



Framework References on Indonesian Language for Foreigners: Multiple Case Study at Nusa Tenggara Barat

Juanda^{1,2(✉)}, Zamzani¹, and Pangesti Wiediarti¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

juanda.ss2014@student.uny.ac.id, {zamzani, pangesti}@uny.ac.id

² Universitas Samawa, Sumbawa, Indonesia

Abstract. This study aims to examine Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing (BIPA) or Indonesian Language for Foreigner in Mataram Lingua Franca Institute (MaLFI), Pusat Bahasa Unram (Pubah Unram), and NTB Language Office. The research is a multiple study design. The data are collected from 14 informants through interview, observation, and documentation. The data collection then analyzed by using Miles & Huberman model and applying Nvivo 12 Plus software. The validation is used credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. The results of this study are as follows. *First*, BIPA framework references at MaLFI and Pubah Unram developed by Regional Universities Indonesian Language Initiative (RUILI) Consortium of Australia Universities. Charles Darwin University (CDU), University of Sunshine Coast (USC), and University of Tasmania (UTas) do not hold BIPA 1 and BIPA 2. The universities teach from RUILI 3 to RUILI 8, while University of New England (UNE) starts from RUILI 2 to RUILI 8 with competence in the BIPA 1 to BIPA 7. Meanwhile, NTB Language Office refers to National Language Agency (Permendikbud No. 27/2017). Thus, framework of RUILI is still relatively the same to National Language Agency (Badan Bahasa Nasional), CEFR, and ACTFL. *Second*, the differences occur precisely in communication activities, language competence, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence.

Keywords: BIPA · Communicative Activities · Framework

1 Introduction

BIPA is largely driven by geographical factors, Indonesian population, trade, industry, tourism, and education (Sujana 2012, 2018). Geographically, Indonesia is close to Australia which of course opens up opportunities for students, tourists, or business people to visit, study, or invest in Lombok. In addition, transportation access between Lombok-Australia that can support these activities. Besides that, the population also contributes to the BIPA program. Indonesia's population is around 268 million people (BPS 2020; Yulaelawati 2015; Flamiejamie 2019; Tadmor 2005; Kaplan and Baldauf 2003; Unesco 2011; Spolsky 2004; Mahsun 2010; Iskandarwassid and Sunendar 2013; UN 1983). Thus,

© The Author(s) 2022

J. Priyana and N. K. Sari (Eds.): ICERI 2021, ASSEHR 705, pp. 364–370, 2022.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-67-1_41

Maurais (2003) believes that Indonesian will become the regional language of trade in 2050 *junto* as a result of the IX Indonesian Language Congress (KBI) (Badan Bahasa, 2015; PP RI Number 57 of 2014).

These opportunities are able to make Indonesia to be a global market destination and to invite foreign workers to work in the country (ASEAN 2009, 2012). On behalf of the government must consider Indonesian language competence for foreign workers (Kepmendiknas RI No. 152/U/2003; Permendikbud RI No. 1/2012; Permenaker RI No. 12/2013; PP RI No. 57/2014; Permendikbud RI No. 45/2019; Permendikbud No. 70/2016; Permendikbud No. 27/2017). Foreign workers are believed to be able to adapt to the work environment quickly. These efforts also support the improvement of Indonesian language status through BIPA (ASEAN 2009; Undang-Undang RI No. 38/2008).

BIPA also contributes to domestic tourism, internationalizing universities, and creating job opportunities (Sujana 2012, 2018). This is evidenced by the interest of foreign students who continue their studies in Indonesia around 10,000 (Wicaksono 2016). Then, the number of tourists is around 2.7 million people (Angkasa Pura 2019; Disbudpar 2019). Finally, BIPA organizers, such as the MaLFI, Pubah Unram, and NTB Language Office are a must given the strategic role. But, framework of BIPA is difference to each other, such competencies outcome, and communicative activities.

2 Research Method

This study is a multiple case study design to examine framework of BIPA, and communicative activities at MaLFI, Pubah Unram, and NTB Language Office. The choice of multicase study was caused by several research objects and settings (Berg 2001; Stake 2009; Yin 2009). The data obtained through observation, interview, and document analysis (video, audio tapes, and photographs), and then the data is organized into categories and themes (Creswell 2013), interpreted, and analyzed through interactive analysis model. The informants were 14 heads or teachers and all of them are given an initials (Yin 2009), such as Hm, ES, Mm, Bh, KA, AJ, Im, YI, KR, HL, SS, ZH, LEH, and SAH. In selection, presentation, and reporting, the author used Nvivo 12 Plus Software. In order to maintain the data, the author used credibility, confirmability, dependability, and transferability.

3 Findings and Discussion

According to data, the author found two cases. *First*, the framework of BIPA used by MaLFI and Pubah Unram refers to RUILI or four Australia member universities, namely CDU, USC, UNE, and UTas (Undang-Undang RI No. 20/2003; Permendikbud RI No. 27/2017; Baldauf 2005; Cooper 2000; Kaplan 1997; Rappa and Wae 2006; Oliva 1992; Brown 1995; PP RI No. 57/2014). While, NTB Language Office tend to Badan Bahasa. For example, regarding to writing competence on A-1 CEFR, BIPA 1, RUILI 2, Novice Low, and Mid Low, ACTFL stipulates the competence to write about personal information (such as introductions, filling out forms, and documents), daily needs, and simple phrases. Then, BIPA 2 is still relatively the same as the A-2 CEFR and Novice High ACTFL, which focus on the ability of students to describe himself/herself and

environmental information. RUILI 2 itself focuses on the ability to read and write short stories (CEFR 2001; ACTFL 2012; Badan Bahasa 2017; RUILI 2020).

Similarities also occur in BIPA 3, B-1 CEFR, Intermediate Low-Mid Low ACTFL, and RUILI 3 which lead to write needs, routines, experiences, expectations, and general situations. Then, students are able to ask and answer questions simply. In contrast to BIPA 4, B-2 CEFR, Intermediate High ACTFL, and RUILI 4 which focus on complex sentences (active sentences and passive sentences). Likewise, BIPA 5, C-1 CEFR, Advanced Low-Advanced High ACTFL, and RUILI 5 are focused on social, academic, and professional field (CEFR 2001; ACTFL 2012; Badan Bahasa 2017; RUILI 2020). However, ACTFL emphasizes the use of common vocabulary, sentences, and simple structures. Then, BIPA 6 focuses on the use of complex sentences in various fields (CEFR 2001; ACTFL 2012; Badan Bahasa 2017; RUILI 2020). Unlike the case with BIPA 7 which stress reconstructing opinions, for example writing papers, articles, researches, and hypotheses. This coverage is the same as RUILI at the advanced level and C-2 CEFR, while the ACTFL has not taught it yet. So, BIPA 7 is equivalent to the ACTFL's superior and distinguished level.

Second, communicative activities. The framework was further detailed by CEFR (2001), ACTFL (2012), Badan Bahasa (2017), and RUILI (2020). For example, writing communicative activities A-1 CEFR, Novice Low ACTFL, BIPA 1, and RUILI 1, students write correspondence, notes, messages, and fill out forms about information about themselves and others. Then, language competence includes concrete situations, grammar, simple sentences, and short phrases (directions, objects or figures). Furthermore, sociolinguistic competence consists of simple expressions (greeting, thanking, apologizing, asking, explaining, confirming, refusing, and approving opinions, etc.). Then, pragmatic competencies include coherence and fluency in speaking, but flexibility, theme development, and propositions have not been taught.

RUILI 2, BIPA 2, B-2 CEFR, and Novice Mid ACTFL, students are able to write personal, family, needs, and professional information. Then, in the communication strategy, the frameworks include the ability to ask for clarification, confirmation, and feedback or question and answer. So, RUILI, Badan Bahasa, and CEFR are relatively the same in terms of the use of communication strategies. In contrast, ACTFL utilizes expressions, body languages, and pictures (visuals) or demonstrations as communication strategies. In addition, there are similarities in linguistic competence, such as emphasizing grammatical structures and linguistic features (prepositions and adverbs) in the context of routines. Similarities are also found in sociolinguistic and pragmatic competencies, such as writing according to norms, ethics, and culture.

RUILI 3 emphasizes that students are able to express ideas in formal and informal situations. In contrast to BIPA 3, B-1 CEFR, and Intermediate Low ACTFL, which focus on writing descriptive texts, narrative texts, and explanatory texts about personal information, employment, education, and complaint letters. In communication strategy, RUILI uses monologue and discussion, while BIPA 3, B-1 CEFR, and Intermediate Low ACTFL use repertoire, expressions, intonation, understand mistakes, and correct them. Then, linguistic competence are still relatively the same, such as the use of prepositions,

affixes, sentences, and vocabulary. However, the CEFR is deeper and more comprehensive than RUILI, Badan Bahasa, and ACTFL, for example covering spelling, punctuation, layout, and sentence organization. Similarities are also found in sociolinguistic competencies that emphasize appreciation of cultural differences, understanding norms, situations, language variety, registers, and repertoires.

RUILI 4, BIPA 4, B-2 CEFR, Intermediate and High ACTFL emphasizes students to write compositions, essays, or various texts in simple sentences. RUILI also addresses themes of culture, tourism, marriage and communication, while CEFR includes film reviews, reports, books, and so on. Another similarity occurs in communication strategies, namely students are able to start, continue, and end conversations in formal and informal contexts (literary works). For example, asking, responding, confirming, clarifying, and realizing mistakes. In addition, linguistic competence focuses on words, vocabulary, phrases, sentences, discourse, conjunctions, spelling, and punctuation. Then, sociolinguistic competence emphasizes students to be able to communicate according to cultural norms, situations, and contexts. Meanwhile, pragmatic competence is focused on the use of linguistic elements in narrative texts, explanatory texts, and descriptive texts, both oral and written.

RUILI 5, BIPA 5, C-1 CEFR, and Advanced Low ACTFL, students are able to write short essays with simple and uncomplicated sentences (formal or informal contexts). RUILI focuses on complex themes, such as politics, democracy, industry, trade, fishing, tourism, and so on. RUILI refers to the abstract, while BIPA 5, C-1 CEFR, and Advanced Low ACTFL focus on the simple sentences and concrete objects. The communication strategy of the frameworks emphasizes the ability to understand the context and face difficulties when communicating with the interlocutor. Next, linguistic competence emphasizes grammars, sentences, paragraphs, and syntaxes in different contexts. Likewise, sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence are focused on understanding cultural norms and language variations in interacting with speech partners.

RUILI 6 and BIPA 6 still emphasize essay writing skills on social issues, while C-2 CEFR and Advanced High ACTFL focus on academic and familiar topics, such as reports, essays, articles, proposals, and literary works. However, RUILI seems to focus on mining, gender, law and criminal issues and society. Meanwhile, these topics are not clearly and explicitly described in BIPA 6, and C-2 CEFR. Compare also with Advanced High ACTFL whose details of competence are still related to familiar concrete topics. Those familiar topics can then be written through narration and description. Next, the communication strategy refer to the ability to participate in formal or informal conversations or discussions. In addition, it also emphasizes the ability to overcome obstacles encountered during the conversation. Then, the linguistic competence focuses on grammar, structure, understanding connotative meaning, and so on. In sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence, students are projected to be able to adapt to the cultural context and use language smoothly. Furthermore, the details of the competence of BIPA 6 above are still related to BIPA 7. RUILI, Badan Bahasa, and ACTFL include competence in writing fiction (literary works) and non-fiction (observations and interviews, essays, papers, and research reports). Then, the communication strategy is to use the right expressions during conversations, discussions, debates, and

make reports smoothly and accurately. Linguistic competence shows similarity in relation to grammars (spelling, sign language, and writing) and syntaxes according to the situation and context. In sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence, RUILI, Badan Bahasa, and ACTFL also emphasize aspects of cultural understanding in various contexts.

Shortly, RUILI do not break down learning outcome into competency units, competency elements, and learning indicators, while the Badan Bahasa, CEFR, and ACTFL are detailed into competency units. RUILI also does not explain the parameters of attitudes and skills explicitly. This is different from the Badan Bahasa which contains cognitive, affective, and psychomotor parameters. For example, actualizing values, knowledge, abilities in the field of work, rights and responsibilities. So, the Badan Bahasa not only expects students to master competencies, but students are also encouraged to have a positive attitude towards BIPA.

4 Conclusion

The framework references of BIPA at MaLFI and Pubah Unram developed by RUILI. RUILI has determined the framework references, learning levels, teaching materials, and excursion activities. The frameworks tend to be inconsistent with Badan Bahasa. In addition, the author also found several obstacles, such as placement test, discipline, punishment, cheating, learning materials (irrelevant themes), learning media, and assignments. The students also not taking lessons, taking vacations, busy learning schedules, budget management transparency, teacher competencies, learning methods, staff professionalism, curriculum, learning evaluation, program socialization, facilities, and collaborative with government. Then, communicative activities, communication strategy, language competence, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence is still viewed the same relatively among RUILI, BIPA, CEFR, and ACTFL.

Acknowledgments. Thanks to the Ministry of Education and Culture, Sumbawa Regency Government, PT Newmont, and West Nusa Tenggara Province Government that support to publish this manuscript.

References

1. ACTFL. (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012*. New York: The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
2. Angkasa Pura. (2019). *Lombok airport routes development*. Lombok: Angkasa Pura.
3. ASEAN. (2009). *Cetak Biru Komunitas Ekonomi Asean*. Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal Kerjasama ASEAN Departemen Luar Negeri RI.
4. ASEAN. (2012). ASEAN vision 2020. Retrived from www.asean.org. Retrieved from http://asean.org/?static_post=asean-vision-2020.
5. Badan Bahasa. (2015). *Rencana stretegis badan pengembangan dan pembinaan bahasa tahun 2015–2019*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Kementerian Pendidik an dan Kebudayaan.

6. BPS. (2020). *Statistik Indonesia 2020*. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.
7. Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.
8. Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
9. CEFR. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for language; Learning, teaching, assessment*. Eropa: Council of Europe.
10. Cooper, R. L. (2000). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Education research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Edition). Singapura: Pearson Educational International.
12. Disbudpar. (2019). *Kunjungan wisatawan ke NTB 5 tahun terakhir*. Mataram: Disbudpar NTB. Retrieved from www.disbudpar.ntbprov.go.id.
13. Flamiejamie. (2019). Top 10 most spoken languages in the world. Retrieved from <https://liverse.com/2008/06/26/top-10-most-spoken-languages-in-the-world/>.
14. Iskandarwassid & Sunendar, D. (2013). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*. Bandung: Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan an Indonesia & PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
15. Kaplan, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
16. Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R.B. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Springer.
17. Mahsun. (2010). *Genolinguistik: Kolaborasi linguistik dengan genetika dalam pengelompokan bahasa dan populasi penuturnya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
18. Maurais, J. (2003). Towards a new linguistic world order. Dalam Maurais, J., & Morris, M. A. (Eds.), *Language in a Globalising World* (pp. 16–17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2003). *Keputusan Menteri Pendidik an Nasional Nomor RI Nomor 152/U, Tahun 2003, tentang Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia*.
20. Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Permendikbud Nomor 1, Tahun 2012, tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja*.
21. Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Permendikbud Nomor 70, Tahun 2016, tentang Standar Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia*.
22. Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2017). *Permendikbud RI Nomor 27, Tahun 2017, tentang Standar Kompetensi Lulusan Kursus dan Pelatihan Bidang Keterampilan Kepe-mantuan Wisata, Pemeliharaan Taman, Pekerjaan Kesehatan, Petugangan Kayu Konstruksi, Pemasangan Bata, Perancah, Pemasangan Pipa, Mekanik Alat Berat, Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing, Pembuatan Batik dengan Pewarna Ramah Lingkungan, Pembuatan Malam Batik, Pembuatan Batik dengan Pewarna Sintetis, Pembuatan Alat Canting Tulis, dan Pembuatan Canting Cap*.
23. Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Permendikbud RI Nomor 45, Tahun 2019, tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja*.
24. Menteri Tenaga Kerja dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia. (2013). *Permenaker RI Nomor 12, Tahun 2013, tentang Tata Cara Penggunaan Tenaga Kerja Asing*.
25. Oliva, P. F. (1992). *Developing the curriculum (3rd edition)*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
26. Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Peraturan Pemerintah RI Nomor 57, Tahun 2014, tentang Pengembangan, Pembinaan, dan Perlindungan Bahasa dan Sastra serta Peningkatan Fungsi Bahasa Indonesia*.
27. Rappa, A. L., & Wace, L. (2006). *Language policy and modernity in Southeast Asia: Malaysia, The Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand*. New York: Springer.

28. Republik Indonesia. (2003). *Undang-undang RI Nomor 20, Tahun 2003, tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*.
29. Republik Indonesia. (2008). *Undang-undang RI Nomor 38, Tahun 2008, tentang Pengesahan Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*.
30. Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Sujana, I. M. (2012). Program Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA): Peluang, Tantangan dan Solusi. Retrieved from <https://imadesujana.wordpress.com/category/tiflbipa/>.
32. Tadmor, U. (2005). Malay-Indonesian and Malayic languages. Dalam Strazny, P. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. (Vol. 2). New York: An Imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.
33. UN. (1983). *Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council*.
34. Unesco. (2011). *Atlas of the world's languages in danger*. Paris: Unesco & Government of Norway.
35. Wicaksono, K. (2 Mei 2016). Jumlah Tenaga Kerja Asing di Indonesia Hanya 70 Ribu Orang. Retrieved from <http://nasional.news.viva.co.id/news/read/767980-jumlah-tenaga-kerja-asing-di-indonesia-hanya-70-ribu-orang>.
36. Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London: Sage Publications.
37. Yulaelawati, E. (2015). Supporting CLCs through a partnership approach. Dalam Noguchi, F., Guevara, J. R., & Yoroza, R. (Eds.), *Communities in Action Lifelong Learning for Sustainable Development*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

