Exploring Cultural Inclusion in the Curriculum and Practices for Teaching Bahasa Indonesia to Speakers of Other Languages

by Imroatus Solikhah5

Exploring Cultural Inclusion in the Curriculum and Practices
for Teaching *Bahasa Indonesia* to Speakers of Other Languages

Imroatus Solikhah & Teguh Budiharso
IAIN Surakarta Indonesia
Email: iim_dr@yahoo.com & teguhprof@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores implementations for teaching Bahasa Indonesia (BI) and the process for including culture when teaching BI to speakers of other languages (BIPA). In this research, content analysis was applied, and a qualitative approach was used to analyze the data, which were obtained from the BIPA websites of 11 universities and one BIPA website hosted by Indonesia's Ministry of Education and Culture. This study also recruited 36 people as participants. Analysis of the data through content analysis comprised six steps: i) transforming the data into narrative text, ii) determining units of analysis in line with the research questions, iii) developing rules for the data-coding system, iv) applying the coding to all units of analysis, v) testing the consistency of each coding, and vi) drawing conclusions about the verified data. The results show how the implementations of BIPA in practice conform to curriculum planning, and they identify objectives, determine teaching materials, provide a learning experience, and evaluate the results. In these four aspects, the results are appropriate, but undesirable properties were identified in terms of the length of the study, an absence of vocabulary items, and learning outcomes for BIPA for specific academic purposes. For cultural aspects, Indonesian culture was found to be included in various topics and learning experiences, but soft diplomacy was not effectively taught through the language-teaching content and methodology.

Keywords: BIPA, culture, language properties, language policy.

Introduction

Bahasa Indonesian (BI) is currently spoken by a growing global population thanks to the success of the Indonesian Government's language policy. As the language of the fourth most populous nation in the world (Read, 2002), BI has become a popular language to learn. Indeed, the success of the BIPA (*Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing*, which translates as Bahasa Indonesia for speakers of other languages) program is such that it is now taught in 29 countries through 420 BIPA centers (Suparsa et al., 2017), with the number of students learning BIPA reaching 55,023 in 2020. The spread of BI learning outside Indonesia has been made possible because BI is considered a standardized version of Malay. Japan became the second country to teach BI/Malay in 1925 (Alwi, 1995; Read, 2002). By the 1950s, BI was being formally taught around the world, such as in Germany, Italy, France, and China. In addition, various American

universities have taught BI since 1952, while Australia and UK universities began in 1955 and 1967, respectively (Read, 2002).

In America, BI has received academic attention in the form of a project to establish Indonesian as part of the Southeast Asian Program, which was initiated by Professor John Echols, in 1952 (Read, 2002). More recently, BI has been taught in reputable American universities, such as Cornell University, Yale University, Arizona State University, California University at Berkeley, Hawaii University, and Michigan University, as well as other institutions in Northern Illinois, Ohio, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Los Angeles (Read, 2002; Soemarmo, 1988). Of the 800 universities in Japan, 75 (9.4%) of them teach BI (Suparsa et al., 2017). In Australia, BI has become the fourth most popular language course, being taken up by 1,402 students (Yabanova & Özerbas, 2020).

From the perspective of language policy, Indonesia, which has an estimated population of nearly 270 million people as of 2020, is a nation of polyglots (Read, 2002), because in addition to the national language, there are 700 regional languages. Indonesia's language policy represents the most spectacular linguistic phenomenon of our age (Alisjahbana, 2019), and it has been described as a "great success" (Bukhari, 1996) and a "miraculous success" (Woolard, 2000).

BIPA was introduced as a means of internationalizing BI by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture's Center for Strategy Development and Language Diplomacy (PPSDK). Initially, BIPA served to offer non-Indonesian's a way of simply learning BI. Recently, however, there has been interest in deeper academic study from learners in the Asian-Pacific region, Europe, and Latin America. By 2019, the global spread of BIPA had reached 48 countries with 179 learning centers (Maryani, 2011). By 2020, this increased to 420 centers in 29 countries. In Indonesia itself, there are 45 BIPA centers that are run by the PPSDK in collaboration with universities and training centers (Yabanova & Özerbas, 2020).

The BIPA program presents a great opportunity to develop a skill that can be beneficial in business, scientific, and other professional aspects. The main objective of serving BIPA programs, however, is to facilitate collaboration and mutual understanding between Indonesian culture and other cultures. More recently, the goal of BIPA has been defined as a form of soft diplomacy for establishing and maintaining good

relations, with Indonesia being positioned as a good global citizen (Ningrum et al., 2017). To achieve this goal, BIPA teachers need to play a role as language ambassadors, and through this, they can apply this soft diplomacy. The natural beauty and diversity of Indonesian culture attracts the attention of non-Indonesians, which often come to the country for the purpose of tourism, business, study, and research. What is more, academically speaking, overseas BIPA programs offer opportunities for organizing BIPA education to teachers outside Indonesia. This in turn creates opportunities for further study through undergraduate, master's, and post-graduate programs at internationally renowned Indonesian universities (Maryani, 2011; Sujana, 2012).

In the diverse global environment, culture is a critical element in teaching and learning foreign languages. Schenker (2012) admits that achieving a mastery of a language does not automatically imply that people with diverse cultural backgrounds will interact effectively. Teaching BI as a foreign language should therefore prepare an intercultural speaker. As Hamied and Musthafa (2019) suggest, "BIPA-Going Global" is now a reality. The program was designed to give participants the necessary skills (i.e., language, political awareness, cultural sensitivity) needed to engage with Indonesia in a constructive and beneficial manner. However, the BIPA program is by no means perfect, and the teaching materials and teaching methodology (Hamied & Musthafa, 2019) require considerable attention.

A review of the literature indicates two broad areas that are characteristic of BIPA. Sujana (2012) emphasizes that BIPA has potential, but the challenges and opportunities still prevail. This study, however, focuses on reviewing foreign language studies, and no empirical suggestions are provided to improve BIPA's implementation. Other studies, such as those of Pratiwi (2019) and Suyitno (2007), convey a similar message in that they emphasize the teaching materials and teaching methods but do not identify a strong foundation for BIPA implementations to take into account.

The study of Hamied and Musthafa (2019) provides a substantial overview of the practices of BIPA. It basically gives the foundation for how BIPA has been positioned as a language policy. Consequently, BIPA needs specific operational planning. The authors suggest that BIPA teachers should have adequate academic qualifications and BIPA-teaching experience, and they recommend systematic BIPA expertise,

professional teacher training, and developmental research for BIPA with funding support from the PPSDK.

Two studies by foreign experts (Paauw, 2009; Read, 2002) into BI teaching have provided a strong foundation for the implementation of the BIPA program. More specifically, Read (2002) analyzed the TIFL curriculum and innovations in BI teaching and found that TIFL teaching materials are mostly accepted as comprehensive instructional materials in Indonesian universities, with communicative competence theory acting as a strong foundation for teaching methodology.

The study of Paauw (2009), which is titled *One Land, One Nation, One Language: An Analysis of Indonesia's National Language Policy*, investigated how language policy for BI has developed, with the results of this being cited as the foundation for language policy by some Indonesian scholars. The framework for how language policy and language planning has been historically applied to position BI as the national language is attributed to language policy strategies. Finally, a study by Kuo and Lai (2019) looked at the role of culture and language, emphasizing that language teaching is made available to develop intercultural speakers.

Drawing upon the results of the above studies, an interplay may be identified to improve BIPA in practice. A BIPA implementation needs a strong foundation in TIFL approaches, yet studies by Indonesian scholars into teaching methodologies for BIPA remain limited. Most studies by Indonesian scholars review the theories but fall short of making empirical efforts to improve BIPA practices.

As a result of language policy, BIPA has been strongly identified by Paauw (2009), and its strong reliance on TIFL has been established by Read (2002). These two studies have allowed Indonesian scholars to develop more elaborate BIPA programs. There are, however, problems in BIPA practices relating to student barriers, motivations, and reasons for learning BI, all of which need to be elaborated on within a global perspective. The learners' needs, as non-native speakers, are well met by a high-quality program, and teachers who are experienced in L2 teaching play a role in this. More specifically, such programs equip learners to communicate effectively through both written and spoken BI and give a good understanding of Indonesian culture. This study endeavors to review BIPA programs and establish whether these programs meet the needs of students.

Research Questions

Drawing from the background for this study, two research questions are proposed to guide the research process:

1) Are BIPA practices coherently applied to teach BI as a foreign language?

2) How does the inclusion of culture empower students to become culture-informed Indonesian speakers?

Review of Literature

The Language Policy

Language policy and language planning are used in two synonymous terms. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) describe language policy as a set of principles, laws , rules and practices aimed at achieving the desired linguistic change in society. While Bianco et al. (2010:152) defines language policy as "a common activity that affects linguistic issues with local circumstances and political considerations." Governments often regard language policy as a matter of decision-making (Spradley, 1980). 'Regulation' is clearly based on regulatory requirements and their present status (p. 8). Spolsky (2004) suggests that there are three components of language policy: (1) linguistic practices such as patterns of language variation; (2) linguistic attitudes or social beliefs influencing linguistic and linguistic opinions; and (3) specific attempts to reform practices. Language policy is designed to address language needs, evaluate language tools, examine the language feature, and develop strategies to improve effective programming (Corson, 1998). The implementation of a language policy, in turn , drives language preparation.In addition, language planning or language engineering, according to Cooper and Cooper (1989), guides writers and speakers in developing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary. Language planning is an element of language policy, but Garvin (1974) asserts that there are two basic ingredients to language planning: language choice and language development. According to Weinstein and Thayer (1990), the purpose of language planning includes maintaining the status quo but also reforming and transforming a language.

Language policy in Indonesia predates the country's independence in 1945. BI was initially a variety of the Malay language. By 1928, BI had become established as the national language thanks to a historic event, namely the First Congress of Indonesian

Youth in 1928. This congress initiated formal language planning activities to develop BI as a distinct language for the Indonesian people (Paauw, 2009).

BI was recognized as the official language for the nation (Alisjahbana, 2019) following Indonesia 's independence on 17 August 1945 and expressly officialized under Article 36 of the Constitution of 1945 (Simanjuntak, 2009). Four historic times have passed: constitutional democracy 1950–59, the Sukarno democratic rules 1959–66, the new order in 1966–98, and the reform era from 1998 to present day. The Republic of Indonesia has been a historic age. Political changes were thus reflected during those years, but language policies and BI 's status as the national language were unchanged (Kaplan & Baldauf 1997). In the recent era, the Indonesian Government has stipulated Government Regulation number 20 Year 2003, article 50 on the legal status of BI. At schools, BI and English are used as instruction languages in order to prepare graduates of international quality. The decision to use BI as the national language of Indonesia was a policy decision. Woolard (2000) states that the process of engineering BI into a language with domestic and international status indicates how language policy is developed. Officially, BI is promoted as the language of the nation, the instruction medium in schools, and the official language in national, governmental, and social affairs, as well as a means for developing culture, science, and technology.

BIPA

BIPA serves as a BI-teaching program for speakers of other languages. In the context of teaching, BIPA falls under the area of teaching methodology and is equivalent to teaching Indonesian as a foreign language (TIFL). As a part of the language policy of the ninth national language congress, BIPA was made available to the global community through the "BIPA Going Global" program (Hamied & Musthafa, 2019).

The PPSDK prepares BIPA programs to assist learners in achieving communicative competence with BI for various goals and contexts. To this end, seven programs are served: 1) the *Darmasiswa* RI Program, 2) the Developing Country Partnership Program (KNB), 3) the In-Country Program, 4) the Critical Language Scholarship (CLS) Program, 5) the AMINEF Program, 6) the Indonesian Flagship Language Initiative (IFLI) Program, 7) the Indonesian Overseas Program (IOP), and 8) the Study Abroad Program (Ningrum et al., 2017). These programs are embedded into a one year

course, with each lasting four months. The level and individual teaching targets (Ningrum et al., 2017) since its introduction in 2015 are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
Number of Teachers and BIPA Centers in Foreign Countries

Year	Number of Teachers	BIPA Centers	Number of Countries	Number of Learners
2015	14	11	8	1.883
2016	74	47	17	9.885
2017	200	79	22	21.940
2018	226	87	22	18.171
2019	78	77	21	3.144
	592	**301**	**90**	**55.023**

Source: Researchers' analysis

From the perspective of students, motivations for learning BI include (1) to speak BI, (2) to come to Indonesia, (3) to understand Indonesian books and newspapers, (4) to study the culture of Indonesia, (5) to work in Indonesia, (6) to send letters written in BI, (7) to attend courses in BI, (8) communicate with Indonesian friends or families, (9) to work in research in Indonesia, and (10) to master academic writing in BI (Read, 2002). In addition, the program is offered at six levels. Classroom teaching is scheduled twice a week for two hours each. In one year, the programs are held three times during January to April, May to August, and September to December. This means that the six programs can be completed in two years (see Table 2).

Table 2.
Levels of a BIPA Program

Level	Course Length and General Objective
BASIC 1	**50 hours**—In this stage , learners are able to understand and use descriptive terms, present themselves, perform daily routines and fulfill needs in a simple way..
BASIC 2	**50 hours**— At that level , students are able to clearly express their emotions, identify their environment and share their everyday needs and routines.
BASIC 3	**50 hours**— When this stage is completed, participants will be able to briefly and coherently articulate their thoughts, goals, priorities and ambitions with explanations in their everyday lives and jobs.
BASIC 4	**50 hours**—Upon completing this level, participants are expected to be able to report their observations of events and express their ideas about topics in their field, both abstract and concrete, fairly fluently and without obstacles that may diminish their interlocutor's understanding.
ACADEMIC 1	**60 hours**— If this degree has been reached, participants can naturally and fluently almost without barriers, even in specialized academic fields, be able to understand and articulate complex texts and perspective views in many subject fields.
ACADEMIC 2	**60 hours** After this stage has been completed, the participants shall be able to understand, fluently and spontaneously in a manner suitable for social and professional needs, long and complex texts containing implied meanings, and also articulate ideas in simple, organized, systematic and comprehensive language, not in a complex academic field, e.g. in a scientific work sense.

In future, the focus will be directed at boosting the number of BIPA programs, increasing the number of students on existing BIPA programs, expanding the degree program, extending the reach into foreign countries, and improving the quality of BIPA learning services and facilities. In practice, BIPA teaching has revealed some problems: (a) teaching BI to foreign speakers differs from teaching English to foreign speakers in many ways; (b) a BIPA program is unique in terms of its teaching methodology, teaching materials, assessment systems, and administrative support systems; (c) being a native speaker of BI is not in itself sufficient for teaching BIPA, and (d) BIPA programming and instructors' professional development never ends.

The Role of Culture in L2 Teaching

Greece (2002) describes culture as a set of learned beliefs, convictions and social norms within a population group. In the meantime, culture is characterized by Kuo and Lai (2019) as consisting of ethnic background, nationality , gender, disability, age , sex, and religion. Culture in nature influences the beliefs, traditions , language and actions of individuals. Cultural awareness is necessary to achieve linguistic competence, as language can influence a society 's culture.

Straub (1999) stresses that the growth of grammatical competence, communicative competence and language proficiencies in the learning of a foreign language (L2) is followed by a shift in one's or another culture attitude. On the other hand, Thanasoulas (2001) notes that cultural skills demonstrate strong awareness in other countries of traditions, practices , values and meaning systems and that this is an important part of L2 education. Teachers are aware that teaching L2 should include the teaching of culture. In short, teaching L2 equips learners with the means to improve their cognitive skills within a foreign culture (Straub, 1999).

In principle, L2 teachers initiate ideas to introduce cultural content in a curriculum. In particular, teachers should be made aware that cultural content in the classroom is influenced by differences in L1 and target cultures. In practice, language teaching focuses on improving four skills in listening , speaking , reading and writing, but teachers should also recognize cultural competence as a fifth skill. The way a target culture works should also mean language teaching, so that culture is still present in the

teaching process. Culture is more difficult to define than grammar or vocabulary (Kovacs, 2017), but it should still be represented in textbooks, teaching materials, modules, and classroom teaching (Solikhah, 2020). Byram (1989) highlights the value of cultural learning though linguistic proficiency as the overall aim of communicative competence. During classroom teaching, culture may manifest in things like silence, frequency of turn taking, politeness (Odlin, 1989), and communications such as persuasion, deception, punishment, and control that bridge the cultural divides in language teaching (Byram, 1989; Fairclough, 1989; Valdes, 1986). Byram (1994) maintains that the wider context of language is society and culture, so communicative competence should be the goal of language proficiency. In the eyes of teachers and students, knowledge and mastery of grammatical systems should be complemented with an understanding of culture-specific meanings, thus demonstrating communicative, or rather cultural, competence.

Methods

Design

This study applied a content analysis (CA) design with a qualitative approach (Solikhah, 2020). CA involves examining documents, text, or speech to see what themes emerge (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2016), such as focusing on unique themes that describe the meanings of particular texts or concepts (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). CA extracts categories or themes inductively through the researcher's careful examination (Patton, 2002). The focus of qualitative CA is placed on language as communication specific to the content or contextual meaning of the text (Tesch, 2013). Textual data—including in verbal, printed, or electronic form—is gathered by narrative responses, open-ended survey questions, interviews, focus groups, observations, and printed media such as articles, books, and manuals (Kondracki et al., 2002). This study applied summative CA, and the process began by determining the content and ended by including latent meanings and themes. This approach analyzed quantitative data in the early stages and elaborated on the contents to identify its qualitative message in an inductive manner (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This study looked at 11 universities: (1) UM Malang, (2) UMM Malang, (3) UNESA Surabaya, (4) Unair Surabaya, (5) UGM

Yogjakarta, (6) UNY Yogyakarta, (7) UNDIP Semarang, (8) UPI Bandung, (9) ITB Bogor, (10) ITB Bandung, and (11) UI Jakarta.

Data and their Sources

The main data for this study comprised curricula, teaching programs, and activities for BIPA implementations, and these were obtained from the web presences of BIPA centers in the various universities throughout Indonesia, as well as from the website of the PPSDK. Data were found through websites, WhatsApp, Instagram, and Facebook. There were 13 universities running BIPA program, and the researchers used these as sources of data. The kinds of data that are useful for this study include aspects of the BIPA programs, namely (1) the purpose of the BIPA program, (2) the level of the program, (3) teaching methods, (4) classroom activities, (5) the curriculum, (6) course books, (7) teachers, (8) the testing of learners' proficiency, (9) the learners' characteristics and backgrounds, and (10) teaching attainments and obstacles. All data were available in written texts.

Participants

The participants for this study were BIPA students, BIPA teachers, and other BIPA staff from 11 universities operating BIPA programs in Indonesia. These participants were distributed as follows: 17 students, 11 teachers, and 8 staff, for a total of 36 participants. These were recruited online using email, WhatsApp, and Facebook. Some 50 participants were initially invited, but only 36 were available. The participants were recruited based on purposive sampling (Lawrence, 2011). Table 3 describes the distribution of the participants.

Table 3.
Participants of this study

No	Kind of participants	Number	%	Remarks
1	Students	17	47	11 universities responded
2	Teacher	11	30.6	8 universities responded
3	Staff	8	22.2	6 universities responded
		36		

Research Instrument

This study employed a survey checklist to collect data. This checklist had 10 items that were to be answered with short responses. These items were developed based on the analysis of the website contents and the results of subsequent discussions with BIPA staff and teachers. The items on the checklist included (1) the purpose of BIPA, (2) the number of students, (3) the country of origin for students, (4) the level of BIPA, (5) textbooks, (6) classroom activities, (7) teaching methods, (8) evaluation, (9) teachers, (10) problems with the teaching–learning process, (11) the perception of teaching materials, and (12) the perception of the teaching–learning process. Prior to distribution, the checklist was evaluated by one expert in BIPA teaching and two BIPA teachers.

Data-Collection Procedure

Data for this study were collected through two processes: downloading information from websites and soliciting answers to the survey checklist. The authors downloaded information from the BIPA webpages of 15 universities and the PPSDK website. In reality, only 11 university websites and the PPSDK website provided comprehensive detailed content that was appropriate for use in this study, so the researcher adopted these for the final data. To elaborate the contents of the websites, the researcher distributed the survey checklist to 50 participants through email, WhatsApp, and Facebook. Of these 50 participants, only 36 provided responses, which were then used as data for this study. Based on these responses through email, WhatsApp, and Facebook, the researcher established that the 17 students came from America, Australia, Japan, Turkey, Vietnam, Cambodia, South Korea, and South Africa, while the 11 teachers worked at eight universities, and the six staff worked in BIPA centers.

Data-Analysis Techniques

The data for this study were inductively analyzed (Patton, 2002) by applying summative CA (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Zhang & Wildemuth, 2016). Initially, the researcher analyzed quantitative data before moving onto to the qualitative data that focused on themes and inferences for the entire data. The analysis process comprised six steps: (1) transforming any data into written text; (2) identifying units of analysis in line with the research questions; (3) defining rules for the coding system; (4) coding all units of analysis; (5) testing the consistency of each coding and theme, so that fixed data were

obtained. If a coding was not consistent, revisions to the messages or themes were made before (6) drawing conclusions to determine the final data.

Operationally, the analyses were performed as follows. Data obtained from the websites and the responses to the survey checklist were narrated. Units of analysis were classified into categories and defined in the checklist and themes for students' responses. Each unit of analysis was coded, tested, and verified. Thematic analysis was used to answer the research questions, including for the teaching purposes of BIPA, its attributes, and problems when conducting BIPA teaching.

Results and Discussion

RQ 1: Do BIPA practices embody a coherent application of teaching BI as a foreign language?

For RQ1, description data are provided in two sets of evidence, namely the analysis of websites and the responses to the survey checklist. The answers to RQ1 were described in terms of (1) teaching objectives and (2) learning experiences and teaching methodology.

Objectives

The objective of a BIPA program, according to the teachers and staff, is to provide teaching activities for learning BI as a foreign language. This objective is defined in the syllabus and expressed in leaflets and brochures. Each BIPA center at the universities indicated a similar model for determining the objective, although there were slight differences in the activities of programs.

Drawing from the syllabi, the level and objectives of BIPA programs were identified. The programs included four basic levels and two for academic purposes. The basic levels teach students BI language skills, including speaking, listening, reading, grammar, and the distinctive and diverse cultures of Indonesia. Academic levels, meanwhile, prepare students to use BI within academic settings (Table 4).

As Table 4 suggests, the vocabulary contents are unavailable, and the Indonesian words in general are not defined in the syllabus. In addition, the learning outcomes that students should achieve at each level are also undefined.

Table 4. Summary of BIPA Programs

Level	Objectives	Contents	Duration
Basic 1	To master oral expression for informal daily interaction	4 skills: grammar, daily conversation, and culture	4 months
Basic 2	To master oral expression for formal uses	4 skills: grammar, formal discourse, and culture	4 months
Intermediate	To master various topics of oral expression for various functions	4 skills: grammar and various discourse uses, and culture	4 months
Advanced	To master critical topics for oral and written discourse	4 skills: grammar and critical discourse, and culture	4 months
IGAP* 1	To master BI for initial academic purposes	Speaking, reading and writing, discourse, and culture	4 months
ISAP* 2	To master BI for complex academic purposes	Complex discourse in speaking, reading and writing, and culture	4 months

*IGAP = Indonesian for General Academic Purposes
*ISAP = Indonesian for Specific Academic Purposes

The motivations for learning BI, from the perspective of students, were adopted from the survey of Read (2002), and the results of our survey are as follows:

1) being willing, in oral or written BI, to communicate (72%);

2) reading books , journals and social media in Indonesia (69 percent);

3) studying Indonesian culture (68%);

4) BI letters and postings to social media (52%);

5) visiting Indonesia (46%);

6) meet the requirements of the course (45%);

7) Communicate with friends or families of Indonesia (42%);

8) conducting research in Indonesia (40%);

(9) being able to work in the university (38%);

10) meet the Indonesian work requirement (30%).

Learning Experiences and Teaching Methodology
Learning experiences, as indicated in the teaching methodology, are adopted by the BIPA program of UMM. In general, all the 11 BIPA centers apply a communicative approach as the basic teaching method, and they also apply five other methods: preaching methods, project-based methods, task-based methods, skill-based methods,

and content-based methods. Teaching materials are set in terms of learning activities, and students practice tasks or skills that are assigned by the teachers (Table 5).

The results of implementing BIPA comprise the objectives and the learning experiences or methodology. A discussion of each of these is provided below.

The objectives were identified from the syllabus contents and derived from the responses of the participants. Similarities appear in that the objective of BIPA is to provide communicative competence in BI. Teaching materials were prepared to equip students with language skills and knowledge of grammar, but no specific vocabulary was given. In addition, culture was proportionally included in the teaching materials through texts and field trips for learning. Of the learning objectives mentioned by the students, there is a strong indication that students' wish to merely learn to speak BI for their own private goals.

Table 5.
Learning experiences and teaching methodology

Activities to achieve learning experience	Teaching methodology
1. Demonstration-, IT-, and pragmatic-based classroom learning	Preaching and discussion
2. Field trips for academic tourism to better recognize and assimilate Indonesian culture	Task-based approach
3. Field trips for business tours to acknowledge the various business products of home industries in the community	Project-based approach
4. Visits to recreational and historical sites for cultural tourism	Task-based approach
5. Practicing dance, gamelan, batik, culinary pursuits, and local mask art.	Task-based approach
6. Engaging in various extracurricular activities, such as silat, photography, activities in nature, slametan, weddings, and mosques as an independent activity	Project-based approach
7. Practicing Bahasa Indonesian in society to build self-confidence and achieve comprehensive communication, such as in markets	Skilled-based approach
8. Field immersion in a farming or home industry	Skilled-based approach
9. Field trip to cultural heritage sites, such as temples and mosques	Project-based approach
10. Project-based approach for general and specific academic needs, such as attending a seminar, talk show, interview, or radio broadcast	Content-based approach

Data sources: BIPA program UMM

The above findings confirm the study of Suyitno (2017) in that the teaching materials of BIPA programs need improvement. Hamied and Musthafa (2019) also warn about BIPA curricula and qualified instructional design. Evidently, this study finds that the goal of BIPA programs is not as academic as it is for EAP (English for Academic Purposes) teaching (Solikhah, 2020), in the sense that BIPA is considered a form of TIFL (Read,

2002). Although BIPA programs have been served in 29 countries through 420 centers, as well as 45 centers in Indonesia itself (Ningrum et al., 2017), the objectives do not seem to accommodate students' wishes. We observe that it will take two years to finish all six programs, assuming that each level takes four months. What is more, the students' needs are more focused on learning BI for general communication. There is evidence that this affects the quality of curricula and the content of modules. In addition, the missing vocabulary list in the teaching content indicates imperfect curricula. The disagreement between the goals defined by BIPA curricula and students' needs indicate that management should perform a needs analysis before implementing a curriculum. Hamied and Musthafa, (2019) state that codifying BIPA expertise is required, and academic studies to improve the quality of BIPA programs in all aspects are strongly recommended. This implies that BIPA syllabi need to be improved and renewed on a massive scale. Within Indonesia, BIPA should be oriented towards helping students to achieve an academic literacy of BI that meets academic needs. Parallel to this, programs may seek to attract foreign students to come study in Indonesian universities.

Based on the choice of teaching methodology for a BIPA program, this study found that communicative competence had been properly applied, thus confirming the research of Read (2002). In Australia, BIPA has been taught since 1952 from the perspective of a TIFL approach. Recently, TIFL has included the communicative approach and its curriculum has been updated to a competence-based curriculum (CBC). The success of BIPA programs outside Indonesia shows that the language policy for BI has been largely successful (Paauw, 2009; Read, 2002). However, although the concept of communicative competence has been used, the cornerstone of communicative competence includes linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects, discourse, and strategies, but these are not well developed. This implies that BIPA-teaching programs should include communicative competence as a wider concern. Together with renewed curricula, standard teaching materials, teaching methods, and the learning outcomes of the students must be developed further.

RQ2: How is culture promoted to students during the BIPA-teaching process?

Answers to RQ2 relate to the inclusion of culture within the teaching materials and classroom teaching.

The primary teaching materials for BIPA programs include modules, handouts, and worksheets. Modules are used as basic guidelines for language skills and grammar. Passages to read, task-based activities, and exercises for speaking, reading, and writing are provided. In addition, grammatical topics that support speaking, reading, and writing skills are also defined. Vocabulary items are taught along with the reading of passages. The content of the teaching materials vary from one BIPA center to another, but in general, all BIPA centers teach language skills, grammar, and cultural elements in the learning experience. Specific emphasis is placed on activities like field trips with social and cultural themes, such as visiting temples and historical sites, browsing cultural art, and attending traditional festivals (Table 6).

Table 6. Cultural content in teaching materials

Description of the teaching material	Yes N=36	No N=36
1. Field work serves natural cultural content.	100%	-
2. Field work is appropriate for the level and cultural understanding.	100%	-
3. The inclusion of cultural content is proportionally developed in each aspect of the material's content.	95%	5%
4. Modules provide techniques for self-learning.	90%	10%
5. Materials promote the four language skills proportionally.	81%	19%
6. Handouts help students to understand the materials clearly.	78%	28%
7. Speaking and writing for communication are emphasized with sufficient cultural background.	72%	28%
8. The scope of grammar supports the level of the class.	65%	35%
9. Modules are well developed and graded in a good sequence.	65%	35%
10. Vocabulary items are suitably available.	10%	90%

Table 6 illustrates the quality of modules, where five items deal with the general quality of the module's contents and five deal with the inclusion of culture in the teaching materials. The percentage grades were ordered by the researchers. The inclusion of culture in teaching materials is indicated as follows: 1 (100%), 2 (100%), 3 (95%), 4 (90%) and 7 (72%). This implies that cultural content is generally perceived as being in good order by the respondents.

With regard to the inclusion of culture in classroom teaching, the respondents expressed that culture has been clearly identified. Table 7 show the students' perceptions about the involvement of culture in BIPA teaching.

The data in Table 7 demonstrates the inclusion of culture in classroom teaching. All six items reveal that culture is readily available, which is a surprisingly excellent result. Indeed, all of these have remarkable scores ranging from 95% to 100%.

The inclusion of culture in BIPA programs has been identified from the content of teaching materials and the teaching process. The results demonstrate that BI really is going global with its TIFL approach, and it is only natural that cultural aspects should receive attention in curricula and practices. In teaching materials and learning experiences, the contents feature various activities that attach culture to the linguistic aspect. This finding is in line with those of other studies (Greey, 2002; Kovács, 2017; Kuo & Lai, 2019; Thanasoulas, 2001). Students cannot truly master L2 until they are proficient in a cultural context. Culture in L2 can be generalized to ethnically, geographically, genetically, physically, mentally, culturally, physically and religiously (Greek, 2002; Kuo & Lai, 2019). Therefore, the inclusion of culture within the system of teaching and classroom instruction should be discussed (Kovács, 2017). Indeed, international students should understand Indonesian culture and teachers should share knowledge of Indonesian culture (Stevick 1982).

Table 7.
Perceptions of the inclusion of culture in classroom teaching

Description of classroom teaching	Yes N=36	No N=36
1. Classroom equally appreciates all students, who may have different ethnicities, race, countries of origin, and religions.	100%	-
2. Classroom equally values the roles of students regardless of gender	100%	-
3. Classroom provides proportional opportunities for any student to participate without considering gender, race, ethnicity, or religion.	90%	10%
4. Classroom respects students' ethnicities, economic statuses, and religious backgrounds equally.	95%	5%
5. Classroom appreciates students' backgrounds from different countries equally.	100%	-
6. Teachers are aware that the difference between Indonesian culture and students' native cultures may influence their learning of BI.	90%	10%

All this implies that an understanding of Indonesian culture needs to be a core element in BIPA programs, so specific training for BIPA teachers may be needed. As BIPA plays a chief function as a soft diplomacy tool, strategies should be made available by the PPSDK. In the teaching process, strategies to promote Indonesian culture should

also be emphasized. However, BIPA requires a renewal in curricula, teaching materials, and teaching methodology.

Overall, this research has bridged some of the gaps left by previous studies. Firstly, TIFL, while it only applies in certain BIPA centers, can now be improved with an update to L2 teaching. Second, an instructional design that emphasizes teaching materials, learning experiences, and learning outcomes should be updated. Third, the cultural aspects of BIPA should be comprehensively embedded in the teaching materials, learning experiences, and learning outcomes. This study reveals novel findings in that BIPA programs should proportionally cover linguistic proficiency and a vocabulary that includes both general Indonesian words and academic words. Indeed, an effort to improve BIPA for academic purposes should be a priority.

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the implementation of BIPA programs and establish how culture was integrated into BIPA teaching and the related language policy. The results indicate that the implementation of BIPA programs shows good levels of attainment, as indicated in the goals and teaching methodology. As a language policy, BIPA has enjoyed great success, with it now being taught in 29 countries through 420 centers. However, drawbacks in implementations were found, including missing vocabulary items and an absence of communicative components, such as linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence, indicating the need for renewed curricula. More specifically, the inclusion of culture in the teaching process has been accommodated in the teaching materials, classroom activities, and learning outcomes. However, BIPA teachers' understanding of cross-cultural matters is not uniform.

Despite the limitations of this study, some suggestions are proposed, because BIPA programs warrant improvement. Each local BIPA center can attend to problems in its teaching contents, teaching methods, and the inclusion of culture in its programs. It is therefore recommended that each BIPA renew its curriculum. Accordingly, the PPSDK, as the central office coordinating BIPA centers, should host a national meeting to develop a new curriculum. This research is by no means perfect, however, and there are limitations because in-depth interviews and direct observations of classrooms were not

included. Future research may pursue a pilot project with a modified research design that includes such interviews and observations.

References

Alisjahbana, S. T. (2019). *Language planning for modernization: The case of Indonesian and Malaysian* (Vol. 14). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Alwi, H. (1995). *BIPA: hari ini dan esok [Teaching Indonesian to speakers of other languages, present and future]. Paper presented to the International Congress on the Teaching of Indonesian as a Foreign Language]*. Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia.

Bianco, J. Lo, Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. L. (2010). Language policy and planning. *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, *18*, 143.

Bukhari, D. (1996). Bahasa Indonesia: The struggle for a national language. *University Of*.

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education* (Vol. 46). Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (1994). *Teaching-and-learning language-and-culture* (Vol. 100). Multilingual matters.

Cooper, R. L., & Cooper, R. L. C. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.

Corson, D. (1998). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. *LAnguage in Social Life Series*. London: Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429468896-1

Garvin, P. L. (1974). Some comments on language planning. *Advances in Language Planning*, 69–78.

Greey, M. (2002). *Honouring diversity: A cross-cultural approach to infant development for babies with special needs*. Centennial Infant and Child Centre.

Hamied, F. A., & Musthafa, B. (2019). Policies on language education in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2), 308–315.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory* (Vol. 108). Multilingual Matters.

Kondracki, N. L., Wellman, N. S., & Amundson, D. R. (2002). Content analysis: Review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, *34*(4), 224–230.

Kovács, G. (2017). Culture in Language Teaching: A course design for teacher trainees. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, *9*(3), 73–86.

Kuo, M.-M., & Lai, C.-C. (2019). Linguistics across Cultures: The Impact of Culture on Second Language Learning. *Online Submission*, *1*(1).

Maryani, Y. (2011). Lokakarya Program Prasertifikasi Guru BIPA: Metodologi Pengajaran BIPA. *Diselenggarakan Oleh Kantor Bahasa Prov. NTB Bekerjasama Dengan APBIPA Bali, Senggigi Beach Hotel*, 13–15.

Ningrum, R. K., Waluyo, H. J., & Winarni, R. (2017). BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia Penutur Asing) sebagai upaya internasionalisasi universitas di Indonesia. In *Proceedings Education and Language International Conference* (Vol. 1).

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer* (Vol. 27). Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Paauw, S. (2009). One land, one nation, one language: An analysis of Indonesia's national language policy. *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences*, *5*(1), 2–16.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Thousand Oaks. *Cal.: Sage Publications*.

Pratiwi, D. F. (2019). *Kesulitan yang Dihadapi oleh para Pemelajar dalam Memperlajari Bahasa Indonesia di Universitas Nottingham, Inggris. [Problems faced by the learners learning Indonesian in the University of Nottingham, England]*. Jakarta.

Read, J. E. (2002). Innovation in Indonesian language teaching: An evaluation of the TIFL tertiary curriculum materials.

Schenker, T. (2012). *The effects of a virtual exchange on language skills and intercultural competence*. Michigan State University. German Studies.

Simanjuntak, R. R. (2009). Bahasa Indonesia: Policy, implementation, and planning. *Lingua Cultura*, *3*(1), 11–19.

Soemarmo, M. (1988). Keadaan dan perkembangan pengajaran bahasa dan sastra

Indonesia di Amerika Serikat [The status quo and developments in the teaching of Indonesian language and culture in the United States]. In *Conference paper, Vth Indonesian Language Congress, Jakarta* (Vol. 28).

Solikhah, I. (2020). Evaluating EAP Textbooks for Indonesian University Students Using Impressionistic and In-depth Assessment. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *4*(2), 395–411.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Spradley, J., & Observation, P. P. (1980). *Holt. Rinehart & Winston, New York*.

Stevick, E. W. (1982). *Teaching and learning languages* (Vol. 32). Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Straub, H. (1999). Designing a Cross-Cultural Course. In *Forum* (Vol. 37, p. n3). ERIC.

Sujana, I. M. (2012). Program Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA): Peluang, Tantangan dan Solusi. In *Makalah disampaikan pada "Seminar Internasional "Menimang Bahasa Membangun Bangsa" FKIP Universitas Mataram, Lombok, NTB* (pp. 5–6).

Suparsa, I. N., Mantra, I. B. N., & Widiastuti, I. A. M. S. (2017). Developing learning methods of Indonesian as a foreign language. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *1*(2), 51–57.

Suyitno, I. (2007). Pengembangan bahan ajar Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA) berdasarkan hasil analisis kebutuhan belajar. *Wacana*, *9*(1), 62–78.

Tesch, R. (2013). Qualitative research : analysis types and software tools. Retrieved from http://www.123library.org/book_details/?id=113487

Thanasoulas, D. (2001). The importance of teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. *Radical Pedagogy*, *3*(3), 1–25.

Valdes, J. M. (1986). Culture in literature. *Culture Bound*, 137–147.

Weinstein, B., & Thayer, L. (1990). *Language policy and political development*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Woolard, K. A. (2000). J. Joseph Errington, Shifting languages: Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesian.(Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language, 19.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xii, 216. *Language in Society*, *29*(3), 456–460.

Yabanova, U., & Özerbas, D. H. (2020). International Student Selection Process in

Turkey: Characteristics, Challenges and Opportunities. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *16*(2), 137–156.

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. (2016). Qualitative Analysis of Content. *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*.

Exploring Cultural Inclusion in the Curriculum and Practices for Teaching Bahasa Indonesia to Speakers of Other Languages