

EXPLORING THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM IN YAPALIS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Muhammad Nawawi

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Sidoarjo

alex nawawi.pbi@unusida.ac.id

Abstract

This research is to describe the implementation of a Bilingual program in Yapalis Senior High School in Sidoarjo. The bilingual program has been conducted for years in the school. The teachers, students, and staff are motivated to speak bilingual, English, and their native language; Indonesia or Javanese, inside and outside the classroom. The researcher intended to identify the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program. It is descriptive qualitative research with observation, interview, and documentation of technique in collecting data. The subjects of the research are some teachers, students, and staff of the school. The researcher has identified that the school has planned and state the program in the school development planning document to reach the graduate assurance for students. The implementation of the program has run well by the role of triggers; teachers and students who are good at speaking English. They practice code-switching between English and their native language in daily communication at school. The school, however, has not done evaluation regularly yet. There was no reward and punishment for students, teachers, or staff. The school needed to design the system of implementing the program. The system consisted of a detailed target, technique, assessment, and evaluation.

Keywords: *Bilingual Program*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menggambarkan pelaksanaan program bilingual di SMA Yapalis Sidoarjo. Program tersebut sudah berlangsung selama bertahun-tahun di sekolah tersebut. Seluruh guru, siswa, dan tenaga non-kependidikan di sekolah tersebut berusaha berbicara dengan dua bahasa, bahasa Inggris dan bahasa ibunya; bahasa Indonesia atau Jawa, baik di dalam maupun diluar kelas. Peneliti mengidentifikasi perancangan, pelaksanaan, dan evaluasi program bilingual tersebut. Penelitian ini termasuk jenis deskriptif kualitatif dengan teknik pengumpulan datanya menggunakan pengamatan, wawancara, dan dokumentasi. Subyek penelitian ini adalah guru-guru, sebagian murid, and tenaga administrasi SMA Yapalis. Sekolah sudah membuat perencanaan program bilingual yang dituangkan dalam program kerja sekolah sebagai wujud nyata kegiatan untuk mencapai standar lulusan. Pelaksanaan program ini sudah cukup lancar dengan peran para trigger yaitu guru dan siswa yang mempunyai kemampuan bahasa Inggris bagus. Warga sekolah sudah terbiasa melakukan alih bahasa ketika mereka menemui kesulitan dalam berkomunikasi. Kekurangan dari program ini adalah belum adanya kegiatan evaluasi berkala yang memantau ketercapaian target. Belum ada system penghargaan dan hukuman bagi warga sekolah. Sekolah hendaknya merancang kembali teknis pelaksanaan program sampai proses evaluasinya. Sekolah perlu menyiapkan system yang memuat target, teknik pelaksanaan, penilaian dan kegiatan evaluasi untuk meningkatkan kualitas program bilingual tersebut.

Kata Kunci: *Program Bilingual*

I. INTRODUCTION

In many countries, bilingual education is an educational option for more than 50 years, but still controversial, especially as regards its adequacy for all children. Bialystok (2018) stated that Bilingual education in America has been a controversial subject almost since the nation was founded and political rhetoric has built the debate from the beginning. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 acknowledged and provided support for services that could assist children with limited English proficiency. Children in American schools to succeed and develop English and their skills in the home language. The event focused mainly on Spanish speakers, but later groups, such as Chinese speakers have made changes to the act to expand its scope.

There have been diverse examples of bilingual education in other countries and numerous political and social connections with these programs. The example is Canada, which has different circumstances in culture, demography, and politics from those in the USA. While officially Canada is bilingual, no one language defines most bilinguals as in the U.S. since most bilingual people speak one of the official languages (English and French) and a heritage language in Canada. Lepage, J. F (2013) implied that the impact on the past generation of the popular French immersion programs in which children who had otherwise little exposure to French became extremely competent, and in many cases completely bilingual, may contribute towards the growth of French-English bilingualism for 50 years.

A bilingual curriculum is a basis for a broad set of programs designed for children and a broader range of special circumstances. Bialystok (2018) pointed out that bilingual education essentially refers to any school curriculum where more than one language is used to teach non-language academic subjects, or the

language of learning does not correspond to the homeland or community language but is based on why languages are incorporated. The specific languages of choice, the program structure, and the relationship between school languages and the collective vary widely and influence the outcome of education.

In the last decade, there were significant improvements in the introduction of bilingual education programs in the Indonesian high-school sense. However, in 2015, the government discontinued the implementation of the International Standards School (ISS) program which encouraged the students to experience bilingual education programs. As a result, the discontinuation of ISS leads to a lack of research to examine how bilingual education programs are progressing and effectively in Indonesia. At the same time, the phenomenon of private schools that offer bilingual programs has been significantly more popular after the ISS program was abolished. However, there is a lack of established instruction on how to implement bilingual programs in such schools.

Schools that decide to develop the bilingual program should consider their purposes. Hong (2010) pointed out three key concepts that show significant differences in practice in bilingual education; immersions of language, monolingual, and bilingual. The goal of immersion in the language is to acquire second language competence by using the second language as the primary teaching medium while monolingual education achieves this goal by only allowing the use of one language as a means of learning, and the bilingual education, on the other hand, uses two language education as a means of language training for language skills in one language or both.

It is sometimes ambiguous in defining the bilingual program for the school. It may be a situation where

minority language children are being taught in a dominant language in which they are targeted at learning skills in a language that is unfamiliar to them, but which dominates their daily lives outside their education. It also may be referred to as an immersion activity in which the medium of instruction is a foreign language, for example, a language that is not the language of broader society (Baker, 2002). Anderson, T., & Boyer (1970) provided bilingual education as the program is given in two languages, with the use of both as teaching resources for all or part of the curriculum such as English as a Second Language (ESL), where the language of instruction and language of the content of the curriculum are immersed in English. Bilingual activities must be implemented in two languages, but the languages delivered through the curriculum differ somewhat (Baker, C., & Jones, 1998). The school, therefore, should choose which concept of the bilingual program will be implemented.

Schools have created their ways to implement bilingual programs. Private schools can design their bilingual programs even the government does not give any instructions. Prayitno, Hadi, & Saleh (2019) stated that schools that perform a bilingual education plan have the freedom to run the program, evaluation of multilingual education organizations with the same frequency, goals, and objectives as in the other schools according to their objectives and their personal goals, and have the right to implement the program. The schools, in this case, should develop a program carefully and measurably, including staffing, teacher recruitment, certification, staff development and curriculums progress, and several terms often used in the creation of a bilingual school (Pranowo., 2005). Mukminin et al (2019) have investigated the teachers' position and abilities for use of English, their policy on language, their teaching material, their English proficiency, their

curriculums, the student evaluation, and their admission policy were interrelated in the successful implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school.

One of the private schools that remain a bilingual environment is Yapalis Senior High School in Sidoarjo. The researcher is curious to explore how the school conducts the program that teachers, students, and staff, are motivated to speak bilingual; English and Indonesia, in daily conversation in and outside the classroom. The researcher revealed the planning program, the implementation; how the students, teachers, and staff practice English at school, and the evaluation of it.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a qualitative one with a descriptive approach. The data was collected directly and naturally from the subject of the research. The data collected is presented in the form of descriptive based on the natural setting of the subject. The data of this research are English words, phrases, or sentences of some teachers, staff, and students of YAPALIS. The researcher used observation, interview, and documentation techniques to collect the data. The researcher, then, analyzed data using four phases of the analytical process by Dornyei (2007). They are (1) transcribing the data; precoding, and coding, (2) growing ideas; memos, vignettes, profile, and other forms of data display, (3) interpreting the data, and (4) drawing the conclusion.

The researcher was in the field where he did the research. He observed the subject to collect the data by being with them during school time. To observe the students, teachers, and staff's utterances, the researcher used both the audio recorder in the form of the cell phone or MP4 and field notes to when he missed the recorder. Another technique was the interview. In this activity, he also had much time to

spend to interview the subjects since he was there with the subjects. This technique also supplied the researcher with great data on the English used by the subject of this research. The interview revealed students, teachers, and staff's perception and motivation to do the bilingual program. The documentation technique, then, intended to identify the planning document written by the principal and his team.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In Yapalis high school, there was a school policy dealing with the bilingual program that started in 2005. It is stated in the school curriculum that one of the objectives is to enhance students' skills in speaking English. The graduate of the school must have a good English. Then, to reach the objective, the school designed bilingual milieu everyday. The program is considered bilingual education since it is using both English and native language as a medium of instruction. English is the second language in the school.

There was no special day for English, like English Day or English Corner like at others, however, the program has been done naturally every day. The most important thing in this program is the role of the triggers who motivate all people at school. The triggers are selected from English presentations done by teachers in 2009. Teachers who can do presentations at least 50% in English they can be triggers of the bilingual program. Then, the teachers have to select the students who are good in English to help them as triggers. Teachers and students who are in charge of the triggers have to speak English every time they meet other students, teachers, or staff.

The implementation of the program can be described into three subjects; the teachers, students, and staff as follows;

The Teachers' English

The English used by teachers is understandable. Most of the teachers speak English especially the young ones. The

senior teachers, however, try hard to speak even they have to be motivated by triggers. The teachers speak English not only during the teaching and learning process but also in their daily conversations with others that it was easy for the researcher to collect the data. For the English teacher, there is no doubt that their English is considerably good structurally and communicatively. There are 6 (six) English teachers in this school and all of them speak English well. The researcher did not find any significant mistakes in their grammar. They speak fluently to the researcher. They can be good triggers since they know how to speak to those who are not English teachers. They can motivate others well. The non-English teachers (the teachers of other subjects) speak English in their teaching activities, as a classroom language of instruction. The young teachers speak more actively than the senior ones. The researcher visited their classes. The English used by non-English teachers is limited in short instruction. It can be seen from the number of sentences produced in their teaching activities. They used daily conversations like "Good morning, students", "Clean the Whiteboard", "Open your book page..." "Have you finished?" and something like that. They also tried to speak English outside class in their conversation with others in their spare time, even they do code-switching a lot to overcome their lack of vocabulary. The researcher often listened to the expression like "Hai..you know dimana my bag? Kok tidak ada in the chair ya" in Javanese dialect, of course. Their intonation and pronunciation often reflected Javanese. It is alright for them as long as they speak freely.

The Students' English

The English used by the students in YAPALIS varied from the lowest to the highest level of English. The smart students, according to their English teachers, spoke English more than their less smart ones. It seemed that they have more

confidence to express their ideas in the learning process. Although they still made some mistakes they still have enough confidence to speak English in the classroom. However, those who have less confidence speak less in the classroom. All can be seen in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Some grammatical errors noted are *tomorrow to my house!, I from the canteen, I not good speak English. what clock? etc.* some pronunciation errors were also made such as: *to go to* which was pronounced as */to go to /* instead of */to go to/* or */te get te/, car /ker/* instead of */kar/* and some others. Overall the students kept trying hard to speak English to get involved in the communication in the classroom. It can be seen from the way they express their feeling of embarrassment when they made mistakes in using English in their communication. When some of their friends laughed hearing the wrong structured sentences from them, they still feel alright with that. They, outside of the classroom, tried to speak English when there was a trigger or a teacher. They, as the teachers, also did code-switching when they got into trouble to express their ideas. Mostly, they performed English and Javanese such as “Ayo rek, let’s go to canteen”, “Eh, tomorrow onok homework ta” with Javanese dialect. The students triggers, however, performed bilingual better, even still in Javanese dialect, such as “friends, yuk, going to the canteen now”. They who always force their friends to speak.

The staffs’ English

The staff of this school did not speak English as much as the teachers and the students. They used English only for the students since the office of the staff is not the same room with the teachers that it kept them away from having a conversation with the teachers. They only have a conversation when they need to inform a teacher about a certain thing or talk to the

student who came to their office for the students' needs. Almost like the teachers, the young staffs speak more than the older ones. There were about ten staff in this school and these who actively spoke English only one person. The other staff speaks English only when they ask the student who came to their office. *can I help you? What do you want?* are the two phrases commonly used by the staff.

The bilingual program has run for years in the school, however, the evaluation of process and result has not done regularly. The school did not have a system yet to conduct the program. There was no reward and punishment for students, teachers, or staff yet. There was a report document about the program, however, it was not regularly. The school intended to redesign the program for the next period to make it better.

IV. CONCLUSION

The bilingual program at Yapalis Senior High School has planned since 2005. The program has been written in the school curriculum. The school has issued that graduates of the school have good English. English and Indonesian language are used in daily conversation; inside and outside the classroom. The school chose some teachers and students as triggers to motivate others to speak English.

In the classroom, English was used by the students and the teachers. For non-English class, the teacher and students use it as classroom language. Outside the class, in their free time, students still used English mixed with the vernacular (Javanese) *code switch* quite often happens when the students speak to their friends. Mostly they switch from English to Javanese or Indonesian language or vice versa when they do not know the English word and when they know the English words the switch it back to English. they did that because they are in the same *speech community*.

The school should design a system of the bilingual program that can be evaluated regularly. It needs evaluation to improve the target and objective of the program every year,

Prayitno, E., Hadi, S., & Saleh, M. 2019. *The Bilingual School Program Management*. Journal of K6, Education, and Management, 2(1), 64–70.

V. REFERENCES

- Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. 1970. *Bilingual schooling in the United States*. Washington, DC: The USA.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. 1998. *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. 2002. *Bilingual education*. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bialystok, E. 2018. *Bilingual education for young children: a review of the effects and consequences*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21(6), 666–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1203859>
- Dornyei, Z. 2007. *Research Method in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hong, H. 2010. *Bicultural Competence and Its Impact on Team Effectiveness*. International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 10(1), 93–120.
- Lepage, J. F., and J. P. C. 2013. *The Evolution of English–French Bilingualism in Canada from 1961 to 2011*. Canada: Statistics of Canada.
- Mukminin, A., Sari, S. R., Haryanto, E., Habibi, A., Hidayat, M., Marzulina, L., ... Ikhsan, I. 2019. *They can speak English, but they don't want to use it." Teaching contents through English in a Bilingual school and policy recommendations*. Qualitative Report, 24(6), 1258–1274.
- Pranowo. 2005. *Teori Belajar Bahasa untuk Pendidik Bahasa dan Mahasiswa Jurusan Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.