

Bilingual EDUCATION PROGRAMS



at **Junior
High
Schools**



Dr. Didik Santoso, M.Pd.
Pirman Ginting, M.Hum.

Bilingual

EDUCATION PROGRAMS at Junior High Schools



Agar siswa mampu berkompetisi, aktif, dan kreatif dalam era global, pendidikan bilingual khususnya pendidikan dengan menggunakan dua bahasa, yakni bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris dalam mengajarkan matematika, kimia, biologi, dan fisika memberi kontribusi yang sangat signifikan dalam menguasai materi pelajaran dan mempercepat penguasaan bahasa Inggris dalam forum ilmiah maupun non-ilmiah. Artinya, bahasa Inggris akan lebih mudah dikuasai bila disajikan secara terpadu dengan bidang yang diajarkan. Melalui keterpaduan ini siswa belajar bahasa Inggris melalui konteks di mana bahasa itu digunakan. Dengan demikian, siswa dengan mudah mengingat dan menggunakan kosakata, gramatika, pengucapan, fungsi bahasa dengan mudah, cepat, dan lancar.



KENCANA

PRENADAMEDIA GROUP

E-mail: pmg@prenadamedia.com

Http: www.prenadamedia.com

ISBN 978-602-1186-60-2



9 786021 186602

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

At Junior High Schools

Sanksi Pelanggaran Pasal 113 Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta, sebagaimana yang telah diatur dan diubah dari Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2002, bahwa:

Kutipan Pasal 113

- (1) Setiap Orang yang dengan tanpa hak melakukan pelanggaran hak ekonomi sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 9 ayat (1) huruf i untuk Penggunaan Secara Komersial dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 1 (satu) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp100.000.000,- (seratus juta rupiah).
- (2) Setiap Orang yang dengan tanpa hak dan/atau tanpa izin Pencipta atau pemegang Hak Cipta melakukan pelanggaran hak ekonomi Pencipta sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 9 ayat (1) huruf c, huruf d, huruf f, dan/atau huruf h untuk Penggunaan Secara Komersial dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 3 (tiga) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp500.000.000,- (lima ratus juta rupiah).
- (3) Setiap Orang yang dengan tanpa hak dan/atau tanpa izin Pencipta atau pemegang Hak Cipta melakukan pelanggaran hak ekonomi Pencipta sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 9 ayat (1) huruf a, huruf b, huruf e, dan/atau huruf g untuk Penggunaan Secara Komersial dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 4 (empat) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp1.000.000.000,- (satu miliar rupiah).
- (4) Setiap Orang yang memenuhi unsur sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (3) yang dilakukan dalam bentuk pembajakan, dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 10 (sepuluh) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp4.000.000.000,- (empat miliar rupiah).

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

At Junior High Schools

Dr. Didik Santoso, M. Pd.

Pirman Ginting, M. Hum.



**BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS**

Edisi Pertama

Copyright © 2015

Perpustakaan Nasional: Katalog Dalam Terbitan (KDT)

ISBN 978-602-1186-60-2 371.3

13,5 x 20,5 cm

x, 106 hlm

Cetakan ke-1, April 2015

Kencana. 2015.0550

Penulis

Dr. Didik Santoso, M.Pd.

Pirman Ginting, M.Hum.

Desain Sampul

Irfan Fahmi

Penata Letak

Jeffry

Percetakan

Fajar Interpretama Mandiri

Divisi Penerbitan

K E N C A N A

Penerbit

PRENADAMEDIA GROUP

Jl. Tandra Raya No. 23 Rawamangun · Jakarta 13220

Telp: (021) 478-64657 Faks: (021) 475-4134

e-mail: pmg@prenadamedia.com

www.prenadamedia.com

INDONESIA

Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh isi buku ini dengan cara apa pun,
termasuk dengan cara penggunaan mesin fotokopi, tanpa izin sah dari penerbit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the most gracious and the most merciful whom the writers would like to express their sincere gratitude, Allah the Almighty who has given their blessing health, strength and patience in the process of completing this book in the title: *Bilingual Education Programs at Junior High Schools*.

This book would not also have been possible brought into existence without the help of a great many people. At first, in particular, the writers would like to express their gratitude to Prof. Dr. Busmin Gurning, M.Pd., for his so generous assistance, guidance, advice, and precious time he spent on the contribution of finishing this book.

Secondly, the writers would also like to express their gratitude to Prof. Tina Mariany Arifin, M.A., P.h.D., Prof. Amrin Saragih, M.A., P.h.D., and Dr. T. Thyrhaya Zein, M.A. for their appropriate and helpful commentaries and constructive suggestions.

They would also very much like to express their gratitude to the all informants at both schools of SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan who have generously given their time and chance, and supplied them with information, particularly Darron Hasibuan, S.Pd., the headmaster of SMP Panca Budi Medan, Drs. H. Ahmad Siregar, M.M., the headmaster of SMP Negeri 1 Medan and the headmaster assistant of curriculum affairs of SMP Negeri 1 Medan, Dewi Sakti Purba, S.Pd. This work is also dedicated to the all teachers and students of both SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 who have provided their time and chance in supporting this book.



CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 BILINGUAL PROGRAM	7
CHAPTER 3 BILINGUAL EDUCATION	11
CHAPTER 4 BILINGUALISM	17
A. Balanced Bilinguals	18
B. Dominant Bilinguals	19
C. Passive or Recessive Bilinguals	20
D. Semilinguals or Limited Bilinguals	20
CHAPTER 5 BILINGUALITY	23
CHAPTER 6 DIMENSIONS OF BILINGUALITY	25
CHAPTER 7 TYPES OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	27

A. Dual-Language Schools	28
B. Canadian Immersion Education	29
C. Two-Way Bilingual Education	31
D. Maintenance Bilingual Education	34
E. Transitional Models	34
F. Early-Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education	36
G. Pull-Out TBE	36
H. Integrated TBE	37
I. Bilingual Structured Immersion Education	40
J. Bilingual Programs for the Deaf	41
K. English-Only Instruction Models	43
CHAPTER 8 LANGUAGE POLICY IN INDONESIA	47
CHAPTER 9 RESEARCH METHOD	51
A. Research Design	51
B. Research Settings	52
C. Data and Data Sources	53
D. Techniques for Collecting the Data	53
E. Steps of Analyzing the Data	54
F. Trustworthiness of the Study	54
CHAPTER 10 RESEARCH FINDINGS	57
A. Full-English	57
B. Dominant English	68
C. Balanced Bilingual	73
D. Code-Mixing Bilingual	77
E. Full-Indonesian	84
CHAPTER 11 DISCUSSION	89
CHAPTER 12 CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	93



A. Conclusions 93

B. Suggestions 94

REFERENCE 97

ABOUT THE AUTHOR 103

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of science and technology have brought many changes in almost all aspects of life that demands a quality system of international scale. So that everyone is expected to have knowledge and skills in order that they can compete in the era of globalization. The demand has brought about consequences and the impacts to the government and educational institutions to create qualified generations. English, as an international language, is very important to follow the developments in this creative and innovative era. English takes a strict role in mastering the science. Students as young generations must have the ability of that international language in order to make them more competitive. Many education experts and government felt essential to teach English intensively and continuously to the high school students even since elementary school.

Students are expected to be able to speak English well so that they are capable of governing the global science and technology development. Hence, school as an educational institution takes important roles to create the students, as generations, to be competitive, active and creative to respond the developments. One of the alternatives considered capable of meeting this challenge is the implementation of bilingual education program or a class with two introductory languages namely Indonesian and English that is so-called bilingual education. The bilingual program is applied in teaching Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics through English. This is considered to accelerate students in acquiring English as a foreign language in anticipating the development and technology, as well as to support the establishment of the International Standard School. This is based on the law No. 20 of 2003, article 50, verse 3 which states that government and/or local governments conduct at least one unit of education at all levels to be developed into an international standard educational unit. It means that every school unit has opportunity to establish the school itself to be an international standard unit. It is intended to create the students to have good ability, particularly English speaking ability, so they are capable of applying the science and technology in the global era, and it can be arrived through the application of bilingual programs.

Lately, there have been many schools which apply bilingual program, so-called bilingual education. The aim of bilingual applications in education is to increase students' ability in English with the output in the mastery of knowledge and technology development. Depdiknas (2007) in



Arnyana (2008) proposes that the purposes of bilingual education program are: (1) to increase the mastery of the materials; and (2) to increase the students' English ability either in scientific or non-scientific forum.

Bialystok (2008), in the results of his studies, demonstrates that childhood bilingualism is a significant experience that has a power to influence the course and efficiency of children's development. Karahan (2005) also states that teaching foreign languages, particularly English, has always been supported in order to be effective in the international arena, to access modern scientific and technological innovations, to interpret and to improve these innovations, to gain knowledge about national and global values and to make comments on them. The point is that bilingual education is one possible solution for educating minority children. Although some children succeed without such intervention, others require the structure it provides.

In Indonesia, bilingual education has recently been a trend to find schools with bilingual program, meaning that it is applying the use of two languages in teaching a subject content. Cummins (2000) in Santoso (2006) states from data of four other experts that there is a tendency the bilingual program students obtained better achievements than those in monolingual program. In the context of the Indonesian multilingual society, where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL), such bilingual program has become a significant breakthrough, encouraging the use of English in non-English subjects (known as subjects across curriculum).

Bilingual education has become a prestige for a number of educational institutions in Indonesia. There are many

schools that use a bilingual system in teaching and learning activities. The government, specifically the Department of National Education, has launched a program called “bilingual program” in which several subjects (Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics) are taught in English. The objectives of this program are to produce graduates whose command of English is high and to produce graduates who have high competence in several subjects (Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics) in accordance with the development of those subjects. Bilingual program has become a significant breakthrough, encouraging the use of English in non-English subjects (known as subjects across curriculum).

SMP Panca Budi, for instance, is one of the schools which applies bilingual program. This school has two different classes—regular classes and bilingual classes. In the regular classes, the teaching learning process adopts the curriculum standard which is decided by government (the ministry of education). Just as regular classes, bilingual classes still adapt the curriculum standard determined by government as well, as applied in the regular classes. Only there are some additions in conducting the curriculum. Bilingual classes are given additional subjects to support the bilingual classes, such as Arabic subject, English, and conversation in English two hours each week for the mastery of the material and the addition of competence. In addition, sciences such as Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics are also given two hours each week and are taught by two languages (Indonesian and English). This program is intended to accelerate the students in studying English as a foreign language in facing the development of science and technology in the global era.



However, it is acknowledged that the opening of bilingual classes in this country is still facing obstacles. There are still problems about the implementation of bilingual instruction programs which need to think it over. Among these are still limited English language skills of bilingual Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics teachers. Besides, in fact, thus far there is not yet an appropriate model of teaching bilingual to the students' conditions. There are still many schools that do not yet understand the implementation of a proper approach or model of teaching bilingual based on the classes' conditions. For instance, the school where this research will be conducted namely SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan. Based on the preliminary observation and interview conducted in mini tour, it can be inferred that the schools have not found yet a proper bilingual education program to teach the bilingual classes. This is due to the lack of the understanding of schools, particularly the bilingual teachers about the information of the bilingual education programs. The schools often apply an unsuitable model in teaching bilingual classes, namely the use of Indonesian and English interchangeably with unbalanced proportion.

Consequently, the use of these two languages, Indonesian and English, often makes wrong concept to the materials which have been being studied, and the aims of bilingual program are not achieved well, that is to increase the students' ability in the material mastery, and their English prosperity. Based on the preliminary observation, the inappropriate implementation does not bring any significant increase to the students' knowledge. The students still get difficulties in understanding the contents of the subjects (Math,



Chemistry, Biology, and Physics), and have low English proficiency.

As a matter of fact, to drive good bilingual classes, schools need to consider the policy of models for organizing bilingual education. Schools should design a program to improve students' English skills. In conducting the bilingual classes, the school also needs to consider the teachers' qualification and ability. They must be able to use English well as a medium of instruction in teaching and learning process. They are expected to be able to teach their subject contents by two languages (Indonesian and English). Therefore, the school must be able to prepare the teachers to teach a bilingual program.

The application of bilingual classes is not as simple as possible. There are many things that need to be considered in conducting it, such as students' linguistic skills, teachers' competence and models applied in teaching and learning activities.

In accordance with the explanation above, the writers were eager to conduct a research about the bilingual education program at SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan. It is aimed to investigate the tendency of bilingual education program which is applied by the schools, how it is conducted in the schools, and why the schools apply the program the way it does. This study was intended to answer the following questions : (1) What bilingual education programs do the junior high schools tend to apply? (2) How do the schools apply the bilingual education programs? And, (3) Why do the schools tend to apply the bilingual education programs the way they do?



CHAPTER 2

BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Bilingual program is a model of instruction applied in bilingual classes. As a model of instruction, it shows a process of teaching and learning in the classroom. Teaching involves teachers to deliver knowledge and the way how to educate learners. Learning is usually directed to the students who consumes knowledge. To conduct the teaching and learning process, languages are used. The languages are used to convey the learning materials. In other words, the teachers instruct the students by using at least two languages.

Salkind (2008) denotes that bilingual education program is instruction that uses two languages as media of instruction. The two languages usually consist of a source language and a target language. The source language is the language of the learners and the target language is the lan-

guage that is to be learned by them. These two languages are presented together in the learning materials. Then, it can be said that bilingual education program is a model of instruction which apply two languages as media of teaching and learning process.

In addition, Feng (2007) states that bilingual teaching has nowadays extended to refer to using a foreign language (often English) as a medium for teaching content subjects in major cities and other developed areas. Most of the bilingual teaching uses English because English is regarded as an international language in which many people in the world use it in business, education, and even as a national language. Therefore, it is reasonable if English is used to be the target language. So, it can be stated that English as international languages is occasionally used as second language interaction in bilingual classes.

With the same sense, Richards et al. (1985) add that bilingual teaching as the use of a second or foreign language in school for the teaching of content subjects. In this way, the target language is taught integratively with the subjects that the learners learn in the school. By applying integrated teaching to the second or foreign language, the mastery of the learners toward the target language will be optimally achieved because the linguistic and cultural dimensions of the language are easily understood and difficulties or hindrance in learning the language will be minimized. This is reasonable because the elements of the language and its culture are matched directly at the same time in the same page of the learning materials in the students' book. The translation of sentences or paragraphs in the source language is



provided in the target language. Thus, the learners' vocabulary and grammar are increased drastically.

In conclusion, recently, the application of bilingual education program tends to use the foreign language, particularly English as a second language instruction in teaching and learning process.



CHAPTER 3

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

In conducting bilingual education program, it is essential at first to understand the term of bilingual education. Bilingual education is a term that has both a specific and generic meaning with respect to children who do not know English. Not only is bilingual education a distinct instructional approach, but it is also a term that refers broadly to the assorted special efforts to educate and serve Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (more recently termed English Language Learner (ELL)). Local, state, and federal programs in the area represent numerous theories and practices that may also go by such terms as English as a second language and English for speakers of other languages (Osorio-O'Dea, 2001). Bilingual education is a program intended to the students in which English is not their native language. It is aimed to increase the students' English proficiency.

Brisk (2006) states that bilingual education is viewed as qualified education delivered in two languages. It means that the process of teaching and learning at class should be in the form of two languages in delivering the materials.

The definition of bilingual education is various in different countries. In Latin America, for instance, bilingual education was viewed as quality education delivered in two languages. The elite eagerly enrolled their children in schools that offered, in addition to the regular curriculum, the opportunity to master at least two languages, the prerequisite, many believed, to vocational and social success. Yet in the United States, the term bilingual education evokes a different meaning. It refers to the education of children whose home language is not English. Bilingual education is often associated with urban education (where the children of immigrants often find themselves in compensatory programs and where high dropout rates are viewed as the failure of students rather than the failure of the system). Bilingual students are often branded as not only children whose English is inferior, but as students who are themselves inferior (Brisk, 2006).

To educate such students successfully requires educational practices based on understanding how children learn languages and tailored to the talents and needs of language minority students. Their entry into American society requires that they learn English and adjust to the American culture. However, it is not necessary, or wise, that they do so at the cost of their native language and culture that, for many, are the foundations for their learning. Strong bilingual schools or programs not only meet the needs of bilin-



gual students but also introduce monolingual students to diverse cultures and languages. Rather than eliminate other languages and cultures in US schools, English-based education has the opportunity to take advantage of the linguistic and cultural diversity of our mixed society. Certain factors such as family background, socioeconomic status, educational level of students and their families, and status of the language and ethnic group in the society undeniably affect schooling.

The topic of bilingual education has received heightened attention over the past few decades (Trujillo M., 2007). How to educate children with limited English skills, or English learners (EL), is a highly controversial and debatable issue that deserves attention because of the vast numbers of English learners in the United States today. ELs are students for whom English is a second language and who come from homes in which a language other than English is spoken.

The assembling of bilingual models is different among countries. It may depend on teachers' qualification, students' ability, or sources. Salkind (2008) asserts that the actual implementation of each model can vary widely depending on the availability of qualified teachers, resources, official policies, and societal and school (district) attitudes.

There are differences within and across these various program models and most school districts use a combination of these approaches. In Massachusetts, for example, there are at least six different prototypes. Nationally, most bilingual education approaches use a *pullout* program where students receive English as a Second Language (ESL) for some period of the school day. The pullout approach is used

most often in schools where there is a lack of bilingual teachers, where there are English learners from diverse cultural backgrounds, and where there is a lack of resources and knowledge about bilingual education (Chambers and Parrish, 1992) in Rivera (2002).

Calderon and Carreon (2001) conclude, in general, that the major differences among these different bilingual education models pertain to: (a) *when* the transition to English should happen and; (b) *how much* instruction in a particular language should take place. For example, in the majority of two-way bilingual programs about half the students are native speakers of English and the other half are LEP. The instruction typically begins with 90% instruction in non-English and 10% in English with increasing instruction to 50% English and 50% non-English. However, the research shows a wide variety in the way two-way bilingual education programs are structured.

It means that the implementation of bilingual education programs should be in transitional process. It should refer to the levels of qualifications surroundings (teachers, students, and sources). According to Dharma in Astika (2009), the implementation of a bilingual class to go through several stages: in the first year the use of language of instruction in English as much as 25 percent and 75 percent of Indonesian. In the second year, the two languages respectively 50 percent of English and 50 percent for Indonesian. And in the third year of the language of instruction uses 75 percent English and 25 percent of the Indonesian language. Lee (2008: 85) stated that this tiered bilingual class is called as bilingual transitional education because students are not directly taught in



the English language in full, but gradually, the portion of the English language grows larger and the portion of students' language increasingly small. The portion could be defined or categorized in accordance with the type of bilinguals.

From those explanations it can be simply drawn an inference that bilingual education program is a model of teaching instruction which implements two languages as media of communicating or instructing in the teaching and learning process in bilingual classes.

Creating a workforce and science with a high degree of bilingual education competence in Indonesian and English is viewed as highly desirable for the economic and technology development of the nation. Competence in the language has become a crucial determinant for access to higher education. As a result, English has become deeply embedded in the curriculum in educational institutions. In the application of bilingual education program should be based on the school environment condition. The school ought to create the policy of bilingual education program in accordance with the school condition, such as students' ability, teachers' qualification and so forth.



CHAPTER 4

BILINGUALISM

The concept of bilingualism seems at first sight to be non-problematical. The term of bilingualism may mean different things to different people as there is no one definition of bilingualism. For the average of speaker, bilingualism can be loosely defined as the use of two languages of the native-like control of two languages (Chin & Wigglesworth, 2007). It means that bilinguals must be able to master two languages, in which the non-native language as native-like control.

Karahan (2005) adds that bilingualism, i.e. competence in more than one language, can be thought at either an individual or social level. The bilingual competence is possibly acquired or studied whether as individual level or social context. Baldauf Jr. & Kaplan (1997) adds that bilingualism is an individual phenomenon; that is, it represents the achieve-

ment of a single person immersed simultaneously in two or more language communities. Ordinarily, it means unequal command of two languages unequal because one's dominant language throughout life. In summary, bilingual individuals (sometimes able to use more than two languages that is, possessing several bilingualism of varying degree) may co-text in multilingual society in which at least one language in the set of bilingualism is widely shared.

From the statements above, it can be drawn an inference that bilingualism is the speakers' ability in using two languages, either in formal or informal situations. The competence of using the alternative language could be acquired in formal context, such as education (at class) or in social context.

The competence of bilinguals has different level of the use of the languages. These different levels are categorized into several terms depending on the ability in using them. Chin and Wigglesworth (2007), categorize the bilinguals into several terms such as balanced bilinguals, dominant bilinguals, recessive bilinguals, and semilinguals. These categories are in accordance with the perceived degree of proficiency they have in both languages.

A. BALANCED BILINGUALS

The term balanced bilingual was first used by Lambert et al. (1995) in Canada to describe individual who are fully competent in both languages. In most instances, when the term balanced bilingual is used, it describes those who are thought to have perfect control of both languages in all settings. Beardsmore (1982) in Chin and Wigglesworth (2007),



argued that balanced bilingual is close to impossible to achieve, and is therefore very rare. Even high-level conference interpreters tend to have a preference for one of their languages, and will often specialize in interpreting into dominant language despite the fact that they are highly fluent in both languages. It means that a balanced bilingual Someone who is approximately equally fluent in two languages across various contexts may be termed an equilingual or ambilingual.

B. DOMINANT BILINGUALS

The term dominant bilingual refers to bilinguals who are dominant in one language. In the context of discussing dominant bilinguals, researchers will often refer to their less dominant language as the subordinate language. However, one important criterion to note is that the term 'dominance' may not apply to all domains. So, someone who is dominant in French may not exhibit this dominance in all areas. For example, a France-German computer scientist may speak French most of time except when he is discussing computer science-related topics as he did his training in computer science in German. In cases where specialist jargon (medicine, sports) is required, speakers may consciously choose to speak in the language they normally use when discussing these kinds of topics. For example, an Italian-German teacher may be fluent in both Italian-German, but always discusses soccer in Italian as he mainly plays soccer with his Italian-speaking friends and talks 'soccer' in Italian and not in German. Similarly, a Chinese engineer who was trained in London may prefer to discuss engineering research in



English despite the fact that her mother tongue is Mandarin Chinese.

C. PASSIVE OR RECESSIVE BILINGUALS

The term passive or recessive bilingual refers to bilinguals who are gradually losing competence in one language, usually because of disuse. As the term 'recessive' seems to have negative connotations, the writers will use the term 'passive bilinguals' to describe this group of bilinguals. For example, a Dutch migrant in Australia may find himself isolated from the Dutch-speaking community as his daily encounters are with English-speaking Australians. Over time, his proficiency level in Dutch may deteriorate owing to the long period of non-use. Periods of non-use can have various effects on bilingual competence. In bilingual communities which are undergoing a shift from one language to another (usually from the home language to the dominant language in the society), it is not uncommon to come across bilinguals who can only understand, but cannot speak, the other language. So, in Australian context, many older Italians still speak Italian, or an Italian dialect, to their children and grandchildren. However, these second-(children) or third-(grandchildren) generation Italians may reply to their parents or grandparents in English. This is because Italian is gradually being replaced by English for the second-and third-generation Italians.

D. SEMILINGUALS OR LIMITED BILINGUALS

The term semilingualism was first used by Hansegard in 1968 cited in Chin and Wigglesworth (2007), to refer to



Finnish-minority students in Sweden who lack proficiency in both their languages. Hansegard described semilingualism in term of deficit in six language competences: (a) size of vocabulary; (b) correctness of language; (c) unconscious processing of language (automatism); (d) language criterion (neologization); (e) mastery of the functions of language (e.g. emotive, cognitive); and (f) meaning and imaginary

Baker (2001) concludes that a semilingual is considered to exhibit the following profile in both their languages: displays a small vocabulary and incorrect grammar, consciously thinks about language production, is stilted and uncreative with each language, and finds it difficult to think and express emotions in either language.



CHAPTER 5

BILINGUALITY

As stated previously that bilingualism is the individual's capacity to speak a second language while following the concepts and structures of that language rather than paraphrasing his or her mother tongue. All these definitions, which range from a native-like competence in two languages to a minimal proficiency in a second language, raise a number of theoretical and methodological difficulties.

On the one hand, they lack precision and operationalism: they do not specify what is meant by native like competence, which varies considerably within a unilingual population, nor by minimal proficiency in a second language, nor by obeying the concepts and structures of that second language.

Otherwise, these definitions refer to a single dimension of bilinguality, namely the level of proficiency in both

languages, thus ignoring non-linguistic dimensions. For example, Paradis (1986) in Hamers & Blanc (2004), while suggesting that bilinguality should be defined on a multidimensional continuum, reduces the latter to linguistic structure and language skill. When definitions taking into account dimensions other than the linguistic ones have been proposed, they too have been more often than not limited to a single dimension. For example, Mohanty (1994) in Hamers & Blanc (2004) limits the definition of bilingualism to its social-communicative dimension, when he says that 'bilingual persons or communities are those with an ability to meet the communicative demands of the self and the society in their normal functioning in two or more languages in their interaction with the other speakers of any or all of these languages'.



DIMENSIONS OF BILINGUALITY

Bilinguality is viewed as the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication. This access is multidimensional as it varies along a number of psychological and sociological dimensions. We have found the following dimensions relevant: (1) relative competence; (2) cognitive organisation; (3) age of acquisition; (4) exogeneity; (5) social cultural status; and (6) cultural identity.

The dimension of competence enables us to take into account the relative nature of bilinguality, since it focuses on the relationship between two linguistic competences, one in each language. Regardless of the state of equilibrium, bilinguality may differ on other dimensions. For example, age and context of acquisition may lead to differences in cognitive functioning.

Further, the age of acquisition plays a part not only in respect of cognitive representation but also in other aspects of the bilingual's development, particularly his linguistic, neuropsychological, cognitive and sociocultural development. Age of acquisition combines with other data from the subject's language biography, such as context of acquisition and use of the two languages. Indeed, age and context often go together: for instance, early acquisition of two languages often occurs in the same family context, while later acquisition of the second language often takes place in a school context distinct from a family context for the first language.

According to whether the speech communities of both languages are present or not in the child's social environment, we refer to either endogenous or exogenous bilinguality. An endogenous language is one that is used as a mother tongue in a community and may or may not be used for institutional purposes, whereas an exogenous language is one that is used as an official, institutionalised language but has no speech community in the political entity using it officially.

In respect of cognitive development, the type of bilinguality is also dependent on the sociocultural environment, in particular the relative status of the two languages in the community. According to whether the two languages are socially valued in his environment, the child will develop different forms of bilinguality.



CHAPTER 7

TYPES OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Bilingual education programs are described broadly according to their goals, type of students served, languages in which literacy is developed, and languages of subject matter instruction. Bilingual education models are divided between those that have as a major goal fluency in two languages and those that strive for fluency in the second language, English. The first type has no limitations in the number of years a student can attend; it can include a program within a school or the whole school can be bilingual. Dual-language schools, Canadian immersion education, two-way bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, and bilingual programs for the deaf are included in this category. The second type, which includes Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), pull-out TBE, integrated TBE,

and Bilingual Structured Immersion, shares the goal of preparing students to function in monolingual classes. Therefore students attend such programs for a limited number of years. Integrated TBE also mainstreams students. Because mainstreaming takes place unbeknownst to students within an integrated cluster, there is no stigma attached to bilingual education or use of home languages. Students continue to use their native language even after reaching proficiency in English, and English speakers learn to respect different languages and cultures (Brisk, 2006).

Roberts (1995) in Rivera (2002) in general classifies the various bilingual education programs into three categories; transitional bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, and enrichment bilingual education models. In addition, Brisk (2006) categorizes the types of bilingual education programs into the following various terms:

A. DUAL-LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

In dual-language schools, also called mainstream bilingual education (Baker, 1993), the curriculum is delivered in two languages, conventionally half of the day in one language and half in the other. A full range of courses is offered. The particular language of instruction for each discipline may vary. Yujin Gakuen is a Japanese dual-language program in Oregon. The elementary grades are in a self-contained school where 80% of kindergarten instruction is in Japanese. In Grades 1 through 5 instructional times is equally divided between Japanese and English. These students can continue their study of Japanese in special programs in local middle and high schools.



A number of dual-language schools tend to be private (Mackey, 1972), often attracting international sojourners as well as children whose parents want them to become bilingual. These schools can include native speakers of both languages, native speakers of English only, or native speakers of other languages. Dual-language schools differ from the two-way programs in that they are not purposely created to serve language minority students, although some schools seek to include a diverse population. The focus is bilingualism rather than the particular needs of a population.

Throughout the world, dual-language schools were created to serve the children of the international community whose parents work in international organizations, embassies, and businesses. These schools serve students who come from different language backgrounds. They usually instruct in two languages and often offer tutoring in the native language of the students. For example, the United Nations International School in New York City serves the children of United Nations delegates, other international students, and English-speaking US students. The languages of instruction are English and French.

B. CANADIAN IMMERSION EDUCATION

This program developed in Canadian public schools to make English speakers fluent in French. A group of parents and linguists frustrated with the poor results of French foreign language education looked for an alternate approach to teaching French. This new approach immerses the students in the second language for the first 2 years of school. Language, reading, and all subjects are taught in French. Begin-

ning in the third year, English—the native language of the students—is introduced for a small portion of the day. With each grade the amount of English instruction increases until in the upper grades (7–12) most of the instruction is in English, and French is only used in a few courses. Because all the students are English speakers, teachers use second language strategies when teaching in French to facilitate comprehension and learning (Lambert & Tucker, 1972) in Brisk (2006).

A late immersion variation introduces intensive instruction in French in the fifth, sixth, or seventh grade. For 1 or 2 years all subjects are taught in French except for English language arts. Before being totally immersed in French, students study French as a second language for 2 or more years. Following the French immersion years, students continue to receive French language and another subject in French. The French curriculum includes language arts, science, mathematics, and social studies.

Canadian immersion education, especially the early immersion variation, has been replicated for English-speaking students in the United States using French, Spanish, or German as the immersion language (Campbell, 1984; Cohen, 1976). In Hawaii this model serves the purpose of revival of the Hawaiian language. Native Hawaiian children who are native speakers of English attend school in Hawaiian until fifth grade. English is then introduced for 1 hour a day and continues to be used alongside Hawaiian (Slaughter, 1997).

This model was originally called *immersion education*. To avoid confusion with other models also called *immersion* it has chosen to call it *Canadian immersion* whether it is implemented in Canada or in the United States. Canadian pro-



grams are solely in French, but this is not so in the United States (Brisk, 2006).

C. TWO-WAY BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Two-way bilingual education is an educational approach that integrates language minority and language majority students for all or most of the day, and provides content instruction and literacy instruction to all students in both languages. Stating this another way, there are three defining criteria of TWI programs. *First*, the programs must include fairly equal numbers of two groups of students: language minority students, who in the United States are native speakers of a language other than English, such as Spanish, Korean, Chinese, etc.; and language majority students, who in the United States are native English speakers. *Second*, the programs are integrated, meaning that the language minority students and language majority students are grouped together for core academic instruction (i.e., content courses and literacy courses) for all or most of the day. *Finally*, TWI programs provide core academic instruction to both groups of students in both languages. Depending on the program model, initial literacy instruction may not be provided to both groups in both languages, but by about third grade, regardless of program model, all students are generally receiving literacy instruction in both languages. Following from this definition, there are four central goals of all TWI programs:

1. Students will develop high levels of proficiency in their first language (L1). This means that the language minority students will develop high levels of speaking, listen-

ing, reading, and writing ability in their native language (e.g., Spanish), and native English speakers will develop high levels of speaking, listening, reading, and writing ability in English.

2. All students will develop high levels of proficiency in a second language (L2). TWI programs are considered additive bilingual programs for both groups of students because they afford all students the opportunity to maintain and develop oral and written skills in their first language while simultaneously acquiring oral and written skills in a second language.
3. Academic performance for both groups of students will be at or above grade level, and the same academic standards and curriculum for other students in the district will also be maintained for students in TWI programs.
4. All students in TWI programs will demonstrate positive cross-cultural attitudes and behaviors.

There are two main program designs in TWI: (1) 90/10 (or a common variation, 80/20), in which most instruction in the primary grades is provided in the minority language, with a gradual increase in English instruction through third or fourth grade, when a 50/50 balance is reached; and (2) 50/50, in which instruction at all grade levels is divided equally across the two languages. Three basic program models were identified at the elementary level. Some programs provided most instruction (80-90%) in the minority language in the early grades, increasing the amount of English at each higher grade level until the use of the two languages was about equal (usually by fourth grade). These programs, often referred to as “90/10” or “minority language domi-



nant,” comprised 42% of the programs in the 2000 directory. Another basic model involves equal amounts of instruction in the two languages from the beginning of the program. Called the “50/50” or “balanced” model, it represented 33% of the programs in the directory. Finally, a small percentage of programs (2%) were “differentiated,” in that they provided differing ratios of instruction in the two languages for English-speaking and language minority students. The directory also included secondary programs (13% of the schools listed), and 9% of the schools did not supply information about program model.

With regard to initial literacy instruction, 31% of the programs reported that they provided initial literacy instruction through the minority language to all students, 22% used both languages simultaneously, 20% separated the students by native language, 1% provided initial literacy instruction solely in English to all students, 14% did not serve primary grades, and 12% were unreported. Regarding staffing, 54% of programs reported that 100% of teachers were proficient in both languages, and 29% of programs reported that 100% of staff members were proficient in both languages (Chistian et al., 2003).

Two-way programs are also called two-way maintenance bilingual education, two-way immersion, and dual-language programs. These programs serve language minority and majority children simultaneously in order to develop fluency in the heritage language of the minority students and the societal language. They encourage socialization between the two groups of students and respect for the others’ cultural backgrounds (Brisk, 2006).

D. MAINTENANCE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Maintenance programs, also called as developmental bilingual education, exclusively serve language minority students but compare in many other ways to dual-language and two-way programs. Maintenance programs seek to develop and maintain the native language of the language minority students and develop a positive attitude toward the native culture while also achieving proficiency in English. Literacy and subject matter instruction in both the native language and English are vital to achieving these goals (Brisk, 2006:38). The specific courses taught in each language vary over the grades and across programs. Twenty-four developmental bilingual programs are available in Houston's Independent School District, the fifth largest school district in the United States, where 54% of its more than 210,000 students are Hispanic. These are one-way dual-language classes (one language group receiving their schooling in two languages), where developing strong subject matter competency in both Spanish and English is emphasized. Spanish is used as the major medium of instruction during the elementary years, with the amount of English instruction gradually increasing with each year until 50% of the instruction is in English, by fourth grade.

E. TRANSITIONAL MODELS

Baker (2001) says that transitional bilingual education aims to shift the child from the home, minority language to the dominant, majority language. Social and cultural assimilation into the language majority is the underlying aim. Furthermore, Rivera (2002) states that the purpose of



transitional models is to teach students English as quickly as possible and once students have learned English, usually within a specific time limit, to ensure that students are exited or mainstreamed into regular English-only classes. Transitional bilingual education programs include the following examples: early-exit transitional bilingual education, late-exit transitional bilingual education, English as a second language pull-out, and one-year structured English immersion. It means that transitional models are designed to help the students who are monolingual in one language to the transition to the English, the language of instruction used in the class regularly. As Marie de Mejía (2005:3) states in his research that Transitional models consist of programs aimed at students who are dominant or monolingual in an indigenous language, and who need to acquire Spanish as a second language. These programs are designed as vehicles for providing meaningful instruction and literacy training in students' first language prior to (or concomitant with) their transition to Spanish.

Brisk (2006) also adds that the goal of these programs is to develop English skills without sacrificing or delaying learning of content courses. Gradually, students take more subjects in English until they can be totally mainstreamed. Literacy in the native language serves as a foundation for English reading and writing. TBE programs vary with respect to the amount of native language instruction, the courses offered, and how soon students are mainstreamed. Brisk classifies the transitional education models into; pull-out TBE, integrated TBE, and Bilingual Structured Immersion Education.

In transitional bilingual education (TBE), also referred to as “remedial bilingual programs” by Thomas and Collier (2002) the native language of language minority students is used while the students are learning English. Once students are proficient in English, they are transferred to the mainstream. Thomas and Collier distinguished between two types of transitional programs. The 90-10 TBE programs start 90% of the instruction in the minority language, gradually increasing English until in the fifth grade students are mainstreamed. In 50-50 programs students receive equal amounts of instruction in English and the other language for 3 to 4 years followed by transition to the mainstream.

F. EARLY-EXIT AND LATE-EXIT TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Early-exit TBE refers to two years maximum help using the mother tongue. Late-exit TBE often allows around 40 percent of classroom teaching in the mother tongue until the 6th grade (Baker, 2001:199). In the same sense, Ramírez (1992) identified yet another type, called early-exit TBE programs, where students received only literacy instruction in the native language and the rest of the subjects were in English. At the end of first or second grade most students were mainstreamed. In conclusion, in these models, the bilingual teachers are not supposed to teach the students in balance between the indigenous language and English as the majority.

G. PULL-OUT TBE

A modified version of TBE for schools with few students



in each grade level places students in the mainstream classroom and pulls them out daily for native language and ESL instruction. The purpose is mainly to help students with their work in the mainstream classes. The bilingual teacher tutors small groups of students from the same grade level by reviewing in their home language particular lessons covered in their mainstream classes. The same bilingual teacher or an ESL teacher may reinforce English language and literacy development using the native language. Bilingual teachers occasionally assist bilingual students after they develop full fluency in English. Bilingual teachers also assist the mainstream teachers in communication with the families. The actual implementation of these programs varies depending on the number of students and availability of teachers.

A school with 65 Japanese students from kindergarten through eighth grade assigned them to mainstream classes according to grade level. A Japanese-speaking teacher and two English-speaking aides who know some Japanese help the students in three ways. For the younger students, one of the instructors spends time with them in their mainstream classes. Older students drop in for tutoring and assistance with homework. New comers are pulled out daily for tutoring in English and other subjects. Sometimes students do their assignments in Japanese, which the staff helps them translate. The bilingual staff works closely with the mainstream teachers and the students' families (Brisk, 1991b) in Brisk (2001).

H. INTEGRATED TBE

The inherent segregation of Transition Bilingual Edu-



cation (TBE) programs has prompted the development of integration strategies to bring TBE and mainstream classes together. Integration of students with different language backgrounds varies with respect to organization, relative use of different languages, and the role of the bilingual teacher. Integrated bilingual programs preserve instruction in the native languages and allow native language use when students are in the mainstream classroom (Brisk, 1991b; De Jong, 1996) in (Brisk, 2001). Although the overall goals of these programs are similar to those of TBE, they also aim to integrate bilingual students with mainstream students by increasing academic and social contact, to expose English-speaking students to other languages and cultures, to support bilingual students who have already been mainstreamed, and to sensitize mainstream teachers to the educational needs of bilingual students.

In many schools bilingual students and their teachers occasionally attend mainstream classrooms where instruction is exclusively in English. While the mainstream teacher conducts the class, the bilingual teacher helps bilingual students to comprehend and participate. Such a practice, which schools claim is integration, resembles submersion with native language support more than it does bilingual integration because the teachers and their classes do not have equal status and the native language of the bilingual students is not for general classroom instruction. Such deviations from the true integration model have been opposed by bilingual education advocates as excusing forfeiture of native languages.

For integration to be truly bilingual, teaching is done in both the native language of the bilingual students and in



English. Mainstream and bilingual teachers and students equally share their classrooms. The staying power of these programs is fragile because they highly depend on the ability of bilingual and mainstream teachers to work together. Changes in personnel quickly dissolve the programs. A fifth-grade integrated cluster developed in Chelsea, Massachusetts brought bilingual, mainstream, and chapter 1 teachers together with their 50 students (Brisk, 1991a). Together these teachers developed the curriculum, assigned responsibilities, planned individual student assignments, dealt with student problems, and communicated with parents. The bilingual teacher taught in Spanish or bilingually.

The other two teachers taught in English but allowed use of other languages in their classroom. Bilingual students often helped when there were communication difficulties. (Brisk, 1994; Faltis, 1994) in Brisk (2006) argues that integration programs at the secondary level are easier to schedule because students regularly travel from one classroom to another. It is harder, however, for mainstream teachers because the content of their classes is more difficult to understand for bilingual students. June, a mainstream social studies teacher, developed strategies and used assistance to help her communicate with her students and facilitate their learning. She secured materials in Spanish for her classes, prepared bilingual lists with the basic vocabulary that she presented at the start of the class, and read aloud difficult material and tests in English. The bilingual aide and bilingual college student volunteers assisted June during small group discussions.



I. BILINGUAL STRUCTURED IMMERSION EDUCATION

Bilingual structured immersion programs place students of the same language background in segregated classes. Most of the instruction is in English except for the first hour of the day, when teachers teach native language literacy and explain concepts in the students' language. Teachers are bilingual and allow students to use their native language even when they are instructed in English. The teachers also receive training in second language methodology and teaching content in a second language (Brisk, 2006). In McAllen, kindergarten students in the bilingual immersion program performed better in tests of English reading than those in TBE. Schneider (1990) compared students in Grades 1 through 5 in bilingual immersion with TBE students in tests of math, reading, and language arts. The results were mixed except for language arts, where bilingual immersion students scored slightly better than TBE students. All students obtained comparable grades once mainstreamed into English-only classes.

The implementation of this program is various. Lambert & Tucker (1972) in Lightbown (2008), the original programs placed children in French immersion classrooms from kindergarten. While other immersion programs start when children are about nine years old; others start at 12 or 13 years. He adds that although there are many variations in the implementation of immersion program, all share the following essential characteristics:

1. The classes are most often made up exclusively or primarily of students whose L1 is the majority community language 1.



2. Teachers are usually bilinguals. They understand and speak the students' L1 as well as their L2.
3. Students have 500-1000 hours of subject matter instruction through the L2 in each school year over a period of several years. The materials are usually adapted to the linguistic level of L2 learners.
4. L1 language arts and some other subjects are, at some point in the students' education, taught through their L1.
5. The majority language is *always* supported by the school, and over time, students are expected to maintain and develop skills in their L1 as well as their L2.
6. The absence of L2 peers limits students' exposure to age-appropriate language registers.

Immersion education has shown that students can acquire good L2 skills while maintaining their L1. Their overall academic achievement is not negatively affected by having received a substantial part of their academic instruction through the second language.

J. BILINGUAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DEAF

Bilingual programs for the deaf employ both signing and the written form of the societal language. The purpose of these programs is to educate deaf learners in the language that is most natural to them, that is, a sign language, while they also gain access to material written in the societal language (Berent, 2001). These programs serve deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The sign language of the community is used in face-to-face communication and the societal language is used for academic content in the written form. Usu-



ally both languages are used during the day.

The term *bilingual* can mean different things for someone deaf or hearing. Different types of modal bilingualism might include knowing the following: (a) two different signed languages; (b) two different nonsigned languages; and (c) a signed language and a nonsigned language. A person may be a proficient user of Italian Sign Language and Costa Rican Sign Language, two sign languages. Another person may know French and Chinese, two nonsigning languages. And yet another person may be able to communicate in American Sign Language and English, a sign language and a nonsigning language. These are all examples of bilingual uses; only the mode of bilingual language use of the deaf community is different from that of others. A person who knows a sign language and a nonsigned language is said to be *bimodal bilingual*.

Bilingual education for the deaf is still in its early stages. But since its inception in the 1970s, studies have indicated conclusive results. It helps if students have sign language skills before learning a nonsigning language; leading researchers in deaf education have shown that deaf children who have a strong foundation in a sign language are more likely to have stronger skills (reading and writing) in the nonsigning language than other deaf children do. Using a sign language as the medium of instruction in class has been shown to be conducive to development of literacy skills across the curriculum. Documented case studies also indicate improvement in nonliteracy areas. Deaf students have more self-esteem and a healthier attitude toward education in bilingual programs that acknowledge their deaf identity



and support the use of a sign language. Their cognitive functions appear to be stronger if they are educated at a school that supports sign language development in addition to written language development (Gonzales, 2008).

K. ENGLISH-ONLY INSTRUCTION MODELS

These programs can be full-time, part-time, or simply pull-out classes where students are temporarily taken from their home rooms for special instruction. The students can be from the same language group or from a variety of language groups working together. The most common English-only instruction programs are ESL and structured immersion (Brisk, 2006).

1. English as a Second Language (ESL) Program

ESL programs, referred to by Thomas and Collier (2002) as remedial English only, provide special classes in the English language for students who are not proficient in the language. Students spend most of the school day in mainstream classrooms but attend daily ESL classes. In some cases students are pulled out from their classes to take ESL with a special teacher. In others, labeled *pull-in ESL*, ESL instructors assist mainstream teachers in their classrooms with students who are not proficient in English. One program for bilinguals devoted half of the school day to ESL language learning and subject content and the other half to mainstream home rooms. In high school, ESL is usually offered as a subject. Classes are offered at various levels of English language proficiency.

Typically students attend beginning, intermediate, or



advanced ESL classes. Another type of ESL program is called high-intensity language training (HILT). Students concentrate on English for a particular period, which may last a summer, a semester, or even a year studying only English with other language minority students before they are integrated into the school. I visited such a program in California that served over 500 students from Grade 4 through high school. The program was housed in its own school building and the students attended English language classes all day. They took separate courses in oral language, reading, and writing. Most students were transferred to a regular school within 1 year. By focusing solely on English language rather than academic content and without English-speaking peers to practice the newly learned language in informal situations, students in such programs had no occasion to naturally practice the language or acquire the language they needed for school.

Typically ESL classes concentrated on teaching English from purely an oral language perspective. Under the influence of the general modern language field, the need for proficiency in a second language for everyday interaction transformed some ESL curricula. The type of second language that English speakers need when they go abroad is not the same as what students who do not speak English need when attending school in the United States. Practitioners have realized that students need English to function socially as well as academically, thus oral practice is not enough for an ESL curriculum. Well-educated students must be able to understand content-area texts; write reports, book reviews, and essays; and interact in class around mathematics, science,

social studies, and literature. This has given rise to other ESL programs, referred to as “enhanced” English-only programs, where ESL is taught through content or sheltered ESL instruction that also provides additional emphasis on student cognitive development; grade-level academic work across the curriculum; interactive, discovery, hands-on learning; or other instructional improvements to “basic ESL” (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

2. Structured Immersion

Structured immersion, sometimes called sheltered immersion, stands for two different kinds of programs. The most common type places language minority students of the same language group in segregated classrooms for instruction in English. Content area courses are taught using the sheltered English approach. Teachers simplify language, develop highly structured lessons, and use non-linguistic support, such as pictures, objects, films, and hands-on activities to present lessons (Northcutt & Watson, 1986). The teachers are supposed to have training in ESL and sheltered English techniques. A second type of structured immersion shares all characteristics with the first but teachers have some knowledge of the students’ home language so that they can understand students and occasionally use the students’ home language for clarification (Ramírez, 1992). Much confusion surrounds structured immersion. The confusion is on the difference of the use of structured immersion and bilingual immersion. Bilingual immersion develops literacy in the native language, a fact that supporters of bilingual education have always maintained helps English language learning.



Structured immersion does not develop literacy in the native language, so there is no guarantee that the results on English tests will be comparable (Schneider, 1990).



CHAPTER 8

LANGUAGE POLICY IN INDONESIA

Language policy is the means by which governments and other groups (e.g. some local authorities in England) set out their intentions to safeguard, develop and exploit the capacity in languages among the people they represent.

In relation to the national language policy, language policy refers to government's authority in considering the national language. According to Halim (1998) the National Language Policy refers to the national policy including planning, standardizing, educating, developing the Indonesian language and the local languages. Alwi et al. (2000) argued that the national language policy was associated with the outlines which were used as a standard in the whole language management in Indonesia. Furthermore, the language policy in Indonesia was associated with: (a) national

language; (b) local language; and (c) the teaching and use of English and other foreign languages.

Halim added that the aspect that should be considered in relation to the national language policy was sustainability in the sense of a systematic and strategic national language policy. However, sustainability in the national language policy should be considered because this problem might become the weakness of the national language policy in the education and development of local languages, and the teaching of foreign languages including English in Indonesia.

Language policy in Indonesia has to contend with a highly multicultural and multilingual society. English, its status, and its role or function in the functioning of the nation and in education in particular has to be seen against the backdrop of where it takes a place in the third of three main categories, *Bahasa Indonesia*, the regional vernaculars, and foreign languages.

The choice of Indonesian to become the national language has been something of a success story. It now is understood and spoken by the majority of Indonesians. In diglossic situations, Indonesian is used, typically, for 'high' or public functions and one or more of the regional vernaculars are used for 'low', informal, personal purposes or as a means of cementing local ties and cultural identity (Renandya, 2000: 114; Sneddon, 2003; Sneddon, 2004; Sneddon, 2006) in Lauder (2008).

Language policy needs to consider by the authorities in conducting bilingual program in the classroom or teaching-learning process. There are four main reasons. (a) It acknowledges the presence in school of certain children with



abilities which should be recognized, as a means of supporting the self-esteem of those children; of aiding their intellectual and academic development; of giving them recognition within their community and perhaps enhancing their life chances. (b) It should lead in school to an increase in awareness of language and languages; to an acknowledgement and acceptance of cultural diversity; to greater communication between members of various cultural groups. (c) It promotes notions of the integrity and value of all languages and dialects, stressing the active involvement of children in genuinely communicative situations, and the inter-dependence of any two or more languages possessed by individual people. (d) It will assure parents that mother tongue is not being developed at the expense of English, but that each is complementing the other, to the benefit of the child (Mills & Mills, 2002).

Suggested activities fall into three groups.

- (a) Cross-curricular activities, using mother tongue to develop concepts and enhance its status/value in the children's eyes, may include: (a) re-telling of stories by children; (b) role play (perhaps with puppets); (c) sequencing/cloze/caption-writing/matching; (d) discussion preceding curriculum activities; (e) book-making (perhaps of an ancestral homeland visit); (f) audio tape-recording (perhaps in the playground); (g) singing songs and rhymes; (h) using mother tongue in assembly; and (i) making multilingual school notices.
- (b) Learning English through the medium of mother tongue, with bilingual colleagues, can proceed by means of: (a) acting as communicators to translate lesson content/



- practise language patterns/develop vocabulary; (b) producing/translating books in English and mother tongue, written and illustrated by the children; (c) discussing items from ethnic minority newspapers; and (d) compiling a multilingual anthology or magazine, to include stories, jokes, reports, interviews, and advertisements.
- (c) Language awareness topics may involve, for example:
- (a) language questionnaire (to children and staff);
 - (b) graph construction (showing language distribution);
 - (c) autobiographical writing about oneself and family;
 - (d) vocabulary of family relationships;
 - (e) collection of language scripts;
 - (f) survey of languages in the immediate environment;
 - (g) mapping of languages represented in the class; and
 - (h) invitations into school of local bilingual speakers.



CHAPTER 9

RESEARCH METHOD

A. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study was conducted by applying qualitative-method by using naturalistic study. Naturalistic study is a type of study in which the researcher very carefully observes and records some behavior or phenomenon, sometimes over a prolonged period, in its natural setting while interfering as little as possible with the subjects or phenomena. Qualitative research is also stated as naturalistic study that has the natural setting, as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

In this study, this qualitative method was used to describe what types of bilingual education programs tend to be implemented in bilingual classes of SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan, how they were applied, and why they were conducted the way they were.

Before conducting the research, the researcher has already held a mini-tour (preliminary observation and interview) with the informants (teachers, headmaster, and students) to obtain preliminary data about the problems of the implementation of bilingual education in the school. Based on the results of the observation and interview the research concludes that there are problems about the implementation of bilingual education programs in the school. The school, particularly teachers do not find yet a good model of bilingual teaching instruction in teaching bilingual students. These are also owing to the shortcoming of teachers' understanding about bilingual education programs.

B. RESEARCH SETTINGS

This study was conducted in bilingual classes of SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan. They are both located on Jl. Jend. Gatot Subroto Km. 4.5 Medan, and Jl. Bunga Asoka 6 Kel. Asam Kumbang Kec. Medan Selayang, Medan. These places were selected because there were several problems faced by the schools in conducting bilingual education. Besides, the similar research has never been conducted yet. In addition, these places were representative to conduct the study, and easily accessible for the researcher.

In a qualitative research, a researcher usually does not have fixed schedule of what to be done, but the researcher is more like loosely schedule traveler than the other. In other words, the researcher enters the research with some idea about what s/he will do, but a detailed set of procedure is not formed prior to data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010) also states that quali-



tative research is to describe recurrent patterns or themes. It can be stated that the research process will finish after finding the pattern or theme. However, this research is expected to be held approximately at the latest for three months.

C. DATA AND DATA SOURCES

The data of this study were the implementation of bilingual education programs. In collecting the data, the subjects of this study in turn were the teachers, headmasters, and students. To support the data, the researcher also observed and interviewed the other informants (bilingual teachers, students and the headmaster). In this study, the researcher firstly tried to do an interview in order to get preliminary information of the implementation the bilingualism in teaching and learning process. After that, observed the students in the class while teaching learning process is carrying out, and then interviewed other bilingual teachers and the headmaster. This was intended to crosscheck between the data observed and the data interviewed.

D. TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING THE DATA

The ways of collecting data were in a variety of ways, such as observation, interviews, and tape recordings. In this study, participant observation and in-dept interview were used to get the data. Bogdan and Biklen (1992:2) say that in depth interview and participant observation are common ways in qualitative research. It is due to qualitative research is naturalistic.

1. Participant Observation

Here, participant observation was done to collect the data in relation to what types of bilingual education program were applied in teaching and learning process and how they were applied. The researcher came into the class while teaching and learning process is going on to do direct observation.

2. In-depth Interview

In-depth interview was conducted in order to get the data in which in turn was processed via transcription. The interview was applied by using tape recorder and transcribes them into the writing form. It was respectively conducted to teachers, headmasters and students. This was in order to crosscheck the data from one another.

E. STEPS OF ANALYZING THE DATA

The data were analyzed through two procedures. The data were analyzed by Bogdan analysis (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). The first data, observation, were analyzed through the following steps; (a) identifying, separate the data from non-data; (b) breaking the data into smaller unit; (c) classifying the data; (d) organizing the data; and (e) discovering the pattern or theme. The data, interview, were analyzed through the following steps; (a) transcribe the data from the tape recorder; (b) classify the data; (c) verify the reason why the school applies the bilingual program the way it does; and (d) conclude the data.

F. TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE STUDY

In qualitative research, trustworthiness of a research



study is important to evaluate its worth. The aim of trustworthiness in a qualitative inquiry is to support the argument that the inquiry's findings are "worth paying attention to" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), there are four criteria for establishing the trustworthiness of qualitative data, namely credibility (true value), dependability (consistency), confirmability (neutrality), and transferability (applicability). Credibility is an evaluation of whether or not the research findings represent a "credible" conceptual interpretation of the data drawn from the participants' original data.

Transferability is the degree to which the findings of this inquiry can apply or transfer beyond the bounds of the project. Merriam in Shenton (2004) writes that external validity "is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations." The concern often lies in demonstrating that the results of the work at hand can be applied to a wider population. Dependability is an assessment of the quality of the integrated processes of data collection, data analysis, and theory generation. Confirmability is a measure of how well the inquiry's findings are supported by the data collected. Shenton (2004) states that the concept of conformability is that the qualitative investigator's comparable concern to objectivity. Here, steps must be taken to help ensure as far as possible that the work's findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the informants, rather than the characteristics and preferences of the researcher. The role of triangulation in promoting such confirmability must again be emphasized, in this context to reduce the effect of investigator bias.



The technique which was applied to establish the trustworthiness of the data was triangulation. Triangulation is typically perceived to be a strategy for improving the validity of the data. Miles and Huberman (1984) says that triangulation is supposed to support a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or, at least, do not contradict it. Sheton (2004) states that triangulation may involve the use of different methods, especially observation, focus groups and individual interviews, which form the major data collection strategies for much qualitative research.

Denzin (1994) identify four basic types of triangulation. *Firstly*, data triangulation involves time, space, and person. *Secondly*, investigator triangulation involves multiple researchers in an investigation. *Thirdly*, theory triangulation involves using more than one theoretical scheme in the interpretation of the phenomena. *Fourthly*, methodological triangulation involves using more than one method to gather data, such as interviews, observations, questionnaires, and documents.

This study used methodological triangulation. Multiple data gathering was conducted to get the data valid, such as observations and interviews. This was intended to create overlapping and therefore cross-validating data in the study of the implementation of bilingual program at SMP Panca Budi Medan and SMP Negeri 1 Medan.



CHAPTER 10

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Based on the empirical data, there are five types of bilingual education programs the researchers found in this study. They are Full-English, Dominant English, Less English, Bilingual Code-Mixing, and Full-Indonesian. It is described as follows:

A. FULL-ENGLISH

Full-English means the use of English completely in the teaching process. Full is defined as there is no any other language except English. Based on the data collected, in certain times, the teachers tend to use full English as a means of instructions in the teaching of the classes even though they still allowed the students to use their native language. The implementation of full-English appeared in many situations, such at the beginning, in explaining, in giving instructions,

in giving questions, and in responding. It can be seen from the data as follow:

"How are you?" "Fine."

"Ok, yesterday we have discussed about ...?" "Blood."

"The characteristics of heretrosit, leukocyte, and thrombosis. Ok, and about blood freezing, isn't it?"

"Ok, before we discusses the next material. Anis, ok, mention about the blood freezing".(I:FE:T₁:PB:Obs)

The data above showed that the teacher used English purely in the teaching process even though the expressions uttered are not completely well-arranged. This full-English was used when the teacher started the teaching and learning process. In this case, the teacher tried to get the students' attention to the lessons that they have already studied previously. These apperceptions were done simply and clearly. The teacher seemed explicit and excited to start the introduction.

In addition to the use of full English, the participant also applied it in the other situation. She also used the full English in giving question. It can be seen from the data as follows:

"So what is the function of fibrinogen, ridho? Fibrinogen same with fibrid?" (Q:FE:T₁:PB:Obs)

In this data, the teacher expressed the question in interrogative form. The question is immediately begun with wh-question, namely *what*. The teacher uttered the question just to do apperception. She wanted to know whether the students have understood the materials that they have learned in the previous meeting. The teacher looked excited



and firm when uttering it. The question was state quite loudly and clearly.

This type is used because of institutional factor. As bilingual schools, the teachers who teach mathematics and sciences are obligated to apply English as one of instruction languages in the teaching process. This can be proven from an interview as follows:

Ya, namanya juga kelas bilingual, jadi kita diwajibkan untuk menggunakan bahasa Inggris saat mengajar, selain dari bahasa Indonesia. Kalau di kelas reguler kan tidak. Jadi, karena sudah menjadi tuntutan gitu.

(Yeah, because they are bilingual classes, so we are obligated to use English in teaching besides Indonesian. But it is not in regular classes. So, it is because a demand). (FE:T₁:PB:Intv)

From the data, it showed that the implementation of full English itself is due to institutional background. As a school that adopt bilingual program, teachers are obligated to apply English as one of instruction means in teaching, particularly for those who teach mathematics and sciences. Meanwhile, Indonesian as a native language was still allowed to use.

The other reason for the use of this type intended to have the appropriate meanings to the lessons. There are some points in the lessons in which the words need to explain in English. This is meant to have the students do not get confused in understanding the meaning of the materials. It can be completely seen in the following interview:

Ya, karena memang ketika kita menggunakan bahasa Inggris yang umum, itu nanti artinya bisa beda di biologi, makanya kita harus pakai bahasa inggris baik. Contohnya gini ya, kita bilang misalnya itu risk gitu kan, kadang risk itu kita gunakan kalau



di Inggris itu artinya rusuk, nanti kan di matematika beda lagi jadinya. Jadi, siswa itu bingung jadi lebih baik kita gunakan bahasa Inggris biologi sternum jadinya gitu. Jadi untuk menghindari kejadian yang seperti itu kami pakai memang bahasa Inggris biologinya.

(Yeah, because when we use general English, it will have different meaning in Biology, so we must use appropriate English. For example, when we say *risk*, sometimes the word risk that we use in English means *rusuk* in Indonesian, while in Mathematics has different meaning. So the students get confused. So we'd better use English biology, sternum, something like that. So to avoid such case we use English biology).
(FE:T₁:PB:Intv)

From the interview above it can be said that the use of English is badly recommended. It is because some elements of the materials prefer being explained in English to have the appropriate meanings, particularly for technical terms. It is in order that the students do not get misinterpretation about the meanings of the materials. The materials will have different meanings when they are explained in Indonesian. Even in general English, so the teachers need to use specific English.

In addition, full English is also implemented by other informant in beginning the teaching. However, the way she started the teaching was different from the previous informant did. It can be seen from the data below:

"Ok, today, yeah, we are going to focus on the table of specification. Yeah. Ok, biology".(I:FE:T₁: SMPN1:Obs).

In this data, it can be described that the teacher just went straight to the points. The teacher directly started the introduction of materials without having apperception at



first. These expressions were uttered while holding a paper containing the materials that they were going to study. In this case, the utterances were stated simply and clearly, and the teacher seemed relaxed and friendly when expressing the utterances.

The use of full-English also appeared when she explained the materials. Sometimes they preferred explaining the materials in full-English. The teacher felt more comfortable to use English in explaining materials. It can be seen in the following data:

"Thirty one up to fifty six. Hmmm. We are beginning from thirty one. Ok, number thirty one. Yeah, the question, yeah the examples given a figure of root, cross section students identify. Ok, your task, identify the cross section of root, yeah, that transport water to the leaf. Eeee ... this the figure, show to you, yeah".(E:FE:T₁: SMPN1:Obs).

The data above showed that the teacher applied English fully when she was going to explain the materials. In this case, the teacher was able to use English fully even though the statements were not yet well-arranged. It can be seen from the expressions *This the figure, show to you, yeah*. In this expression there are some elements need to add. It should be *this is the figure, I show you*. The words *is* and *I* should be involved in the expressions. It seemed that the teacher got a bit of obstacle in uttering the expressions. She looked rather confused to find the words she would like to use in expressing them. Meanwhile, the teacher looked friendly and relaxed when uttering the expressions. The utterances used were spoken slowly and clearly.

Besides that, full-English also appeared when the teach-



ers gave instructions to students, such as the data as follows:

"Ok, may be you can open bilingual book, yeah, biology page one hundred forty six, page one hundred forty six. You can look to the dicotyledon. Ok, found it". (O:FE:T₁: SMPN1:Obs)

From the data above it can be said that the teacher was applying full English when she gave instructions. Here she ordered the students to consult to their biology book. The instructions were stated in quite polite way. It can be seen from the use of modality in the expressions. The instructions were begun with the word *may*. It shows that the teacher instructed them as if she requested them. The teacher applied simple English when giving the instructions. This was meant to have students understand them clearly. The teacher seemed quite relaxed and serious when uttering the expressions. The expressions were uttered clearly and in quite low voice level. Meanwhile, there is a bit of error in arrangement occurred in the utterances, for example *You can look to the dicotyledon*. The utterance should be *You can look at the dicotyledon*. The word *to* must be changed into *at*. Even it was stated that way students could understand the instructions. It was proven from the students' activity. The students directly did the instructions by consulting their book.

Furthermore, full English is also carried out in giving questions. As bilingual classes, the teacher also felt comfortable to use full English in giving questions. It can be seen in the data below:

"Ok, beginning from number thirty one up to fifty?"

"In monocotyledon, what's the part of the stem of the root transport water to the leaf?" (Q:FE:T₁: SMPN1:Obs).



In the first utterance, the question was stated when starting the discussion of the lessons. The teacher firstly distributed papers to the students before asking them the question. She then asked them the numbers that they were going to study. In this case, the teacher used declarative form in giving the question. Meanwhile, there is a misconception in arranging the utterance. The teacher get started the question with gerund, while it should use bare verb. It could be seen from the use of the word *beginning*. The word should be *begin* instead of saying *beginning*.

In the second, the teacher used real form of question. It can be proven from the use of *what*. The word *what* was used to begin the question. It was immediately stated at the beginning of the utterance. Here, the question was stated in complete sentence. In giving the questions, the teacher seemed relaxed but quite serious. The questions were expressed slowly and clearly.

The use of full English in those situations is because of some factors. One of them is because of institutional need. As a school which implements bilingual programs, the teachers have to be able to use English as a means of language instruction in the teaching. It can be seen from the interview as follows:

Karena memang sekolahnya sudah RSBI, jadi menuntut kita harus menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam mengajar. Sudah tuntutan dari sekolah, tuntutan kurikulum juga. Selain itu buku-bukunya juga sudah pakai bahasa Inggris.

(Because the school has been an International Standard Pilot School, so we are obligated to use English in teaching. It is a demand from school, and also curriculum. Besides that, the books have also used English). (FE:T₁:SMPN1:Intv)

From the result of interview above, it can be prompted that the application of this type is also owing to the institutional background. As a school which has adopted international standard (International Standard Pilot Project School), the teachers must be able to communicate the lessons in English, particularly in the teaching process. Next, the books they use have also applied English, so it forces them to be able to master English in order that they are qualified in elaborating the materials in the book.

The application of full English is also appeared in teaching the other subject, Physics. However, it was occurred in two situations, namely in explaining and in giving questions only. It can be seen in the following data:

"Ok, from experiment we can explain. This is explain to you. Electrostatics. Electrostatics charging by friction. Some objects like glass and silk will acquire electric charges when they are rubbed together. Rubbing transfers negative charges called electron from one object to another." (E:FE:T₃: SMPN1:Obs)

In this data, the type is applied for teaching physics. The teacher used English fully when explaining. The teacher uttered the expressions after he had already performed a small practice with a help from a student. Yet, there are still some errors in constructing the sentences. It can be seen from the utterance *This is explain to you*. In the utterance, the teacher get close the word *is* to *explain*. In good English grammar, the word *be* such as *is*, *am*, *are* and so forth can be get close to the bare infinitive. The teacher also had a error when she wanted to state passive sentence. It can be seen from the utterance *Electrostatic charging by friction*. It should



be *Electrostatic is charged by friction*. Although the teacher looked rather flustered when stating the utterances, but he expressed them in relax.

The teacher also applied this type in the other situation, that is when he was giving questions. Yet, the utterances were stated quite simply. It can be seen from the following data:

“What’s the meaning of removed?”

The data above is one of simple utterances used in stating a question. In this form, the teacher used interrogative form in expressing the questions. It can be proven from the use of the word *what* in the first of the utterance. He immediately revealed it at the beginning of the sentence. The teacher expressed the utterance when he wanted to prove whether students understood his explanations by asking them the meaning of the word *removed*. He looked relaxed and friendly when stating the utterance.

The implementation of full English in this case is because of a demand from a school. The teacher is suggested to use English as a second language of instruction in the teaching. It can be authentically seen in the data as follows:

Karena bahasa pengantar yang wajib itu ya bahasa Inggris. Jadi bahasa pengantarnya wajib full bahasa Inggris.

(Because English is obligated to use as a medium of instruction. So the medium of instruction must be full English).
(FE:T₃: SMPN1:Intv)

The data shows that the use of full English is owing to the institutional factor. The school which applies bilingual education makes English compulsory to use in the teaching.

In the other hand, teachers are required to utilize English as a medium of instruction in teaching. Nevertheless, Indonesian as the students' majority language is still allowed to use.

Meanwhile, the English utterances are still relatively simple. The teachers tend to use quite simple English vocabularies or constructions in instructing the classes. This is particularly because of the students' ability. The students have various level of ability. Even some of students still have very low basic English. Based on the reason the use of simple English vocabularies and utterances are intended to have the students better profound of the materials explained. In other words, simple English is used in order that the teachers can transfer the materials and the students can follow them well. It can be proven from the interview as follows:

Karena semua siswa itu kan tingkatannya beda-beda. Mungkin ada siswa yang bahasa Inggrisnya dia kok tampilan beda dengan bahasa Inggris conversation? Ini kan bahasanya Physics jadi kita pakai yang sederhana, biar mereka lebih paham.

(Because every student has different level of ability. Perhaps, any students felt very confused to and different from the displayed English with English conversation. This is physics so we use simple ones, so they get better understanding).
(FE:T₃:SMPN1:Intv)

From the result of interview above, it can be proposed that the teachers prefer using simple English utterances in order to get the student to have good concepts about the materials, particularly when it is related to the specific/technical terms, such as physical terms. There are sometimes some specific terms of certain subjects which have different English usage with the general English. So the teachers are



expected to be able select and apply suitable English utterances simply. It is also supported by the other statement from another informant as follows:

Bahasa Inggris yang gampang dipahami anaklah. Kalimat-kalimat yang biasa digunakan, yang mudah dipahami. Kalau memang ada bahasa inggris yang memang susah sekali kita cari padan katanya yang sesuai yang bisa buat anak paham.

(English utterances are easily understood by students. The sentences are commonly used, easily comprehended. If there are any very difficult English utterances, we will find their appropriate synonyms which help students get well profound). (FE:T1:SMPN1:Intv)

From the analysis above, it shows that the teachers tended to employ general English in the teaching, namely the utterances or construction which are commonly used in everyday life communications. They and students will try to consult dictionary if they find some very difficult words. They will find appropriate synonyms of the words that can be easily comprehended.

Those data above can also be crosschecked with an interview from a student that stated that the teachers tended to employ quite simple utterances in teaching. The analysis can be showed in the data as follows:

Kadang-kadang bahasa sehari-hari, yang bisa dimengerti.

(It is sometimes daily utterances, which are easily understood). (FE:S1:SMPN1:Intv)

It is proposed that the teachers are recommended to utilize simple English, the utterances that are usually used in daily life. It is in order that the students are able to comprehend the materials delivered.

From those data, we obtain a proposition that full-English is applied for teaching sciences and mathematics. It was applied in several conditions, such as; in the beginning, in explaining, in giving instructions and in giving questions. The utterances the teachers employed were still quite simple enough. By such way, the students are expected to be able to have well profound about the materials.

B. DOMINANT ENGLISH

Dominant English means the implementation of English dominantly in the teaching process. English as a second language is applied more predominantly than the other language, Indonesian. Indonesian took less involvement when both English and Indonesian were used in the teaching process at the same moment. In the other hand, it can be stated that English take more roles as the language of instructions in the teaching of the classes than Indonesian does. Just as full-English, dominant English is also applied in several situations, namely; in the beginning, in explaining and in giving instructions. It can be analyzed in the following data:

"How are you?" "Fine."

"Ok, let's start our lesson. The topic is static electricity. To understand about static electricity I give phenomena, for example like cutter, engine photo copy, mesin fotokopi maksudnya. It is phenomena about static electricity". (I:DE: T₃:SMPN1:Obs)

In the data above, the teachers started the introduction by greeting the students. Then the students responded him also in English by saying *fine*. After the condition was conducive, the teacher invited the students to get started studying



the lessons. In starting the study, the teacher at first did a small practice to get the students' attention to the materials that they are going to learn. After doing the practice, he then wrote the title of the lesson on the whiteboard. In this case, the teacher used two languages in which English was more dominantly than Indonesian. The Indonesian utterance itself was stated at the end of a sentence as the translation of its English. The teacher used the utterances when he saw there was no any reaction from students. He seemed relaxed and friendly when uttering the expressions. The expressions were expressed slowly and clearly.

The use of the dominant English is functioned to give additional explanation, to give students more understanding and attention to the explanations. It can be proven from the data collected as follows:

Karenakan secara umum memang ada situasi yang siswa itu tidak semua bisa mengerti dalam bahasa Inggris, maka kita pakai bahasa Indonesia. Jadi bilingual dia.

(Because generally there is a certain situation that not all student can understand the explanation in English, so that we use Indonesian. So it becomes bilingual). (DE:T₃:SMPN1:Intv)

It proposes that the teacher employed the English more dominantly in his teaching in order to help students comprehend the materials delivered. It is because not all students have the same level of ability in English. Sometimes, in certain situations, the teacher needs to apply Indonesian as a supporting language to make students profound the concepts when the materials are delivered more dominantly in English.

The use of dominant English was also applied in other

situation. The teachers also used dominant English in explaining the materials. It is proven from the data as follows:

“No. Ok, yeah, when the gas enter to the leave, stomata. The function of spongy tissue to bring as a place to store gas and then also to change oxygen and then carbon dioxide. Untuk menyimpan udara”. (To store the oxygen).
(E:DE:T₁:SMPN1:Obs)

In this data, it shows that the utterances were alternated with questions. It can be seen from the word *no*. It shows that the explanation was preceded a question to the students. Because they could answer the question well, then the teacher himself answered it by explaining that. In this case, the teacher also applied two languages in explaining the materials. Just as the previous situation, English was also used more dominantly than Indonesian. Indonesian utterance was stated at the end of the expressions functioning as the additional information to the explanation. However, some of the utterances stated in English were not arranged in good arrangement. It can be proven from the sentence “*The function of spongy tissue to bring as a place to store gas and then also to change oxygen and then carbon dioxide.*” The sentence should be “*The function of spongy tissue is a place to bring and to store gas and then also to change oxygen and then carbon dioxide.*” In giving the explanations, the teacher seemed serious but relaxed. The utterances were spoken slowly and clearly.

As stated previously, here, the use of this type is as well as to assist students get the lessons. The use of both of languages, particularly Indonesian in the restatement is aimed to emphasize the explanations. By translating them into In-



Indonesian, the students are expected to have deeper profound. In other words, the use of Indonesian in the explanations is to have the students understand the materials more quickly and clearly. It is showed from an interview as follows:

Karena anak-anak. Kadang-kadang dari gayanya anak ini tu kayaknya anak-anak kurang paham, jadi saya indonesiakan gitu. Jadi intinya untuk membuat anak-anak paham. Tapi untuk PowerPoint saya tetap menggunakan bahasa Inggris.

(Because of students. Sometimes, we can see from the students' performance that they do not understand so much, so we use Indonesian. So the important thing is to make students understand. Yet, I use English for my PowerPoint).
(DE:T₁:SMPN1:Intv)

From the data collected above, it can be prescribed that English was applied more dominantly than the other language that is Indonesian. It is also due to the students' ability. The teacher would use Indonesian when the students had obstacles to understand the materials. Sometimes the students get difficulties in understanding some utterances, so that the teachers need to use Indonesian to give clearer explanations. She knew that by observing the students' reactions when explaining the materials. However, English would be used fully when it was in written form, such as PowerPoint or exercises.

Furthermore, dominant English was also conducted by another informant. Some of the instructions were uttered by using English dominantly, while the other language, Indonesian as their native language get less spaces. It can be seen from the data below:

"Ok, listen to me, please. Take a piece of paper. One paper

for one group. Ok, give the name of the chief of the group, *ketua kelompoknya*, and the member of group, *buat nama anggotanya*." (O:DE:T₃:PB:Obs)

In the data, the teacher did the instructions after she had finished explaining the materials. She firstly made certain whether the students had understood the materials that have been explained or not. After they understood, she kept on to the exercise. She ordered the students to arrange groups and to do the exercises on a paper for each of groups. In giving the instructions, the teacher also kept using both English and Indonesian. Just as the previous data, here English was used more dominantly as well than Indonesian. Some of the expressions were restated in Indonesian, like the utterances *give the name of the chief of the group, ketua kelompoknya, and the member of group, buat nama anggotanya*. The teacher seemed explicit and serious when uttering the utterances. The instructions were expressed quite explicitly and clearly. So the students understood them quickly.

This implementation is intended to give emphasis on the explanations so the students can understand them more clearly. As stated by an informant as follows:

Ya tergantung situasinya sih. Kalau kelihatannya anak-anak itu agak bingung, ya saya gunakan Bahasa Indonesianya. Kan kita bisa lihat dari reaksi mereka.

(Yeah, it depends on the situation. If the students look confused, I will use the Indonesian. We can see from their reaction). (DE:T₃:PB:Intv)

The result of interview above showed that the use of the type relies on the situation of class. In the other words, the teacher will apply the type based on the students' situation.



It will be applied if possible. The teacher used Indonesian in the expressions is to give more details about the materials explained in English, so that students are able to get better insight on the materials or instructions.

In conclusion, from those whole data, it gains a proposition that dominant English is implemented in teaching science and mathematics. The use of the type also takes place some situations, such as in the beginning, in explaining and in giving instructions. Yet, the utterances of this type used in the teaching are not so many as the other ones did.

C. BALANCED BILINGUAL

Balanced bilingual is the implementation of the two languages in balance in the teaching process. All the instructions are divided equally across the two languages. In the other words, the teachers apply both of the languages in the same portions. In the process of teaching, it was found that the teachers tended to use balanced bilingual in two situations, namely in explaining and in giving question. It is described as follows:

If electrons are removed the atom is positively charged. If electrons are added, the atoms are negatively charged.

(Jika elektron bergerak atau berpindah maka atom bermuatan positif. Jika elektronnya bertambah maka dia akan bermuatan negatif.) (E:BB:T₃:SMPN1:Obs)

In the data, the teachers applied the two languages equally, in which English was stated at first, and then translated into Indonesian. In this case, the balanced bilingual was used in explaining the materials. The teacher used this type when he did not see any responses from students about



his explanations. At first, he stated the explanations in English, and then stopped a moment to see any responses from students. Because he did not find any comments or responses from them, he repeated the explanation by using Indonesian. In the process of expressing the utterances, the teacher seemed relaxed, and the expressions were expressed clearly and in relax.

The use of this type is aimed to help the students have deeper understanding about the materials. By doing such way, students are expected to be able to comprehend the concepts of the materials. It can be proven from an interview as follows:

Biar konsepnya jelas. Karena pada suatu statemen konsepnya itu harus pas. Kadang-kadang dalam bahasa Inggris kan siswa kurang memahami konsep yang pas. Maka diiringi dengan bahasa Indonesia.

(To make the concepts clear. Because the concepts should be appropriate in a certain statement. Sometimes, students cannot follow the appropriate concepts in English. So it should be supported by Indonesian). (BB:T₃:SMPN1:Intv)

It can be implied that the teacher needs to use Indonesian in the teaching. It is purposed to help students get the concepts clearly. In certain concepts, students are not very well to follow the concepts if they are elaborated in English fully now and then. That is why the teacher is required to accompany their explanation with Indonesian.

Further analysis on the use of this type can be seen from the data as follows:

"There are four operation in math. Ada empat operasi dalam matematika." (E:BB:T₃:PB:Obs)



Just like the previous data, here the teacher also used the balanced bilingual in explaining material by using English at first, and then repeated it in Indonesian. In this case, the use of this type is purposed to get students' attention. The teacher applied this when the class was not conducive enough to follow her explanations. So the teacher restated the explanation in Indonesian more loudly. The utterances were stated quite seriously, and the teacher looked serious enough when expressing the statements. Besides that, the use of Indonesian in this moment is to give emphasis on the

In addition, the balanced bilingual also takes place in question form. Teachers also used balanced bilingual when giving questions. It can be proven from the data below:

"Pahlevi, can you observe Constanta? *Berapa besaran konstanta?*" (Q:BB:T₃:PB:Obs)

In the data above, the teacher constructed the question in interrogative form. She used modal *can* in the beginning. She gave the question while displaying the slides containing the materials. The teacher ordered students to look at the slides and asked one of them to observe them. In this situation, the teacher looked serious and explicit, and the question was uttered loudly and very clearly.

Here, the use of Indonesian is to give students more emphasis on the explanation in order that they get deeper understanding. It can be seen the data as follows:

Tergantung anaknya juga sih. Kadang-kadang kalau dia full bahasa Inggris saja, nanti anaknya kurang nyambung gitu, kurang paham mereka. Ya terpaksa kita ulangi lagi pakai bahasa Indonesia.

(It depends on the students. Sometimes, if we use English fully, students cannot understand clearly. So we should repeat it in Indonesian. So, they will make noise if they). (BB: T₁:PB:Intv)

The use of Indonesian is quite important in order to assist students to have better interpretation to the explanation. As well as, by applying Indonesian in the utterances, students are expected to pay more attention to the teacher's explanation. Sometime, students will get lazy and noisy when they cannot the explanation from the teacher.

"Liquid to gas ...?"

("Cairan menjadi gas ...?") (IT₁:SMPN1:BB)

The teacher expressed in declarative form. It was immediately begun with a verb. The question was derived from the students' answer from the preceding teacher's question. The teacher restated their answer with rising intonation to form the statement into a question. The Indonesian utterance was intended to convince the students that it is not the answer suggested to the teacher's question. In this case, the question was stated simply and clearly, and the teacher seemed curious and friendly while stating it.

The teacher applied this way is based on the students' condition. She will be applied when they find the students confused to her explanation. It is presented in the data as follows:

Ya mungkin ada susah anak mengartikan, memahami dalam bahasa Inggrisnya, saya bahasa indonesiakan. Tetapi tetap awalnya full English.

(Yeah, perhaps there are students that find difficulties to un-



derstand in English, so I translate into Indonesian. But, it is full English in the beginning). (BB:T₁:SMPN1:Intv)

The implementation of balanced bilingual occurred when the students got lacks of understanding about the explanations of the materials. The students felt difficult to infer the explanations, so the teachers needed to restate them in Indonesian. Or sometimes, as stated above, it took place when the teacher would like to convince their students to certain statements or explanations.

The reason is also supported by a statement from a student. It can be seen in the data as follows:

Kayak tadi kalau kaminya masih gak ngerti dicampur pake bahasa Indonesia.

(As done a while ago. If we do not still understand, it will be mixed with Indonesian.) (BB:S₃:SMPN1:Intv)

The analysis above shows that there is a match with the data provided by the previous informants that stated the balanced bilingual is implemented to help students profound the materials. The teachers used Indonesian when students did have well profound of the explanations.

From all data above, we can propose a proposition that balanced bilingual was also applied for teaching, particularly for teaching sciences and mathematics. The type was employed only in explaining and in giving questions.

D. CODE-MIXING BILINGUAL

Code-mixing bilingual is the use of two languages simultaneously, in which some elements such as lexical items or entire constituents from one language are inserted into a



structure from other language at the same utterances. In this study, this type occurred in several situations, such as at the beginning, in explaining, in giving questions and in giving instructions. As stated in the data as follows:

"Jagung ya don't have wood because don't have cambium. Paddy, grass, corn, yeah, don't have cambium. So, the stem cannot bigger. Yeah, that's dicotyledon". (Corns). (E:CMB:T₁:SMPN1:Obs)

From the data, we can say that the teacher mixed the language from the non-dominant language, English, to the dominant language, Indonesian. The teacher inserted some elements from Indonesian into a structure from English when the lessons were more dominantly explained in English. The elements were inserted at the beginning of the statements. The teacher seemed rather confused to express the word *jagung* instead of saying *corns* in English when she expressed the utterances. She took times to think it over first before uttering the utterances.

The teacher taught that way was because of her own unconsciousness. She did not realize that she was expressing the Indonesian words instead of their English. It can be seen from the following data:

Kadang-kadang saya keceplosan, latah saya. Saya kira bahasa Inggris, tapi rupanya terucapkan Bahasa Indonesia.

(Sometimes I do not realize that. I think it is English, but, in fact, it is expressed in Indonesian). (CMB:T₁:SMPN1:Intv)

It can simply be stated that the use of code-mixing in this type was due to the teacher's factor herself. The teacher already had the English of the concepts in her mind, but, in



fact, she expressed them in different language unconsciously.

Code-mixing bilingual also takes place in the beginning of the teaching process, namely when the teachers did warming up. The teachers mixed the two languages when starting the teaching process. It can be seen from the data as follows:

"We continue our *materi*, ya. Kemarin sudah sampe calculate electrostatic. Ok, *sekadar* review ya. *Lihat ke depan*."

(We continue our materials. Yesterday we have already been in calculate electrostatic. Ok, just to review. Look at to the front top.) (I:CMB:T₂:PB:Obs)

The data above showed that the teacher mixed the languages. The teacher inserted some English codes into her sentences. In this case, the teacher did the code-mixing when she would like to do apperception to the previous lessons. She expressed the utterances while writing the topic on the white board. The teacher seemed in a rush when stating the expressions, so she forgot some English codes. That influences her to do insertion from English into Indonesian. The utterances were stated quite explicitly and very clearly.

In this case, the teacher employed two languages by inserting some codes from Indonesian into English is purposed to give emphasis on students. As presented in the data as follows:

Ya ... itu tadi untuk membuat siswa lebih mengerti. Kan tidak semua siswa bisa paham kalau semuanya pakai bahasa Inggris. Jadi intinya untuk membantu siswa lebih paham gitu.

(Yeah, that is to make students have better understanding. Because not all students cannot understand when materials are explained in full English. So, above all it is to help them get deeper profound). (CMB:T₂:PB:Intv)

As prompted in the preceding data, here this type was employed in order to give more emphasis on the elaboration of materials as well. It was because every student has different level of ability in understanding the materials. Not all students are able to master the materials well when they are fully implemented in English. So the teacher needed to insert some codes of the students' majority language, Indonesian into their minority language, English.

Besides that, teachers also did code mixing when they wanted to give instructions to students. In this part, code-mixing was conducted in simple utterances. It is proven from the following data:

"*Nah sekarang*, now you rub the rule on your hair ya". (Well, now, ...)

"*Perhatikan* the glass rod". (Look at). (O:CMB:T₃:SMPN1:Obs)

In the both of data above, some Indonesian codes as the dominant language inserted into a structure from English, the non-dominant language. In this case, the code-mixing was done when he would like to perform a small practice before beginning his explanation. From the data it can be simply prescribed that the teacher did the code-mixing not due to the teacher's lacks of language proficiency, but it more tends to the influence of the dominant language, Indonesian. The teacher felt comfortable to mix the languages because it was influenced by the dominant language, Indonesian as their daily communication means. He seemed enjoyed when stating the utterances. The utterances were stated in relax and clearly. It was seen from the codes inserted in the utterances. The utterances used were simple and easily understood.



In addition, the teacher also used code-mixing bilingual in giving questions. It can be seen from the data as follows:

“One *S kuadrat* plus one *S kuadrat* is?” (Q:CMB:IT₃:PB:Obs)

In the simple data above showed that the teacher inserted Indonesian code into English structure. Here the question was stated in affirmative form, in which the teacher tried to increase her voice intonation while uttering the utterance. This was in order to form the statement into a question. The teacher expressed the utterance when she explained the materials. It seemed that she got confused to find the good pronunciation of the word *kuadrat* in English, so she inserted an Indonesian code instead of saying *quadrate* into English structure.

As proposed by the other informant, in this moment, the teacher also applied code-mixing program is because of the teacher's factor.

Kadang-kadang keceplosan sih. Mau bilang menulis tapi tiba-tiba men-write gitu. Karena lupa. Tidak sengaja. Kita mau mengucapkan bahasa Inggrisnya rupanya terucapkan bahasa indonesianya.

(Sometimes, it is expressed unconsciously. We are going to say *menulis*, but suddenly it is uttered *menwrite*. It is actually done unconsciously. We would like say it in English but, in reality, it is uttered in Indonesian.) (CMB:T₃:PB:Intv)

Code-mixing was appeared because of the teacher's error in producing the words or utterances in English. It does not mean that she did not know them, but it is more related to her unconsciousness. She actually knew their English concepts, however, she got mistaken when uttering them.



Code-mixing was also happened to the other informant. The teacher employed the code-mixing in giving question as well.

"Siapa yang bisa mem-put star or cross in the second right triangle?"

(Who can put star or cross in the second right triangle?).

(Q:CMB:T₂:SMPN1:Obs)

The data showed that the teacher stated the utterances in real interrogative form. She did the insertion when she asked students to do exercise on the white board. In this case, the teacher was in a rush while stating the utterances, so it seemed like she forgot the English of the utterances.

Based on the result of interview with the informant, the teacher did code-mixing is caused by her lack of language proficiency.

Ya, kadang-kadang ga bisa saya bahasa Inggris yang general itu. Saya kan bisa bahasa Inggrisnya bahasa Inggris matematika. Jadi kadang-kadang lupa.

(Yeah, sometimes I do not the general English. I just know more English mathematics. So, sometimes, I just forget).

(CMB:T₂:SMPN1:Intv)

It shows that the teacher inserted some Indonesian codes into English is because she was not yet very well in English, particularly general English. The teacher was not able to produce the English utterances when she would like to implement or explore the concepts using every day English.

Even though not all teachers admitted that the implementation of code-mixing in teaching is because of the



teachers' weakness in English. Yet, a headmaster stated that one of the obstacles in implementing bilingual programs is teachers' ability in English mastery. Not all teachers are proficient to use English in the teaching. This can be proven from an interview with headmaster that states as follows:

Kendalanya ya SDM-nya. Kemampuan SDM-nya itu belum memenuhi standar seratus persen. Kalau guru itu sudah paham otomatis dia mengomunikasikannya pun bisa. Nah sekarang guru paham bahasa Inggrisnya, namun mengomunikasikannya ke anak tentu beda, bukan bahasa buku yang diucapkan ke anak. Harus ada bahasa yang kita pergunakan yang berhubungan dengan kehidupan sehari-hari. Nah kemampuan untuk itulah masih kurang pada guru. Makanya kadang kita harus berbahasa Indonesia tadi. Nah kalau misalnya dalam menyampaikan aplikasinya ke dalam contoh kehidupan sehari-hari gurunya bisa dalam bahasa Inggris dan anak memang paham dengan kalimat yang disampaikan bisa seratus persen bahasa Inggris. Tapi karena kemampuan guru tadi pun belum maksimal dalam mengomunikasikannya maka dibuat bahasa Indonesia juga.

(The obstacles refer to human resources. Human resource capabilities do not yet meet the standard done hundred percent. If the teacher had understood, automatically he could have been able to communicate it. Supposed that the teacher understood the English, but the languages used by the teacher to students are definitely different, not book languages. There should be a language that we use to relate to everyday life. That's the lack of ability to the teacher. So sometimes we have to use Indonesian. So if for example the teacher is able to communicate the applications in English to everyday life examples and students are familiar with the sentence given, it could be one hundred percent in English. But because of the ability of teacher had not yet made up in communicating it, so he has to use Indonesian as well). (IH: CMB:SMPN1:Intv)

From the collected data above, it can be proposed that the teachers tend to do code-mixing is due to the teachers' ability lacks of language proficiency. In certain cases, the teachers are not yet able to explain some points of the lessons in English well, so they should use Indonesian. Or sometimes, the use of code-mixing in the teaching of bilingual classes is because the teachers have not yet had ability to elaborate the lessons by applying everyday life English utterances. The teachers know the concepts in English, but they can not implement them to everyday life examples, so the students can understand the materials explained quickly and clearly.

Finally, it can be inferred that code-mixing bilingual is applied in the teaching bilingual classes, particularly for teaching mathematics and sciences. The type is purposed to give an emphasis on the study.

E. FULL-INDONESIAN

Full-Indonesian means the use of full Indonesian in the teaching process. Indonesian is fully applied in the teaching without any inferences from the other language, English. The teachers applied this type when delivering the materials. Just the same as the other types, this full-Indonesian also occurred in occasions; such as in explaining the materials and in giving instructions. However, the teachers applied this type only in small occasions of teaching. It is described as follows:

"Operasi, proses dalam matematika."

(Operation, the process in mathematics.) (E:FI:T₃:PB:Obs)



From the data above, it can be implied that the teacher expressed the utterance in full Indonesian is not because she did not understand its English. The teacher stated the utterance when she asked students a question. This was used as a clue in order that the students can answer question stated previously by the teacher. In addition, it was aimed to help the students to understand the materials explained.

Itu untuk materi baru yang vocabulary atau kata-katanya yang belum terlalu familiar bagi anak-anak. Karena vocabulary anak-anak yang masih terbatas, jadi menggunakan bahasa Indonesia semua.

(It is used for new materials whose vocabularies or words are not familiar to students. Because the students' vocabularies are still limited, so we use full Indonesian.) (FI:T₃:PB:Intv)

As mentioned above that the application of this type in the teaching is intended to help the students have deeper concepts about the materials. In the other hand, it can be stated that this type is used to convince or give an emphasis on students about the materials presented. However, it was commonly applied for teaching the lessons whose vocabularies or words are not quite difficult for students, particularly for new materials.

The teachers also implemented this type when giving instructions. It can be seen from the data as follows:

"Kemarin Miss udah buat keterangannya ya apa itu F, k, q1, q2, r. Ok, sekarang satu orang untuk menjelaskan apa yang telah ditulis oleh temannya. Ya coba si Elier."

(Yesterday, I have already explained what F, k, q1, q2, r are. Ok, now please one of you explains what your friend wrote.) (E:FI:T₂:PB:Obs)

The utterances used in the data above were quite simple. It does not mean the teacher did not get their English. In this case, the teacher used the utterances when she wanted to convince students about the materials. She wanted to make students certain that they were able to do the question. The expressions were presented quite firmly and very clearly. The teacher seemed firm when uttering the utterances.

Here, the reason for implementing this type was similar to the pervious informant that is to help students understand the elaboration of materials. It can be seen from the interview as follows:

Untuk pendalaman atau pengayaan materi itu pakai bahasa Indonesia biar sampai aja dia. Karena kan enggak semua siswa seratus persen ngerti pakai bahasa Inggris. Jadi kalau guru nya pakai full bahasa Inggris, kan ada juga yang tidak mengerti. Vocabulary-nya masih kurang.

(We used Indonesian to elaborate the materials in order that they can be transferred. So, if the teachers used English fully, there will be some students that cannot understand. They still have limited vocabularies.) (FI:T₂:PB:Intv)

The use of full Indonesian is used to give deeper elaboration to the materials. Not all students have the same level of ability to understand materials elaborated in full English. It is because some of students have very limited vocabularies.

Those statements above also supported by a statement from a student. As shown in the data as follows:

Kalau misalnya ada yang sulit-sulit bahasanya jadi pakai bahasa Indonesia jelasinnya.

(If, for example, there are difficult languages, so we will explain them in Indonesian.) (FI:S₃:PB:Intv)



This statement shows that the teachers used Indonesians when the languages of materials used were not authentic or familiar to students. This permitted teachers to use Indonesian completely to make students able to follow the study and to get deeper profound.

From those data above, we obtain a proposition that the implementation of full-Indonesian in the teaching is caused by the lacks of students' vocabulary mastery. This is purposed to give deeper elaboration about the materials, particularly new materials.



CHAPTER 11

DISCUSSION

In reference to the findings of this research, it can be seen that there is a gap between the theories proposed by Brisk (2006). As stated in the theory the linguist states that there are two main types of bilingual education programs, namely the first type has no limitations in the number of years a student can attend; it can include a program within a school or the whole school can be bilingual. Dual-language schools, Canadian immersion education, two-way bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, and bilingual programs for the deaf are included in this category. The second type, which includes Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), pull-out TBE, integrated TBE, and Bilingual Structured Immersion, shares the goal of preparing students to function in monolingual classes.

Whereas, in this study, there are five types of bilingual

education programs were found in the teaching of bilingual classes, in which three of them theoretically match with the types proposed in the theory, namely, Full-English, Dominant English and Balanced Bilingual, while two of them are new types of bilingual education programs that are not described in the theory.

Theoretically, Full-English can be described as Bilingual Structured Immersion. In the theory, Bilingual Structured Immersion is described as a type in which most of the instruction is in English except for the first hour of the day, when teachers teach native language literacy and explain concepts in the students' language. Teachers are bilingual and allow students to use their native language even when they are instructed in English. The teachers also receive training in second language methodology and teaching content in a second language (Brisk, 2006).

It is similarly to the Full-English. The type also employs English in the most of instructions. Here, Teachers still allow students to use their majority language, Indonesian. They also receive training in second language methodology. Teachers applied the type in several situations, namely in starting the teaching process, in explaining, in giving questions and in giving instructions. The reason for using this type is due to the institutional factor. As schools that adopt bilingual programs, teachers are required to use English as one of languages of instruction in the teaching. In its implementation, teachers still tend to use simple English utterances. It is purposed to help students understand the concepts well.

The second type is Dominant English. Dominant Eng-



lish could theoretically be categorized as two-way bilingual education with 90/10 (or a common variation, 80/20), in which most instruction is provided in the minority language (Brisk, 2006). In this study, Dominant English means the use of more dominant English in the teaching. Teachers applied English, students' minority language, more predominantly in their teaching. The type is used because of students' ability factor. Here, Indonesian language is applied to get students to have better profound of the explanations because not all students have well ability in English. Even some of them have no any basic in English.

The third, Balanced Bilingual which is theoretically categorized as Two-Way Bilingual Education with 50/50, in which instruction at all grade levels is divided equally across the two languages. This program serves language minority and majority children simultaneously in order to develop fluency in the heritage language of the minority students and the societal language (Brisk, 2006). In this case, Balanced Bilingual serves two languages equally in the teaching. Teachers apply the two languages equally in teaching, in which English, the students' minority language, is served firstly, and then followed by Indonesian. In the other words, teachers apply Indonesian as the translation of utterances stated in English. As stated in the previous types, the use of this type is also owing to the students' ability factors. Sometimes, in certain situations, students cannot follow the concepts if the materials are explained in full English only. The other reason is to influence students to be confident. Sometimes, the students are very sure or confident to give responses when the materials are fully explained in English.

However, there are two new types of bilingual education program the researcher found in this study. Those types are different from those proposed by the linguists in theories. The researcher labels the two types such as: (1) Code-Mixing Bilingual, in which the instructions are provided by mixing the two languages. Some codes from one language into a structure from other language. Ho (2007) prescribes that code-mixing is the change of one language to another within the same utterance or in the same oral/written text. It is a common phenomenon in societies in which two or more languages are used.

Here, teachers try to insert some codes from Indonesian into English. Teachers implement this type is due to their English proficiency. Not all teachers are able to use English fully in the whole the teaching process, particularly when they would like to express some applications in daily languages. Some of teachers are not yet able to elaborate the book languages in every day life utterances. That causes teachers do insertion. They mix the two languages at the same utterances by inserting some codes from one language into a structure from the other language, or vice versa.

And 2) Full-Indonesian is defined as a type in which some of the instructions are in full Indonesian. Teachers use full Indonesian only when they taught the materials whose words or vocabularies are not familiar to students. It is owing to the students' English proficiency. Students do not have enough vocabularies, particularly when were studying new materials. The type is helpful to give students deeper comprehensions on the lessons.



CHAPTER 12

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the types of bilingual education programs, the conclusions were drawn as follows:

There are five types of bilingual education program applied by the schools, namely:

- a. Full-English, in which all the instructions are delivered in English. The teachers tend to apply English completely when explaining the materials. The English expressions they applied were still simple components.
- b. Dominant English, which provides the instructions with both of the languages, English and Indonesian, in which English is applied more dominantly than Indonesian.
- c. Balanced Bilingual, which provides the instructions equally across both of the languages, English and Indonesian, in the teaching.

- d. Code-Mixing Bilingual, in which the teaching is conducted by inserting some elements from one language, Indonesian into the other language, English. This is a new type of bilingual education programs found by the researcher applied at the schools.
- e. Full-Indonesian, in which the instructions are fully provided in Indonesian. This is also a new type of bilingual education program found by the researcher in this study.

The reasons why the teachers apply those types of bilingual education programs in the teaching process are; 1) in order that the students are able to understand the teachers' explanations of materials. By using the types the students are expected to have a deeper profound of the lessons delivered. And 2) it is due to the teachers' lack of ability in English mastery. The teachers apply the third type of bilingual education programs as a new type found in this study is because the teachers have not yet made up in communicating several points of the lessons in English well, so the teachers do some insertions.

B. SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the conclusions, suggestions are presented as follows:

1. Since this study has not involved all aspects of bilingual education programs and especially about the implementation of bilingual education programs, it is expected that other researches can develop this research.
2. It is also suggested to the other students of English Applied Linguistic Study Program:



- a. Because some types of bilingual education programs are not found in this study, it is suggested that further studies on the types of bilingual education programs should be conducted.
- b. Students of Applied Linguistics Study Program should explore and investigate some other phenomena of bilingual education programs in any teaching of bilingual classes in order to reveal some other types and reasons of the implementation of bilingual education programs.

REFERENCES

- Alwi, H. 2000. *Fungsi Politik Bahasa*. Dalam Alwi, H. dan Sugono, D. (Eds.) *Politik Bahasa: Risalah Seminar Politik Bahasa Pusat Bahasa*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Arnyana. 2008. *Pengembangan Model Pembelajaran Bilingual Preview-review Dipandu Strategi Kooperatif STAD dalam Pembelajaran Sains di SMA*. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran UNDIKSHA*, No. 2 TH. XXXXI April 2008. ISSN 0215 – 8250. Fakultas MIPA, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Eighth Edition. USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Astika, G. 2009. *Model Kelas Bilingual di Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional: Sebuah Pemikiran Konseptual*. Guru Pembaharu.com: Forum komunikasi, interaksi, dan kolaborasi pendidik. Accessed on 5 August 2001 on the <http://gurupembaharu.com/home/?p=2733>
- Baker, C. 2001. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bi-*

lingualism. Third Edition. UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. 1993. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf Jr., & Kaplan. 1997. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, E. 2008. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development: Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingualism at an Early Age and the Impact on Early Cognitive Development*. York University, Canada: ©2006-2008 Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development. Accessed on 4 July 2011 on the http://www.childencyclopedia.com/documents/BialystokANGxp_rev.pdf.

Bialystok, E. 2003. *Bilingualism in Development: Language, Literacy, and Cognition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brisk. 2006. *Bilingual Education: From Compensatory to Quality Schooling*. Second Edition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brutt-Griffler, J. & Varghese, M. 2004. *Bilingualism an Language Pedagogy*. UK: Multilingual Matters.

Campbell, R. N. 1984. *The Immersion Approach to Foreign Language Teaching*. In *Office of Bilingual Education, Studies on Immersion Education* (pp. 114–143). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Calderon, M. and Carreon, A. 2001. "A Two- Way Bilingual Program: Promise, Practice, and Precautions." In: R. Slavin and M. Calderon (Eds.) *Effective Programs for Latino Students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chin & Wigglesworth. 2007. *Bilingualism: An Advanced Resource Book*. USA: Routledge.

Christian, et. al. 2003. *Trends in Two-Way Immersion Education: A Review of the Research*. The Johns Hopkins University. All rights reserved. Accessed on 8 August



2011 on the <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report63.pdf>.

- Cohen, A. D. 1976. *The Case for Partial or Total Immersion Education*. In A. Simões, Jr. (Ed.), *The bilingual child/El niño bilingüe* (pp. 65–89). New York: Academic Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Feng, A. 2007. *Bilingual Education in China*. UK: Multilingual Matters.
- González, M. J. 2008. *Encyclopedia of Education Bilingual*. Arizona State University: SAGE Publications.
- Harley, A. T. 2001. *The Psychology of Language from Data to Theory*. Second Edition. University of Dundee, Scotland: Psychology Press.
- Halim, A. 1998. *Bahasa Indonesia Menjelang Tahun 2000: Risalah Kongres Bahasa Indonesia V1*. Indonesian Language by 2000: A paper presented in Indonesian Language Conference V1. Centre for Language Development, Department of Education and Culture, Jakarta. p 133–140.
- Karahan, F. 2005. ISB4: *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*. Ed. James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan, 1152–1166. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Hamers, F. J. & Blanc, A. H. M. 2004. *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Ho, Y. J. W. 2007. *Code-mixing: Linguistic form and socio-cultural meaning*. The International Journal of Language Society and Culture. URL: [www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/ISSN 1327-774X](http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/ISSN%201327-774X). Lingnan University, Hong Kong. Accessed on 4 August 2012 on the <http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/issues/2007/21-2.pdf>.



- Lauder, A. 2008. *The Status and Function of English in Indonesia: A Review of Key Factors*. Department of Linguistics, FIB, University of Indonesia, Depok 16424, Indonesia Makara, Sosial Humaniora, Vol. 12, No. 1, Juli 2008: 9-20. Accessed on 15 August 2012 on the http://journal.ui.ac.id/upload/artikel/02_Lauder,%20A%202007%20The%20status%20and%20function.pdf.
- Lee, C. 2008. Interdisciplinary collaboration in English language teaching: Some observations from subject teachers' reflections. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, Vol. 7, (2), 129-138.)
- Li, X & Wang, L. 2010. *A Survey on Bilingual Teaching in Higher Education Institute in the Northeast of China*. ISSN 1798-4769. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 353-357, July 2010. © 2010 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.4.353-357. Accessed on 3 September 2011.
- Lightbown, M. P. 2008. *Easy As Pie? Children Learning Languages*. Concordia University: Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (COPAL). Accessed on 8 August 2011 on the http://doe.concordia.ca/cop-al/images/dept_of_edu/cop-al/documents/02_p_lightbown.pdf
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Cuba, E. G. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. California: Sage Publication.
- Man-Fat. 2005 (January). *A Critical Evaluation of Singapore's Language Policy and its Implications for English Teaching*. Hong Kong. Accessed on 25 August 2011 on the <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/singapore.html>
- Marie de Mejía, A. 2005. *Bilingual Education in South America*. UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mills, J. & Mills, W. R. 2002. *Bilingualism in the Primary*



- School*. London and New York: Routledge
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2006. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Blackweel Publishing.
- Northcutt, L., & Watson, D. 1986. *S.E.T.: Sheltered English Teaching Handbook*. Carlsbad, CA: Northcutt, Watson, Gonzales.
- Osorio-O'Dea, P. 2001. *Bilingual Education: An Overview*. Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report for Congress. Received through the CRS Web. Order Code 98-501 EPW.
- Ramírez, J. D. 1992. *Executive summary*. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, 1–62.
- Richards, J., Platt, J. and Weber, H. 1985. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Rivera, L. 2002. A Review of the Literature on Bilingual Education. Latinos in Massachusetts: Education. The Mauricio Gastón Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy.
- Salkind, N. J. 2008. *Encyclopedia of Educational Psychology*. University of Kansas: SAGE Publications.
- Schneider, S. 1990. *Integrating whole language with a sheltered English curriculum: Alongitudinal evaluation of at risk language minority students*. Paper presented at the annual meetingof the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.
- Schrudder, K. 2010. *Effectiveness of Dual Language Instruction Classroom Instruction*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Teaching. Sierra Nevada College.
- Shenton, K. A. 2004. *Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects*. Education for Information 22 (2004) 63–75 63. IOS Press.
- Slaughter, H. 1997. *Indigenous Language Immersion in*

Hawaii, an Effort to Save the Indigenous Language of Hawaii. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion Education: International Perspectives* (pp. 105–129). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. 2002. *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-Term Academic Achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.

Trujillo, M. 2007. *Bilingual Education in California: Is It Working?* Penn McNair Research Journal, Volume 1 2007 Issue 1 Article 3 p. 11-16. University of Pennsylvania.

Yu, X. 2011. *Practice and Consideration on Bilingual Teaching in Basic Course—Advanced Mathematics.* ISSN 1799-2591 Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 95-97, January 2011 © 2011 Academy Publisher Manufactured in Finland. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.1.95-97.



ABOUT THE AUTHOR



DIDIK SANTOSO, the oldest son of six children of Mr. Moedjiono and Mrs. Halimah, was born in Tanjung Pinang, Riau Island on June 16, 1966. Didik graduated from Primary School in Tanjung Balai Asahan (1980), Junior High School in Tanjung Balai Asahan (1983), School of Teachers Training in Tanjung Balai Asahan (1986), English Education Department, Language and Art, Institute of Teachers Training in Medan (1992), and Master of State University of Padang.

(2001), Doctor in Language Education Department of the State University of Jakarta (2007) The writer has experiences as an English lecturer of Tarbiyah Faculty, IAIN Sumatera Utara (1994 until today), a guess lecturer at English Education Department of Tarbiyah and Teachers Training Faculty, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta (2002-2008), a guess lecturer of Teachers Training and Edu-

cation Faculty at University of Asahan, guess lecturer of S-2 Program of English Applied Linguistics at State University of Medan (2009-Now), a guess lecturer at S-2 Program of Literature Departement at Islamic University of North Sumatera, a guess lecturer of S-3 Program of Linguistics Departement at State University of North Sumatera (2010-Now). The writer is also an instructor of an accelerated training in mass media research at Journalism Education Institution "Antara" Jakarta (2004-2006).

The writer wrote some research works including *A Comparative Study on the Application of the Direct Method and the Functional Approach in Teaching Vocabulary* (Skripsi, 1992), *The Correlation between the Parents' Education Levels and their Children's School Achievement* (field research, 1996), *An Integrated English Teaching at English Tadris Department, Tarbiyah Faculty, IAIN Imam Bonjol Padang* (Thesis, 2001), writing a student book "Accelerated English Conversation for Beginners" (2004), and *The Effect of Instructional Approaches and Learning Styles on English Speaking Skills* (Dissertation, 2007). Writing a student book "Accelerated English Conversation for Intermediate Students" (2009), writing several some articles in International Journals.

The writer followed some trainings: Junior High School Teachers' Profession Training (1992), On the Job Training for Civil Servants (1994), Research Training for Junior Lecturers: Basic Level (1996) and Intermediate Level (1997), Indonesia Education Convention II in Medan (1997), as a participant of PELLBA 10 in Jakarta (1998), as a congress participant of Bahasa Indonesia in Jakarta (1998), Training of English Teaching Methodology conducted by UNESCO in Jakarta (2003), as a participant in International Seminar : Muti-Faith Educa-



tion for Harmony and Peace in Jakarta (2005), as a participant in Teaching English of Foreign Language Indonesia in Salatiga funded by RELO of American Embassy (2006).

The writer was a member of Corruption Combatting Commission Team for the Riau Province Area (2004), and a member of Joint -Venture Team in Economics, Education, and Social Welfare between the Government of Indonesia and Taiwan in Zuhai, Republic of China (2006).

The writer's organizational experiences are: as a chairman of HMI Komisariat FPBS IKIP Medan (1991-1992), a vice-treasurer of HMI Cabang Medan (1992-1993), a member of the Indonesia Private Entrepreneur Union in Medan (1994-1999), and a member of Himpunan Muballiq & Qari-Qariah Jakarta (2004-present).

The writer was appreciated as Qori Terbaik II Tingkat Mahasiswa (1989) and Cum Laude of Master Program, Graduate Program of State University of Padang.

The writer married Arlina, Dra, M.Pd. in 1997 and has one daughter and three sons named Dina Miftahurrizki (Senior High School), Ardi Rafif Akbar (Junior High School), Muhammad Asro Yusro (Islamic Junior High School), and Muhammad Faizul Ilmi (Primary School).



Pirman Ginting, lahir di Buluh Mengkal, Desa Rante Besi, Kec. Gumung Setember, Kab. Dairi. Setelah menamatkan SD di Buluh Mengkal, SMP di SMP Negeri 2 Tanah Pinem Kab. Dairi (1998), dan SMA di SMA PAB 6 Helvetia Medan (2002), kemudian melanjutkan pendidikan ke Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (2003) dan memperoleh gelar sarjana pendidikan (S.Pd.) tahun 2007. Pada tahun 2010 melanjutkan pendidikan ke program pascasarjana INIMED program studi linguistik terapan bahasa Inggris dan memperoleh gelar magister humaniora (M.Hum.) tahun 2012.

Penulis sudah aktif mengajar semenjak masih aktif belajar di bangku perkuliahan. Pada tahun 2007 diterima sebagai guru di SMA Panca Budi Medan, dan 2010 diterima sebagai dosen di FKIP-UMSU hingga sekarang.