

Effectiveness of Implementing Productive Skills Assessment in BIPA Learning

Novi Haryanti,¹ Ribut Wahyu Eriyanti,² Hari Sunaryo³

Corresponding: haryanti633@gmail.com

University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

DOI: [10.35974/acuity.v10i3.4025](https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v10i3.4025)

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of evaluation practices in developing students' productive skills—specifically speaking and writing—in Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA). Employing a mixed-methods approach, data were collected through speaking and writing tests, questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and classroom observations. The findings reveal that consistent evaluation frequency and contextually relevant learning activities significantly influence students' perceptions and the development of their productive skills. Performance-based assessments—such as monologues, dialogues, and writing tasks rooted in real-life situations—emerged as the most effective and meaningful evaluation methods. However, the delivery of feedback remains a critical weakness, as many students reported receiving vague and unhelpful feedback, which hindered their skill improvement. Consequently, there is a pressing need to design an evaluation system that is not only consistent and context-driven but also provides practical, targeted, and constructive feedback. These findings are expected to inform the development of more effective BIPA evaluation strategies that emphasize the enhancement of speaking and writing skills, ultimately supporting students in becoming confident and active users of the Indonesian language in everyday contexts.

Keywords: *BIPA learning, speaking skills, writing skills, context-based evaluation, constructive feedback.*

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian language plays a vital role for foreign speakers. As a country rich in cultural diversity, Indonesia uses its national language as a key to understanding its culture. The Indonesian Language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) program holds an important role in introducing Indonesian language and culture to the global community. This program aims to promote the use of Indonesian as a national language and to elevate its status as an international language applicable in various global activities. Through BIPA, foreign learners can acquire the Indonesian language more easily and quickly, enabling them to communicate with locals and understand the cultural norms and traditions within Indonesian society (Marsevani et al., 2024). BIPA also carries the mission of introducing the richness of Indonesian cultural perspectives (Simanjutak et al., 2024).

Productive skills—speaking and writing—are crucial components of BIPA learning. The ability to communicate effectively in Indonesian fosters social and economic connections between foreign speakers and Indonesians. Moreover, understanding the language allows learners to engage more deeply with cultural events such as traditional ceremonies and festivals. Proficiency in Indonesian can also open up broader opportunities for business and networking. Being a foreigner who can speak Indonesian fluently demonstrates respect and appreciation for Indonesia's culture. Efforts to increase global interest in the Indonesian language continue through various innovations, including digital learning platforms. In today's digital age, BIPA learning can be more effective

when supported by technology. Therefore, innovative strategies and approaches are needed to enhance the appeal of the Indonesian language to foreign learners.

Developing productive skills in BIPA learning, however, is not without its challenges. One of the major obstacles students face is cultural differences. Inability to communicate effectively in Indonesian may lead to social isolation and hinder interaction with native speakers who are not fluent in other languages (Reflinaldi et al., 2024). Motivation is another key factor. Students' attitudes toward a new language and culture strongly affect learning outcomes. Those who are open-minded and eager to learn generally progress faster than those who are less receptive (Nugraheni et al., 2024).

Teaching methods also present challenges, particularly when the formal language taught in classrooms does not match the informal Indonesian used in daily life. To improve speaking outcomes, it is essential to align instructional approaches with students' real-life communication needs. Research by (Khan Monib & ur Rahman Hadi, 2025) emphasizes that speaking performance is shaped not only by instructional strategies but also by emotional barriers such as anxiety and by classroom conditions, all of which affect fluency and confidence. In response, technology offers powerful support in modern language education. Digital tools like language learning apps, websites, and online platforms have been shown to enhance learning effectiveness and motivation while expanding access to diverse language resources (Marsevani et al., 2024). In particular, platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, and Duolingo provide interactive and engaging content that helps students overcome challenges related to vocabulary, pronunciation, and consistent speaking practice (Nurarifah et al., 2025).

Despite numerous studies on BIPA learning, few have specifically examined how evaluation methods impact the development of productive language skills such as speaking and writing, especially in technology-assisted and culturally diverse learning environments. This indicates a research gap that this study aims to address. Accordingly, the primary objective of this research is to analyze the effectiveness of evaluation methods in BIPA learning on students' productive skills. A secondary objective is to explore the various factors—including motivation, cultural background, and learner engagement—that influence the development of speaking and writing skills. This study is grounded in the theory of applied linguistics, especially in second language acquisition, where effective assessment methods are believed to play a significant role in shaping language outcomes. The primary hypothesis of this research is that student-centered and adaptive evaluation methods significantly enhance the productive language skills of BIPA learners. A secondary hypothesis assumes that non-linguistic factors such as motivation and exposure to culture also play crucial roles in skill development. This study also touches on ongoing academic discussions about the relative effectiveness of formal classroom instruction versus informal language exposure, contributing insight to this diverging perspective.

To address these challenges, several strategies can be employed. First, teaching materials should be adapted to students' proficiency levels. A step-by-step approach—from basic to advanced—helps learners progress without becoming overwhelmed (Simanjutak et al., 2024). Second, interactive teaching methods such as role plays, group discussions, and collaborative activities have been shown to enhance student engagement and understanding in a more enjoyable and meaningful way (Nugraheni et al., 2024). Third, it is important to create a supportive learning environment by offering engaging materials and access to contextual resources such as videos, audio content, and books (Marsevani et al., 2024).

Finally, integrating elements of Indonesian culture into the learning process is essential. Exposing students to Indonesian songs, food, traditions, and everyday customs not only enriches their vocabulary and language comprehension but also helps them adapt socially and emotionally within a new cultural setting (Marsevani et al., 2024).

By understanding this background, along with the challenges and strategies involved, BIPA learning can be designed and implemented more effectively. This allows students to develop their productive skills in Indonesian optimally. The role of BIPA learners goes beyond personal language acquisition; they can also serve as ambassadors for the Indonesian language worldwide

(Kosasih & Leksono, 2021). Some may become pioneers in promoting Indonesian in their home countries through teaching in educational institutions or BIPA centers, thus contributing to the spread and popularity of the language within their communities (Kosasih & Leksono, 2021).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Second and Foreign Language Learning

Second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learning is a complex multidisciplinary field involving psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, neurolinguistics, and education (Dey, 2023). Although these terms are often used interchangeably in everyday conversations, there are significant contextual differences. A second language refers to a language learned in an environment where that language is actively used in daily communication, such as an immigrant learning the language of the country they reside in (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022). In contrast, a foreign language is learned in a setting where the language is not commonly used in daily interactions, such as Indonesian students learning English at school (Enamul Hoque et al., 2017). The distinction between L2 and FL affects learners' motivation. Second language learners tend to have integrative or instrumental motivation, whereas foreign language learners may be more driven by educational value or personal interest (Zareian & Jodaei, 2015). Moreover, L2 environments provide broader and more diverse exposure, allowing learners to develop language skills more naturally through authentic interaction (Stephen D. Krashen, 2013).

Second Language Acquisition Theories

There are various theories that explain how individuals acquire a second language, offering essential frameworks for understanding language learning processes and influencing teaching methods. One major theory is behaviorism, which states that language learning occurs through habit formation via repetition, imitation, and reinforcement, emphasizing the role of the environment in shaping language behavior (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022). On the other hand, the nativist theory suggests that humans have an innate capacity to learn language through what is called a "language acquisition device" in the human brain, enabling individuals to naturally acquire language (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022).

The cognitive theory highlights the importance of mental processes such as attention, memory, and problem-solving in language learning. In this theory, individuals are seen as actively constructing language knowledge through interaction with their environment (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022). Combining behaviorist and cognitive elements, interactionist theory emphasizes the role of social interaction, where language is acquired through communication with native speakers and negotiation of meaning (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022).

Acculturation theory also provides an important perspective by viewing language as part of cultural expression, stating that successful second language acquisition is significantly influenced by how well an individual adapts to the culture of that language, including social and psychological distance (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022). Meanwhile, the monitor theory explains that language learning involves two distinct systems: acquisition, which occurs subconsciously, and learning, which happens consciously through understanding grammatical rules (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022).

Effective Foreign Language Learning Methods

Various foreign language learning methods have been developed and applied, each with different principles and techniques. A classical method is the Grammar-Translation Method, which emphasizes grammar and vocabulary learning through text translation from the target language to

the mother tongue. Although effective for reading and writing, this method pays little attention to speaking and listening skills (Kurniawan et al., 2020).

In contrast, the Direct Method emphasizes exclusive use of the target language in the classroom without using the mother tongue. It focuses on speaking and listening skills and teaches vocabulary through demonstration and context (Khoirunnisa & Nuriah, 2024). The Audio-Lingual Method emphasizes habit formation through repetition, imitation, and pattern drills. Rooted in behaviorist principles, this method stresses accurate pronunciation (Maedeh Alemi, 2017).

The Communicative Approach seeks to use the target language effectively in real-life situations. According to the book *Effective Strategies in Foreign Language Learning*, this method emphasizes the importance of motivation and goal-setting in language learning, with a focus on speaking and listening skills, as well as grammar and vocabulary in meaningful contexts (Melati et al., 2022).

Finally, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers a more practical approach by using meaningful tasks relevant to everyday life to promote language learning. This method particularly supports the development of speaking and writing skills through real-life language use while naturally reinforcing grammar and vocabulary (Cholifah, 2019). (Zahra & Arbaoui, 2024) further emphasizes that TBLT is highly effective in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) settings, where aligning language tasks with learners' academic or professional goals creates more authentic and motivating learning experiences that boost productive skills.

Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA)

Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) is a program designed to teach Indonesian to individuals whose native language is not Indonesian. This program aims to improve learners' Indonesian proficiency in various aspects, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. BIPA teaching serves as a key instrument in promoting the function of the Indonesian language (Mulyaningsih, 2024).

Curriculum and Approaches in BIPA Programs

The BIPA curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements regarding objectives, content, learning materials, and methods used as guidelines for conducting educational activities to achieve specific learning goals (Rosmalela Sidik, 2022). The BIPA curriculum should align with international standards (Mulyaningsih, 2024), particularly concerning the communicative function of a language. A well-designed BIPA curriculum should be practical and beneficial for learners (Mulyaningsih, 2024).

The curriculum is divided into several levels: beginner (basic user), intermediate (independent user), and advanced (proficient user).

Approaches used in BIPA learning may vary depending on learning goals, learner characteristics, and available resources. A common approach is the communicative approach, which focuses on using Indonesian for effective communication in real-life situations. This approach emphasizes speaking and listening skills and the learning of grammar and vocabulary through context.

There is also the integrative approach, which combines the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—into a unified learning process. With this approach, learners are expected to use Indonesian holistically in various contexts. The thematic approach is another effective choice, focusing on specific themes such as Indonesian culture, daily life, or social issues. These themes help learners not only develop language skills but also enrich their understanding of Indonesian culture and society.

Factors Influencing BIPA Learning Success

BIPA learning success is influenced by various internal and external factors. Internal factors include learning motivation, language aptitude, learning styles, and learners' educational backgrounds. External factors include the teaching methods used, available materials, the learning environment, and support from teachers and peers.

Key factors that significantly impact BIPA learning success include learning motivation, teaching methods, instructional materials, learning environment, and curriculum. Motivation is a critical factor; motivated learners are typically more active and persistent in overcoming learning challenges. Effective teaching methods greatly assist learners in understanding materials and developing language skills. These methods should be aligned with learning objectives, learner characteristics, and available resources.

Relevant learning materials tailored to learners' needs and interests can boost motivation and make it easier for them to understand and apply Indonesian in daily life. A supportive learning environment, including teacher, peer, and family support, fosters a positive atmosphere that encourages language development. Equally important, the BIPA curriculum must meet international standards to ensure optimal and globally relevant Indonesian language instruction (Mulyaningsih, 2024).

Productive Skills in Language Learning

Productive language skills refer to the ability to produce language, both orally and in writing. These skills involve the ability to effectively and efficiently convey messages, ideas, thoughts, and information. Productive skills are essential in language competence as they enable individuals to actively participate in communication and interact with others (Sa'diatunnisah, 2023).

Definitions of Speaking and Writing Skills

Speaking skills involve the ability to articulate sounds or words to express, state, and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings to others (Alda Kahfifah Ritonga, 2024). This skill goes beyond just pronouncing words—it includes using spoken language actively, productively, and spontaneously in various communication situations. Speaking skills also require the ability to deliver information clearly, correctly, effectively, and engagingly, so that the message is well received by the listener (Huda, 2022).

Writing skills refer to the ability to express ideas, thoughts, and opinions in a structured and systematic written form (Widya et al., 2023). This involves effectively using graphic elements, language structure, and vocabulary to clearly and accurately communicate information to the reader (Widya et al., 2023). Writing is considered the most complex language skill because it does not occur naturally like speaking, but must be developed through extensive, regular, and continuous practice (Sa'diatunnisah, 2023).

Techniques and Strategies for Teaching Productive Skills

There are various techniques and strategies to teach productive skills, both speaking and writing. These aim to enhance learners' ability to produce language effectively and efficiently. For speaking, proven techniques in BIPA learning include discussions, which allow learners to express opinions on topics relevant to their lives (Saputri et al., 2024). Role-playing helps them practice language use in simulated real-life situations. Presentations train formal speaking and the systematic organization of arguments. Other techniques like interviews and communication simulations encourage spontaneous and natural language use, helping learners gradually develop speaking skills appropriate to real contexts.

Writing skills can be developed using techniques that encourage structured and creative written expression. Writing daily journals allows learners to reflect on their experiences and feelings in written form (Ragam Info, 2024). Assignments like writing letters and essays help

expand their ability to adjust their writing style to communication goals. Writing reports about specific events trains accuracy, structure, and objective information delivery. Complementing these traditional practices, (Zarfsaz & Salamat, 2024) found that Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) techniques can effectively enhance writing performance by helping learners manage focus, reduce anxiety, and visualize their writing goals more clearly.

Creative writing activities such as composing short stories, poems, or drama scripts are also useful for stimulating imagination and artistic expression (Widya et al., 2023). When applying these techniques, it is important for teachers to consider learners' characteristics, learning goals, and create a motivating and supportive environment for optimal learning outcomes.

Factors Affecting Language Learning Effectiveness

Language learning effectiveness is determined by many factors (Putri & Yuhdi, 2021). These can be classified into internal and external factors. Internal factors come from within the individual, such as motivation, interest, aptitude, cognitive ability, and linguistic background (Putu et al., 2021). External factors come from outside the individual, including teaching methods, materials, learning environment, social support, and facilities (Erina Mifta Alvira et al., 2023).

Motivation and Linguistic Background of BIPA Students

Motivation and linguistic background are important factors that influence the success of BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers) students in learning the Indonesian language. Motivation, as one of the key factors, determines the level of engagement, persistence, and enthusiasm of students in the learning process (Syamsu, 2022). Students with high motivation tend to be more active in participating in learning activities, more persistent in facing challenges, and more focused on achieving their academic and professional goals. These motivations can come from various sources—such as a desire to communicate with Indonesian people, an interest in Indonesian culture, or the need to meet academic requirements or job demands. Other influencing factors include personality, attitudes toward the language, the role of the teacher, learning styles, and the relationship between languages (Syamsu, 2022).

Aside from motivation, the linguistic background of BIPA students also plays a significant role in determining the effectiveness of language learning. Students with prior experience in learning foreign languages—especially those with similar structure or vocabulary to Indonesian—tend to adapt more quickly (Syamsu, 2022). Their existing linguistic knowledge helps them understand grammar concepts, vocabulary usage, and sentence patterns in Indonesian, speeding up their second language acquisition process.

The Role of Environment and Communication Practice

A supportive learning environment plays a crucial role in enhancing the effectiveness of BIPA learning. A good learning environment includes a positive classroom atmosphere, strong interaction between teachers and students, and peer support (Erina Mifta Alvira et al., 2023). In addition, access to facilities such as libraries, language labs, and the internet also serves as an important supporting factor. A well-organized learning environment—backed by professional and creative teachers, an early start to language instruction, and a well-structured curriculum—has been shown to improve students' language skills (Syamsu, 2022).

Besides the environment, communication practice also plays a key role in BIPA learning. Students need opportunities to use Indonesian in real-life communication settings, both inside and outside the classroom. Communication practice can include activities like discussions, role-playing, presentations, interviews, and task-based projects. Through regular communication practice, students not only improve their speaking and listening skills but also enhance their reading and writing abilities in Indonesian.

This research will fill a gap in current studies by exploring how BIPA's curriculum, teaching methods, and communication practices specifically impact productive language skills, especially speaking and writing, among foreign learners. The novelty of this research lies in

providing new insights into how these factors interact within the context of Indonesian language learning for foreign speakers.

METHODS

Research Design

This study uses a mixed methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative research techniques (Riazi & Candlin, 2014). The study adopts a descriptive-analytical design, focusing on naturally occurring learning conditions rather than experimental manipulation (Pallawagau & Rasna, 2022). Participants were not randomly assigned to any groups; instead, they were observed within their natural classroom environments. The study was conducted as a within-subject design, where each participant completed one comprehensive questionnaire that included both closed- and open-ended items.

The quantitative component aimed to objectively measure the effectiveness of evaluation methods on productive language skills, while the qualitative component explored students' experiences and perceptions through open-ended responses (Afshar & Ranjbar, 2023).

Research Participants and Sampling Procedures

The target population in this study consisted of BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers) students enrolled at various educational institutions across Indonesia. Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on specific inclusion criteria: they had to be at the intermediate or advanced level of BIPA, have completed at least one full semester of coursework, and be willing to voluntarily participate in the research (Hasna Nabilah, 2023). A total of 100 students were recruited, representing a range of learning environments. All participants were provided with informed consent forms detailing the purpose of the study, their rights as participants, and the confidentiality of their responses. Participation was free to withdraw at any time without any consequences. No incentives were provided.

Sample Size, Power, and Precision

The final sample included 100 students, in line with recommended sample sizes for Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis involving multiple latent constructs. The study was designed to meet adequate statistical power, ensuring that relationships between variables could be examined with reasonable confidence. Although formal power calculations were not conducted, the sample size meets thresholds cited in prior research using similar methods (Siti Amaliyah, 2022).

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected over two months, from December 2024 to January 2025, through an online questionnaire shared with BIPA learners. The instrument was created in digital form using Google Forms to ensure wide accessibility. Before distribution, the questionnaire underwent a pilot test with five students to ensure clarity, language appropriateness, and ease of completion.

There were no manipulations or experimental conditions; students answered the questionnaire based on their actual learning experiences. Participation was anonymous and conducted in accordance with ethical research practices.

Measures and Covariates

The primary instrument was a **self-administered questionnaire** that included:

Closed-ended items for quantitative data, measuring students' perceptions of evaluation methods, their self-reported improvement in speaking and writing, and frequency of evaluation.

Open-ended questions allowing students to describe challenges, preferences, and suggestions regarding their learning and assessment experience.

The questionnaire covered variables such as feedback quality, frequency of speaking/writing evaluations, student motivation, and learning context .

Manipulations or Interventions

This study did not include any **intervention or experimental manipulation**. All data were collected based on students' existing classroom experiences and their retrospective reflection on evaluation practices. No control or experimental groups were established.

Data Analysis

The **quantitative data** were analyzed using **Partial Least Squares (PLS)**, a structural equation modeling (SEM) technique well-suited for studies involving complex relationships and small to medium sample sizes. PLS was applied to assess latent constructs such as feedback quality, evaluation methods, and their influence on speaking and writing performance. Measurement and structural model validity were tested using standard PLS procedures.

Additionally, **descriptive statistics** (means, frequencies, and percentages) were used to summarize participant demographics and response patterns (Siti Amaliyah, 2022), supporting the interpretation of results.

The **qualitative data** from open-ended responses were analyzed using **thematic analysis**. Responses were coded inductively to identify recurring themes related to learners' challenges, perceived usefulness of evaluation methods, and suggestions for improvement (Afshar & Ranjbar, 2023).

RESULTS

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics Analysis

Background information	Frequency	Valid %
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	48	48%
Female	52	52%
<i>Age</i>		
< 20 years	12	12%
20–30 years	78	78%
31–40 years	10	10%
<i>Education</i>		
High school	2	2%
Bachelor	72	72%
Master	26	26%
<i>BIPA Study Length</i>		
< 6 months	54	54%
6–12 months	41	41%
1 year	5	5%

<i>BIPA Learning Motivation</i>		
For study	86	86%
For jobs	3	3%
For daily necessities (living inIndonesia)	11	11%

The analysis of respondent characteristics shows a balanced gender distribution, with 48% male and 52% female. The majority of respondents are in the 20–30 years age range (78%), followed by 12% under 20 years old, and 10% aged 31–40 years. This indicates that most of the sample consists of young individuals who are generally more active in educational and language learning programs.

In terms of educational level, most respondents hold a Bachelor's degree (72%), while 26% have a Master's degree, and only 2% have completed up to high school. This high level of education suggests that respondents are likely to have higher expectations for the evaluation methods in their learning.

Based on the duration of their studies in the BIPA (Bahasa Indonesia for Foreign Speakers) program, the majority of respondents have studied for less than 6 months (54%), followed by 41% who have studied for 6–12 months, and only 5% who have studied for more than one year. This indicates that most participants are still in the early to intermediate stages of language learning. In terms of learning motivation, 86% of respondents participate in the program for academic purposes, while 11% study for daily life needs, and only 3% learn for work purposes. These findings show that language learning in this context is more driven by academic needs rather than professional or social reasons.

These characteristics emphasize the importance of developing evaluation methods that cater to the diverse needs of participants, especially those in the early stages of learning and with high academic motivation. With relatively high educational backgrounds, respondents are likely to have expectations for more structured and meaningful evaluation methods, thus requiring a more systematic approach to assess their learning outcomes.

Table 2. Measurement Model Analysis

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	AVE	Composite Reliability
<i>Language Evaluation Methods</i>			0.349	0.794
<i>LEM 1</i>	You receive a learning evaluation on the BIPA learning process that is undertaken	0.2223		
<i>LEM 2</i>	The evaluation in the form of a written test helped me understand my language skills.	0.746		
<i>LEM 3</i>	The direct speaking test is more effective than the written test in measuring productive ability	0.315		
<i>LEM 4</i>	Varied evaluation methods (e.g. oral, written, projected) helped me learn better.	0.773		
<i>LEM 5</i>	Project-based evaluation provides an opportunity to develop creative and productive abilities.	0.607		
<i>LEM 6</i>	The evaluation questions are presented clearly and according to my abilities	0.693		
<i>Int 7</i>	The use of technology in evaluation (e.g., online testing) increases the effectiveness of evaluation.	0.553		
<i>Int 8</i>	Evaluations involving group assignments can improve my speaking skills.	0.575		

Source: SEM-PLS data processing results (2024)

<i>Frequency of Evaluation</i>			0.190	0.535
<i>FOE 1</i>	Regular evaluations help me improve my language skills	0.250		
<i>FOE 2</i>	The current evaluation frequency is in accordance with my learning needs.	0.754		
<i>FOE 3</i>	Evaluating too often causes me to feel stressed.	0.584		
<i>FOE 4</i>	The lack of evaluation makes it difficult for me to know the development of my skills.	0.225		
<i>FOE 5</i>	The evaluation done only at the end of the semester was not enough to assess my progress	-0.033		
<i>FOE 6</i>	Conducting regular evaluations helps me focus on learning.	0.351		
<i>FOE 7</i>	The frequency of more frequent evaluations encourages me to be more consistent in learning	0.425		
<i>Availability of Feedback</i>			0.391	0.749
<i>AOF 1</i>	The feedback from the evaluation helped me understand my weaknesses.	0.661		
<i>AOF 2</i>	Teachers always provide feedback after the implementation of the evaluation.	0.797		
<i>AOF 3</i>	I feel more confident after receiving feedback from the teacher.	0.847		
<i>AOF 4</i>	The feedback provided helped me improve my speaking skills.	0.849		
<i>AOF 5</i>	Constructive feedback encourages me to study harder.	0.417		
<i>AOF 6</i>	The absence of feedback makes evaluation less useful.	-0.172		
<i>AOF 7</i>	Written feedback is more effective than verbal feedback	0.163		
<i>Language Learning Context</i>			0.279	0.711
<i>LLC 1</i>	Evaluations in formal classes helped me understand the material better.	0.657		
<i>LLC 2</i>	Evaluation activities outside the classroom are more interesting and relevant to me.	0.449		
<i>LLC 3</i>	A supportive learning environment increases the effectiveness of evaluation.	0.159		
<i>LLC 4</i>	Speaking practice outside of the classroom helped me prepare for oral evaluations	0.539		
<i>LLC 5</i>	Evaluation based on real-life situations (e.g., simulations) is more beneficial	0.490		
<i>LLC 6</i>	I am more confident when the evaluation is carried out in an informal setting.	0.572		
<i>LLC 7</i>	The appropriate context of the evaluation (e.g., relevant themes) encouraged me to be more engaged.	0.662		
<i>The Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Proficiency</i>			0.782	0.878
<i>TROE 1</i>	The evaluations carried out are relevant to my needs in daily life	0.892		
<i>TROE 2</i>	The results of the evaluation helped me to know how far my productive skills were developing.	0.877		

The measurement model is evaluated using factor loadings, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and Composite Reliability (CR) to test the validity and reliability of the constructs. AVE ≥ 0.5 indicates good validity, while CR ≥ 0.7 indicates strong internal consistency.

Language Evaluation Methods

The AVE for the LEM construct is 0.349 (below standard), indicating that the indicators do not fully explain the concept. However, the CR value of 0.794 shows satisfactory reliability.

Some indicators, such as LEM1 (0.2223) and LEM3 (0.315), have low values, while LEM2 (0.746) and LEM4 (0.773) contribute more strongly. There is a need to improve the weaker indicators to enhance the accuracy of measuring language evaluation.

Evaluation Frequency

AVE 0.190 and CR 0.535 indicate very low validity and reliability. Some indicators, such as FOE5 (-0.033), even have negative loadings. A revision of the statements in the instrument is required to align them better with students' perceptions of evaluation frequency.

Feedback Availability

AVE of 0.391 is still below the standard, but the CR of 0.749 indicates moderate reliability. The indicators AOF3 (0.847) and AOF4 (0.849) show that teacher feedback is considered important, while AOF6 (-0.172) and AOF7 (0.163) are less relevant. Improvements in feedback delivery are needed to make it more meaningful for students.

Language Learning Context

AVE of 0.279 and CR of 0.711 indicate weak validity and minimal reliability. Some indicators, such as LLC3 (0.159), contribute very little. The learning context needs to be more clearly defined to ensure evaluation aligns with students' needs.

Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Skills

The speaking and writing tests in this study are designed to measure various aspects of students' productive skills, such as fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and the ability to construct and present ideas logically, both orally and in writing (Hasna Nabilah, 2023). Additionally, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews are used to explore students' backgrounds, motivations, and perceptions regarding BIPA learning evaluations (Afshar & Ranjbar, 2023). The results show that the indicators of evaluation relevance to productive skills (TROE) have the best validity and reliability (AVE 0.782 and CR 0.878), with high scores on students' perceptions of the connection between evaluations and their actual skills. Students responded positively to evaluations that were contextual and project-based, especially those that supported speaking and writing skills in everyday life. Therefore, these instruments are considered effective in capturing the development of productive skills and could serve as an important reference in improving BIPA evaluation methods in the future.

Table 3. Structural Model Analysis

	R – Square	Adjusted R – Square
Language Evaluation Methods	0.468	0.446

Source: SEM-PLS data processing results (2024)

The R-Square value for Language Evaluation Methods is 0.468, meaning that 46.8% of the variability in language evaluation methods can be explained by the independent variables in the model. This value indicates a moderate level of predictive power, suggesting that there are other factors outside of the model that also influence language evaluation methods. Therefore, further research is needed to identify other variables that contribute to the effectiveness of language learning evaluation.

Table 4. f-Square Test Results Analysis

	Language Evaluation Methods
Frequency of Evaluation	0.190
Availability of Feedback	0.009
Language Learning Context	0.119
The Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Proficiency	0.007

Source: SEM-PLS data processing results (2024)

The f-Square test results show that among the independent variables, Frequency of Evaluation has the greatest influence ($f^2 = 0.190$), followed by Language Learning Context ($f^2 = 0.119$). Meanwhile, Availability of Feedback ($f^2 = 0.009$) and Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Skills ($f^2 = 0.007$) have very small effects.

These findings indicate that the frequency of evaluation and the learning context have a greater impact on students' perceptions of evaluation methods than feedback or relevance of the evaluation itself. In other words, how often students are evaluated and how supportive their learning environment is play a larger role in shaping the effectiveness of evaluation methods. This suggests that strengthening routine evaluation systems and grounding them in the learning context can improve students' experience and understanding in language learning.

Table 5. Hypothesis Testing Results

	Original sample (O)	TStatistic (O/STDEV)	P Values	Information
Frequency of Evaluation→ Language Evaluation Methods	0.347	3.601	0.000	H1 is accepted
Availability of Feedback→ Language Evaluation Methods	0.097	0.757	0.450	H2 is not accepted
Language Learning Context→ Language Evaluation Methods	0.362	3.154	0.002	H3 is accepted
The Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Proficiency→ Language Evaluation Methods	0.078	0.773	0.440	H4 is not accepted

Source: SEM-PLS data processing results (2024)

The hypothesis testing results show the factors that influence *Language Evaluation Methods. Frequency of Evaluation* ($\beta = 0.347$, $p < 0.000$) and *Language Learning Context* ($\beta = 0.362$, $p = 0.002$) have a significant positive effect, thus H1 and H3 are accepted. This means that frequent evaluation and a supportive learning environment can improve the effectiveness of the applied evaluation methods.

On the other hand, Availability of Feedback ($\beta = 0.097$, $p = 0.450$) and Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Skills ($\beta = 0.078$, $p = 0.440$) show no significant effect, thus H2 and H4 are rejected. This indicates that while feedback is important, the way it is delivered may not be effective enough to enhance students' learning experience. Additionally, students may not feel that current evaluation methods directly improve their productive language skills, suggesting a need for evaluation methods to be better aligned with real-world language use.

DISCUSSIONS

Frequency of Evaluation and Language Evaluation Methods

The results show that the frequency of evaluation significantly affects language evaluation methods ($\beta = 0.347$, $p < 0.001$). Frequent evaluation allows students to monitor their progress, reinforce their understanding, and maintain learning consistency. This aligns with research by (Black & Wiliam, 2009), who emphasize the importance of continuous formative assessment in improving student learning outcomes. Formative assessments provide regular feedback that helps students identify their strengths and weaknesses, enabling them to adjust their learning strategies effectively (Black & Wiliam, 2009). With regular evaluations, students can better focus on addressing their weaknesses and gain a clearer understanding of the expected learning standards.

Availability of Feedback and Language Evaluation Methods

The hypothesis that feedback influences language evaluation methods was not supported significantly ($\beta = 0.097$, $p = 0.450$). This suggests that the feedback given to students may be ineffective or not well-structured, and therefore does not have a significant impact on their learning experience. Feedback that is too general, non-specific, or not given in a timely manner may reduce its value. Shute (2008) highlights the importance of focused, specific, and timely feedback in improving learning. Effective feedback should provide clear information about what has been done well, areas that need improvement, and concrete steps to make progress (Shute, 2008). Hence, more detailed, constructive, and relevant feedback mechanisms are needed to help students understand their weaknesses and improve their language skills more effectively.

Language Learning Context and Language Evaluation Methods

The language learning context has been proven to significantly influence the evaluation methods used ($\beta = 0.362$, $p = 0.002$). This means that a supportive and relevant learning environment is very important for effective evaluation. Evaluation methods designed to reflect real-life language use are more meaningful for students. (Rukmini & Saputri, 2017) emphasize the importance of implementing authentic assessment, which involves tasks relevant to the real world. These tasks allow students to demonstrate their ability to use language meaningfully—for example, through collaborative projects, engaging presentations, or simulated interactions in professional settings. As a result, students may feel more comfortable and better prepared to use language productively because the evaluation reflects the skills needed in daily life.

Relevance of Evaluation to Productive Skills

The relationship between the relevance of evaluation and productive skills is not significant ($\beta = 0.078$, $p = 0.440$). This shows that current evaluation methods may not fully capture students' productive skills effectively. Evaluations based on written tests or standard quizzes might not be enough to assess real speaking and writing abilities. Therefore, more performance-oriented evaluation methods are needed—such as project-based assessments, presentations, or real-life interaction simulations—to ensure the evaluation reflects the actual productive skills students need.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that the effectiveness of learning productive skills in the BIPA program is greatly influenced by the frequency of evaluation, learning context, and the quality of the instruments used. Routine evaluation within a relevant learning context helps students monitor their speaking and writing skill development, reinforces understanding, and boosts motivation and confidence.

The use of various instruments—speaking tests, writing tests, questionnaires, and interviews—proves to offer a comprehensive picture of student progress, especially when evaluations are conducted through performative approaches like monologues, dialogues, and project-based tasks simulating real-life situations. However, findings also show that the feedback provided during evaluation is still not specific enough and has not fully driven optimal skill improvement.

Therefore, it is necessary to develop an evaluation system that focuses not only on outcomes but also on processes, emphasizing feedback that is applicable, contextual, and encourages self-reflection. Further research is recommended to explore additional factors such as learning motivation, technological support, and innovative pedagogical approaches to improve the overall quality of evaluation and the effectiveness of BIPA learning.

REFERENCES

- Afshar, H. S., & Ranjbar, N. (2023). Mixed Methods Research in Applied Linguistics: The Status quo of the Current Issues and Practices. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(1), 49–74. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2023.121272>
- Alda Kahfifah Ritonga, N. A. F. Z. P. I. M. D. R. T. H. (2024). Keterampilan Bahasa Produktif Sebagai Fondasi Penting bagi Kesuksesan Akademik dan Karier. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(3).
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Cholifah, M. (2019). Pengajaran Bahasa Berbasis Tugas (Task Based Language Teaching): Pendekatan yang Efektif Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 4(2), 131–139. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jibs.v4i2.3187>
- Dey, M. (2023). Book Review: Understanding Second Language Acquisition. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 26(1), 408–410. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i1.5953>
- Enamul Hoque, M., Enamul Hoque Director, M., & Bangladesh, E. (2017). *An Introduction to the Second Language Acquisition*. EDRC, Dhaka, Bangladesh. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335690866>
- Erina Mifta Alvira, Arel Vaganza, Andromeda Putri, & Bagus Setiawan. (2023). Analisis Permasalahan Belajar : Faktor-Faktor Efektivitas Proses Pembelajaran Pada Siswa. *JURNAL PENDIDIKAN DAN ILMU SOSIAL (JUPENDIS)*, 2(1), 142–153. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jupendis.v2i1.1186>
- Hasna Nabilah, K. (2023). Penerapan Media Kotak Wayang Bermuatan Wawasan Keindonesiaan Pada Keterampilan Berbicara Bipa 3. *Jeil| Journal Educational of Indonesia Language*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36269/jeil.v4i2.800>
- Huda, K. (2022). Membangun Keterampilan Berbahasa Terstruktur Dan Produktif Yang Membangun Pikiran Dalam Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Edutraind : Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pelatihan*, 6(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.37730/edutraind.v6i1.162>

- Khan Monib, W., & ur Rahman Hadi, H. (2025). Determinant Factors Influencing English Speaking Skill among Undergraduates: Challenges and Remedial Strategies. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture*, 10(1).
<https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v10i1.3351>
- Khoirunnisa, P., & Nuriah, S. S. (2024). Metode-Metode Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa: GTM (Grammar Translation Method) The Direct Method, Audio Lingual, The Silent Way. *KARIMAH TAUHID*, 3(5).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i5.13220>
- Kosasih, L., & Leksono, R. P. (2021). Bahasa Indonesia for Foreigners (BIPA) Text Books Challenges to Prepare Students' Readiness in the Working World. *Nuances of Indonesian Language*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.51817/nila.v1i1.19>
- Kurniawan, R., Zaini Miftah, M., & Qamariah, Z. (2020). Grammar-Translation Method Affects Students' Reading Comprehension and Motivation. *International Journal of Research on English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1).
- Maedeh Alemi, E. T. (2017). Audio Lingual Method.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293731529>
- Marsevani, M., Bal Jannate Raj Kaur, Gabriela Micheline Slikker, Jennifer Wiwit, & Desty Febria. (2024). Design of BIPA Teaching Materials in the Riau Islands Context for Darmasiswa Students. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 8(3), 488–498.
<https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v8i3.75929>
- Melati, I. K., Iswatiningasih, D., & Wuriyanto, A. B. (2022). Strategi Pembelajaran Bipa Dengan Pendekatan Komunikatif-Kontekstual Berbasis Kearifan Lokal. *Jurnal Kajian Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.24114/bss.v11i2.37351>
- Mulyaningsih, I. (2024). Pengembangan Kurikulum BIPA di Jurusan Tadris Bahasa Indonesia. *Bahasa: Jurnal Keilmuan Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 4(2), 148–155.
<https://doi.org/10.26499/bahasa.v4i2.777>
- Nugraheni, A. S., Siwi, A. A., & Sulistiawati, A. (2024). BIPA Learning Based on Ecolinguistics on the Listening and Speaking Skills of BIPA Students in Vietnam. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 5(2), 274–283.
<https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v5i2.1259>
- Nurarifah, L., Imah, N. ', Putri, R. A., & Hardiyanti, M. (2025). Improving English Speaking through Media in the Digital Age. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v10i1.3107>
- Pallawagau, B., & Rasna, R. (2022). Pemerolehan Bahasa Asing Sebagai Bahasa Kedua (Kajian Pemerolehan Bahasa Arab). *Journal of Arabic Education and Linguistics*, 2(2), 64–76.
<https://doi.org/10.24252/jael.v2i2.31151>
- Putri, R. A., & Yuhdi, A. (2021). Efektivitas Pembelajaran Daring Bahasa Indonesia Kelas Xii SMA Rk Deli Murni Bandar Baru. *Eunoia: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 1(1).
<http://jurnaltarbiyah.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/eunoia/userJournal>
- Putu, N., Damayanti, A., Negeri, S. D., & Jembrana, D. (2021). Efektivitas Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Dengan Google Classroom Terhadap Minat Baca Saat Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(2). <http://jayapanguspress.penerbit.org/index.php/cetta>
- Ragam Info. (2024, October 17). Mengenal Keterampilan Bahasa yang Keduanya Bukan Bersifat Reseptif | kumparan.com. *Kumparan.Com*. <https://kumparan.com/ragam-info/mengenal-keterampilan-bahasa-yang-keduanya-bukan-bersifat-reseptif-23jTLcm4JaQ>
- Reflinaldi, R., Faisol, Y., Hadi, S., & Ilyas, E. (2024). How to Build Strategic Communication: Speech Act Analysis on King Salman's Speeches at the United Nations General Assembly. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Research*, 4(1), 11–21.
<https://doi.org/10.51817/jpdr.v4i1.742>
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135–173.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000505>

- Rosmalela Sidik. (2022). Analisis Kurikulum BIPA bagi Ekspatriat Jepang. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 22–38. <https://doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxx>
- Rukmini, D., & Saputri, L. A. D. E. (2017). The authentic assessment to measure students' English productive skills based on 2013 Curriculum. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 263–273. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8128>
- Sa'diatunnisah, I. N. S. S. R. H. I. (2023). Analisis Keterampilan Berbahasa Produktif Siswa Kelas VII di SMPN 5 Mataram Tahun Pembelajaran 2023/2024. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 2(1). <http://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JUPBAS/index>
- Saputri, F. T., Amanda, D., Pajira, N., Naibaho, M. A., Meipia, T. A., & Putri, A. (2024). Meningkatkan Perkembangan Bahasa Indonesia Anak Usia Dini Melalui Penggunaan Metode Bercerita. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 2(7), 62–65. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12509100>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Simanjutak, E., Naelofaria, S., & Wulandari, A. (2024). Indonesian Teaching Materials for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) Level B2 Integrated North Sumatra Culture Based on Book Creator. The European Union Digital Library (EUDL). <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.24-10-2023.2342124>
- Siti Amaliyah, D. S. (2022). Analisis Metodologi dan Materi Buku Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 5(1), 44–51. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/diskursus.v5i1.12540>
- Stephen D. Krashen. (2013). Second Language Acquisition: Theory, Applications and Some Conjectures. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/second-language-acquisition/F143D2DC137377E45F2588441A949701>
- Syamsu, P. K. (2022). Faktor-faktor Efektivitas Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, 11(2), 187–207.
- Widya, A., Jurnal, :, Dasar, P., Nanang, O., Fadli, N., Fitrotul Laili, N., Zahro, F., Fikri, M., & Nasir, A. (2023). Pembinaan Keterampilan Berbicara dan Menulis Bahasa Jawa Kelas 3 Di Madrasah Ibtidaiyyah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Fakultas Dharma Acarya Universitas Hindu Negeri*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25078/aw.v8i2.2710>
- Zahra, F., & Arbaoui, E. L. (2024). Implementing Task-Based Approach in ESP Education: Business Schools as a Case Study. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v9i2.3178>
- Zareian, G., & Jodaei, H. (2015). Motivation in Second Language Acquisition: A State of the Art Article. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education*, 5(2), 2223–4934.
- Zarfsaz, E., & Salamat, M. (2024). The Effect of Using NLP Techniques on the Writing Ability of EFL Learners. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v8i2.2952>