

Teacher Academic Background and Learning Outcomes in BIPA Instruction: A Mixed-Methods Comparative Study

Dhani Putra Riyanto¹, Yupika Maryansyah¹

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia

Corresponding author e-mail: ghanipr0311@gmail.com

Article History: Received on 1 July 2026, Revised on 6 July 2026,
Published on 7 August 2026

Abstract: This study investigates whether the learning outcomes differ between BIPA students taught by English Education graduates and those taught by Indonesian Education graduates. Employing a convergent mixed-methods comparative design, the study integrated quantitative achievement data with qualitative learner perceptions collected during the same instructional period. Quantitative data were obtained through a standardized Indonesian language achievement test assessing vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and sentence construction, and were analyzed using descriptive statistics and an independent-samples *t*-test. Qualitative data were collected through five open-ended questions and analyzed thematically to explain and triangulate the quantitative findings. The results revealed a statistically significant difference in learning achievement between the two groups, with students taught by English Education graduates achieving significantly higher scores than those taught by Indonesian Education graduates ($M = 81.83$ vs. 57.00 ; $t(58) = 8.318$, $p < .001$). Qualitative findings reinforced these results by indicating that learners in the English Education group perceived clearer instructional explanations, greater opportunities for classroom interaction, and more supportive feedback, which helped explain their higher achievement. These findings suggest that teachers' academic backgrounds are associated with different instructional orientations that influence BIPA learning outcomes. The study provides empirical evidence to inform BIPA teacher recruitment, professional development, and teacher education policies aimed at strengthening instructional quality in Indonesian language programs for foreign learners.

Keywords: BIPA Instruction, English Education, Indonesian Education, Learning Achievement, Mixed Methods

A. Introduction

Recently, modern language instruction to non-native speakers has been framed as an innovative vehicle for facilitating intercultural communication, promote international education, and enable seamless global mobility. In this perspective, Indonesia has sought to internationalize the teaching of Indonesian and the promotion of Indonesian culture by advocating Bahasa Indonesia Bagi Penutur Asing (BIPA) (Isnaniah, 2021;

Oktaviani & Amra, 2024; Rohimah, 2021). Today, BIPA programs are offered in numerous institutions of higher learning, national cultural institutions, and Indonesian embassies/consulates all over the world. Students in these programs come from diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds. Consequently, BIPA instruction has evolved from a predominantly form-focused endeavor to a sophisticated enterprise that aims to integrate the teaching of language (linguistic and communicative competence) and culture (Haliq et al., 2025; Tiawati et al., 2023, 2024). The growing global interest in Bahasa Indonesia has led to a significant expansion of *Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers* (BIPA) programs across formal and non-formal educational settings. As Indonesian is increasingly positioned as a language of regional and international communication, the quality of BIPA instruction has become a critical concern, particularly with regard to teacher competence and academic preparation. Effective BIPA instruction requires not only pedagogical skill but also a strong command of Indonesian linguistic systems, including grammar, discourse, pragmatics, and sociocultural norms, which differ fundamentally from those of learners' first languages.

Consider in Indonesia where appropriate, the professional qualifications of BIPA teachers are not solely pedagogical considerations but are also explicitly regulated by national language policy. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 24 of 2009 on the Flag, Language, State Symbol, and National Anthem mandates the protection, development, and internationalization of the Indonesian language, positioning Indonesian as a symbol of national identity that must be taught accurately and responsibly. This legal framework implicitly emphasizes that Indonesian language instruction for foreign learners should be delivered by educators with adequate linguistic competence and academic grounding in Bahasa Indonesia.

More specifically, the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 27 of 2017 concerning BIPA Implementation provides formal guidelines for the organization of BIPA programs. This regulation stipulates that BIPA instructors are expected to possess competencies related to Indonesian language mastery, pedagogical skills, and cultural knowledge. The regulation highlights that BIPA instruction is a specialized field of language education, requiring systematic understanding of Indonesian linguistic structures and usage rather than general foreign language teaching experience. Such policy directions reinforce the normative expectation that BIPA teachers should ideally have an academic background in Indonesian language education.

Change in BIPA pedagogy is continuing in conjunction with other advancements in the pedagogy of other foreign and second languages. Current practice in the field has integrated the use of communicative competencies, the facilitation of interlearner communication, and the use of learners and socially contextualized materials in the learning process, as opposed to teaching other previous models that focused on behavior, grammatical accuracy, and other forms of language learning in isolation

(Fatimah & Rahmawati, 2022; Milati, 2024; Zahid, 2025). More recent works addressing the pedagogy of BIPA have fostered and demonstrated the use of stimulating and demanding learners use of the target languages communicatively, as well as the use of authentic materials and tasks that are integrated with the culture and pedagogy in the teaching of BIPA. Of course, the use of these materials, tasks, and design principles in the teaching of BIPA, takes into account the principles of sociocultural theories of language education and of CLT. Impediments to the enactment of the principles of pedagogy described in this are in the primary and most mental models of the teaching professionals (Romijn et al., 2021; Turlybekov et al., 2024).

It is generally accepted that the strongest predictor students' outcomes is the quality of the teacher. In the case of BIPA, teachers are expected to not only be proficient in the Indonesian language, but also demonstrate pedagogical adaptability, cultural sensitivity, and knowledge of second language acquisition (Mukti, 2020; Tantri et al., 2025). In contrast to the more regulated pathways in English language teacher education, BIPA instructors in Indonesia are generally heterogeneous in their academic backgrounds, mainly English Education and Indonesian Education. These two fields of study are representative of different disciplinary traditions, theories, and pedagogical frameworks, all of which can significantly influence the way teaching is done (Laksono & Ismiatun, 2023).

Education program alumni are prepared within the fields of applied linguistics and second language acquisition, with significant training in communicative language teaching, task-based learning, and learner-centered pedagogy. For these educators, fluency, interaction, and functional language use are the main goals of instruction (Salmanova, 2025). On the other hand, alumni from Indonesian Education Programs are more likely to be trained in the language's structure, grammar instruction, textual analysis, and literary-cultural studies. These educators prioritize accuracy, usage of formal language, and mastery of the standard Indonesian language. While both of these training orientations may be seen alongside standard pedagogy, and are valuable in their own right, they also demonstrate very different ideas of what effective language learning for non-native speakers is (Mufidah & Sari, 2022).

Theoretical analysis of such interdisciplinary divergences can be performed under the concept of which includes the beliefs, knowledge and experiences teachers possess, and how those are translated into different instructional methods. Evidence stemming from the field of teacher cognition suggest that varying education backgrounds of teachers, as well as their discipline specific identities, shape their lesson planning, management of classroom dynamics, feedback mechanisms, and evaluation of students' performances. In the educational context of languages, such cognitive orientations influence the balance between accuracy and fluency, the extent of learner autonomy, and the type of meaningful opportunities for input and output. Hence, applying the teacher cognition approach in understanding BIPA instruction can shed

light on how teachers' educational qualifications may influence the students' learning outcomes (Borg, 2003).

BIPA has gained attention from the academic world, but most of the attention has been from studies that look into teaching materials, integration of culture, teacher training models, and student motivation. Although these studies provide some valuable information about BIPA teaching, they assume teacher competence is the same across the board and they do not analyse teacher background as a variable that can be compared. Very little literature actually looks into the link between a teacher's academic background and the academic achievement of students learning BIPA. More specifically, there seems to be little to no literature that uses a comparative framework to investigate if students taught by a teacher whose major is English Education achieve more than students taught by a teacher whose major is Indonesian Education (Tiawati et al., 2024).

This absence is also compounded by how many language education studies conceptualize learning achievement. Learning achievement is viewed as a multidimensional construct made up of knowledge of language, the ability to communicate, and the confidence of the learners to use the target language (Sya et al., 2021; Zeng, 2023). However, within BIPA and other emerging instructional contexts, empirical studies attempt to define achievement using very limited criteria and descriptive evaluations without focusing on outcomes related to the teacher. This explains why the relationship among teacher education pathways, teaching methods, and student achievement is sparse, both theoretically and in studies (Dzulkurnain et al., 2024; Eka et al., 2024).

More generally, the BIPA discussions include the Indonesian language studies field; however, the problems regarding its pedagogy are similar to those encountered in English education and in the teaching of foreign languages in general. These include the tension between accuracy and fluency, the diversification of the target learners, and the alignment of assessment to the teaching of communication, which are some of the key issues in various contexts of language education. This means that empirical evidence gathered in BIPA classrooms is valuable as it can provide issues that are likely to be transferable in language teacher education and even in English education, especially in contexts when the teachers are qualified using a wide range of disciplines (Suyitno, 2015; Widyasari & Dardjito, 2022).

Though theoretically, the intersection of teacher cognition and teacher background is significant, evidence connecting these dimensions to BIPA learning outcomes is scarce. So far, studies examining the intersection of teachers' academic formation and learner's responses of classroom instruction on language achievement through the lens of objective measures are few and far between. The lack of such studies narrows the gap within the literature and subsequently the possibilities for developing evidence-informed interventions pertaining to BIPA teacher education and

continuing professional development (Dhari & Syafryadin, 2025).

The present study aims to resolve this gap through a mixed-methods comparative analysis of BIPA students' learning outcomes. BIPA students taught by English Education and Indonesian Education teachers are the subjects of this research. Quantitatively, the study compares the Indonesian language achievement of BIPA students taught by English Education-majored teachers and those taught by Indonesian Education-majored teachers using a standardized Indonesian language proficiency test aligned with BIPA proficiency descriptors. Qualitatively, students' responses of instructional practices, classroom interactions, feedback and culture integration are analyzed. By combining these two strands of data, the study aims to show whether or not a gap in achievement is present and which of the teacher's educational background is responsible for it through their pedagogical practices (Kalinowski et al., 2020; Solikhah & Budiharso, 2020).

This study addresses the following research questions: **RQ1:** Is there a statistically significant difference in Indonesian language learning outcomes between BIPA students taught by teachers with English Education backgrounds and those taught by teachers with Indonesian Education backgrounds? **RQ2:** How do BIPA students perceive the instructional practices of teachers from these two academic backgrounds in terms of instructional clarity, classroom interaction, feedback, and cultural integration? In the context of teacher education and pedagogy, especially BIPA teaching, the study aims to contribute to the existing knowledge. Those who make rural and urban BIPA teachers training pedagogy, balance communicative competence, linguistic accuracy, and integrate culture in a diverse classroom, and therefore make pedagogy that rural and urban BIPA pedagogies integrated and evidence-based.

B. Methods

Research Design and Methodological Orientation

In this study, the researchers applied a comparative mixed-methods design to analyze diversities in learning achievements of the BIPA students with respect to the academic qualifications of the students' teachers. In order to ascertain the study's outcome, learning outcomes, and students' responses of classroom activities and settings, the study specifically compared two classes in the students' learning: those BIPA students learning with educators who majored in Indonesian education and those students learning with educators who majored in English education. The comparative structure of the design allowed the study to find out the extent to which the variations of the educational pathway of the teachers could be reflected in the students' learning achievements in the integration of a foreign language (Ivankova et al., 2006; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Wei, 2022).

A convergent mixed-methods approach was undertaken in which, during the same instructional period, achievement data, and perception data were collected and analyzed separately before being merged in the interpretation phase. This approach was necessary so that learning achievement was analyzed as a measurable phenomenon and as a pedagogically embedded complex relevant to the instructional choices and the classroom ecologies. The merged data strands meant that the current study could address not only the existence of any statistically significant differences between the two groups, but also the extent to which students' experiences in the classroom could account for some of the performances patterns (Gierus et al., 2025; Ortega-Auquilla et al., 2022). A convergent mixed-methods approach is particularly relevant here in BIPA research, since learning outcomes in foreign language education embrace several cognitive as well as contextual elements. The current study, with the integration of achievement data and learner perception data, is able to provide a broader understanding of instructional effectiveness provided by different teacher academic backgrounds (Latif & Wasim, 2024).

Research Context

Participants in this investigation were enrolled in one of the Indonesia tertiary-level BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers) programmes which have been adapted from the Indonesia national BIPA implementation framework. The objective of the BIPA programme was to help students gain communicative competence in the Indonesian language, and achieve accurate language use, and cultural familiarity through integrated language teaching. To enhance instructional uniformity among the instructional groups, participating classes met the same syllabus, learning outcomes, and assessments, with particular regard to central language components and teaching duration. This uniformity in instruction reduced the curricular elasticity and the other learning outcomes could be attributed to the teachers' qualifications, rather than to differences in the institutions, or the curriculum (Isnaniah & Islahuddin, 2020; Rahmanu et al., 2023).

The defined instructional context focused on a particular segment of the A2-B1 learning spectrum; foreign language learning developmental stages particularly at this juncture can be significantly shaped by the instructional manner, feedback provisions, and interaction in the classroom. Face-to-face classes were held over the course of one teaching cycle, where student engagement and participation were prioritized, and instruction was conducted exclusively in Indonesian. Because of this controlled teaching environment, an immersion was then offered where the context permitted the study of the possible consequences of the teacher's academic qualifications on the students' learning achievement and responses related to the classroom ecology.

Description of Participants and the Sample Selection Method.

The description of the sample included 60 international students in the BIPA programs, divided in that sample to consist of two equal groups. Group A: 30 students with teachers having Indonesian Education qualifications. Group B: 30 students with teachers having qualifications in English Education. The selection of the sample was intentional, and the inclusion criteria was 1) a students' presence in an A2-B1 BIPA course; 2) a students' completion of at least a defined teaching period with the same teacher, and 3) a students expressed voluntary willingness to participate in the study. It was determined that the sample size was sufficient for conducting the analysis, so the study was able to perform inferential statistical tests with reasonable assurance. The analysis was also context-specific, but having more participants made the analysis more reliable, thus making it easier for the researchers to make claims about the differences between the groups they compared.

Table 1. Participant Profile and Grouping

Group	Teacher Background	Proficiency Level	Number of Students
A	Indonesian Education	A2-B1	30
B	English Education	A2-B1	30
Total			60

Research Instruments

The two research questions were answered using two complementary instruments: an Indonesian language achievement test and a student open-ended questionnaire.

Indonesian Language Achievement Test

The achievement test used in this study was developed with reference to the Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia (UKBI), which is a standardized Indonesian language proficiency assessment officially administered by the Language Development and Fostering Agency of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia. UKBI is designed to measure Indonesian language proficiency across different user groups, including native speakers and foreign learners, and is aligned with internationally recognized principles of language proficiency assessment. As a standardized test, UKBI applies systematic procedures in test construction, scoring, and interpretation, ensuring consistency, reliability, and validity across administrations. The proficiency descriptors used in UKBI are comparable to international language proficiency frameworks, allowing test results to be interpreted beyond local instructional contexts. For this reason, UKBI has been widely adopted as a reference instrument in academic, professional, and international settings requiring standardized measurement of Indonesian language competence.

The achievement test was composed of 20 test items covering learners' ability to master vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and the construction of

sentences. These aspects were chosen as they are the primary learning objectives at the A2–B1 BIPA levels, and are also the ones that are typically focused on during the assessments done in the classrooms. The test items were formulated in accordance with the BIPA proficiency level descriptors, and was modified from the Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia (UKBI) (Oktriono, 2019). Expert judgment from a panel of experienced BIPA instructors was used to confirm the content validity of the test, as they were the ones who reviewed the test items and provided feedback on whether the language used, the levels of difficulty, and the instructions were unambiguous. The test was scored using a simple scoring method where students earned a score of one for every correct answer until they reached the maximum of 20 points.

Open-Ended Questionnaire

The student responses instrument in this study consisted of five open-ended questions designed to elicit learners’ reflective accounts of their learning experiences in BIPA classrooms. Unlike Likert-scale questionnaires that quantify attitudes, this instrument adopted an open-ended format to allow participants to describe their experiences, challenges, and responses in their own words. The questions focused on learners’ experiences related to vocabulary learning, grammar instruction, reading comprehension, sentence construction, and overall instructional influence, aligning directly with the skill domains assessed in the achievement test. (Bui, 2022; Jin & Peng, 2022).

The open-ended questions were not intended to function as an independent quantitative measurement tool. Instead, they served a qualitative explanatory role, providing contextual insights to help interpret differences in learning achievement identified through statistical analysis. This approach is consistent with mixed-methods research principles, where qualitative data are used to explain and enrich quantitative findings rather than generate standalone claims (Nawi et al., 2020). Prior to full administration, the questions were reviewed and piloted with a small group of non-native speakers of Indonesian to ensure clarity, appropriateness of language, and relevance to the BIPA learning context. Feedback from the pilot phase was used to refine question wording and minimize potential ambiguity, thereby enhancing the credibility of the qualitative data (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

Table 2. Instrument Description and Purpose

Instrument	Focus	Number of Items	Data Type	Function
Achievement Test	Vocabulary, grammar, reading, sentence construction	20	Quantitative	Measure learning outcomes
Open-ended Questionnaire	Vocabulary learning, grammar instruction, reading comprehension, sentence construction, overall instructional influence	5	Qualitative	Explain and triangulate achievement patterns

Data collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted in two sequential stages. First, the achievement test was administered under standardized and proctored conditions to ensure inter-group uniformity. All participants received identical instructions and were allotted the same amount of time to complete the test. This procedure was implemented to minimize procedural bias and to ensure that any observed differences in test performance could be attributed to instructional factors rather than testing conditions (Alareifi, 2023). Following the completion of the achievement test, participants were invited to respond to the open-ended questionnaire. Administering the qualitative instrument after the test allowed learners to reflect on their instructional experiences while these experiences were still salient and directly connected to their test performance. To reduce potential social desirability bias and encourage honest responses, all participants completed the questionnaire anonymously (Nederhof, 1985).. The qualitative data obtained from this stage were used to explain and triangulate the quantitative findings derived from the achievement test.

Data Analysis

After confirming that the sample size was sufficient for comparative analysis, the quantitative data from the achievement test were analyzed using both inferential statistics and qualitative analysis. Descriptive statistics, including mean scores and standard deviations, were first computed to provide an overview of learners' performance in each instructional group. These statistics offered an initial depiction of achievement patterns across vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and sentence construction.

To examine differences in learning achievement between students taught by teachers with Indonesian Education backgrounds and those taught by teachers with English Education backgrounds, an independent-samples t-test was employed. Prior to conducting the inferential analysis, the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were examined to justify the use of parametric testing. In addition to testing for statistical significance, effect size (Cohen's *d*) was calculated to estimate the magnitude and practical significance of any observed differences, recognizing that effect size provides more meaningful interpretive value beyond p-values alone (Díaz-Reza et al., 2018; Lakens, 2021).

The qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions were analyzed using thematic analysis. Responses were first read repeatedly to achieve data familiarization, followed by initial coding based on the four language skill domains assessed in the achievement test. Codes were then grouped into broader themes reflecting instructional practices, learning challenges, and perceived influences of teaching approaches. Rather than producing numerical summaries, the qualitative findings were used to explain and contextualize the quantitative results, particularly

patterns and differences identified through the t-test.

Finally, an integrated interpretation was conducted by juxtaposing quantitative achievement outcomes with qualitative themes. This triangulation allowed the researchers to explore how instructional experiences and teaching practices may account for observed differences in learning achievement, thereby enhancing the interpretive depth and credibility of the findings (Hopkins et al., 2009; Wolverson et al., 2016).

Table 3. Alignment of Research Questions, Instruments, and Analysis

Research Question	Instrument	Analysis Approach
RQ1	Achievement Test	Descriptive statistics, exploratory t-test, effect size
RQ2	Open-Ended Questions	Thematic analysis

Trustworthiness, Validity, and Ethical Considerations

To bolster confidence in the findings, several strategies, including the positive influence of external expert evaluation on content validity, internal consistency reliability assessment, and data integration from distinct responses and achievement sources, were utilized towards establishing credibility (Bakhtiari-Dovvombaygi et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2020). Ethics were fully maintained whereby participants were engaged on voluntary and informed bases and assured that data collected would in no way influence their academic assessment. All participant data were de-identified and kept in a safe location (De Sá Leite et al., 2018).

Methodological Reflexivity and Limitations

There are numerous methodological principles that should be taken into account per the limitations of the study. While the sample size is ample enough to assist in conducting comparative statistical analysis, Only a single instructional lens was used, which may pose a larger barrier to extrapolating the outcomes to a broader cross BIPA context. Also, the achievement test was primarily receptive and form-focused language skills, and no direct measures of productive skills were included in such as speaking and listening. Such assessment may not be able to reflect the true nature of the communicative competent learners may have in Indonesian language (De Sá Leite et al., 2018).

Although studies limitations are present, the study was able to display transparency, methodological, instruction, and design that is able to triangulate achievement data to responses data. Rather than forming absolute conclusions, pinpointing BIPA learning outcomes to precisely how teachers' academic qualifications correlate to, findings are contextually significant. This also provides insights on the studies findings to incorporate multi sites, longitudinal designs, and broader, more productive language assessment instruments in future studies (Liu & Read, 2021).

C. Results and Discussion

1. Result

The study's findings based on a convergent mixed-methods methodology are presented in this section. The quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed concurrently, and integrated during interpretation. Following mixed-methods methodology guidelines (Ivankova et al. 2006; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Wei, 2022), the qualitative findings from the open-ended questionnaires are integrated in an explanatory and triangulatory manner with the quantitative data from the Indonesian language achievement test, which serves as the primary data point for the achievement outcome disparity analysis of the two instructional groups. The blending of these two data strands paints a multifaceted picture of measurable achievement disparities and unquantifiable learner responses of instructional practices regarding the academic backgrounds of the teachers. The findings are structured into three primary subsections. In the first, the overall learning achievement quantitative data and language skill component breakdowns are presented. In the second, the qualitative themes from the students' open-ended responses are summarized to elucidate the quantitative data. In the third, an integrated interpretation is presented to illustrate the triangulation of qualitative evidence with the statistical outcomes.

Quantitative Findings: Comparative Learning Achievement

The first research question examined whether there was a statistically significant difference in Indonesian language learning achievement between BIPA students taught by teachers with English Education backgrounds and those taught by teachers with Indonesian Education backgrounds. Students' achievement scores were obtained from the standardized Indonesian language achievement test adapted from the UKBI framework. Descriptive statistics and an independent-samples *t*-test were employed to compare the performance of the two instructional groups.

Group Statistics

HASIL PERBANDINGAN		KELAS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
		KELAS ENGLISH MAJORED	30	81.8333	10.70837	1.95471
		KELAS INDONESIA MAJORED	30	57.8000	12.35956	2.25654

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
HASIL PERBANDINGAN	Equal variances assumed	1.252	.268	8.318	58	.000	24.83333	2.98544	18.85733	30.80934
	Equal variances not assumed			8.318	56.844	.000	24.83333	2.98544	18.85474	30.81192

Figure 1. t-test Statistical Analysis Output

Based on the results of the Independent Samples t-test, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) states that there is a significant difference between the two groups. The Levene's test yielded a significance value of 0.268 (> 0.05), indicating that the variances of the two groups can be assumed to be equal. Furthermore, the t-test results showed a Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.000 (< 0.05), which means that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the English Education-taught class and the Indonesia Majored class, with the English Education-taught class obtaining a higher mean score ($M = 81.83$) than the Indonesia Majored class ($M = 57.00$).

Statistical analysis with an independent samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference in overall achievement between the two groups. Assumption tests for normality and homogeneity of variance were in favor of the application of parametric analysis. The calculated effect size provided a meaningful magnitude of difference, indicating that the gap observed was statistically and educationally significant. The findings strengthened the claim that teachers' academic qualifications have an effect on the learning outcomes in BIPA instruction.

From the perspective of the skill domains, the most significant differences were in sentence construction and reading comprehension. Students taught by English Education teachers were better able to construct grammatically and contextually correct sentences and were better able to derive meaning from written texts. The differences in vocabulary and grammar knowledge were present, but the differences were not as significant as the differences in sentence construction and reading comprehension. The evidence suggests that instructional methods that combine an emphasis on the communicative aspects of language with a learner-centered approach are more effective.

Qualitative Findings: Learners' Perspectives on Instructional Practices

Qualitative data stem from five open-ended questions concerning learners' vocabulary, grammar, reading, sentence-writing, and general instruction. Thematic analyses were conducted, and the responses were organized by the same skills associated with the achievement test. As per the goal of qualitative data in a convergent mixed-methods framework, the findings are not presented as standalone statements; rather, they offer a narrative explanation to add depth to the quantitative findings. Several thematic responses, in general, were noted from students of English Education teachers. Describing instruction as interactive, flexible, and context-supportive, they referred to all the language skills and classroom activities. Positive experiences were shared, with the teaching of vocabulary being linked to exemplification, contextualization, and practice in using the taught vocabulary in the speaking and writing activities. Explanations of the grammar were said to be reasonable, practically focused, and uncoupled from the mere mechanical description of rules, and, in real-life communication, grammar constructions functioned. Reading

activities were largely described as structured and not teacher centered, and most of the predictive, analytic, and meaning-making discussions were devoted to the achievement of an answer rather than the correction of the answer.

In contrast, students taught by Indonesian Education teachers had a more restricted learning experience. Students recognized teachers' strong command of language and grammar and formal Indonesian, however, instructional rigidity and lack of scaffolding were reported as problems. Grammar explanations were said to be detailed, yet difficult to use in language tasks. Vocabulary learning was perceived as more based on texts than context, and less than learning opportunities for practice. Reading was often described as focused on answering questions with little to no interaction or interpretation. These qualitative differences fit the descriptions of the different approaches in the literature. English Education programs, in contrast, focus on the pedagogy of communicative language teaching, whereas Indonesian Education programs focus on formal structural elements, and accuracy. Most importantly, these views do not imply that Indonesian Education teachers are ineffective. The findings suggest different instructional foci that could result in different student learning experiences and outcomes.

Combining both quantitative and qualitative results helps in explaining the further achievement gaps. the largest achievement gaps give evidence as to why learners taught by English Education teachers have higher achievement gaps. The learners' testimonials point to English Education teachers' teaching practices centered on classroom interactions, teaching clarity and the use of practical teaching language, and the influence of practical language teaching on students' sentence construction and reading comprehension skills. The gaps are evident within the educators' construction of the grammar with contextual exemplars, the students' construction of the grammar, and the contextual reading of the Indonesian texts.

Students' testimonials give evidence of practical language teaching as captured in the achievement gaps of the sentence construction and reading comprehension of the language. *Grammar becomes clearer when compared with English structures. Reading strategies taught by the teacher help comprehension. English background helps connect explanations* (S4). The claim of the students referenced above is evidence of the teaching clarity and contextualization, English Education, and teaching of the reading Indonesian texts the most in the achievement gaps.

On the one hand, the comparatively lower achievement scores among learners taught by Indonesian Education teachers are explained by learners' descriptions of various teaching constraints. While describing the teachers' command of the language, these students often pointed out the teacher's deficiency in helping students turn explicit grammatical teaching into practical communication. This explains the greater disparity in students' more productive and integrative skills than in the less discrete areas of knowledge like vocabulary recognition.

Integrated Interpretation of Findings

The findings, when viewed together, suggest that there is an interplay between teachers' academic qualification, teaching methods, and the resultant variability in learning outcomes for BIPA students. The quantitative data confirms the existence of a statistically and practically significant learning disparity in favor of the students taught by the English Education teachers. The qualitative data, on the other hand, captures the lived reality of learners in relation to different teaching methodologies employed in the classroom.

In accordance with the principles of convergent mixed-methods (Ivankova et al., 2006; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Wei, 2022), the qualitative data do not contradict the quantitative findings, but rather, enhance their interpretation. The merging of qualitative and quantitative data increases the overall credibility of the research findings. It justifies the conclusion that teachers' academic training impact pedagogical approaches and significantly influence BIPA learning outcomes, especially for learners at the A2-B1 levels.

2. Discussion

The current study aimed at investigating whether the differences in teachers' academic training, specifically English Education and Indonesian Education, result in differences in BIPA students' learning achievement, and how student's responses of teaching in the classroom may help explain these differences. Using a convergent mixed-methods approach, the results provide evidence that teacher's disciplinary training has a substantial impact on student's learning outcomes, especially at A2-B1 levels. This discussion focuses on the interpretation of the results, placed within the context of existing BIPA literature and language education, offers an explanation within the frameworks of teacher cognition and pedagogical orientation, and identifies the implications, limitations, and potential for future research.

The BIPA students with teachers from English Education backgrounds scored higher on the UKBI-referenced achievement test than those with teachers from Indonesian Education backgrounds. The difference was statistically significant, suggesting the gap is an educationally relevant phenomenon. The largest differences were in sentence construction and reading comprehension, whereas the differences in vocabulary and grammar were smaller. Results demonstrate that the English Education-trained teachers the advantage does not primarily lie in the knowledge of discrete linguistic elements, but in students' knowledge of integrative functional language use.

From an interpretive point of view, these findings indicate that teaching methods that focus on communicative use, interactions, and contextualized practice may be particularly effective for foreign learners of Indonesian at the intermediate level. At

the A2–B1 level, learners move beyond the rudimentary recognition of linguistic forms toward more independent and adaptable uses of the language. This includes the ability to produce sentences and understand written texts and demands more than just knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of a language. It needs opportunities to use the language meaningfully and purposefully within a communicative situation. The better performance of students taught by English Education teachers, therefore, seems to be a result of teaching practices that respond to this developmental need.

The qualitative patterns are useful for deepening this interpretation. Students, when describing English Education teachers, described teaching as clear, interactive, and enactive, meaning supportive of the use of language in real situations. They praised teachers for use of examples, explanation, and practice (guided practice) and functional (explanations) practice helping them to understand the linguistic forms, as well as the describe and function of the forms. In contrast, learners' descriptions of teaching by Indonesian Education teachers included the expertise of the teachers as being strong in the field of linguistics, however, students described as most of the challenges being resulting from dense explanations and the lack of instructional support. Devoid patterns of qualitative data, described the most strong achievement difference as being in the integrated, and, in contrast, lacked in the segregated knowledge areas. These findings echo previous studies on the BIPA pedagogy and teacher training and broaden their scope. Previous studies have pointed out the necessity of communicative competence, the merging of culture and instruction, and learner-centered practices in BIPA teaching (Fatimah & Rahmawati, 2022; Milati, 2024; Tiawati et al., 2023, 2024). Most of the cited literature pertains to teaching materials, the structure of the curriculum, or broader principles of teaching, with an almost blanket assumption of teacher competence. This research is responding to the call in the literature for studies on teacher effectiveness by providing the first empirical evidence that teacher background itself is a significant variable and, in the process, fills an evident gap in the literature, which often lacks a comparative dimension in assessing the range of academic backgrounds in BIPA teaching and the subsequent student performance.

The results also align with studies highlighting the intersection of teacher cognition and practices followed. Borg's (2003) model posits that teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and experiences mostly determined by the professional training they receive-shape their understanding of the curriculum, lesson construction, and learner engagement. With respect to this study, English Education teachers, trained in applied linguistics and second language acquisition, seem to emphasize learner fluency, language interaction, and functional use of language. In contrast, Indonesian Education teachers, trained in linguistics with emphasis on an analytical, structuring, and textual formal accuracy, seem to attend to language correctness and explicit knowledge. Both orientations are valid and may differ in their outcomes based on the proficiency and needs of the learners.

The evidence presented here should not be understood as evidence that Indonesian Education teachers are incompetent. Rather, they are suggesting that pedagogical training that teaches Indonesian Education may not be optimally aligned with the needs of foreign learners that are at the A2-B1 level, specifically in instances where they are taught in Indonesian. Although immersion is highly regarded in foreign language teaching, the qualitative evidence indicates that a lack of sufficient scaffolding may prevent students from being able to internalize and use the language. This corresponds to the language teaching literature that considers the tension between accuracy and fluency and the appropriateness of teaching strategies to the learners' level of language and cognition.

The implications for BIPA teacher preparation and professional development, in particular, have BIPA policy-related relevance. National legal frameworks, e.g., Law Number 24 of 2009 and the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture Number 27 of 2017, cite the importance of BIPA teachers, the Indonesian language, and knowledge of Indonesian culture. These frameworks correctly identify the significance of Indonesian Education, but the findings present the need for similar recognition of Indonesian Education and its elements. For instance, one aspect of the Indonesian Education system as a discipline, especially at the teacher training and professional development level, focuses on the pedagogical frameworks for the teaching of a second language and the particular teaching style of communication. BIPA teacher education programs are more likely to succeed if they employ professional preparation models that are neither one, nor the other, or both, so to speak, one professional preparation model that incorporates linguistics and, to some degree, teaching.

Practically, the findings suggest that Indonesian Education-trained teachers who teach BIPA need some professional development that focuses more on communicative language teaching, teaching that uses the theory of scaffolding, and teaching that centers on the students. On the other hand, English Education-trained teachers would need more professional development on the theory of language, especially the structures and components of the Indonesian language, to ensure they comply with the formal and appropriate standards of the language, so that they would teach the language accurately. This sort of professional development that crosses academic disciplines would address the pedagogical gap in this study and would encourage a more balanced approach to teaching.

The implications for assessment practices in BIPA programs are positive. In addition to aiding comparison of learning outcomes and strengthening findings, the UKBI-referenced achievement test bolsters the test's outcome validity. Given the observed differences in integrative skills, future BIPA assessments will likely need to focus more on the learners' productive and interpretive skills, particularly in sentence construction and reading comprehension in order to address more substantive, and potentially, questions of learners' development. Bringing assessment in line with

teaching aims and learning objectives is still the most pressing problem in BIPA.

The study is in need of some limitations that must be stated. First, the given sample size, the study was undertaken within one teaching context. This confines the findings to a single BIPA program context and institutional culture level. Second, the achievement test was geared towards more receptive and focused on the skills of form. Speaking and listening were not directly included. Hence, findings will not capture learners' full communicative competence, especially in the area of oral interaction. Third, self-reported respon of the qualitative data could be the result of personal expectations, learning preferences, or culture, which is a variable for the self-reported qualitative data.

The outlined limitations present several avenues for future research. First, the future research may benefit from multi-site studies with a range of BIPA programs to assess the validity of the present findings across different contexts. Second, longitudinal studies may be useful in exploring the different ways in which the effect of teacher academic background changes as learners move to higher levels of proficiency. It is possible that the teaching strengths derived from Indonesian Education training become more pronounced at an advanced stage when learners' training involves more linguistic precision and style. Third, future research should assess learners' productive skills (speaking and listening, for example) because such assessments would provide a more balanced view of learning achievement.

Further research may also consider BIPA teachers combining use of differing academic training models. Research, especially experimental or design-based studies, on the possible blending of different pedagogical models for BIPA will be useful in informing teacher education and curriculum design. Additionally, the absence of empirical qualitative studies on teachers' own perspectives lacking instructional decision-making may help work to mitigate the gaps in the conceptual framework relating to the role of teacher cognition as a moderator between the academic background of the teacher and the instructional practice at the micro level.

To summarize, the BIPA students' learning achievements and the instructional experiences related to the BIPA students' learning, are, in part, attributable to the teachers' academic qualifications, as the findings of this study suggest. Using a mixed-methods approach with a quantitative and qualitative data convergence framework, this study articulates the extent to which the outcomes of learning and the responses of the learners are influenced by the teaching style of a teacher trained in a specific discipline. The findings serve a purpose in the continued engagement with the teaching of BIPA, teacher training, theoretically language policy, and point to the necessity of a more structured and informed approach regarding the preparation and the guidance of the BIPA teachers in a more diverse and international context.

D. Conclusions

This study engages with the teaching of BIPA, and in particular, the teachers' academic qualifications, and the impact of this on the learners' instructional experiences and teaching the measurable learning outcomes related to the instructional outcomes. The findings highlight the existence of a relationship between differences in disciplinary training and the variation of pedagogical practices. This relationship, in turn, defines the extent to which learners, towards the end of the intermediate level, possess the necessary and desired competency of the Indonesian language. The findings discuss the teaching of foreign languages in the context of BIPA and advocate for a pedagogical approach that communicates the implications of a stronger focus on the communicative elements of language and the teaching of the language with greater emphasis on structural elements. The study yielded several implications. For BIPA teacher education, the findings highlight the potential benefit of cross-disciplinary integration of applied linguistics, second language teaching, and Indonesian language structural pedagogy. For teaching practice, the results stress the need for harmonizing teaching methods with the psychological and communicative capabilities of students at different stages of development. This study also sparks some policy controversies regarding BIPA teachers and the potential scope of current policies.

E. Acknowledgement

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to Allah SWT for His infinite mercy, blessings, guidance, and strength that made the completion of this study possible. We sincerely thank Washlurahim Safitri, Head of the Department of English Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, for the academic support provided throughout the study. We are also profoundly grateful to all lecturers of the Department of English Education for their knowledge, dedication, and inspiration throughout his academic journey. Heartfelt thanks are dedicated to our beloved parents, Tri Wulandari and Dodi Riyanto, for their unconditional love, endless prayers, sacrifices, and unwavering support; to his beloved siblings, Azelia Kartika Adila and Athaya Atma, for their encouragement; and to his beloved partner, There Octaviani, for her patience, understanding, and constant motivation. We also sincerely appreciate our close friends for their companionship and support throughout this journey. Finally, we would like to acknowledge ourselves for our perseverance, resilience, and determination in overcoming every challenge encountered during the completion of this research.

References

- Alareifi, R. M. (2023). A Mixed Methods Study of Graduate Students' Achievement Motivation and Perceptions of Implementing Asynchronous Online Discussions. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences*.

- <https://doi.org/10.33193/jalhss.88.2023.795>
- Bakhtiari-Dovvombaygi, H., Pourhasan, K., Rahmaty, Z., Zare-Kaseb, A., Abbaszadeh, A., Rashtbarzadeh, A., & Borhani, F. (2024). Evaluation of cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Persian version of the critical thinking disposition scale: methodological study. *BMC Nursing*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02129-y>
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Bui, H. P. (2022). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective ESP teaching. *Heliyon*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10628>
- De Sá Leite, S., Áfio, A. C. E., Carvalho, L., Da Silva, J. M., De Almeida, P. C., & Pagliuca, L. (2018). Construction and validation of an Educational Content Validation Instrument in Health. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 71 suppl 4, 1635-1641. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2017-0648>
- Dhari, A. W., & Syafryadin. (2025). Indonesian Foreign Language (IFL) Learners' Difficulties In Learning BIPA. *Paramasastra*. <https://doi.org/10.26740/paramasastra.v12n1.p113-122>
- Díaz-Reza, J., García-Alcaráz, J., & Martínez-Loya, V. (2018). Descriptive Analysis. *Impact Analysis of Total Productive Maintenance*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01725-5_8
- Dzulkurnain, M. I., Irianto, S., Rasmita, R., Uktolseja, L., Hartono, W., & Manurung, T. (2024). Understanding the benefits and challenges of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in English education: a literature synthesis. *Journal on Education*. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i4.5876>
- Eka, W., Rahmanu, D., & Ar, G. O. E. M. (2024). Multimodal immersion in English language learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Heliyon*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38357>
- Fatimah, S. F. S., & Rahmawati, Z. N. (2022). Recognizing Aspects of Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA). *SINDA: Comprehensive Journal of Islamic Social Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.28926/sinda.v2i3.658>
- Gierus, B., Du, T., Maduforo, A., Gilbert, B., & Koh, K. (2025). Prevalence and Quality of Mixed Methods Research in Educational Subdisciplines: A Systematic Review. *SAGE Open*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251335171>
- Haliq, A., Akhiruddin, A., & Ismail, A. (2025). Culture-Based Indonesian Language Program for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) at BIPA Course Institutions in Yogyakarta. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Dan Sastra*. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v9i1.66363>
- Hopkins, W., Marshall, S., Batterham, A., & Hanin, J. (2009). Progressive statistics for studies in sports medicine and exercise science. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 41 1, 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e31818cb278>
- Isnaniah, S. (2021). The Contribution of Indonesian for Foreign Speaker (Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing/BIPA) in Islamic Universities for Developing World Civilization. *Sunan Kalijaga: International Journal of Islamic Civilization*.

- <https://doi.org/10.14421/skijic.v4i2.1993>
- Isnaniah, S., & Islahuddin. (2020). Management of Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) at Islamic Religious Higher Education Institutions (PTKI) in Indonesia and Thailand. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 9, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2020.91.1-27>
- Ivankova, N., Creswell, J., & Stick, S. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, 18, 20-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x05282260>
- Jin, S., & Peng, L. (2022). Classroom perception in higher education: The impact of spatial factors on student satisfaction in lecture versus active learning classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.941285>
- Kalinowski, E., Egert, F., Gronostaj, A., & Vock, M. (2020). Professional development on fostering students' academic language proficiency across the curriculum – A meta-analysis of its impact on teachers' cognition and teaching practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 88, 102971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102971>
- Lakens, D. (2021). Sample Size Justification. *Collabra: Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/9d3yf>
- Laksono, P. T., & Ismiatun, F. (2023). Adapting to a Hard Situation: BIPA Teachers' Successful Strategies for Teaching Local Culture During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v5i1.11199>
- Latif, M. W., & Wasim, A. (2024). Investigating EFL instructors' approaches to classroom-based assessment culture: an explanatory sequential mixed-method approach. *Language Testing in Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00332-x>
- Liu, X., & Read, J. (2021). Investigating the Skills Involved in Reading Test Tasks through Expert Judgement and Verbal Protocol Analysis: Convergence and Divergence between the Two Methods. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 18, 357-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2021.1881964>
- Milati, N. (2024). Ethnopedagogy-Based Indonesian Language Teaching Techniques for Foreign Speakers. *SEMBIO: Prosiding Seminar Nasional Biologi Dan Pendidikan Biologi*. <https://doi.org/10.59672/sembio.v2.3773>
- Mufidah, N., & Sari, A. L. (2022). The Challenges and Opportunities in Opening Indonesian Language Education Study Program at UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. *Dinamika Ilmu*. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v22i2.4871>
- Mukti, T. W. P. (2020). A Borderland Discourse Analysis on English Language Students and Graduates Teaching BIPA. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v4i1.2109>
- Nawi, F. A. M., Tambi, A., Samat, M. F. Bin, & Mustapha, W. Z. W. (2020). A Review on the Internal Consistency of A Scale: The Empirical Example of the Influence of Human Capital Investment on Malcom Baldrige Quality Principles In Tvet Institutions. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 3, 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.37231/apj.2020.3.1.121>

- Nederhof, A. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420150303>
- Oktaviani, W., & Amra, M. F. (2024). Indonesia's Cultural Diplomacy Strategy Through the Indonesian Language Program for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) in Australia 2021-2023. *Sriwijaya Journal of International Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.47753/sjir.v4i2.127>
- Oktriono, K. (2019). UKBI: Experimental development of web-based Indonesian language proficiency test for foreign speakers. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1175. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1175/1/012254>
- Ortega-Auquilla, D., Sigüenza-Garzón, P., Chumbay, J., & Heras, E. (2022). Motivation in English Learning at University: A Mixed-Methods Study Investigating the Perceptions of Different Stakeholders. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.12.10>
- Prasetyo, A. E. (2019). *Developing an Indonesian Reading Proficiency Test for BIPA Learners*. 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v3i2.6792>
- Rahmanu, I., Adnyana, I., Laksana, I., Sutarma, I., Somawati, N., & Nugroho, I. (2023). Investigating the Implementation of Multimodality and Spherical Video-Based Immersive Virtual Reality in the Indonesian Language for Foreign Speakers' Learning Materials. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpsl.1307.20>
- Riazi, A., & Candlin, C. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47, 135–173. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444813000505>
- Rohimah, D. F. (2021). Internationalization of Indonesian and Internalization of Indonesian Culture Through Indonesian for Foreign Speakers (BIPA). *An-Nas*. <https://doi.org/10.36840/an-nas.v2i2.104>
- Romijn, B., Slot, P., & Leseman, P. (2021). Increasing teachers' intercultural competences in teacher preparation programs and through professional development: A review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103236>
- Salmanova, S. (2025). Communicative Approach in Foreign Language Teaching: Advantages and Limitations. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.250009>
- Solikhah, I., & Budiharso, T. (2020). Exploring Cultural Inclusion in the Curriculum and Practices for Teaching Bahasa Indonesia to Speakers of Other Languages. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 11, 177–197. <https://consensus.app/papers/exploring-cultural-inclusion-in-the-curriculum-and-solikhah-budiharso/a39983cd6344549ab0b1979daf2265cb/>
- Suyitno, I. (2015). *Pedagogical Norms and Learning Needs Analysis in Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA)*. 15. <https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v15i1.6561>
- Sya, M. F., Adri, H., Kholik, A., Sudjani, D., Latifah, Z. K., & Usan. (2021). Indonesian Learning: Towards The Academic Achievement of Communicative Competence.

- Indonesian Journal of Social Research (IJSR)*. <https://doi.org/10.30997/ijsr.v3i3.152>
- Tantri, N. R., Fitrah, Y., Kusmana, A., Wulandari, B. A., & Utama, G. T. (2025). Bridging Epistemology, SLA, and Cultural Content in BIPA Enhancing Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers. *Allure Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v5i1.20783>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Tiawati, R., Bidin, A., & Baba, S. (2023). How the Language Competence of International Students is Culturally Oriented When Learning Indonesian Language. *Studies in Media and Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v11i6.6020>
- Tiawati, R., Kurnia, M. D., Nazriani, N., Annisa, W., & Harahap, S. (2024). Cultural Literacy in Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA): Overcoming Barriers and Fostering Language Proficiency with Cross-Cultural Understanding Issues. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Research*. <https://doi.org/10.51817/jpdr.v4i1.739>
- Turlybekov, B., Seidaliyeva, G., Abiev, B., & Kazyhankyzy, L. (2024). Development of professional-pedagogical competence in future English language teachers. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v7i3.3009>
- Wahyuni, D., Maulina, Y., Mulia, A., & Sunardi, S. (2021). Cultural Discourse in Reading Texts of Indonesian Language Proficiency Test. *International Journal of Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.23590>
- Wei, Y. (2022). On the Mixed Methods Designs in Language Education Research. *Learning & Education*. <https://doi.org/10.18282/l-e.v10i8.3103>
- Widyasari, H., & Dardjito, H. (2022). Teaching Indonesian for other language speakers. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v28i1.5887>
- Wolverton, S., Dombrosky, J., & Lyman, R. (2016). Practical Significance: Ordinal Scale Data and Effect Size in Zooarchaeology. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology*, 26, 255–265. <https://doi.org/10.1002/oa.2416>
- Xu, A., Baysari, M., Stocker, S., Leow, L., Day, R., & Carland, J. (2020). Researchers' views on, and experiences with, the requirement to obtain informed consent in research involving human participants: a qualitative study. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-020-00538-7>
- Zahid, S. H. (2025). Bridging Disparities in Communicative Language Teaching for Educators and Learners in Bangladesh. *Journal of Social Research and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.52096/jsrbs.11.23.11>
- Zeng, J. (2023). A theoretical review of the role of teacher professional development in EFL students' learning achievement. *Heliyon*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15806>