *dibawa*) while using the informal negation *gak* in this formal discourse..

*Ya, mungkin kalau salah satu model, itu bisa dari sistem pemerintah Amerika, sih. ... Ada seperti polisi tertentu yang mereka keliling kota pada jam kerja, dan mereka cari anak, kalau yang ndak di bangku sekolah. Kalau tidak di bangku sekolah, mungkin jam 2, jam 11, di tengah hari, mereka **ditanya** mengapa, mengapa **gak** di sekolah. Kalau tidak ada alasan yang benar, mereka, ya, tidak **ditangkap**, sih, tapi mereka **dibawa** kembali ke sekolah atau ke rumah.*

‘Yes, perhaps one of the models could be from the American government system, I suggest. ... There are special police that go around the city during business hours, perhaps at 2 PM, 11 AM, in the middle of the day; they look for children who are not in school. If they are not in school, they ask why they are not there. If there is no good

reason, they are not detained, of course, but rather they are taken back to school or to their homes.’

The superior speaker also shows an emerging ability to use a variety of discourse strategies (lexical and syntactic) that are culturally nuanced and native-like. Specifically, one finds the use of the particles *nah*, *sib*, *kok*; metaphors, emotive expressions, fillers, and culturally appropriate syntax. The discourse particles *sib*, *nah*, and *kok* are used to offer meta-comments on the speaker’s or the interlocutor’s beliefs. *Nah* signals a summary or consequence of prior discourse. Having just presented the activities of the truancy officer in the U.S., the speaker says, **Nah**, *kalau sejauh saya tahu, belum ada cabang polisi begitu di Indonesia*. ‘Now, as far as I know, there are no branches of the police like this in Indonesia.’ The speaker is implying that there should be truancy officers in Indonesia and is endeavoring to convince the interlocutor of this. *Nah* is used again immediately following the speaker’s statement that in Surabaya there are many interesting historic sites. *Nah, tapi tempat itu tidak dilestarikan dengan baik*. ‘Well, (continuing this topic of discussion), but those places are not well-preserved.’ The speaker is trying to convince the interlocutor of the importance of preserving historical places. Finally, *nah* is used in the following sentence with reference to a museum in Surabaya. *Tapi dari strukturnya, sampai bentuknya, sampai pamerannya seperti ketinggalan jaman. Nah, saya heran sekali, kok bisa ini tahun 90an*. ‘But, from the structure, the shape, and the looks (of this museum), it is out-of-date. Well, I was very surprised, how can it be from the 1990s.’ In this last sentence, the particle **nah** summarizes the speaker’s reaction to the

condition of a museum and the interjection *kok* is used to express the speaker's surprise/disbelief.

The particle *sih* engages the interlocutor by marking a statement as one that the interlocutor is likely to not believe (or minimally will be surprised to hear). *Sih* implies a reality that is contrary to expectations. *Kalau tidak ada alasan yang benar, mereka, ya, tidak ditangkap sih, tapi mereka dibawa kembali ke sekolah atau ke rumah.* 'If there is no good reason, they are not detained, *sih* (believe it or not), but they are taken back to school or to their homes.'

Another important characteristic of the superior speaker is an increasingly diverse set of connectors such as *oleh karena itu* 'because of that'; *di satu sisi* 'on the one hand'...*di sisi lain* 'on the other hand'; *baik ... maupun* 'both... and', and *gara-gara* 'because'. Below are some examples of the use of these connectors in the interview data.

*Ada yang masuk ke emm industri prostitusi atau penjual atau pedagang narkoba. Jadi ini memang masalah berat. Oleh karena itu, ada sebuah LSM di Jakarta, kalau nggak salah, itu disebut dengan ILO di Jakarta.*

'There are those who enter the prostitution industry or become sellers or traders of narcotics. Therefore this indeed is a serious problem. Because of this, there is an NGO in Jakarta, if I am not mistaken, it is called ILO in Jakarta.'

Another example of a more sophisticated connector is the use of *di satu sisi... di sisi lain* 'on the one hand...on the other hand'.

*Terus, mereka coba bekerjasama, kayaknya dengan pemerintah Indonesia, untuk cari informasi yang bisa, yang bisa, yah **di satu sisi** bantu anak yang kerja, tapi **di sisi lain** mereka mau menghentikan anak lagi bekerja sebelum umurnya.*

‘Then, they try to work together, like with the Indonesian government, in order to find information that can, that can, yes, on the one hand help the children who work, but on the other hand, they want to stop any more underage children from working.’

An additional advanced connector which the superior speaker is able to employ is *baik ... maupun* ‘both...and’. *Ada banyak tempat bersejarah .... yang bisa dikunjungi oleh orang, **baik** domestik, **maupun** luar negeri.* ‘There are many historical sites ... that can be visited by both domestic and foreign visitors.’ Note that in addition to the use of the more specialized connector, the speaker also uses the passive construction, *dikunjungi* which shows a familiarity with the common pattern of maintaining a patient focus (rather than a subject/agent focus) in the discourse. The following sentence offers another example of the use of the connector *baik ... maupun* ‘both...and’. *Ada banyak kesempatan dapat beasiswa, **baik** dari universitas sendiri, **maupun** dari pemerintah tapi kalau di Indonesia belum.* ‘There are many opportunities to obtain a fellowship, both from the university and from the government, but in Indonesia these are not yet available.’



## Conclusion

Based on the 22 ratable interviews, this project produced the appended Indonesian Oral Proficiency Guidelines (OPG) for novice-mid through superior levels of Indonesian; each level description contains sample quotes from the interview data. While this OPG offers the field of Indonesian language teaching a yardstick for the assessment of oral proficiency, it must be acknowledged that more interview data is needed to improve the reliability of this OPG. With no sample for novice low level and only one or two interviews for novice-mid, novice-high, intermediate-low, intermediate-high, and advanced-high, it is essential to expand the interview database to enrich and validate the level descriptions.

It is noteworthy that there has been a wash-back effect from this project on curriculum development, encouraging teachers to establish *Can Do statements* to be included in their syllabi, allowing students to do self-assessments. Another pedagogical effect of this project has been the increasing awareness of the need to develop materials that expose students to the form and function of formal and colloquial registers and to teach students to recognize the social contexts that demand the use of these registers. The project has demonstrated the critical value of in-country experience for learning how to use registers, emotive particles, address terms, and prosody.

While this current project has focused largely on what learners can do with language at various proficiency levels, the data can be used to study error analysis. A closer look at the speech data may reveal patterns of error or challenges that students encounter at different levels of proficiency. To date,

there have not been studies in the field of Indonesian that focus on this issue.

## References

- ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Guidelines. *ERIC Digest*.  
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED347852.pdf>  
Accessed January 8, 2015.
- ACTFL. (1987). Chinese Proficiency Guidelines. *Foreign Language Annals*, 20, issue 5, 471-487.
- ACTFL. (1987). Japanese Proficiency Guidelines. *Foreign Language Annals*, 20, issue 6, 589-603;
- ACTFL. (1988). Russian Proficiency Guidelines. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, issue 2, 177-197.
- ACTFL. (1989). Arabic Proficiency Guidelines. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, issue 4, 373-392.
- ACTFL. (1990). Hindi Proficiency Guidelines. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, issue 3, 235-252.
- Liskin-Gasparro, Judith, 2003, The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and the Oral Proficiency Interview: A brief history and analysis of their survival, In:  
*Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 36(4): 483-490.
- Omaggio Hadley, Alice, (1993), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, *Teaching Language in Context*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

## Appendix

### INDONESIAN ORAL PROFICIENCY GUIDELINES

#### Created by the Consortium for the Teaching of Indonesian (COTI)

#### Novice Mid

Speakers at the Novice Mid level speak in discrete words and phrases, producing mostly memorized utterances. They attempt to create with the language through simple recombination of elements and are successful less than half of the time. See the following examples. *Ya saya suka kota besar. Suka lebih kota besar daripada kota kecil. Ehm, saya dari mana kota besar Vancouver.* [Yes, I like big cities. I prefer big cities rather than small cities. Ehm, I am from where big city, Vancouver.]

The speakers are limited to speaking in informal contexts about self and immediate surroundings and dealing with common topics of daily life. They are highly reactive when responding to direct questions. Their responses consist of limited words, and they need frequent prompting from the interlocutor. These speakers are often able to combine numbers and nouns correctly e.g. *enam mobil* (six cars), *satu kucing* (one cat) and are able to use the simple connector *dan* (and). On other occasions, they use incorrect word order. For example, *banyak lain restoran dan 1800k* [many other restaurants and shops]. Long pauses and hesitations are frequent; and utterances show lack of appropriate vocabulary. In addition, there are inaccuracies in pronunciation, intonation, and grammar. For example, they use question words in answers. “*Saya dari mana kota besar,*” [I am **from where** a big city.] or incorrect word order: ‘*dengan dia teman*’ [with **friend his**]. Due to the above mentioned inaccuracies, especially the pronunciation which is strongly influenced by the first

language, they are only understood with difficulty by sympathetic interlocutors familiar with non-native speakers. They are able to respond to simple questions on familiar topics. For example, they can respond with phrases and very simple sentences when asked whether they like where they are living now. Q: *Apakah kamu suka tinggal di Victoria?* A: *Eh, ya. Victoria ... Victoria cantik ... eh dan ... eh tidak ramai.* (Q. Do you like living in Victoria? A. Eh, ya. Victoria... Victoria is pretty... eh and ... eh not crowded).

### Novice High

Speakers at the Novice-high level can handle a variety of tasks pertaining to the Intermediate level, but are unable to sustain the performance at that level. They are able to create with the language through the simple recombination of elements more than half of the time. They have an emerging ability to produce strings of discrete sentences albeit with inaccurate grammar when asked to describe a picture the definite marker *-nya* is often lacking.. For example, *Dia bercakap-cakap [dengan] adik. J duduk dan bermain di komputer. C bekerja di perpustakaan. Dia istri, istri namanya Charlotte.* [He talks (with) younger sibling. J sits and plays on computer. C works in library. She is wife, wife, her name is Charlotte]. They can use language to convey information related to self and immediate environment (study, family, places, preferences) while using mostly formulaic and memorized phrases, such as *saya tinggal di asrama, asrama kecil dan kotor.* [I live in a dorm, [the] dorm is small and dirty]. They can use basic kinship terms such as *adik laki-laki/perempuan* (younger sibling), *ibu* (mother), *bapak* (father), *kakek* (grandfather), *nenek* (grandmother), and *istri* (wife). They function best when discussing common daily topics and are able to respond to simple, direct questions. They tend to

repeat, rephrase, and clarify the interlocutor's utterances in their responses. Speakers at this level frequently use simple phrases and sentences as well as incomplete and/or inaccurate sentences. For example, *Keluarga berasal di Appleton*. [My family comes **at/in** Appleton.] *Sarah PR di kelas Inggris* [Sarah [**did**] homework in English class]. Pronunciation is often inaccurate, influenced by the first language, but can still be understood by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to non-native speakers.

Common pronunciation errors include *denang* (*dengan*), *tarus* (*terus*), and *kelurgar* (*keluarga*). Other frequent errors are incorrect word order such as *saya asrama* (dorm my), incorrect use of non-nominal in the place of nominal negation: *tidak* for *bukan*, the omission of prepositions such as *Erika berasal North Ccarolina*. [Erika comes North Carolina.], incorrect affixation such as *berkerja* instead of *bekerja*, and deletion of verbs such as *saya adik perempuan dan adik laki-laki* [I [**have**] a younger sister and brother]. They insert words from their first language, for example *while duduk, saya want...* [**while** sitting, I **want...**] which is a sign of linguistic breakdown.

### Intermediate Low

Speakers at the intermediate-low level are able to communicate some basic ideas. They communicate with difficulty and with long pauses while searching for words, and they use simple sentences mostly without connectors. They demonstrate limited ability to create with the language to convey basic, limited personal information, for example, *Saya di Madison untuk Bahasa Indonesian* [I am in Madison **for** Indonesian]. Their responses are typically reactive, indicating inability to initiate conversation. Topics in the conversations include self, family, friends, and familiar places. For example X *kecil* [X is small], Y *besar* [Y is big]; X *banyak orang-orang* [[In] X [there are]

a lot of people], basic desires, and simple expressions of likes and dislikes, such as *Saya mau ...* [I want to...]. Occasionally utterances are incomprehensible. Pronunciation and sentence structure are influenced by their first language, and therefore the speaker can be understood only by a sympathetic interlocutor. For example, *Saya pacar mau NIU. Saya tinggal di Dekalb. Saya tidak pacar now* [I girlfriend want (me to go to) NIU. I live in Dekalb. I don't [have] a girlfriend now]. They are able to use limited time markers, such as *besok* (tomorrow), *bulan/tahun lalu* (last month/year), and *dulu* (in the past). Some patterned errors are evident, such as word order (e.g. *hijau mobil* 'car green'; *Anda kucing* 'cat your'), incorrect preposition (e.g. *Saya berasal di Madison* 'I am originally in/at Madison'), the deletion of *ada* (to exist) in negative statements (e.g. *Tidak orang membeli* '[There is] no people buy), inability to use nominal negation 'bukan' (e.g. X *tidak [bukan] NYU* 'X isn't NYU) and missing verbs in prepositional phrases. For instance, *Sheila naik sepeda motor untuk [membeli] makanan ke mini market*. [Sheila rode a motorbike to [buy] food to a mini market].

### Intermediate Mid

Speakers at the intermediate-mid demonstrate ability to create with the language both combining and recombining learned materials. They speak in strings of sentences with few connectors and lack some reference or definite markers (*dia, -nya, ini, itu*). For example: *Ini keluarga saya. Ini kakak perempuan saya. Kakak perempuan [saya] bernama Kelly*. [This is my family. This is my sister. [My] sister's name is Kelly]. They are able to communicate uncomplicated ideas (e.g. *Paman minum kopi, tapi hari ini mau tidur siang* '[My/the] uncle drinks coffee, but today [he] wants to nap.'). personal experience (e.g. *Saya punya dulu pacar di Singapur dan teman-teman di Singapur lagi. Saya tinggal dengan*

*teman lain, tidak dengan pacar.*), and future plans (e.g. *Saya mau belajar konflik di Aceh...Saya mau bepergian dan bekerja (di) Indonesia, Singapur, dan Malaysia*). They are also able to make simple comparisons (e.g. *Madison cantik, lebih cantik daripada Singapur, tetapi sekarang saya mau tinggal di New York*). The topics are concrete such as self, family, occupation, travel, school, and leisure activities. For example: *Saya belanja, tidur, dan main-main dengan teman saya*). They are able to utilize time and sequence markers (e.g. *sebelum, sesudah, sesudah itu*). When they hesitate, they revert to their first language. They are able to use simple connectors such as *karena* and *jadi*, and they show the emerging use of the particle ‘ya’ (e.g. *lancar sedikit, ya. Singapur kotor, ya*). They are able to use some verbal affixation, especially the orefixes, *meN-* and *ber-* (e.g. *membuat, berbicara, bekerja, bepergian*). Common patterned errors include passive voice (e.g. *Artikel mereka membaca, artikel di CST*), prepositional choice (e.g. *berbicara di Irak, naik mobil di ibu saya, membaca jurnal di Irak*), and inaccurate word choice (e.g. *Saya bepergian di NY sedikit hari*).

The intermediate speaker is interactive typically offering short responses in utterances that are not well connected. They are able to use some strategies for clarifying meaning. For example, they repeat parts of the question for clarification. They are able to provide simple explanations such as, *Saya suka Chicago [sekali]. Mengapa? karena Chicago besar dan banyak, banyak [university]*. When a breakdown occurs, they revert to their first language. For example: *Blagojevich governor di Illinois. Dia, I don't know how to say, got arrested. Inaccurate negation of nouns still occurs, e.g. Itu [tidak] politik di Amerika*.



## Intermediate High

Speakers at the intermediate-high demonstrate emerging ability to describe and narrate. They show an emerging ability to create a paragraph, but mostly operate in strings of sentences, for example: *Di televisi semua sedang mengikuti inauguration presiden Obama. Saya sendiri menonton waktu dia pidato. Saya pikir bagus sekali. Saya tertarik, em tetapi, itu hanya kata-kata, saya ingin tunggu, menunggu apa yang dia akan lakukan untuk menolong ekonomi AS, dan menolong orang penduduk AS mendapat kerjaan.*

They have incorporated some communicative strategies such as asking for clarification and self-repair, for example, ‘*Peristiwa’ itu artinya apa?* and *habi...em, selesai itu...; Saya ingin tunggu... menunggu ...* They are able to make more complete comparisons and utilize a greater variety of connectors such as *meskipun, jadi, karena, and kalau*. Occasionally they lapse into informal forms and pronunciation, while formal forms are more appropriate: For example, they use *sama* for *bersama*; *anak-anak*; *li(h)at* for *melihat*; *kerja* for *bekerja*; *kasih* for *memberi*; *bilang* for *mengatakan*; *bikin* for *membuat*. They are beginning to use a greater variety of verbal affixes such as *ber-*, *meN-*, *di-*, *ke-* and *ter-* and nominalizing affixes such as *peN-*, *per-*, *-an*, and *peN-an*. Occasionally they use the passive voice (e.g. *Ini adalah gambar keluarga saya yang diambil waktu saya masih anak kecil*.) At this level of proficiency they are understood by sympathetic interlocutors and are able to successfully handle most uncomplicated tasks such as making statements and giving reasons. For example, *Saya lebih senang keluarga yang besar karena saya anak satu-satunya. Saya senang kalau ada banyak orang di rumah saya.* The topics cover familiar ones such as self, personal aspirations, and familiar routines. The Intermediate high speakers have emerging ability to discuss some broader topics such as comparisons between family dynamics in their

own country and in Indonesia. They are able to use reported speech such as *Teman saya bilang sesudah kira-kira 15 menit dia bisa masuk ke dalam.*

## Advanced

Speakers at the advanced level are able to handle a wide range of communicative tasks discussing a wide variety of topics such as food, sports, education, current events, and social issues in informal and some formal settings. They are active and equal conversational participants, demonstrating some emerging skill at tailoring language for the social situation. They are able to ask for clarification. For example, *Dari artikel? Yang saya mengerti.*

They can narrate and describe with ease at the paragraph level while shifting time frames and employing sentence connectors if discussing familiar topics. For example, *Biaya sekolah terlalu mahal, dan karena itu dia tidak bisa bersekolah lagi. Dan dia perlu membantu keluarga.* Sentence structure is increasingly complex indicated by the correct use of active and passive verbs, subordination, and reported speech. For example, *Artike ini melaporkan pada tahun dua ribu dua Indonesia punya kira-kira empat juta pekerja anak dan kebanyakan anak-anak yang bekerja menjadi pembantu rumah tangga, kuli pengangkut barang atau bekerja pada industri yang terkait dengan pelacuran.*

There is greater control of affixation including the *di-* *meN*, *ter-*, *ke-an*, *per – an* constructions. Grammatical mistakes and interference from first language still occur but generally do not interfere with comprehension. For example, *Mengapa es tidak **dihapus** [leleh] di dalam minyak goreng? Hanya [baru] berusia 10. Itu adalah alasan yang konkrit dan yang **pemerintah bisa***

***melaksanakan*** *aktivitas atau program*. They are also able to circumlocute. For example: *Saya tidak ingat, tapi mungkin ....*, and repair their own mistakes. The advanced speaker can produce connected paragraph length discourse with sufficient accuracy and clarity to convey his/her message with little confusion. They are understood without difficulty by speakers unaccustomed to non-native speakers.

### **Advanced High**

The advanced high speakers are full conversational partners, showing the ability to initiate exchanges and respond; they also can sustain conversations using fillers ‘*ehm*’, ‘*ya*’ and small questions such as ‘*tentang apa?*’ while engaging with the interlocutor. They are able to present their own ideas in well-organized sequences. For example, *Yang pertama, mungkin pemerintah Indonesia harus bantu, harus biaya sekolah harus turun. Atau mungkin sekolah, 25ndus ada sekolah gratis, mereka bisa belajar sampai SMA gratis, dan sesudah itu mulai bekerja, jadi tidak, orang tuanya tidak harus membayar untuk sekolah. Dan yang kedua, mungkin 25ndus tidak ada banyak anak-anak, mungkin 25ndus ada hanya 2, contohnya 2 anak-anak, mereka orang tuanya tidak, tidak harus bayar banyak untuk anak-anak. Dan ada uang cukup untuk kehidupan.*

There is an emerging ability to hypothesize and support an opinion with detailed explanation. For example, *Ya, dan mereka tabu, 25ndus, 25ndus anak laki-laki, dia harus mendapat pekerjaan yang bagus, karena dia yang harus membantu orang tuanya 25ndus mereka sudah tua. Tapi 25ndus anak perempuan, mereka waktu, 25ndus mereka kawin, mereka mau pindah ke rumah lain dengan suaminya. Jadi mereka 25ndus, mengapa kami mau bayar*

*sekarang untuk sekolah anak perempuan 26ndus nanti dia tidak mau membantu kami. 26ndustr membantu keluarga yang lain.*

There is evidence of an increasing understanding of registers, including the use of academic language and appropriate collocations such as *kebijakan pemerintah*, *mencapai tujuan*. They are able to control many affixes such as *meN-* *-i*, in *mengakui*, and *ke-* *-an* in *keanekaragaman*, and a variety of connectors such as *meskipun*, *walaupun*, *sedangkan*. Their pronunciation is accurate, including the borrowed words such as *idealis*.

They are able to cover a broad range of topics, mostly concrete and factual ones such as current events (i.e. economic problem), child labor, education, and popular places to visit. They are able to circumvent abstract explanations by giving illustrations or anecdotes. For example,

*Menurut saya mulai dengan orang yang, mungkin 5 tahun yang lalu, dengan orang yang mau membeli rumah dan mobil dan barang-barang yang, yang, dan mereka tidak punya uang cukup untuk itu, jadi mereka memakai kredit. Contohnya rumah, mereka mau rumah yang besar, yang baru, yang lebih bagus daripada keluarga atau temannya. Dan mereka mengambil kredit dan mereka tidak bisa membi, tidak bisa bayar? Jadi mulai dengan krisis rumah, dan sekarang ada banyak orang yang tidak bisa membayar rumah, harus, harus pindah, jadi mereka ... mulai dengan rumah.*

They can link sentences smoothly and speak in well-connected discourse. For example, when asked to comment on the impact of the devaluation of the dollar in the travel industry, the answer given is: *Ya, tahun ini sulit. Terlalu sulit mungkin dan tahun depan juga. Karena 26ndus tahun ini bisnis saya turun sampai hanya 30% dari tahun yang lalu. Contohnya, ada sekolah dari SMA dari Kanada. Setiap tahun bulan Maret mereka ke negara lain dengan*

*program saya. Tetapi tahun ini untuk bulan Maret depan, mereka 27ndust Costa Rica. Tetapi barganya waktu kami eh... organisasi programnya. Harganya USD3,500 per orang. Tetapi dolar dari Kanada turun banyak. Sekarang barganya seperti 4,500 dolar. Naik 1,000 dolar dua bulan. Jadi mereka tidak bisa. Kalau ekonominya tidak bagus, orangtuanya ... mungkin anak-anak bisa buat satu tahun atau dua tahun lagi ... mereka bisa berjalan tapi sekarang tidak ada untuk... . Ada uang untuk kehidupan tetapi tidak ada uang untuk berjalan di dunia.*

They put stress on the proper word for emphasis, e.g. *Menurut saya, bail-out itu untuk Wall Street **dan** untuk 27ndustry mobil itu tidak bagus, tidak bagus, jelek.* They are full conversational partners, initiating exchanges, responding, and requesting clarification. For example:

*Q. Apa yang menjadikan anak-anak seperti Seno tidak bersekolah?*

*A. Yang saya mengerti, biaya sekolah terlalu mahal dan karena itu dia tidak bisa bersekolah lagi.*

*Dan dia perlu membantu keluarga.*

*Q. Apa yang sudah dilakukan pemerintah?*

*A. **Dari artikel?***

## Superior

Speakers at the Superior level are able to express their own opinions and provide support for their ideas in well connected and extended discourse. They are also able to hypothesize and discuss abstract topics such as religious and cultural diversity and the characteristics of responsible journalism. They are able to discuss a wide range of topics in both formal and informal settings. The topics may include unfamiliar subjects such as educational systems in the US, political bias in newsreporting, lack of public interest in the preservation of historic places and monuments in Indonesia, the post-1998 freedom of the press

in Indonesia, and the impact of tourism on local cultures in Indonesia.

In terms of accuracy, the superior speakers may make occasional errors due to direct translation from English into Indonesian or they may lapse into English for sophisticated terms such as ‘interdisciplinary’ for *lintas jurusan/ lintas ilmu*. The errors, however, do not hinder fluency. They are mostly aware of the errors they make, and more often than not, they are able to self-correct. They are able to control complex affixation such as *meN-i*, *per-an*, *peN-an*, and *mempes*; and use passive voice with ease. For example, “*Saya pikir bahasa itu bisa **dilontarkan** kepada semua, kepada semua, seluruh masyarakat; kita sering **dipengaruhi** oleh pemikiran orang lain.*”

They are able to use sophisticated conjunctions such as ‘*apabila*’, ‘*apalagi*’, ‘*oleh karena itu*’, ‘*gara-gara*’, ‘*walaupun*’, ‘*di satu sisi ... di sisi lain*’, ‘*akibatnya*’, and ‘*baik ... maupun*’ to express relationships among events. At this level, the word ‘*adalah*’ is used to define terms and ‘*bahwa*’ to introduce an explanation. The superior speaker is at ease in using nuanced and idiomatic expressions such as ‘*menenangkan jiwa rakyat*’ and ‘*mendarah daging*’. Speakers at this level have a good sensitivity to the target culture, displaying an awareness of how others might perceive comments. Thus, when explaining herself, one interviewee responds gracefully to compliments, corrects herself to sound more culturally appropriate in order to avoid sounding arrogant, and is able to use a euphemism. Such cultural sensitivity help these speakers select the appropriate register to achieve the desired effect for their speech acts. For example, one interviewee uses the rhetorical device *adakah* instead of *apakah*.

Superior speakers are also able to correctly and effectively use emotive expressions and discourse particles such as *sih* and *kok*, ‘fillers’ such as *kayaknya*, *kalau nggak salah*, *apa namanya*, *yah*, and *anu*, and words that give emphasis such as *memang* and *sendiri*. In addition, the superior speaker produces extended discourse, effectively using particles such as *nah* to indicate the progression of an argument to its conclusion, making the discourse coherent and easy to follow. The conversational partner of the superior speaker senses that there is ‘music’ in the discourse of a superior speaker as words are lengthened for emphasis; stress is added for highlighting; and rhetorical devices such as repetition give emphasis to phrases.