



SNAP TO READ

## AN EVALUATION ON TWO SAHABATKU INDONESIA COURSEBOOKS IN LITTLEJOHN'S TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

**Aulia Salsabilla, Shohihuzzihni, Hana Farida**

*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*

*auliasalsabilla461@gmail.com, shohihuzzihni2000026026@webmail.uad.  
ac.id, hana.farida@enlitera.uad.ac.id*

First received: September 28, 2022    Final proof received: November 14, 2022

### **Abstract:**

*The use of proper learning materials in foreign language learning have a pivotal role. Feasibility analysis on language learning material surely different from other subjects'. Sahabatku Indonesia coursebooks has been main reference for BIPA learning programs. This qualitative descriptive research evaluates Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 and Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 using Andrew Littlejohn's Textbook Analysis Framework in three steps of analysis. The result of the evaluation shows both coursebooks could accommodate in process of learning BIPA relatively effective. It appears from the linguistic aspect and cultural context in the coursebooks provided comprehensively. Nonetheless, the learning methods still can be improved to make more room for the learners to be more engaged in the language through more active roles in bringing or producing their related texts can still be improved.*

**Keywords:** Foreign language, learning materials, Indonesian language learning materials, evaluation.

## INTRODUCTION

Foreign language learning has always been important for many reasons, such as to manage intercultural relations and to gain more opportunities in this global era. Learning a foreign language, however, has also been a challenge. To make it easier to learn, various organizations, language courses and even the government continually look for more ways to have the learning or teaching methods improved and more effective materials developed. Ministry of Education and Culture Republic of Indonesia (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan) has also developed a number of materials to accommodate the learning of Indonesian language as a foreign language. Among them, Sahabatku Indonesia coursebooks, which have been written in different skill levels and are freely accessible on their website, has been the main reference for foreign students to learn Indonesian language. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of these materials, which in turn contributes to the development of Indonesian language learning, for foreigners in particular, this research thus has been conducted.

Indonesian language has been one of the languages foreigners has interest in learning. There are many schools and universities all around the world that has Indonesian language as one of the major. Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing or BIPA is program designed to Indonesian language learning in which the subjects are foreigners. They take BIPA for various purposes and they also have various background which in turn influence their learning purposes. Among them are tourists who wish to be able to get a comfortable short stay in Indonesia, businessmen who want to run productive and successful businesses, diplomats who want to facilitate the interrelation between Indonesia and their own countries, and researchers who want to take it as a subject of research (Kusmiatun: 1-3). Despite the various reasons, one similarity underlies their motives to learn BIPA that is to be able

to utilize Indonesian language practically or professionally, and in to do so they often need to learn BIPA in a methodical process in order to get an efficient and effective result.

Maryani (Sujana, 2012: 3) said that in 2011, there were 179 BIPA courses in 48 different countries. In 2022, the website of Ministry of Education and Culture Republic of Indonesia (<https://bipa.kemdikbud.go.id/jaga>) showed that there are already 488 institution that facilitate BIPA courses all over the globe, and the number was still growing. It showed that despite the fact that there may be people who take an autodidact method, growing number of BIPA courses reflects the increasing number of students who accept the effectiveness of methodical learning. To achieve the desired result, therefore, it is important to have an ever-growing improvement on the BIPA learning methods.

Indonesian language has been an obligatory subject in Indonesia for students in their primary school to university level. Teaching Indonesian language thus has been common practice in Indonesia, especially by those who has graduated from Indonesian language teaching department in many universities. They have mastered various skill to teach Indonesia language effectively to those students. It is, however, still uncommon to have departments of Indonesian language teaching for foreigners in Indonesia. The first department of BIPA was established in 2019 in Universitas Negeri Makassar (<https://profesi-unm.com/2019/07/12/pertama-di-indonesia-fbs-unm-buka-prodi-bipa/>), and even though the number of similar departments has steadily increased, Indonesia still has a long way to go to have sufficient number of resources in BIPA learning. As the subjects of BIPA learning are foreigners, it is important to consider that the learning method should be different from the usual practice of Indonesian language learning for the native speakers.

Learning a language as a foreign language surely different from

learning someone's first language. Many discussions and researches have discussed of how there are different principles and methods to make the foreign language learning methods more effective. Dr. Paul Pimsleur, one of experts in audio-based language learning, for example, discussed about how many standard approaches in language learning, especially on pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary learning will instead be ineffective in foreign language learning (Pimsleur, 2013). Meanwhile, Bobykina emphasized the importance to employ more innovative methods in foreign language learning as the learning process will be heavily influenced by cultural background and intercultural interactions of the learning subjects and the teachers (Bobykina, 2015).

There were many other researches that tried to discuss and prove how there are many things to consider in foreign language learning, in particular in the area of language transfer and cultural transfer. The learning methods of BIPA as a foreign language for non-native speakers therefore should have different approaches from the standard approaches practiced on Indonesian students in Indonesia. Based from the discussion above, it can also be argued that the different methods in language learning consequently should also include the differences in learning materials. One of the prominent differences is the cultural content in BIPA coursebook from those Indonesian language coursebooks used by Indonesian students.

Coursebook as one of the learning materials has always been important in learning process. McGrath in Sariçoban and Can (2013) argued that, "...coursebooks are the main determining factors in deciding what to teach, how to teach and in what order to teach". To accommodate BIPA learning process, many institutions has published BIPA coursebooks. Some of them are distributed and sold freely in bookstores, while many others are coursebooks designed for private use by some institutions. Meanwhile, Sahabatku Indonesia are series of coursebooks published by Ministry of Education and Culture

Republic of Indonesia, and they can be freely accessed by public on their websites. Many BIPA institutions and BIPA learners has used these books as their main reference in their learning process.

There have been already many researches discussing the feasibility analysis on Sahabatku Indonesia coursebooks as learning materials in BIPA, such as Salsabila Shofia Rahma and Sarwiji Suwandi (2021) on Sahabatku Indonesia level BIPA 1, Durrah Nafisah, Liliana Muliastuti, Nuruddin Nuruddin (2020) on Sahabatku Indonesia level B2, Sambada Wicaksana and Imam Agus Basuki (2019) on Sahabatku Indonesia level A1, Lina Handayani and Siti Isnaniah (2016) on Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Anak Sekolah level B1, and many other researches. Those articles already discussed various elements should be considered in course learning materials. Nevertheless, many of the things discussed emphasized more on the linguistic, cultural context, or learning context in general while ‘forgetting’ that it was for language learning material and Indonesian language learning provided in the coursebooks are for foreigners, therefore there was still more room in the discussion.

According to Littlejohn (2011), an analysis on language learning material should consider several things. His analysis requires three steps which include the analysis on the content, the deduction the need of teachers and the students, and the implication on the materials’ roles to promote the effectivity of a language learning. They also reflect on the consideration on the class interaction in the task/ activity or selection on the language content. Therefore, it is important to have a discussion on the language learning material ‘differently’ from other subjects’ material just as other subjects’ materials can also have a specific type of evaluation. Littlejohn argued that it is essential for a language learning material to have different analysis framework as the other existing frameworks “usually involve making general, impressionistic judgements on the materials, rather than examining

in depth what the materials contain (Littlejohn, 2011: 181).”

The aim of this research is to analyze the feasibility of Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 and Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 in their reference as materials in Indonesian language learning for foreigners. The choice on these coursebooks is based on the reference that most of the previous researches had discussed the beginner level of Sahabatku Indonesia while there are a few researches to none on the next level of the coursebook. Another reflection is that these levels, which is level 3 (or intermediate level), have passed the level of basic mastery of the language so that they allow the students to conduct more active interaction in their practice which is also important in the language learning process.

## **METHOD**

This research was qualitative descriptive research and the analysis was conducted using Andrew Littlejohn's (2011) Textbook Analysis Framework to evaluate the feasibility analysis on Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 (referred as Book A in this research) and Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 (referred as Book B in this research) as coursebooks in Indonesian language as a foreign language learning. The analysis mainly focused on the middle chapters of the coursebooks as Littlejohn in Kemm, R. (2021: 317) argued that “material to be analysed should ideally be taken from around the midpoint of a book as this material is most likely to be representative of the book as a whole.”

To meet the objective there were three steps of analysis according to the framework as shown in the table below.

1.	Objective description	What is there? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statements of description</li> <li>▪ Physical aspects of the materials</li> <li>▪ Main steps in the instructional sections</li> </ul>
2.	Subjective analysis	What is required of users? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subdivision into constituent tasks</li> <li>▪ An analysis of tasks: What is the learner expected to do? Who with? With what content?</li> </ul>
3.	Subjective inference	What is implied? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Deducing aims, principles of selection and sequence</li> <li>▪ Deducing teacher and learner roles</li> <li>▪ Deducing demands on learner's process competence</li> </ul>

(Adapted from Littlejohn, 2011: 185)

The first step was an objective description on the materials found in the book, such as designs, type of material, required classroom time, division of the sections, the unit pattern, etc (Littlejohn, 2011: 186). The second step which was a subjective analysis included the “deductions about what exactly teachers and learners using the materials will have to do (Littlejohn, 2011: 188)”. In this step, the analysis mainly focused on the tasks or the activities in the learning process. Meanwhile, the last step on the subjective inference dealt with the final statement on the overall aim of both previous two discussions which then lead to a conclusion on the roles of the teacher and the learners (Littlejohn,

2011: 197).

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

### **An Overview on Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 and Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3**

According to Littlejohn, there are three points of identification should be conducted in this step which consist of statements of description, physical aspects of the materials, and main steps in the instructional sections. All three points refer to the objective evaluation or description on the books and their component to reveal the explicit nature of the materials.

Both materials, Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 (Book A) and Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 (Book B), are coursebooks published by Ministry of Education and Culture Republic of Indonesia (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan) in 2019, and both of them can be used worldwide by foreigners who wish to learn ‘general’ Indonesian language. Their intended audiences, however, are different. Book A was written for general learners of BIPA in intermediate level or level BIPA 3 according to Standar Kompetensi Lulusan (SKL) Kursus dan Pelatihan BIPA (similar to CEFR in English language learning) with no age limit, while Book B was written for learners of BIPA in intermediate level or level BIPA 3 who are students in elementary or high school. Both of them were written fully in Indonesian language.

Each of the book has a lesson plan in which the students can see how the topics, the unit division, and the learning contents were distributed. There is no different book for teacher so the teacher and the students get the same material distribution. The materials of each book were set in 10 chapters in 129 pages for book A and 118 pages for book B. There was no estimated time written on the book, therefore the duration of learning for each level was not clear either. The books were published in full color and can be freely accessed online on



<https://bipa.kemdikbud.go.id/>.

The materials in each unit have standardized elements. Each unit has pre-activity, listening, speaking, reading, vocabulary, grammar, writing, and knowledge about Indonesia section, all of them are arranged in the same manner. However, the numbers of activity in each unit are different. It ranges from five to seven activities in each unit. The types of activity also vary from one unit to another.

In Book A chapter 5, for example, is started with a brainstorming about some pictures on daily activities, continued with listening section on answering question after listening to an audio downloaded using a QR code, speaking section on describing a picture, reading and vocabulary section with a single activity on answering questions based on a reading text, grammar section on writing according to provided information, writing section on writing about a person after an observation, and knowledge about Indonesia section on floating market in Lok Baintan.

Meanwhile in Book B chapter 5 is started with a pre-activity on brainstorming about a picture provided in the book, continued with listening section on identifying the correct and false statement according to an audio file, speaking section on interviewing friends, reading and vocabulary section on answering question based on a reading text, grammar section on writing sentences using conjunction, writing section on writing an exposition text, and knowledge about Indonesia section on School wall magazine.

Two chapters from two different books showed some similarity and also differences. While they have the same sections in each chapter, the activities in each chapter, however, varied from each other. With each section mostly has its own activity/ practice, except the activity for reading and vocabulary section which has one activity serving the two sections. Also, there is no activity for the last section of each unit, the knowledge of Indonesia, whether in these two chapters discussed

previously or in the other chapters in two books. This section noticeably only serves as ‘additional’ context for the foreigners to learn more about Indonesia.

### **Task Analysis**

In the second step of analysis, the focus was on the tasks in the language learning process with Littlejohn discussed the term ‘task’ on Task Based Language teaching (TBLT) as “classroom work which require the learners to engage in the negotiation of meaning, and thereby make the language input that they receive comprehensible and thus suitable for acquisition (Littlejohn, 2011: 188).” Afterwards, he also discussed some other definitions and the concept of task. From the discussion, he concluded that ‘task’ is basically “refers to any proposal contained within the materials for action to be undertaken by the learners, which has the direct aim of bringing about the learning of the foreign language (Littlejohn, 2011: 188).” Hereafter, he translated it to three points of further discussion, how; a process through which learners and teachers are to go with whom: classroom participation concerning with whom (if anyone) the learners are to work about what: content that the learners are to focus on. (Littlejohn, 2011: 189)

Using Littlejohn’s Textbook Analysis Framework, two coursebooks of BIPA materials with the same publisher and the same level but different intended audiences were analyzed. The assignment of the number of the task in the analysis process referred to previous definition of task, therefore in every section, even in every kegiatan (activity) -as written in the original material-, it was found to have several ‘tasks’ with each of the task was analyzed and evaluated. The total of the task evaluated from Book A was 11 tasks and from Book B was 16 tasks. There were some contents in the both books should be omitted form the analysis because of the lack of clarity in the instruction and the description of the tasks, including the last sub units in every unit of the books. In the sub units, there were always

contents or materials in form of extended written texts about Indonesian culture, which was important in BIPA learning. Nevertheless, they could not be analyzed along with the other ‘tasks’ because there was no clear instructions and expected activity form the learners regarding the texts, it appeared to be more of additional knowledge or trivia about Indonesia. The result of the analysis was shown in the table below, the discussion will be separated in three parts according to the framework designed by Littlejohn with separate tables showing the result of evaluation in every part.

Table 1. Task Analysis based on Littlejohn’s Textbook Analysis Framework (What is the Learner Expected to Do?)

task number	Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 (Book A)											Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 (Book B)											Total (Book A)	Percent age (Book A)	Total (Book B)	Percent age (Book B)					
	pre-activity			listening		speaking	reading	writing	pre-activity			listening		speaking	reading	vocab	grammar	writing													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11					12	13	14	15	16
<b>I. What is the Learner Expected to Do?</b>																															
<b>A. Turn Take</b>																															
Initiate	v	v	v								v	v	v	v														3	27%	8	50%
Scripted response	v				v	v		v	v		v																	5	45%	4	25%
Not required				v			v	v														v	v					3	27%	4	25%
<b>B. Focus</b>																															
Language system (rules/form)																												0	0%	0	0%
Meaning	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	10	91%	13	81%
Meaning/system/form relationship											v																	1	9%	3	19%
<b>C. Mental Operation</b>																															
repetition				v			v								v	v												2	18%	4	25%
deducing language rule										v																		1	9%	2	13%
hypothesizing	v					v					v																	2	18%	4	25%
apply general knowledge	v									v																		3	27%	1	6%
research											v																	1	9%	2	13%
express own ideas/ information	v	v																										2	18%	4	25%
select information				v						v																		3	27%	1	6%

The first table showed the data about what is the learner expected to do from the two books. The evaluation was based on three main points, which were ‘Turn take’, ‘Focus’, and the ‘Mental Operation’. On the turn take, it was found that most of the response expected from the learners using Book A will be scripted response from 45% of the tasks, while only 27% of the tasks required initiation from the learners. It was different from Book B that put more emphasize on learners’ initiation, as shown by its 50 % percentage of the tasks, while the scripted response only took 25 %. Meanwhile, the percentage for tasks that did not require response were in similar percentage in both books, it ranged from 25% to 27%.

For the focus of the materials in the language learning process. It should be the case that the language would be the focus of the analysis. The consideration of this point was whether the focus was only on the language system, its meaning, or both. The result of the evaluation showed that majority of the tasks focused more on the meaning, as it took 91% in the Book A and 81% in the Book B. There was no finding on the focus only on language system, while the focus on both language system and the meaning had 9% percentage in Book A and 19% percentage in Book B.

In the discussion on mental operation expected from the learners who used the book, the findings were varied, and the percentages were quite even in Book B with no one kind of operation dominating the tasks. The tasks required repetition, hypothesizing, and express on own's idea or information in the same percentage, 25%. The expectation for apply general knowledge and select information, however, were quite low with percentage of 6%. Also, deducing language rule and research had 13% percentage. It was different from Book A which had percentage of 27% in apply general knowledge and select information, 18% in repetition, hypothesizing, and express own's idea or information, and 9% in deducing language rule and research.

Table 2. Task Analysis based on Littlejohn's Textbook Analysis Framework (Who with?)

task number	Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 (Book A)											Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 (Book B)											Total (Book A)	Percent age (Book A)	Total (Book B)	Percent age (Book B)										
	pre-activity			listening		speaking	reading	vocabulary	grammar	writing	pre-activity			listening		speaking		reading	vocabulary	grammar	writing															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16									
<b>II. Who with?</b>																																				
alone simultaneously	v	v	v	v	v		v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	10	91%	12	75%
learner in pair group																			v														0	0%	2	13%
learner to group																			v	v													0	0%	2	13%
learner to whole class						v																											1	9%	0	0%
alone outside the class																																	0	0%	0	0%

The second part of evaluation was displayed in the table above. It discussed the subject of interaction in each of the activity. The findings shown that the majority of the tasks expected the learners to do it alone simultaneously with the percentage of 91% in Book A and

75% in Book B. There was a single task in Book A (9%) that required the students to do it with the whole class and 2 tasks each (13%) in Book B for activities that the learners need to do in pair and group activity. There was no requirement in Book A for the tasks done in pair or group activity, and in Book B to do it with the whole class. Meanwhile, there was also no requirement for students to do some tasks outside the class whether it was done simultaneously or with the other learners.

Table 3. Task Analysis based on Littlejohn’s Textbook Analysis Framework (Input What Content?)

task number	Sahabatku Indonesia BIPA 3 (Book A)											Sahabatku Indonesia untuk Pelajar BIPA 3 (Book B)																Total (Book A)	Percent age (Book A)	Total (Book B)	Percent age (Book B)							
	pre-activity	listening	speaking	reading	vocabulary	grammar	writing	pre-activity	listening	speaking	reading	vocabulary	grammar	writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13					14	15	16				
<b>III. Input What Content</b>																																						
<b>A. Input to Learners</b>																																						
<b>Form</b>																																						
graphic	v				v	v																												3	27%	3	18%	
extended discourse: oral				v	v																														2	18%	5	31%
extended discourse: written																																		5	45%	4	25%	
word/phrases/ sentences: oral	v	v	v																															3	27%	4	25%	
word/phrases/ sentences: written	v	v	v																															5	45%	9	56%	
<b>Source</b>																																						
Materials	v			v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	8	73%	11	69%	
Learners		v	v																															3	27%	7	44%	
Teachers																																		0	0%	0	0%	
outside the course																																		0	0%	0	0%	
<b>Nature</b>																																						
grammar explanation																																		1	9%	2	13%	
personal information		v	v																															3	27%	8	50%	
fiction				v	v																														6	55%	3	19%
general knowledge	v																																	2	18%	4	25%	
<b>B. Output From Learners</b>																																						
<b>Form</b>																																						
extended discourse: oral																																			1	9%	4	25%
extended discourse: written																																			1	9%	2	13%
word/phrases/ sentences: oral	v	v	v																																3	27%	4	25%
word/phrases/ sentences: written	v																																		3	27%	2	13%
<b>Source</b>																																						
Materials	v			v																															5	45%	4	25%
Learners		v	v																																3	27%	9	56%
Teachers																																			0	0%	0	0%
<b>Nature</b>																																						
grammar explanation																																			0	0%	2	13%
personal information		v	v																																3	27%	9	56%
fiction																																			3	27%	3	19%
general knowledge	v																																		2	18%	3	19%
No Output				x																															3	27%	4	25%

The third table above displayed the third part of the evaluation in Step 2. This part of discussion focused more on the ‘input to learners’ and ‘output from learners’ which signified the reception and the production process experienced by the learners using the two coursebooks as the language learning materials. Both aspects were evaluated in the same frame of form, source, and nature.

From the evaluation, it could be seen that the form in which the learners got their input from Book A was from written form, both in extended form or word/phrase/sentence one. Each of them had 45% percentage. The next one was oral form, both in extended form and word/ phrase/ sentence one, that took 18% and 27%, and the graphic only had 9% as its percentage. Meanwhile, Book B was mainly dominated by written form in word/ phrase/ sentence as it took 56% of the tasks. Word/phrase/sentence: oral and extended: written form came next with 25% for each of the percentage, and there was also graphic which took 19% of the percentage.

For the evaluation of the output of the tasks, the percentage of Book A was quite different from Book B. Book A was dominated with word/ phrase/ sentence, both in oral or written form, with the same percentage, 27%, and the extended form, both oral and written had 9% each. Whereas in Book B, oral form had the biggest percentage with 25 % for each of the extended and the word/ phrase/ sentence while the written form, both extended and word/ phrase/ sentence had 13%. The possible source of the input was differentiated into four types; materials, earners, teachers, outside the source, and it resulted on materials being the majority in Book A with 73%, and learners with 27%, while the rest of the two could not be identified throughout the tasks.

The evaluation was also similar in Book B where the materials and the learners dominated with 69% and 44% each. Similar to Book A, it had no source from the teachers and outside the source. The output, too, had similar result. The learners produced the language with 45% from materials as the source and 27% from learners in Book A, while book B had 25% from materials and 56% from learners without identification of other sources in the evaluation of output in the tasks.

Whereas the nature of the tasks was also identified into four types; grammar explanation, personal information, fiction, and general

knowledge, both in the input and the output. The findings shown that, in Book A, most of the tasks had fiction as its nature in the input with the percentage of 55%. In Book B, however, it only had 19%. The majority was from personal information with 50%, while in Book A, it only had 27%. Book A and Book B were similar regarding the grammar explanation, with the least percentage of 9% and 13% for each of them. Another source, general knowledge, had 18% for the tasks in Book A and 25% for the tasks in Book B.

As for the output, there was no identification on the grammar explanation in Book A, and Book B had only 13%. Personal information and fiction had similar percentage in Book A with 27% of the tasks, while Book B was dominated with the output of personal information with 56% and 19% for fiction and the general knowledge.

## **DEDUCTION**

Overall, the tasks in both of the coursebooks indicated the argument that the student-centered learning quite effective as shown by the percentage of the turn take. Both of the books had higher percentage in both responses (initiate and scripted response combination) than in 'not required category. However, the higher percentage in the scripted response compared to the initiate in Book A shown the argument that it was rather limited in the term of creativity in Book A whereas Book B had higher percentage in initiate category which can be considered as a higher chance for the learners to produce their own texts.

As materials in language learning program, both of the book could be argued to faithfully offer the suitable materials for language learning program, especially foreign one, as almost all the focus were in the use of the language, albeit it has no focus solely on linguistic system. Rather, the usage of the language held greater focus as it had percentage majority of more than 80% in both books in how the language could be used and a little bit of discussion on how the

linguistic system affect the meaning. The evaluation shown the position of the books regarding the priority in a language learning process for foreigners. As discussed previously, many foreign language learners including BIPA learners mostly took a language learning course to get the language mastery in practical situation. therefore, it was important to put more emphasis on the practicality in using the language.

As for the mental operation, the number of varieties in which the learners had to experience reflected the intention of the book to create conditions in which the learners would be able to have many different ways to experience the language, which in turn also prevented them from boredom. Also, with the almost even distribution in both of the books, it can be argued that a language learning process could actually effectively be implemented in various, creative ways, and more modern methods, instead of homogenous methods which belonged to more traditional practice of question and answer in old coursebooks.

The more modern context in a language learning process, however, could be deemed ineffective without the proper method in implementing it. One of the most important contributing factors surely referred to users of the language which were the subjects or the learners. in these two coursebooks, the use of the language by the users could be evaluated from the second main point which was 'who with?'. As seen from the table 2, the majority of the tasks required the learners to do them alone simultaneously in both of the coursebooks. This fact can lead to an argument that actually there was a room for improvement so that the learners could use the language more actively and produce it in more realistic and practical context, for example by adding more group activity which would allow them to make an active interaction.

Lastly, each of the input and the output from the tasks had three points of evaluation; the form, the source, and the nature. For the form, what could be easily noticed was the percentage of graphic in the tasks of both of the coursebooks, it belonged to the group of sources



with the second least number. The help of pictures or other kinds of graphics, however, was quite important in language learning process, especially in the beginning stage, particularly for foreign learners. It could help them with the visualization of the context and also cultural background knowledge delivered through the pictures. therefore, it can be argued that its percentage was quite insufficient. Another thing to be noticed in the Book A was the percentage of the written form, both extended or in word/ phrase/ sentence were much higher than the others. it could reflect the focus on the learning method that relied less on the practicality of oral communication.

As for the output, Book A and Book B had different emphasize on its form. Book A had higher percentage in written form, while Book B had higher percentage in oral form. This evaluation, however, was rather inefficient considering Book A was actually for general learners whereas Book B was for students as most of the general learners actually learned BIPA for them to be able to use it in daily conversation or in a practical use. The source of the input in Book A and Book B were similar in their percentage, with the materials placed as the main source in most of the tasks and some other tasks referred to the input from the learners. The percentage showed the supporting system for the learners to be able to easily access the information and the language they should learn. On the other hand, this evaluation and how there was no identification on the chance of the task to get the source from outside the course (for example, by assigning the leaners to bring out their won texts under the supervision of the teacher) also shown lack of room for the learners to be more creative in creating their own texts, which was also shown in the output.

## **CONCLUSION**

The evaluation in this research was conducted in three steps in order to find the feasibility analysis on two main references of BIPA

learning materials as foreign languages using Littlejohn's Textbook Analysis Framework. From the evaluation, it could be concluded that both books could facilitate the process of learning Indonesian language as a foreign language quite efficiently, as seen from the comprehensive linguistic and cultural context offered in the books and the text production expected from the learners. Nevertheless, there was still room for improvement for both of the books, especially regarding the leaning methods which need to make more room for the leaners to be more engaged in the language through more active role in bringing or producing their own related texts.

## REFERENCES

- Sujana, I. M. 2012. Program Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA): Peluang, Tantangan dan Solusi. International Conference on “Menimang Bahasa Membangun Bangsa”. <http://eprints.unram.ac.id/id/eprint/13220>
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2021). Jaga BIPA. <https://bipa.kemdikbud.go.id/jaga>
- Profesi Online Universitas Negeri Makassar. (2019). Pertama di Indonesia, FBS UNM buka Prodi BIPA. <https://profesi-unm.com/2019/07/12/pertama-di-indonesia-fbs-unm-buka-prodi-bipa/>.
- Pimsleur, Dr. P. (2013). How to Learn a Foreign Language. Pimsleur Language Program.
- Bobykina, I. (2015). My Philosophy of Teaching Foreign Languages. *Prosedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 684-687. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.076.
- Sarıçoban, A & Can, N. (2013). An evaluation of the 9th grade local and the international English coursebooks in terms of language skills and components. *Prosedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 997 – 1001. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.150.
- Handayani, L. & Isnaniah, S. (2020). Analisis Kelayakan Isi Buku Ajar Sahabatku Indonesia dalam Pembelajaran BIPA. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 10(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/j.8.1.25-35>
- Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the trojan horse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kemm, R. (2021). Junior high school textbooks: An in-depth analysis. Communities of teachers & learners. *JALT*. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2020-39>
- Rahma, S. S. & Suwandi, S. (2021). Analisis Kelayakan Isi dan Muatan Budaya Dalam Buku Ajar BIPA. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra (Journal of Language and Literature Education)*, 21(1). [https://doi.org/10.17509/bs\\_jpbsp.v21i1.36654](https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v21i1.36654)
- Nafisah, Durrah, Muliaستی, L., & Nuruddin. (2020). Deiksis Persona Dalam Buku Ajar BIPA Sahabatku Indonesia Tingkat B2. *Indonesian Language Education and Literature*, 5(10). DOI: 10.24235/ileal.

v5i2.5336

Wicaksana, S & Basuki, I. A. (2019). Analisis Soal Latihan Keterampilan Membaca Dalam Bahan Ajar Bipa Sahabatku Indonesia Tingkat A1. *BASINDO: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, Dan Pembelajarannya*, 3(2). <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/basindo/article/view/11589>